



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on the Status of Women

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 047

PUBLIC PART ONLY - PARTIE PUBLIQUE SEULEMENT

Monday, January 30, 2023

Chair: Mrs. Karen Vecchio



Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Monday, January 30, 2023

• (1100)
[English]

The Chair (Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC)): Good morning, everyone. Welcome to meeting number 47 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Status of Women.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted on October 31, 2022, the committee will resume its study of women and girls in sport.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format pursuant to the House order of June 23, 2022. Members are attending in person in the room and remotely using the Zoom application.

I would like to make a few comments for the benefit of the witnesses and members.

Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. For those participating by video conference, click on the microphone icon to activate your mike, and please mute yourself when you are not speaking.

For interpretation for those on Zoom, you have the choice at the bottom of your screen of either floor, English or French audio. For those in the room, you can use the earpiece and select the desired channel.

I will remind you that all comments should be addressed through the chair.

For members in the room, if you wish to speak, please raise your hand. For members on Zoom, please use the "raise hand" function. The clerk and I will manage the speaking order as best we can. We appreciate your patience and understanding in this regard.

In accordance with our routine motion, I am informing the committee that all witnesses have completed the required connection tests in advance of the meeting.

Before we welcome our witnesses, I would like to provide this trigger warning. This continues to be a difficult study. We will be discussing experiences related to abuse. This may be triggering to viewers, members or staff with similar experiences. If you feel distressed or if you need help, please advise the clerk.

I would now like to welcome our witnesses.

As an individual, we have Professor Gretchen Kerr, who is online. From Gymnastics Canada, we have Ian Moss, chief executive officer, who we have right in front of us here on the panel. From the

Office of the Sport Integrity Commissioner, OSIC, we have Sarah-Ève Pelletier, sport integrity commissioner.

I am now going to pass it over to Gretchen Kerr for opening remarks.

Gretchen, you have the floor for five minutes.

Dr. Gretchen Kerr (Professor, As an Individual): That's wonderful. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear before your committee. The challenges that this committee is addressing are so important and have significant potential to bring about long-needed changes to the culture of sport in Canada.

My remarks today are informed by a long history of engagement in sport, including as a former elite gymnast and coach. I have been researching gender-based violence and gender equity in sport for over 30 years and have applied this expertise to the development of the UCCMS, for which I was the subject matter expert. I was a contributing author to the Coaching Association of Canada's safe sport modules and recently published a book entitled *Gender-Based Violence in Children's Sport*. I have served as a volunteer case manager for Gymnastics Canada and as co-director of the national gender equity in sport research hub. My current role is as dean of the faculty of kinesiology and physical education at the University of Toronto.

In these brief opening remarks, I'd like to address three key points.

The first is that the substantial body of research in the area of gender-based violence in sport confirms what athletes have been reporting. The second is that addressing gender-based violence in sport requires systemic change, including system alignment. The third is that we must build upon what we already know and what has already been done to address gender-based violence—including from international examples and previous research—and identify what works in order to advance the progress made thus far.

I'll review each of these three points in greater detail.

A wealth of research evidence exists that spans decades, including research conducted in Canada with Canadians. For example, in 2019, of 1,000 Canadian national team members representing over 60 sports, 23% said they experienced psychological violence on a repeated basis, 21% experienced neglect, 7% experienced sexual violence and 3% experienced physical violence. These were all on a repeated basis, not one-offs. Importantly, these findings from Canada have been replicated in other westernized countries, which is important because it points to common denominators across the culture of sport and confirms athletes' accounts of their experiences.

We also know from research evidence that athletes have not had access to safe, transparent and trauma-informed places to go with their disclosures or reports of maltreatment. There are many reasons for this, including structural barriers, which leads to my second point.

Addressing gender-based violence in sport requires systemic changes, including system alliance. It's a systemic issue and therefore needs systemic solutions. We need to go well beyond police checks and ridding the system of bad actors; we need to address everything from policies to education, complaint mechanisms, support for survivors, jurisdictional constraints, funding and other incentives. It also means addressing the challenges presented by the multi-jurisdictional structure of sport in Canada, including resolving the gap that exists in awareness, policies and practices between NSOs and their PT counterparts and with those sport programmes offered outside of government jurisdiction entirely. Important next steps include alignment of all jurisdictions so that athletes at every level of sport in Canada have access to safe sport, gender equity policies, education, independent complaint mechanisms and support.

Finally, it's important to build upon what we already know, and we know a lot. For example, the 2019 prevalence study of national team athletes informed the development of the UCCMS and the OSIC. Similarly, the majority of the 2019 AthletesCAN recommendations have been fulfilled. We are making progress.

Of course, we have further to go. The recommendations from the 2018 FPT working group on women and girls in sport and the 2019 Red Deer Declaration have not been fully implemented and thus provide important road maps for next steps.

The introduction of OSIC is important in offering assurances of the independence that athletes need in order to report without fear of repercussions. Of course, OSIC will need time to gain the confidence of the sport community.

- (1105)

While the implementation of the UCCMS is a critical step forward, it needs to be adopted by all sport organizations at all levels in Canada.

The Chair: Thank you, Gretchen. I'm going to have to cut you off there. We're already over time. You will be able to finish up some of these comments during your questions.

I'm now going to pass it over to Ian Moss with Gymnastics Canada.

Ian, you have the floor for five minutes.

Mr. Ian Moss (Chief Executive Officer, Gymnastics Canada):

Thanks for inviting Gymnastics Canada to attend this meeting. I'm here to answer any questions the committee members may have as truthfully and openly as I possibly can.

We are deeply committed to support and advance recommendations that will help to make sport safer and more inclusive and equitable. While the focus of this committee is on girls and women in sport, the comments I offer are focused on the importance of creating an environment and culture that will positively impact all participants.

I have been working in sport since 1990 in a variety of roles. I share this because I have witnessed many attempts to modernize our fractured and outdated sport system over the last three decades, with limited success. In my opinion, until the system itself is modernized, we will continue to react to the emergence of new issues rather than proactively creating a solid foundation that's designed to mitigate risks related to safety, cheating, poor governance and maltreatment. We can't have good sport without modernizing the system, and for this reason I believe we ought to focus on modernizing the systems and structures that underpin sport.

Recently there have been calls to hold another Dubin-like inquiry. It's important to note that Dubin himself articulated that it was less about dealing with doping as a singular issue, but rather to address the moral crisis affecting the health and vitality of sport. He argued that sport required society to examine the values attached to the sector. Sport is now grappling with a more insidious moral crisis that would benefit from a re-examination of the root causes that continue to give rise to unethical conduct. Unless we address the root causes, more issues will continue to surface, and the sport system, as depleted and disconnected as it is, simply cannot bear the load of increased expectations as society continues to shift. We must modernize the system.

Gymnastics Canada has been one of the sports that have been at the centre of the safety in sport crisis. As with any issue, there are multiple perspectives and complexities that far exceed my capacity to articulate today.

The recently released McLaren group review of gymnastics in Canada provides a detailed précis of not only the current challenges facing the gymnastics community, but also a way forward in our collective desire to foster a safe and welcoming culture. The report and ensuing recommendations help us better understand some of the current limitations while, importantly, offering structural, cultural, financial and operational considerations to effect meaningful and sustainable change.

We need to start measuring what matters most to our collective community. The current sport system has not kept up with the contemporary humanistic approaches that are required to thrive in our increasingly complex environment. Once we start to measure alignment with cultural values we will be in a better position to meet societal expectations.

I commend the committee for providing sport leaders with a platform to examine the many outdated practices and approaches in sport that have contributed to unsafe environments. I believe this is a much-needed conversation in order for our system to change. While uncomfortable, it's critically important for sport to shift into the 21st century if we are to ensure a safe, welcoming and thriving culture and environment for all participants.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

• (1110)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll now pass it over online to Sarah-Ève Pelletier from the Office of the Sport Integrity Commissioner.

Sarah, you have five minutes.

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier (Sport Integrity Commissioner, Office of the Sport Integrity Commissioner): Madam Chair, members of the committee, thank you for your invitation and for your work on this important and troubling issue for people in the sport community.

Sport should be a positive, welcoming and enriching experience for everyone involved. That experience should be about joy, about friendship and about growth. This is the kind of experience I'm privileged to take away from my own participation as a former athlete.

Unfortunately, as demonstrated by powerful and heartbreaking testimonies before and outside of this study, as well as by studies about the prevalence of maltreatment, it is clear that too many have experienced harm in their sport journey. Even one experience of maltreatment is too many. It simply is not what sport is all about.

I have been guided by a deep motivation to act as a positive agent of change for sport, with the athletes at the heart of it. This is the same motivation that drove me to step into this role eight months ago, at such an urgent time for sport.

[*Translation*]

The Office of the Sport Integrity Commissioner shares your vision that all participants in Canadian sport should benefit from quality, inclusive, accessible, welcoming and safe sport experiences.

We are working hard to make sport safer by actively addressing the issues, while also broadening our services to support those who are reaching out.

We are nowhere near where we want to be and acknowledge that much more work is needed to attain this vision. As we build the foundations of this program, we note that sport in our country is in dire need of harmonized rules around maltreatment in sport and how to address it. The Universal Code of Conduct to Prevent and Address Maltreatment in Sport, or UCCMS, provides a strong foundation at the national level. However, the current lack of consistency in the rules and their application at the different levels of sports participation remains an important gap to be addressed.

I echo the recommendations made by other witnesses who have appeared that education and prevention are required at all levels to truly effect the sustainable change in culture that is needed.

We are attentive to feedback from athletes and others directly impacted by experiences of harm. We continue to work diligently and relentlessly to strengthen our processes.

We are building. We are a place where people can now go for help. And just like this committee today, we are listening, adapting and doing everything within our power to make sport safer.

Thank you for listening and thank you again for your important work.

• (1115)

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll now start our rounds of questions. For the first round of questions, each party will be granted six minutes before I ask them to wrap up.

I'll start off with CPC and Anna Roberts.

Anna, you have the floor for six minutes.

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

Thank you for joining us today. As we discussed in previous meetings, this issue has been going on for too long. It's time to act. Enough has been said. Enough witnesses have come forward. We're sitting idle and not protecting the most innocent people in our country.

I guess I'll start with Mr. Ian Moss.

You mentioned that with Gymnastics Canada, your primary job is to protect the athletes. Was I correct in hearing that?

Mr. Ian Moss: Yes.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: In protecting the athletes, what I'd like to know is this: How much money does Gymnastics Canada receive from Sport Canada?

Mr. Ian Moss: That's no problem at all. We receive essentially a core grant, like many national sport bodies do. That has been the same for the last decade. It's roughly a million dollars a year.

We also get what they call top-up funding through the Own the Podium process, which is a combination of Sport Canada and Olympic committee money. That currently totals also about a million dollars.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: In total, then, it's approximately \$2 million per year.

Mr. Ian Moss: Yes.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Does Gymnastics Canada receive money from the registration fees collected by local clubs?

Mr. Ian Moss: That's correct as well. Yes. We get eight dollars per participant across the country.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Okay.

From two separate media reports, you as the high-performance director were aware of allegations against Alex Brad and Scott McFarlane. Did you take any measures to suspend the coach and investigate the allegations?

Mr. Ian Moss: I believe you're referring to Alex Bard.

I am fully aware of those situations, of course, because I was central, certainly to the Alex Bard matter. As in every decision I take, it was based on facts. As such, I made decisions related to Alex Bard's position initially and then the contractual termination based on the facts I had available to me.

With Scott McFarlane, with respect, that was a criminal case that we didn't have any actual involvement with, because it was through the criminal process. If I may clarify that, obviously there was an employee before me who was involved with the Scott McFarlane case at the Ottawa gymnastics club, though, so I wasn't directly involved.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Help me understand something. I was reading some information from CBC.

In 2017 a complaint about Brad was taken directly to you. Months before, Brad was promoted to head coach. Brad was allowed to resign.

The Chair: I think you're referring to Bard. Is that correct?

Mrs. Anna Roberts: I'm sorry. Yes, it's Bard. I apologize.

He was allowed to continue to coach, even though it was known that these allegations had been made. How can we protect our young athletes when we haven't fully, for lack of a better word, punished the individuals who created these situations?

Our athletes are struggling. We've heard it from many athletes. It's disturbing to me, as a mother and previously a recreational athlete, that we are allowing these individuals to get away with it.

Mr. Ian Moss: It is a very difficult scenario, of course. I'm in a position in which I have to ensure that there is due process in everything we do, which is based on facts. While allegations come forward, they have to be based on factual evidence.

When the decision was ultimately made in regard to Mr. Bard, that decision was based on factual evidence that was available to me.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: How many complaints were filed? Can you tell us that?

Mr. Ian Moss: There was ultimately one complaint filed, and action was taken. It was not in respect to abuse and maltreatment.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Was that complaint investigated?

Mr. Ian Moss: It was not, because it was a code-of-conduct complaint, and a decision was made in terms of a contractual matter.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Were any other complaints referred to any other...? Were there none?

• (1120)

Mr. Ian Moss: With respect to Mr. Bard, that is, to date, the only complaint I have on file.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Would you say that the witness who came forward to make the complaint was able to articulate what her situation was so you could pursue it further?

Mr. Ian Moss: I'm sorry, but I would just like to clarify. With respect to the formal complaint that came forward, which ultimately resulted in the termination of his contract, yes, that individual did not come to me but it came through a board member. The decision was made collectively to terminate him based on that.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: He is not allowed to coach anymore. Is that correct?

Mr. Ian Moss: No, that's not correct. It was a contractual matter that was dealt with. This was not an issue of abuse and maltreatment. This was a code-of-conduct issue.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: I don't understand that.

We have a complaint against this individual, and an investigation is not necessary because it was a code-of-conduct issue. Can you explain what that means? I'm totally confused.

Mr. Ian Moss: That's fair. I totally understand the confusion.

Obviously our system is based on a whole series of policies and procedures. We have to follow those policies and procedures based on that requirement.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Human factors don't—

The Chair: Anna, I'm sorry, but your minutes are up. I'll get back to you.

I'm going to pass it over now to Jenna Sudds for six minutes.

Ms. Jenna Sudds (Kanata—Carleton, Lib.): Thank you very much, Chair, and thank you to all of the witnesses for being here with us today.

I'd like to start my questions with Ms. Pelletier. We heard, in your testimony, about your ambition for OSIC, obviously, and the mandate that you have but also the sentiment that much more is needed in order to ensure that we are protecting athletes.

I'm wondering if you can speak to the limits of the powers you have currently and perhaps even what additional powers you feel you could use in order to fulfill your vision and mandate.

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: I will start with limitations.

The first thing I'd like to acknowledge is that today we have the ability to receive and look into matters that relate to maltreatment and discrimination. Whenever we have the ability to look into those matters, we do. When we don't, we try to provide the best help and empower those who come forward with the means and the tools to have options, and to know what types of resources they can access.

We realize, as of today, that some cases that come to us are inadmissible. We then look at where we can redirect those inadmissible cases. In less than one-third of those cases, we are able to find an alternative mechanism.

What I'm referring to here are what I would call the current gaps in our system at the different levels of participation. Our mandate, within OSIC, is primarily at the national level, but we know that coaches, athletes and participants experience sport at all levels of the system—at the local and provincial level. That is one limitation. I would call it a systemic limitation to our existing mandate, but it is something that could be solved collectively if all levels of the system were joined together.

In terms of our powers, we have powers that are effective. We can impose sanctions against individuals who have committed violations. We have the power to compel participation by those who have signed on to our processes. We also have the mandate to maintain a registry of sanctions.

Those are three things we feel are very necessary in order to have an effective mechanism that will truly serve its purpose, but the way our jurisdiction and mandate are currently construed, there are some limitations to those three aspects that I mentioned.

I would be happy to provide you with further details on each of those, if that's of interest.

Ms. Jenna Sudds: That's excellent.

I want to make sure I understood. One of the things I heard you say was that one of your limitations was around the admissibility of cases if they are not at the national level. Am I understanding that correctly?

If someone comes forward with an instance that is under the jurisdiction of a province or a territory at the local level, you currently don't have the tools to address that situation. Is that correct?

• (1125)

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: The tools to address that situation are inconsistent for the time being, because they would rely on whether there was an existing solution in place at those provincial or territorial levels. What I want to speak to are the gaps and inconsistencies in how that is currently happening at the provincial, territorial or simply local club levels.

In some instances, there is a system in place, such as in the province of Quebec. If, based on the circumstances, there is an ability to inform the person who comes forward of that option, and to help alleviate, as much as possible, the burden of having to navigate yet another system, that is something we'll do.

The weaknesses, or the gaps that I'm flagging, are that those systems are not currently in place everywhere. There are instances in which individuals come to us to address their matter, and we're not able to address their matter. Essentially, it could be that there is no alternative forum where we can provide that option to them.

Ms. Jenna Sudds: If I'm understanding you correctly, and please clarify... You used Quebec as an example. Quebec would have an office similar to OSIC in place to address issues at the provincial level, whereas currently other provinces and territories in Canada do not. Is that correct?

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: Yes.

In terms of the inconsistencies we face, Quebec may have a set of rules, and may have a system to address the breach of conduct for those rules, both in terms of having harmonized rules that apply to all participants, and having an effective system to respond to potential issues. Those are gaps that we currently see.

Ms. Jenna Sudds: Is there a mechanism, or a will, for provinces or territories to sign on, or to participate, with OSIC, as other national organizations have?

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: The services of the OSIC are also available to the provinces and territories. They may join if that corresponds to their needs. Of course, our office can offer those services to the designated provinces and territories, or we can also work in collaboration with an alternative mechanism if that is the preferred option.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

I'm now going to turn the floor over to Andréanne Larouche.

You have six minutes.

[*Translation*]

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

Thank you to the witnesses for being here and taking part in this important study.

I get the impression that, the more we look into this, the more troubling facts we uncover.

I have questions for all of the witnesses, but I will start with Ms. Pelletier.

In your opening remarks, you stated that the Office of the Sport Integrity Commissioner should be inclusive and accessible. Unfortunately, it is clear that this is not the case at the moment.

Commissioner, with respect, I find the government's reaction to this independent inquiry, which has been requested by a number of people, to be strange. It is also strange not to give the athletes more say. Based on what we see in the media, it looks like this is just the tip of the iceberg. The Office of the Sport Integrity Commissioner estimates that 66% of the complaints, or two-thirds, have been deemed inadmissible.

There is widespread public support for an independent public inquiry. In addition, a number of researchers, including professor Gretchen Kerr, confirmed that this has been a topic of research for decades now.

I commend the leadership of Scholars Against Abuse in Canadian Sport, which compiled these studies. This past summer, the researchers' studies were mentioned during the study conducted by the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. All of the experts and academic institutions can't be wrong. I hope the call for an independent public inquiry to shed light on this abuse and maltreatment will be heard. The Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sports is also calling for an independent inquiry.

I will get straight to the point: this independent inquiry will be invaluable, Ms. Pelletier, because things are not well in Canadian sport in general right now.

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: Your remarks and all the points you raised are very important and bring to light the fact that there is indeed a great deal of work to do. We are at a watershed moment in sport.

Since its creation eight months ago, the office has been working hard to move forward and be there for people. As I said earlier, when people come to the office, our primary goal is to support them, give them information and help them, even if it is outside the office's mandate. Obviously, we all want the system to be flawless. That way, anyone with a concern or problem would have somewhere to go.

I assure you that our primary focus, whether it falls within our mandate or not, is to support people by providing them with resources, from our program or elsewhere.

• (1130)

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: You went over all the obstacles your office faces when responding to victims' requests.

In October 2022, when coming out of a caucus meeting, the Minister of Sport told the media that the office had been mandated to conduct an independent investigation. There has been no reaction from Sport Canada, even though it has now been three months.

Is progress being made in the investigation? Could you tell the committee about the results of your work? What is the scope of your mandate? Which witnesses have you heard from?

Will you be consulting the public and responding to the minister's call made back in October?

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: You spoke about the limitations of our powers. I can tell you that, in a few months of operations, we have identified instances to make our process even more effective.

I just want to clarify that we have very effective powers that allow us to investigate cases, study them and impose sanctions on individuals who allegedly committed violations. These are powers we have and that we exercise. So far, it has worked.

Is the system perfect as it is now? No, because it is still being developed. There is much work yet to be done and we will have the opportunity to improve it.

I think what you are referring to in terms of investigation powers concerns sport environment assessments. It's the second component that empowers the office not only to investigate actions by individuals, but also to conduct assessments of various sport environments. We know there are systemic problems in some sport environments. It is therefore not just a question of the actions of a few individuals. Once an assessment has been completed, we issue recommendations. In addition, the office will also closely monitor the implementation of the recommendations in the environment...

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: Ms. Pelletier, I have to interrupt you as my speaking time is up.

It seems that you do not have all the resources or the staff you need to respond effectively to all of the legal investigations.

[English]

The Chair: Thanks so much.

We will be sure to get back to Andréanne on her next round.

I'm now going to pass it over to Leah Gazan for six minutes.

You have the floor, Leah.

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Thank you so much. My first questions are for Dr. Kerr.

I just started this study. It's very new to me. I've never followed organized sports. However, I know that, particularly in gymnastics, there has been a long and violent history of abuse of little kids.

Do you agree, yes or no, with a national judicial review or inquiry in regard to what's currently happening in sports?

Dr. Gretchen Kerr: I believe that our time and resources are better spent in other ways.

The calls for judicial—

Ms. Leah Gazan: I have limited time.

I asked you that because you submitted a brief to the Standing Committee on the Status of Women in December 2022, and you said that in your opinion there were avenues available for redress other than opting into a judicial inquiry—and you're sharing that—to investigate maltreatment in Canadian sport.

However, the former minister for sport came out in the media last week saying the exact opposite.

I'll quote Kirsty Duncan, who is a former minister of sport: "It should not be a fight. I'm asking for the protection of athletes and children. There should never have been pushback." This is what Duncan told the CBC in an exclusive interview. She went on to state, "I will not stand idly by while there are athletes, children and young people hurting in this country. And I do not accept the status quo. And if [we] do not push for an inquiry, it means accepting the status quo. And I will not be complicit."

That came from the former minister. I mean, that's clear. She would have known what was going on as the minister.

Do you agree that there is some truth to what she's saying? Because of the rampant amounts of abuse, doesn't this call for a national inquiry in light of all the allegations and confirmed cases of abuse coming out in sport?

• (1135)

Dr. Gretchen Kerr: Well, I and others would argue that we cannot allow the status quo to continue. However, I would also argue that there are better paths forward than a judicial inquiry. The judicial inquiry will give us information we already have in terms of prevalence, effects, causes and so on. It will detract from the progress that we're making thus far. We have the information we need to implement change and to make those changes.

Ms. Leah Gazan: I'm sorry, but because I have limited time and you've already submitted a report, I'd like to ask you a couple of other questions.

Do you act in an advisory capacity for other sport organizations, such as COC or AthletesCAN, yes or no?

Dr. Gretchen Kerr: Yes.

Ms. Leah Gazan: Okay.

Is the president of AthletesCAN, Erin Willson, your Ph.D. student?

Dr. Gretchen Kerr: Yes.

Ms. Leah Gazan: Was Ellen MacPherson, former safe sport director for Gym Can, also your Ph.D. student?

Dr. Gretchen Kerr: Yes.

Ms. Leah Gazan: Over the past 30 years, you've had a lot of Ph.D. students. I'm a former academic. I know that much of academia is getting research grants.

In terms of research grants and funding, did you receive \$1.65 million of funding from Sport Canada between 2020 and 2022?

Dr. Gretchen Kerr: The contract for the national research hub on gender equity has ended.

Ms. Leah Gazan: Okay, but did you receive, between 2020 and 2022, \$1.65 million?

Dr. Gretchen Kerr: Yes, I did. The centre did.

Ms. Leah Gazan: If there was a judicial inquiry, could that potentially...? If something happened, and let's say—I'm not saying this is your motive—it impacted the funding to Sport Canada, could that potentially indirectly affect your ability to receive grants from Sports Canada—if that organization came under jeopardy?

Dr. Gretchen Kerr: Absolutely not, and I'd be happy to elaborate on my rationale for that response.

Ms. Leah Gazan: Sure. Please do. You're more than welcome to submit briefs to the committee. Unfortunately, I don't have a lot of time here.

My next questions are for Ian Moss and are around Mr. Alex Bard.

Were you aware of indiscretions by Alex Bard prior to the complaints coming forward?

Mr. Ian Moss: I was aware of concerns with respect to some of his behaviour, and we dealt with those concerns.

Ms. Leah Gazan: I just want clarification. You spoke about how Alex Bard was not dismissed but was able to resign because of breaches of the code of conduct. What breaches were those?

Mr. Ian Moss: There's an element of confidentiality, I would suggest, in some of this. I don't know whether I'm allowed to breach that.

There was certainly a code-of-conduct issue in regard to one incident that occurred at a social event. As such, it was dealt with as any other code-of-conduct issue for any other individual would be.

• (1140)

Ms. Leah Gazan: Fair enough.

The Chair: Your time is up.

I would just say that you can bring everything to us. That's not a problem. We do take all things. Non-disclosure agreements and all of those things have no impact on our committee.

Thanks so much.

I'm now going to pass it over to Warren Steinley. I believe he and Anna may be working out some times. Why don't you guys figure this out?

Warren Steinley or Anna Roberts, take the floor. You have five minutes.

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I'm happy to be here with the committee.

This reminds me a lot of a conversation I had when I was younger. I grew up in Swift Current, Saskatchewan. That was where the Graham James coaching incidents happened. A lot of young men were sexually abused by their head coach.

There is a lot of talk around changes happening in sports all over this country. I feel that it's déjà vu, and these same conversations are still being had about young people and the safety of young people in sports.

I'm a huge fan of sports. I think it's great for young people to get involved, but there's always a segment of the population that gets into coaching for the wrong reasons. I think we really need to take our time, because I don't want this conversation to happen again in 20 years, when something happens to my daughter, perhaps, or another young girl in gymnastics.

One of my first questions would be this: The McLaren report actually references multiple sports in its recent report. We saw a situation with women's soccer in which a coach against whom serious allegations had been made in Ontario began to coach in British Columbia. Do you believe there needs to be a national registry to ensure that perpetrators no longer coach or are part of the association?

I will be asking Sarah that. Do you feel that is something that should fall under the OSIC?

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: Thank you.

First, I want to share the preoccupation that certainly from an OSIC standpoint, we do not want to see history repeating itself.

What you are referring to is a sanctions registry, a national registry of individuals who are under sanctions. We definitely share that objective that you mentioned. We firmly believe that in order to make sure individuals who are under sanctions do not have the ability to navigate the system or try to find gaps in the system, we need a registry of sanctions that is publicly accessible.

Currently our office—

Go ahead.

Mr. Warren Steinley: I just have a couple more questions, but thank you very much for that.

I believe there should be a national registry, and I think you're on the same page.

You said in one of the briefs that you've had 24 complaints at your office already, and 16 are in limbo because the sports authority in that province or the national sport authority or governing body hasn't signed on to your office. The minister has set a deadline of April for these sports bodies to sign, so that you would be able to investigate these complaints further.

Why is it April? Why is it so long from now? I think it should be done now. Time is of the essence. I think we should make sure these bodies sign on or else their funding should be looked at, because it's important to protect our kids. I'd like to have your comments on that. Do you think the timelines are suitable, or should we speed this up so we can make sure we get rid of the bad coaches and that the good coaches have the opportunity to do their jobs?

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: I would agree that time is of the essence. The earlier a sport organization joins the program at a national level, the greater our ability will be to address cases that relate to participants under their jurisdiction.

To your point, we have received, all the way up to December 31, a total of 48 complaints. So far in 2023, we have had yet another increase in the number of organizations joining the program. We can already see the positive effect of that on our admissibility and the number of complaints we're able to look into.

Mr. Warren Steinley: Would you be able to break down those complaints by sport?

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: Yes, we can. We maintain statistics by sport and by other types of measurement, by type of maltreatment, discrimination or the type of behaviour that is being alleged.

Are you asking if I can...?

• (1145)

Mr. Warren Steinley: Yes, the 48....

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: Unfortunately, this would compromise the confidentiality of specific matters. We will be reporting some further details on an annual basis, but, again, those who come forward, the victims and the survivors, in sometimes very small sport environments, in order to protect their confidentiality—

Mr. Warren Steinley: Thank you.

I'm sorry. I have 20 seconds left.

If you can, all the information that you could bring to us about the sports and the breakdown would help with our committee work, for sure. I don't want to break any confidentiality agreements, but I don't think it's a problem for our committee because, as the chair might interject, I think we'd be able to have that information.

I always find that confidentiality is what really protects these people who are doing harm to children. I don't think, frankly, that they should be able to hide behind confidentiality, because the kids need to have their say and be respected more than these people who are committing abuses against the kids.

The Chair: Thanks so much, Warren.

I will now pass it over for five minutes to Sonia Sidhu.

Sonia, you have the floor.

Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you to the witnesses for your very important testimony.

My first question is for Madame Pelletier.

We have heard about the importance of independence during this study, and a registry or database for individual sanctions. My colleague has already mentioned that. A database of individual sanctions for maltreatment should be developed. What are your thoughts on this recommendation for a registry? Can you clarify that?

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: Yes, we support it, and we strongly believe that a national registry of individuals under sanction is needed. That needs to be a registry that is publicly searchable. As of today, our office has a mandate and maintains a sanctions registry. That said, there are challenges in terms of making the information in this registry publicly available, because of the current privacy legislation across the various jurisdictions.

Again, this is definitely something we're actively working on. We may need some help to make it happen, but this is definitely something that is part of the objectives of the UCCMS and of the Office of the Sport Integrity Commissioner.

Ms. Sonia Sidhu: Thank you.

Can you explain the steps of OSIC's complaint intake process? How are athletes supported through this process? Can you explain this step by step?

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: Athletes, survivors and people who come forward can access both legal aid and mental health referral before, during and after they've gone through the complaint management process.

The entry point to the complaint management process is often the Canadian sport helpline, a dedicated helpline meant to accompany and provide information to those who simply need to know where to go and if the OSIC is an avenue for them.

There is support in place. I want to say that this is definitely something that we are looking to expand and improve so we can truly accompany the individuals who come to us and ask for help.

Ms. Sonia Sidhu: How are the investigations helping trauma-informed individuals?

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: Trauma-informed care is essential in everything we do. It starts from the moment we engage with individuals and at any point in time.

In terms of our investigations, they are performed by independent professionals. They bring experience from human rights, sexual violence, and dealing with children and minors. Some of them have experience in sports, and some don't. All of them have both experience and specific training to ensure trauma-informed care in everything they do.

Ms. Sonia Sidhu: Thank you.

I'm wondering if you can expand on why two-thirds of the cases referred to OSIC are inadmissible.

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: There are different reasons.

The first reason could be that the matter submitted to us doesn't relate to maltreatment, discrimination or another behaviour under the UCCMS, which is our jurisdiction.

The second reason could be that the organization impacted is not a signatory to our program. That being said, as we've discussed in the previous question, we are seeing fewer of these occur, because the number of organizations joining has increased significantly.

The last reason is one that refers to some existing gaps. For example, if an organization has joined but the participant impacted by the allegation is a coach in a local club, it may not mean that today

this coach is under the authority and jurisdiction of the national organization. As such, they may not fall under our jurisdiction.

However, as I said, even if that's the case, we're going to try to find ways that we can help to provide resources through our program or otherwise for the people who come forward with their issue.

• (1150)

The Chair: You have 10 seconds.

Ms. Sonia Sidhu: I'll pass. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

We're now going to pass it on.

Andréanne, you have two and a half minutes.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'm going to get straight to the point, Mr. Moss, because I don't have much time.

Unfortunately, I am starting to understand why you are against holding an independent inquiry. You weren't even able to do a thorough job in the case of coach Bard, who was accused of multiple instances of sexual assault.

What kind of message in terms of impartiality and independence do we get when the same lawyer is representing your organization, Gymnastics Canada, and a coach who stands accused of multiple sexual assaults?

Mr. Moss, you do understand that there is nothing independent and impartial here. What impression do we get when it is you yourself who questions the victims to see if their complaint is admissible or not?

Wouldn't that process be somewhat intimidating and again, show a lack of impartiality and independence on your behalf?

[*English*]

Mr. Ian Moss: Gymnastics Canada is in support of a judicial inquiry. We have never not been in support of it.

We've been in a situation where we've had to take action very quickly because there was no other opportunity for others to be engaged, and that's what we've done. From that point of view, we fully support the role of a judicial inquiry into the overall review of the sports system.

Mr. Bard to date has not been, to my knowledge, accused of any sexual assault or any allegations of that nature.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: Have lawsuits been filed against yourself by staff members within your organization?

Have any staff members filed a lawsuit against you during your mandate as director of your sport organization? If so, how many lawsuits are there?

[English]

Mr. Ian Moss: To my knowledge, there are no cases.

[Translation]

Ms. Andr anne Larouche: Did the coach accompany minors during the Tokyo 2020 Olympic Games?

[English]

Mr. Ian Moss: I'm sorry. Which coach are you referring to?

[Translation]

Ms. Andr anne Larouche: I was talking about Mr. Bard, who went to Tokyo despite being accused of committing the assaults. Did he accompany minors at the Tokyo Olympic Games?

[English]

Mr. Ian Moss: Mr. Bard was not at the Tokyo Olympics.

[Translation]

Ms. Andr anne Larouche: Mr. Moss, what is the most upsetting to me, is that yet again, we get the impression that you didn't seek to get to the bottom of the problem and that more time was spent covering up and protecting the image of Gymnastics Canada, rather than really trying to defend the victims. That is the impression we get from your organization.

[English]

The Chair: Excellent. Thank you so much.

We're now going to go to two and a half minutes for Leah.

Leah, you have the floor.

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

I'll go back to you, Mr. Moss. I'm very happy that you do support a judicial inquiry, because the more I hear, the more I think it's necessary.

Going back to Mr. Bard, it is deeply troubling to me. I understand that you maybe can't disclose what he violated, but in a TSN article on August 15, 2022, you said:

This decision is as a result of both formal and informal complaints that I have received over the past two weeks in respect to Alex's behaviour in his official capacity with Gymnastics Canada; the nature of these complaints is consistent with issues that we have discussed with Alex in the past—

It was over two weeks before, obviously.

—and, it appears, our efforts to caution and educate him have not worked.

What that tells me is that he's not able to be educated on appropriate and inappropriate behaviour, reminding us that very often we are talking about working with people who are underage.... Because of that, I would find that deeply troubling. Did you initiate a safe sport investigation in light of that information, yes or no?

• (1155)

Mr. Ian Moss: I did not.

I believe you're referring to a confidential email that I provided to the board based on due process that I...accountability that I'm required to follow.

Ms. Leah Gazan: You identified that there was a pattern of behaviour. You couldn't educate him.

With that knowledge, knowing that he would be able to continue coaching—because you said he continued to coach—why would you not feel it was necessary to conduct a safe sport investigation of a coach who had demonstrated a pattern of troubling behaviour without any sort of rectification of that behaviour?

Mr. Ian Moss: Beyond a code of conduct complaint, there was no formal complaint in place with regard to his behaviour. He is a coach who has a great level of technical expertise, but has not necessarily adjusted to some of the behavioural—

Ms. Leah Gazan: He had technical expertise, but maybe not social expertise.

Would you agree with that? Answer yes or no.

Mr. Ian Moss: At some point, it came to a point where we felt that it was not appropriate for him to continue on in his contractual role.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

We have six minutes left. Of those, three minutes will go to Anna and three minutes will go to Marc Serr .

Anna, you have the floor.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'm going to address my question to Mr. Moss again. I'm going to read something for you, and then I'm going to ask a question.

CBC has learned the current CEO of Gymnastics Canada once promoted a coach to one of the highest positions in the organization despite having received complaints alleging inappropriate behaviour.

CEO of Gymnastics Canada, Ian Moss, allegedly knew of concerns about well-known and well-respected coach Alex Bard before he named him to run the country's women's...gymnastics program.

Alex...was one of Canada's most respected and well-known gymnastics coaches. But several people say the former national team coach was also known for...inappropriate actions that included behaving abusively toward female coaches and kissing, touching and stoking fear in young gymnasts.

My question to you, Mr. Moss, is this. Do you have any children?

Mr. Ian Moss: Absolutely.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: If this had happened and one of your children came to you and explained this, what actions would you have taken?

Mr. Ian Moss: I would have moved forward with a formal complaint.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Why wasn't that done?

Are you telling me that these gymnasts were not telling the truth? You're making them sound like they're making up stories. That's not the case. The case is there were several allegations. There were not one or two, but several.

Mr. Ian Moss: There were several allegations. That's the point.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Earlier, you said that it was a misde-meanour, for example, and it wasn't a huge thing, but now we hear differently. I don't know what the truth is.

Can you help me understand that?

Mr. Ian Moss: Absolutely.

I said earlier, at the front end, that we have a process based on policies and procedures and a fair and equitable process for everybody who's underneath those policies. As such, we deal with complaints as they come forward. Ultimately, that's—

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Obviously, this complaint was neglected, because these athletes were not taken seriously. From my point of view, we failed them.

You're the CEO, and you failed these young athletes.

I don't know, as a parent, how I could possibly allow this man to continue coaching and jeopardizing our youth. I just don't understand it.

Mr. Ian Moss: With respect, we have to do due diligence in terms of facts. It's as simple as that.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: However, the facts are clear.

Mr. Ian Moss: No. They're not.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: How would you say they're not?

Mr. Ian Moss: Allegations are not facts.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: You said earlier, when I questioned you, that it was really nothing to investigate—

Mr. Ian Moss: No. I didn't say that.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: —but these allegations are serious.

Mr. Ian Moss: I did not say that, actually.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Correct me, please. I apologize.

Mr. Ian Moss: I said that we dealt with the matter when a formal complaint came forward with regard to the code of conduct. We also dealt with the other matters that were concerns about behaviour in trying to ensure that there were behavioural adjustments.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Obviously, this one was lost.

The Chair: Thanks so much.

We're now going to pass it over to Marc Serré for the final questions.

You have three minutes.

Mr. Marc Serré (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you to the witnesses.

My first question is for Dr. Kerr. You didn't get a chance to answer earlier, because you were interrupted several times, but the federal funding you received for athletes' mistreatment and gender equity research.... Can you explain a bit of that research and why that ties into your comment about not needing a national inquiry?

I wanted to give you the chance to answer that question, please.

• (1200)

Dr. Gretchen Kerr: The funding for the national gender equity hub was not to fund research on gender-based violence. It was to

bring together a collective of researchers from various disciplines across the country who study gender equity, so we could have a consolidated database that we could share broadly. It was separate and distinct from what we're talking about here today.

The issue of the judicial inquiry is more about its purpose. If it's to understand the nature of the issues and problems, we have that information. In fact, we have repeated history, because we're having the same discussions we had in 1996 when we had a crisis with the Graham James case.

If the purpose is to provide athletes with a voice to tell their stories and seek justice, I propose that there are far more effective, trauma-informed ways to do that. That's the rationale for.... Yes, we need to move ahead, but I believe there are better and more effective ways than going backwards to do a judicial inquiry.

Mr. Marc Serré: Thank you.

[*Translation*]

My second question is for Ms. Pelletier.

Earlier, when you spoke of a national inquiry, you said that approximately two-thirds of the complaints that you received were deemed inadmissible. Can you tell us how many of those complaints originated in the Province of Quebec?

If there is indeed a national inquiry, what role will the Office of the Sport Integrity Commissioner have, given Quebec's jurisdiction? I'm trying to understand the Office's role in the context of provincial responsibilities, especially those of Quebec. What is the number of cases that you weren't able to look at?

Ms. Sarah-Ève Pelletier: As I said earlier, to date, only one third of the complaints deemed inadmissible could be forwarded to an independent complaints system, whether that be Quebec's or a mechanism set up by a national sport organization other than the Office of the Sports Integrity Commissioner.

It is therefore a small number and again, one that is based on our first six months of activity.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you so much.

Before we end this panel, there are a few documents I would like to request. I know there have been some requests.

To the Office of the Sport Integrity Commissioner—looking at those 24 cases—it was noted what's admissible and not admissible. Could we get some information and a breakdown of those 24 cases? Send it to our clerk. She'll be able to review it, and we can discuss that. We would like to have that list.

I would ask to have, from Gymnastics Canada, all the emails, letters and minutes of board meetings regarding Mr. McFarlane and Mr. Bard. We would like to see all the confidential documents. Please send them directly to us, so we can ensure we are getting both sides of the story. We would really like to see those documents.

To Gretchen Kerr, thank you so much for coming. You noted there are other ways of moving forward. Perhaps you could provide those other ways of moving forward in a brief. That would be great. Thanks so much.

On behalf of the group, I would like to thank you all for coming today.

We are going to take a brief pause to switch up, probably for about a minute.

We'll suspend for one minute.

• (1200) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1205)

The Chair: We are reconvening.

Go ahead, Andréanne.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: Madam Chair, I rise on a point of order.

I want to take a few seconds to inform you that we had just finished questioning Mr. Moss on the goings-on at Gymnastics Canada when he proceeded to verbally assault Ms. Kim Shore upon leaving the room.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you very much for bringing that forward.

What is normal protocol? One moment, please.

Sonia, can you take the chair for the first few minutes, during the opening comments? I will look into this.

What we're going to do is this: I'll manipulate while good old Sonia works the chair.

I would like to welcome our three guests: Donna Gall, Sophie Gagnon and McLaren Global Sport Solutions.

You each have five minutes.

Donna, you may start with your opening five minutes.

• (1210)

Dr. Donna Gall (Professor and Filmmaker, As an Individual): Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the committee.

I appear today as a storyteller, a filmmaker, a scholar and an educator with a commitment to and track record of exploring issues and telling stories about women and girls in sport in Canada.

My core recommendation today is that we need more stories to be told about women and girls in sport to make sport better, more equitable and safer for women and girls.

These include the stories of abuse and hardship that have been told with such grace and generosity by some of the witnesses before this committee. Sharing stories is shining a light into dark places where rot has grown. Light and attention are what is needed to get rid of the rot. I believe these stories have the power to change sport, but we also need stories to show us what sport can be for women and girls in Canada.

In my doctoral research examining the audience for professional women's hockey, I heard again and again how often the stories about women in sport are the stories of the problems of women in sport. If this is the only narrative we hear, the performative risk is that the repeated association among “women”, “sport” and “problem” becomes normalized and naturalized.

We need stories showing sport as a site of empowerment for female athletes at every skill level—stories about the now and the future, fully inclusive stories, as well as stories about the long history of women and girls in sport in Canada. Consider the ubiquitous *Heritage Minutes*. Of the 97 videos produced telling stories about Canadian history, 12 of them tell stories of sport. Of those 12, only one is about female athletes—the Edmonton Grads basketball team. *Heritage Minutes* exist because of significant public funding, but why then are they not fully representative of the Canadian public?

I have three recommendations to make to the committee to support more opportunities for storytelling on multiple media platforms.

The first is about funding for media coverage of women's sports. The systemic and persistent lack of media coverage contributes to the perception that women and girls in sport are less worthy of an audience's attention, literally less valuable in terms of ratings. It perpetuates the idea that women and girls have no legitimate role in sport and puts the safety of female athletes at risk. I recommend special funding from Canadian Heritage dedicated to media coverage of women's sports. To be clear, this does not mean broadcasting the occasional midday game, but instead investing in women's sport broadcasts in prime time, with high production values and significant audience development. We saw this strategy work with women's soccer in 2015 and 2019. It is worth noting that the CBC spent decades investing in men's sport, constructing the audience for sport to be the audience for men's sport. The public broadcaster should be compelled to make equal investment in the broadcast of women's sport.

The second recommendation I have is about funding for scripted and factual media content. Meaningful media coverage demands more than covering games, races and matches of occasional elite competitions. I recommend specialized funding from Heritage Canada to support the creation of factual and scripted stories of women and girls in sport for broadcast television, streaming platforms and other digital media platforms. I note the impact of the Netflix documentary series *Formula 1: Drive to Survive* and how it increased public knowledge, appreciation and viewership for that sport. At the very least, I would like to see more *Heritage Minutes* dedicated to historical Canadian female athletes, such as Bobbie Rosenfeld and the indigenous women's softball team from Six Nations, Ontario.

The third recommendation is about athletes telling their own stories. Athletes are too often silenced. I recommend the creation of digital storytelling funding for sporting organizations to provide the tools and platforms to teams of all levels that will allow girls and women to share first-hand stories of their experiences in sport. Imagine a YouTube channel dedicated to showing Canadian female athletes from all over the country sharing their experiences, their training, their competitions, their triumphs, their hardships and their camaraderie.

To conclude, the stories we tell help to shape the world we live in. Stories about sport in particular work to construct our mythologies and our ideas about culture, value and gender. We need to tell stories that shine a light on the abuse suffered by many women and girls in sport, and we need stories that celebrate sport as a space that can empower, strengthen and support women and girls to make not only sport but all of society better and safer.

Thank you very much for this opportunity.

• (1215)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We will now move over for the next five minutes to Sophie Gagnon, from Juripop, who is online.

Sophie, you have five minutes.

Ms. Sophie Gagnon (Executive Director, Juripop): Thank you so much.

Hello, everyone.

[*Translation*]

I will be doing my presentation in French.

[*English*]

I'm happy to answer questions in English.

[*Translation*]

I am appearing before your committee as the spokesperson and Executive Director of Juripop.

Juripop is a nonprofit organization founded in 2009. Our mission is to improve access to justice throughout Quebec. Our services are available through a team of 35 people based in Montréal.

We were asked to appear before you today because of our expertise in providing legal support to people who have experienced gender-based violence.

For more than five years, Juripop has supported thousands of victims of sexual violence, domestic violence and harassment in the workplace in Quebec. We help victims and survivors understand their rights in all areas of the law and to assert them, whether it be through an internal administrative investigation, after a complaint to the police, or a civil suit.

Our expertise truly lies in the factors underpinning victims' understanding or not of their rights; their trust or lack of it in a truth-seeking process; and obtaining justice after sexual violence.

In my remarks today, I will share observations drawn from our experiences with victimized individuals and survivors.

We are not experts in sports. We are active in several areas where we can draw significant parallels, such as power imbalances, be they due to positions of power or age, and where sexual violence is prevalent, as seems to be the case in the sports community.

I'd like to present what we consider ideal parameters for internal justice. By "internal justice," I mean a process for seeking the truth, sanctions and remediation implemented by the organization where sexual violence has occurred. I will therefore emphasize the factors we consider essential to the success of a process with victims. It ensures that people feel heard and maintains or reestablishes their trust in the organization.

I will go quickly to stay within my time. Don't hesitate to ask questions if needed.

First of all, for people who are victims, it is essential to ensure confidentiality of the complaint. I cannot stress this enough. People want their complaints to be confidential. We realize this is not always possible. We've seen situations where organizations committed to ensuring complaint confidentiality, but in the end, they were unable to meet that commitment.

Therefore, we recommend that if a complaint cannot remain confidential, it's essential to be transparent with the victimized individual and inform them in advance, as well as on an ongoing basis.

Quality internal justice, in our view, is led by an independent and impartial entity. The organization's investigative mechanisms are very unlikely to gain the support or trust of victimized individuals, be it due to a real conflict of interest, or the appearance of a conflict of interest. It is therefore essential for an independent entity to lead the process.

The process must be fast as well. All too often, we see internal processes that take months. If an entity wishes to proceed with an internal investigation, it must grant priority to the investigation and dedicate the human and material resources required to lead it quickly. Otherwise, it could lead to work stoppages and mental health issues, or the individual who initially decided to participate in the process may quit.

It's also essential to support the person who was victimized or the complainant on two levels.

First, it's important to offer them psychosocial resources to put them in a good frame of mind and, second, to offer legal support resources.

That's what we do at Juripop: we support people who file a complaint with an employer. Our role is not to replace an investigator. It is to be present for the victim in order to explain the investigation, as well as make sure that the person is able to understand their rights and assert them throughout the process.

• (1220)

There's another important aspect, but it's controversial. It's communication of the investigation's findings. Obviously, the detailed report usually remains confidential, specifically to protect witness confidentiality. However, the conclusions must be communicated and explained to the complainant; otherwise there's a sense of misunderstanding or breach of trust...

[English]

The Chair: Sophie, I'm going to have to interrupt you. You're a bit over your time here. It's hard to get your attention online.

During the questions, you can add additional comments, if that's okay.

Thank you so much.

Ms. Sophie Gagnon: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: We're now going to pass it over to Richard McLaren.

Richard, you have five minutes.

Mr. Richard McLaren (Chief Executive Officer and Professor of Law, McLaren Global Sport Solutions Inc.): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

At the outset, I want to say that I'm not receiving any translation.

Is there translation? I cannot understand French.

The Chair: Let's just check.

Is there a translation button at the very bottom of your screen? Sometimes there is something that says "interpretation". Make sure that's on "English" rather than "floor".

Do you see that there?

Mr. Richard McLaren: Yes, I do. I've put it on "English".

The Chair: Marc, could we try some French?

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Serré: Hello, Mr. McLaren, can you hear me?

[English]

Mr. Richard McLaren: Yes, everything is working for me.

Thank you.

The Chair: That's fantastic.

Richard, we're going to start your five minutes right now.

Mr. Richard McLaren: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Thank you to the members of the committee for asking me to report on the work I've done with Gymnastics Canada.

Briefly, about myself, I'm a professor emeritus at Western University law faculty. I've been working in various high-profile reviews and investigations in sport and sport integrity for a number of years. I'm best known, perhaps, for the investigations I did for the World Anti-Doping Agency about the Russian state-sponsored doping problems connected with the Sochi Winter Olympics.

I have a group of people who work with me who constitute a highly specialized team. We do a considerable amount of investigative work, but we also do a number of other activities and reviews. We have done a lot of work for a number of different sports organizations.

What we focus on at MGSS is mitigating risks related to ethics and governance within organizations. Our mission is to help sports organizations protect and enhance their brand, navigate difficult organizational issues related to ethics, governance and integrity, and inform strategic business decisions.

That's just a very quick background of myself and McLaren Global Support Solutions Inc. Let me turn to the gymnastics project we did for Gym Can and reported on last week.

There are two parts to that project. One was to assist the sport to develop a framework or road map for how a cultural review should be conducted by Gym Can for the benefit of the gymnastics community. That was the largest part of the project. The other part was to look at their safe sport policies in place, determine if they met international standards and recommend any changes that would be required.

The methodology of our work involved research into over 1,000 members of the Canadian gymnastics community. We did 58 personal interviews and conducted two surveys. One survey involved input from the provincial and territorial gymnastics organizations, and the other was an open access public survey of the gymnastics community in Canada. There were 974 individuals who responded to our research surveys. Almost 500 of them were gymnasts.

Let me turn to the highlights of the report.

The gymnastics community demands change and strongly supports a rigorous independent cultural review to be undertaken. The research team wanted to know the extent of the appetite the gymnastics community had for a cultural review. Was it necessary? If so, what should it entail?

More than 1,000 voices representing the gymnastics community in Canada provided feedback. Most of the gymnasts in the sport reported positive experiences. However, toxic examples of abuse and maltreatment persist at all levels. Coaches, judges and staff have also reported maltreatment. Themes or areas of concern were identified through the survey and interview work to establish the foundation for the future work on a cultural shift of gymnastics. It should be noted that most gymnasts interviewed and surveyed reported positive experiences. Nevertheless, there are examples of abuse and maltreatment at all levels of the sport.

The cultural review should be led by an independent interdisciplinary team and have a human rights-based approach included as a key feature of the proposed cultural review framework.

I would welcome questions about what we've done and anything else the committee would wish to ask me, and hopefully I will be able to respond.

Thank you.

• (1225)

The Chair: Thank you so much, Mr. McLaren.

Working on the fly, because we have a bit of committee business, I'm going to mess a little with times, if that's okay. I was going to go four minutes, four minutes, four minutes, four minutes, which brings us up to 16, and then we'll go three, three, one and one. That will fill in all of our time.

We'll start over on this side with Mr. Waugh.

Kevin, you have the floor for four minutes.

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair, and welcome, guests.

I'll start with you, Mr. McLaren. Thank you for your comprehensive report and your 46 recommendations.

Part of the problem with all national sport organizations is that you have provincial authorities but then you have the federal authorities, and several of those don't match.

If you don't mind, I saw that four or five provinces have one direction and three or four other provinces go in another direction, so that seems to be an area of concern. When you have a national sport organization like gymnastics, you have those that have veered off in other directions and, at the end of the day, you have several opinions—right or wrong—compared to the national sport organization.

Do you want to comment on that? I think that at that level, when you're getting into a sport and everybody wants to reach the Olympics, you see some differences between the provincial and national bodies.

Mr. Richard McLaren: You're very correct, sir. There are considerable differences between different levels.

Specifically, talking about gymnastics, which is what we reviewed, there's the club level, then the provincial and territorial level, and then the national level. The different levels don't particularly get along with each other. The provincial levels challenge the national organization frequently. There's not a good rapport there. The provincial levels also have difficulties with the grassroots clubs that are the foundation, really, of gymnastics.

That problem is common across most sports in Canada. The national federations have only a limited jurisdiction and have to get the co-operation of the provincial or territorial organizations, and those organizations need to get the grassroots group to co-operate as well.

Unfortunately, in gymnastics, that system does not work in a well-integrated fashion. There is a considerable friction between the different levels of the sport.

• (1230)

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Yes. We've seen that throughout the years. The framework and the safe sport policies are good, but we need more people to speak up when they see stuff that shouldn't be happening in the sport, whether it's in gymnastics or other sports for girls and women in Canada.

We have to thank Kim Shore. I see that in your report, at least at the end, she did send you...because Gymnastics for Change.... We know what has been going on for a number of years. It can't continue. It is these people who have competed and have seen stuff who need to be the voice of those coming into the sport. Thank God we have the Kim Shores of the world coming forward, with her story and others.... Can you talk about that?

I've just listened to Mr. Moss. I don't think he's listening to those who pay his paycheque, if you don't mind me saying so: the grassroots. I was very disturbed. I don't know if you heard him, but he was on the previous panel. There are major issues with gymnastics, and I would say that it starts with the executive director.

I want to say thank you for doing the interviews, because it is those people who need to be heard in this investigation.

Mr. Richard McLaren: Well, we did not conduct an investigation. What we were trying to do is understand what the community felt was needed. Was a cultural review required? If it was, how should it be done and what should be a part of it? We were trying to build the foundation for a review that would be conducted by an independent group of people subsequent to the release of our work. They would have a head start for the information that was available.

The Chair: Thanks, Mr. McLaren. I have to switch it over now.

Anita Vandenbeld, you have four minutes. Go ahead.

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

I would like to start with Professor McLaren.

In your recent report on gymnastics, you made a number of recommendations. One of them was that there needs to be better monitoring of national sports organizations. I wonder how best that would be done. I know there's a move right now to build into the contribution agreements clauses that would have these kinds of requirements, but I'd be interested in your views on that.

The other recommendation you made was that there should be more supports for athletes. I think all of us here are very concerned about what happens to an athlete when they are harmed and what kinds of supports they do or don't have. Could you elaborate on that a little as well?

I have another question after that for the other witnesses, so could you do that in a very short time? Thank you.

Mr. Richard McLaren: I will try to be brief.

As to the monitoring, accountability is a problem in any sport. Gymnastics has a problem that many other sports have. There needs to be some oversight. Most sports are trying to tackle that problem by establishing some form of an integrity unit that has an ability to be independent, and check that the sport is doing everything it's supposed to be doing according to its constitution. That's the monitoring point.

Being more supportive of athletes is certainly required, particularly in gymnastics. You are talking about very young children who start at the club level in that sport. Education is probably the most important part of trying to get that support—education that doesn't just go to the children but also goes to parents, coaches and others involved, such as trainers, physios and so forth.

I'm sorry, but I missed your third point, or you didn't give me your third point. You were going to raise that, I think.

Ms. Anita Vandenbeld: Yes, you covered both of my points.

I would like to ask Ms. Gagnon the same question about the supports. We heard earlier today from the sport integrity commissioner that there is a helpline. If athletes call that line, they can get referred to legal aid. I know that your organization is providing that support. You also said that more needs to be done.

Could you tell us how likely is it that a young athlete who needs legal assistance is able to access that assistance? How do we make that more prevalent?

• (1235)

Ms. Sophie Gagnon: Usually, the resource that is the best suited to be on the front line to assist athletes, or victims, are psychosocial organizations. I would recommend that these psychosocial resources be made aware of the availability of legal support, that they be trained to explain what kind of legal support is offered, and that they also be trained to put the parties in touch. That is with regard to the victim and legal information support.

For the legal information support to be effective, in our experience we need much more than legal information or a one-time conversation. We would really recommend that a lawyer be assigned to the file of a specific victim, that the documents be read, and that documents be drafted should documents need to be drafted. There should really be a counsel and client relationship established in order to make sure there is trust, and that legal advice is relevant to the situation at hand.

The Chair: Thanks so much.

We're now going to pass it over to Andréanne Larouche, for four minutes.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you to the witnesses for being here.

I'll proceed quickly, because time is running out.

Ms. Gagnon, you said you don't have expertise in the sports community, but you are aware of similar issues with abuse of power in other communities. You know that athletes no longer trust the system in place. They came before us, federal MPs, asking us to act and change the culture.

Furthermore, statistics show that the system implemented by the federal government after Hockey Canada's scandals simply doesn't work. Indeed, the Sport Integrity Commissioner stated that two thirds of the complaints her office received were deemed inadmissible.

You worked with the Committee of Experts on Support for Victims of Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence, which tabled its report, *Contre la violence sexuelle, la violence conjugale et Rebâtir la confiance*, in December 2020.

Given the toxic environment in which sports communities find themselves, do you agree that partisanship should be set aside to set up an independent commission of inquiry, as we saw in Quebec? Victims requested it to help them rebuild trust.

Ms. Sophie Gagnon: This discussion, which was fruitful in Quebec, was notable because it went beyond the law's traditional framework. Normally, we look at who is the victim and who is the alleged aggressor, and we make sure the alleged aggressor is held responsible for their acts. That's good, but it falls far short.

To actually achieve redress in such a case, and avoid other similar cases in the future, a complete culture shift has to happen. We're talking about overhauling governance and training, and reconsidering values.

In short, no matter what elected officials decide, it's essential to go beyond the binary limitations of traditional justice, which opposes the accused and the complainant. We need a much more comprehensive review of the parameters of justice and trust in an organization.

Ms. Andr anne Larouche: Thank you, Ms. Gagnon.

Time is running out, so I will now ask Mr. McLaren a question. I may come back to you during my second round of questions.

Mr. McLaren, in your report, you talked about three possible models for creating an office to accept and process complaints. This is in response to the requirement for a universal code on abuse in sport. The government chose the Office of the Sport Integrity Commissioner. However, in your view, the problem is that it could simply become another patch on the disparate sports system already in place in Canada.

Could you quickly elaborate on that?

[English]

Mr. Richard McLaren: The idea I was trying to get at is that it's established in the universal code of conduct as very important as a first step. Then, the sport at all levels—right down to the grassroots level if it's going to be effective as a national, harmonized system—needs to be involved in it. When you come to a sport like gymnastics, where there's a considerable difference of opinion between the grassroots level, the provincial-territorial level and the national level, that doesn't work. That's what I meant by it's being a patch or a band-aid on the system unless you can change the culture, as Sophie was just talking about. Again, a much better-functioning hierarchy of the administration of rules, regulations and practices from the grassroots right up to the national federation level.... That's a major cultural change.

• (1240)

The Chair: Perfect. Thank you so much.

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

Bonita, you have four minutes.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo (Port Moody—Coquitlam, NDP): Thank you very much.

I would like to thank Ms. Gall and Ms. Gagnon for really shining a light and even talking about shining a light to expose some of the things that really need to change in sport. I also want to recognize the power imbalance. That's why it's so important that this committee be here having this discussion. We need to correct that power imbalance, especially for the youngest kids, a lot of them—a disproportionate number—girls.

My initial question is for Mr. McLaren. It's around sharing with us how much the gymnasts want their sport and that they want it to be safe.

We heard earlier from Mr. Moss that there are a number of complaints every week, but that they're properly addressed. You mentioned in your opening statement that your organization explored policies and the work you did.

Can you explain the process of how gymnasts are protected from abuse by Gymnastics Canada?

Mr. Richard McLaren: It's a very quick overview, and it's a very detailed issue.

As Mr. Moss was referring to, there's a code of conduct, and then there are safe sport practices. I think, from listening to him, there's no necessary interconnection of those—while I think there should be. The safe sport policies that we reviewed.... Unfortunately, the sport changed its policies to harmonize more with the UCCMS within the few weeks of our report. Our analysis of all that is based on a prior version of the sport's code, and we need to do some supplementary work and review how it changed. How much did it actually encompass what we recommended, and is it complete? Should it have done more?

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo: Thank you.

I'll ask that of the committee. Mr. Moss said that the complaints are properly addressed. Can we get a thorough explanation of their process and how they're being addressed? I think this is something Madam Gagnon spoke about: Who is applying the sanctions and the follow-up?

I have one more question for Mr. McLaren, and then I'll ask Madam Gagnon one question.

Mr. McLaren, there is some concern, definitely, from where I'm sitting in this chair, about a potential conflict of interest between where some of these sports organizations are getting their funding—whether it's federal or Sport Canada—and the protection of athletes. I'm thinking about little girls.

Do you have any thoughts about what's potentially a conflict of interest in how we get funding, and what's being prioritized when gymnasts arrive on the mat or in their clubs?

Mr. Richard McLaren: I don't think there's a conflict of interest. The problem is accountability. Monies are provided. Then, how are they used? Are they used effectively, and who is examining the use of the funds? That's the accountability. If they're directed at protecting young athletes, how is that done? Who is checking to see that it has been done and where it needs to be improved or changed if it hasn't been done?

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo: Thank you for that. I think that's why we're hearing that we need so much independence.

I wanted to talk to Madam Gall but I'm not going to have an opportunity, I don't think.

I would like to go to Madame Gagnon, just around this accountability and this power imbalance. How can there be an application of consequences for any of these actions? I think that's where it becomes very difficult.

Ms. Sophie Gagnon: It's extremely complicated. The best situations we've seen.... We have an expertise in the artistic environment, so in the arts, and the best examples we've seen are where there is really authentic and strong leadership from the top of the organization to ensure that there is change.

Unfortunately, sometimes we see these situations more when there has been a change in leadership, because the persons who apply the sanctions and who are responsible for organizational change aren't personally tied up with the situations that led to the complaint. It's extremely difficult to see such a change in culture without a change of leadership, but there's no easy answer to your question.

• (1245)

The Chair: That's perfect. Thanks so much.

We're now going on to our next round. It's going to be three minutes, three minutes, one minute and one minute.

Anna, you have the floor for three minutes.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Thank you, Madam Chair.

My question will be for Professor McLaren or Sophie, whichever one of you wants to answer it.

I'm not sure what you heard about the testimony from Mr. Moss and that the allegations could not be proven. I don't know how many times you have to be told different stories, from different athletes, to take action. I don't know who he's protecting. To be honest with you, I think he's protecting himself.

What I want to know is this: How do we protect children? You talked about accountability. What mechanisms can we put into place to ensure that this behaviour does not continue? Do we have to install cameras in gymnasiums? Do we have to install cameras to ensure that we prevent the situation that's going on, because obviously these young adults—and young children—are coming with their problems and we are doing nothing about it.

Ms. Sophie Gagnon: I can quickly offer some thoughts.

First of all, I myself am a lawyer and I believe many people wrongly use principles of criminal law to discuss sexual violence in the workplace or in day-to-day life. For example, the presumption of innocence, and so on, is not relevant outside the criminal courtroom. That's one.

Second, if we want to implement change, the first step for an organization is to clearly define what types of behaviours they wish to see, and what types of behaviours they do not want to see anymore. Organizations have full control over these definitions. They can use what the law says as inspiration, but they can be much bolder and more courageous than what the law says.

So there's defining the standards, and second, training the people inside the organization to understand these standards and behave by them, and third, making sure there is a mechanism in place to file

complaints when these standards are not met, to make investigations, and then to have sanctions.

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Okay, so we've talked about educating the coaches and we've talked about addressing these issues, but obviously it's still failing.

Basically, the impression I got from Mr. Moss, which is very disappointing, is the fact that if it was his child maybe he'd take it more seriously, but we need to stop it. We need to stop it now. We can't wait another year, or two years, or three years, because it's impacting these young adults—and young children—and it's going to carry on with them. It's going to create mental health issues.

How do we stop it? Do we put in cameras? Are we allowed? I'm not a lawyer. I'm not going to sit here and pretend I'm a lawyer, but is that a mechanism that we need to protect the innocence of victims?

Mr. Marc Serré: I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

Can we just refrain from personal attacks, like referring to the person's children? I find that really offensive, personally.

The Chair: Okay. That's very fair, Marc.

When speaking, let's just.... I'm just going to remind you that it's time for the answer to this one and you have only about 15 seconds to respond. Who was that question for?

Mrs. Anna Roberts: Could I have Professor McLaren, please?

The Chair: Mr. McLaren, you have about 15 seconds.

Mr. Richard McLaren: I think to protect them immediately is very difficult because you have to change roles and behaviours, and that requires clear rules, as Sophie was speaking about. It requires education of the people involved, and then aggressive, appropriate administrative action on the part of the sport. That is all going to take time. You can just instantaneously protect children, but those are the steps that need to be done.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

We're now going to move over to Marc Serré for three minutes.

Marc, you have the floor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Serré: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I thank the witnesses for being here with us today.

My first question is for you, Mr. McLaren. You did a study with Gymnastics Canada. The recommendations, including the ones you made about institutions, were implemented through the Office of the Sport Integrity Commissioner—OSIC—just six months ago.

If there were to be a national inquiry, that could represent approximately 4,000 athletes. Yet there are thousands more athletes at the local and provincial levels. If there were to be an inquiry, it would take years to conduct it, but it would be possible to do so.

What specific recommendations would you make today to reinforce the powers of the OSIC, support national organizations and resolve dilemmas with local and provincial organizations?

Which recommendations would you like to make to the government today to reinforce the powers of the OSIC?

• (1250)

[English]

Mr. Richard McLaren: My recommendation would be to require the provincial and territorial organizations to implement all the policies and procedures in the universal code that the national federation has, and that the provincial and territorial organizations require those at the grassroots to have the same rules and regulations, so there is a harmonious system throughout.

I know there are a lot of legal problems with doing so, but I think that's the answer to improving the system and making it effective. Right now, it doesn't go down to the grassroots.

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Serré: Thank you for the 46 recommendations you already made. I believe you already submitted them to the committee.

As for the Universal Code of Conduct to Prevent and Address Maltreatment in Sport, how can the federal government support provinces and local organizations? What are your recommendations on that?

[English]

Mr. Richard McLaren: Moves need to be made by the national federations to be co-operative, and provincial and territorial organizations need to be more accepting of the role of the national federations.

How can the federal government do that? I think it's only by encouraging greater co-operation and discussion, since it really doesn't have the legislative authority to push it down to the provinces and further down to the grassroots.

The Chair: That's perfect. Thank you so much.

We're going to Andréanne for one minute.

[Translation]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you, Ms. Gagnon, for contributing to this study, which leveraged your expertise. You effectively demonstrated your experience with culture change.

Mr. McLaren, you've drawn up several reports sponsored by organizations in the field of sport. They were rumoured to be in survival mode and singled out for their inaction after many complaints of abuse and mistreatment. You recently did the report for Gymnastics Canada and Canada Soccer.

How much were you paid for each of these studies?

Could you table your mandate letters with the clerk?

[English]

Mr. Richard McLaren: Which reports are you speaking about? If it's Gymnastics Canada, then yes, I can.

What other ones are you thinking of? I've done a great number.

[Translation]

Ms. Andréanne Larouche: I was talking specifically about Gymnastics Canada and Canada Soccer.

[English]

Mr. Richard McLaren: Okay. I'd have to check the Canada Soccer one. Canada Soccer was a different type of review from the Gymnastics Canada one.

I can tell you what the Gymnastics Canada fees were right off the top of my head. It was \$200,000.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

If you can provide that additional information, Mr. McLaren, on that secondary one and send it our way, that would be fantastic.

Mr. Richard McLaren: Yes.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

We're now going to go to the final round of questions.

One minute goes to Bonita.

Ms. Bonita Zarrillo: Thank you so much. My question is for Ms. Gall.

We've heard today about the need for a culture change. Certainly, we know there are embedded patriarchal norms. We have it here in government as well.

I know you've done a lot of work on hockey in your filmmaking and storytelling. I was just wondering if you would be able to share with us some of what you saw of distinct differences and attributes in two different gender-based hockey cultures.

Is there something positive that you could share with us, where one could take up the other?

Dr. Donna Gall: What's positive is the fact that this conversation is happening at all, because in 2015, when I made the documentary about women in sport and I was trying to tell stories about athlete safety and issues of sexual abuse, I couldn't find anyone who was willing to talk to me about these issues. Waneek Horn-Miller sort of explained her experience at Water Polo Canada, but I wasn't able to find people whose experiences we are hearing like the stories we heard today. It's amazing that these stories are told.

In terms of hockey—I don't know if I'll have time—I would just like to say that, if you're going to talk about changing culture, we have to understand that culture is made up of discourses, how athletes are represented, and how young people in particular see female athletes in a highly sexualized manner. There are impacts to athlete safety with that. Yes, it would be great if young girl hockey players could see themselves having a career in hockey one day. That would be fabulous.

• (1255)

The Chair: Wonderful, thank you so much.

I'd really like to thank Donna Gall, Sophie Gagnon and Richard McLaren. Thank you so much for coming to our committee and providing your testimony.

We are going to be suspending and going in camera, so I'm going to ask everybody who is not a member of staff or from the whip's office.... We will need to clear the room so we can immediately go in.

I will suspend for about 30 to 40 seconds, because really there are just a few of you.

It's going to be a little longer, because we've got to switch over, but we're just going to ask everybody from the public to leave the room, so we'll suspend for a minute here.

[Proceedings continue in camera]

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>