



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on the Status of Women

FEWO



NUMBER 050



1st SESSION



41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, November 22, 2012



Chair

Ms. Marie-Claude Morin

Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Thursday, November 22, 2012

•(0845)

[Translation]

The Chair (Ms. Marie-Claude Morin (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, NDP)): Good morning, everyone. We shall begin our session without further ado.

Welcome to the 50th hearing of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women. Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee is resuming its study of sexual harassment in the federal workplace.

Welcome to all of our witnesses. This morning we welcome Mr. Karol Wenek, Commander Tony Crewe, Ms. Jacqueline Rigg, Ms. Susan Harrison, and Lieutenant-Colonel Mark Gendron, who are all from the Department of National Defence. We also welcome the National Defence and Canadian Forces Ombudsman, Mr. Alain Gauthier.

This morning we will be hearing three 10-minute presentations, to be followed by a question period which will last till 10:30.

We will begin with Mr. Karol Wenek.

You have 10 minutes at your disposal.

[English]

Mr. Karol Wenek (Director General Military Personnel, Chief Military Personnel, Department of National Defence): Thank you.

Good morning. My name is Karol Wenek. As the director general military personnel, I'm responsible for, among other things, personnel policies intended to prevent discrimination and achieve equal employment opportunities throughout the Canadian Forces.

With me today, to assist in answering your questions on sexual harassment and related issues, is Commander Tony Crewe, director of human rights and diversity for the Canadian Forces. Also with us is Lieutenant Colonel Mark Gendron, director of law military personnel in the office of the Judge Advocate General. He is available to provide information regarding the legal processes and procedures that might be engaged in dealing with allegations of sexual harassment.

In the comments that follow, I will briefly address our policy framework, our definition of harassment, military statistics on sexual harassment, the training and education of military members, and some recent initiatives relevant to this topic.

The Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence have a joint harassment prevention and resolution policy that applies to both military and civilian personnel. The director of human rights

and diversity, who reports to me, is responsible for the harassment prevention and resolution policy as it applies to military members.

The Canadian Forces policy on harassment was introduced in the 1980s and updated several times thereafter. The most recent version of the policy, dated December 2000, shifted the emphasis to prevention and early resolution through alternative dispute resolution and brought military and civilian personnel under the same policy. The policy's overall goal is to provide and ensure a respectful workplace by promoting the prevention of harassment and the prompt resolution of harassment complaints.

Although I am here this morning to speak specifically about sexual harassment, I think it is helpful to view our policy as part of a spectrum of Canadian Forces policies pertaining to sexual behaviour in the workplace. We have, for example, a policy regulating personal relationships and fraternization that is intended to preserve trust in the integrity of command while preventing the exploitation of junior military members and other vulnerable personnel.

Additionally, our sexual misconduct policy deals with behaviours that are either sexual in nature or committed with the intent to commit an act or acts that are sexual in nature and which constitute an offence under the Criminal Code or code of service discipline. These behaviours include offences such as sexual assault, indecent exposure, voyeurism, and acts involving child pornography. Our policy on harassment and sexual harassment falls somewhere in the middle of this policy continuum.

Harassment is defined as:

any improper conduct by an individual that is directed at and offensive to another person or persons in the workplace, and that the individual knew or ought reasonably to have known would cause offence or harm. It comprises any objectionable act, comment or display that demeans, belittles, or causes personal humiliation or embarrassment, and any act of intimidation or threat. It includes harassment within the meaning of the Canadian Human Rights Act (CHRA).

We have no definition or policy specifically for sexual harassment.

Systematic information on sexual harassment in the Canadian Forces is derived in varying degrees from four data sources: our tracking system for internally filed harassment complaints, our alternative dispute resolution database, statistics on human rights complaints externally filed with the Canadian Human Rights Commission, and periodic surveys of military members.

The harassment complaint tracking system is intended to capture all harassment complaints in both the Canadian Forces and the department. From 2002 to October 2012, there were 513 complaints by military members recorded in the harassment complaint tracking system. Of these, 31 or 6% were sexual harassment complaints. Of these 31 sexual harassment complaints in this 10-year period, 11 were determined to be founded or partially founded.

This is an incidence rate of about one a year in a military population of roughly 100,000 personnel. The remaining 20 complaints are either still open, were unfounded, were withdrawn, or were referred to the military police. When sexual assault is suspected during an investigation, these cases are automatically referred to the military police in accordance with the sexual misconduct policy I referred to earlier.

Of the founded complaints, 10 were by female members and one was by a male who filed a complaint against a male respondent.

● (0850)

For the founded sexual harassment complaints, the process to complete the investigation and resolution of the complaint took 90 days on average. The policy requires the responsible officers to finalize a complaint within 180 days.

In accordance with the current policy, there are consequences for respondents when complaints are determined to be founded. The most frequent administrative measure was to send the respondent on harassment awareness training, and the next most common action was a recorded warning. In some cases an apology was required, and in a few cases the offending individual was suspended from duty. In one case a fine was given, and in two cases the individual was sent on communications and leadership training.

Statistics on harassment are also kept by the director general alternative dispute resolution. However, it should be noted that while statistics are available on cases involving harassment, their database does not differentiate among categories—for example, sexual harassment. According to past issues of their annual report, they determined that the number of combined military and civilian harassment cases from 2002 to 2010 ranged from a low of 153 to a high of 382.

Statistics drawn from the human rights commission's complaints database for the period 2002 to 2012 indicate there were 196 complaints lodged against the forces, sexual harassment accounting for 13, or 6.6%, of all complaints. The latter involved two prohibited grounds of discrimination, namely sex and sexual orientation. Of the 13 sexual harassment complaints, eight were resolved by mediation, two complaints were dismissed, one was withdrawn as a result of the grievance process, and two have not yet been finalized.

In 1992 and again in 1998, a Canadian Forces survey on harassment was conducted, in which participants were asked if they had experienced harassment within the previous 12 months. In 1992, 26% of women and 2% of men believed they had been subjected to sexual harassment. In the 1998 survey, results showed a decline in the reported rate for sexual harassment, which was 14% for women.

The results of a 2012 harassment survey of regular force members are currently being finalized and will be available in the coming

months. Subsequent survey research will focus on members of the reserve force and recruits and is scheduled to be conducted in 2013.

All Canadian Forces members receive elements of harassment prevention and resolution training at various levels of their professional development throughout their careers. Upon entry into the forces, both non-commissioned members and officers receive training on personal conduct policies. The intended outcome is adherence to the professional norms expected of military members. As part of this module, military members are taught that harassment, in any form, is inconsistent with national defence ethics, constitutes unacceptable conduct, and will not be tolerated.

As noted in the policy application, enforcement of the harassment prevention and resolution policy is a responsibility of leaders and commanders who are designated as responsible officers. Consequently, all new commanding officers are required to certify that they have read and understood the Chief of the Defence Staff's guidance to commanding officers. Among other things, this highlights their duties for harassment prevention and resolution, including their role as responsible officers for members under their command.

As part of our continuing effort to remind people of our policy on harassment, we released new harassment prevention posters this year and distributed them to all units in the Canadian Forces for display in common work areas. The messages are simple and straightforward, and the posters allow for the inclusion of local contact information.

By way of conclusion, the hard data portray a reassuring picture of sexual harassment in the Canadian Forces, in that the incidence of formal complaints, both internally and externally, is relatively low. Alternative dispute resolution statistics suggest there is a higher rate of harassment incidents, but if most complaints are being resolved through the options of self-help, supervisor intervention, or mediation, rather than through the more adversarial forms of formal investigations, that is also encouraging.

The decline over time in self-report survey responses of sexual harassment is also good news, but I hasten to add that two data points do not constitute a trend. Therefore, we look forward with interest to the next round of survey results.

This concludes my opening statement. Thank you for your attention.

My colleague will now proceed with her opening statement.

● (0855)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Wenek.

I now give the floor to Ms. Rigg.

Ms. Rigg, you have 10 minutes.

[*English*]

Ms. Jacqueline Rigg (Director General, Civilian Human Resources Management Operations, Assistant Deputy Minister (Human Resources - Civilian), Department of National Defence): Good morning, and thank you very much for the opportunity to be here to speak with you today.

My name is Jacqueline Rigg. I am the director general of civilian human resources management operations in the Department of National Defence. I oversee the operations of six civilian human resources centres across Canada. I work in partnership with civilian and military managers in the area of strategic and operational human resources management.

With me today is Susan Harrison, director of civilian labour relations. She's the director responsible for the civilian harassment policy.

To put my remarks today in context, I offer the following description of the DND civilian workforce.

Over the past 10 years, the Department of National Defence civilian workforce has ranged between 20,000 employees and 29,000 employees. The DND workforce is unionized, being represented by 10 bargaining agents covered by 18 collective agreements; 40% of the civilian workforce are females and are employed in all the occupational groups, ranging from executives to blue-collar trades. Approximately 70% of the entire workforce are managed by members of the Canadian Forces. The Department of National Defence is located in all regions of the country, including the north. National Defence is committed to providing a respectful workplace by promoting prevention, coupled with prompt resolution of harassment.

We believe that all civilians have the right to fairness, respect, and dignity, and to work in a workplace free of harassment. Our strong stance on harassment, including sexual harassment, is evidenced by our stand-alone policy on harassment and the associated tools to support the program.

The Department of National Defence has had a policy in place since 1982. In 2000, the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces harmonized their separate policies and introduced the DND and CF harassment prevention and resolution policy in advance of the similar Treasury Board of Canada policy. The context of the policy is that mutual trust, support, and respect for the dignity and rights of every person are essential characteristics of the work environment. The policy statement itself says:

The CF and DND are committed to providing a respectful workplace by promoting prevention and prompt resolution of harassment. All CF members and DND employees have the right to be treated fairly, respectfully and with dignity in a workplace free of harassment, and they have the responsibility to treat others in the same manner.

Harassment in any form constitutes unacceptable conduct and will not be tolerated. No CF member or DND employee shall subject any person in the workplace to harassment. Any member or employee who subjects another person to harassment is liable to disciplinary and administrative action.

Our policy conforms to the requirements of the Treasury Board of Canada policy issued in 2001 and is aligned to the new 2012 policy on harassment prevention and resolution released in October. All these policies require the establishment of a complaint procedure; methods of resolving complaints; and remedial, corrective, and restorative measures. DND is fully compliant.

That said, we are in the process of working with the Canadian Forces to revise and update our harmonized policy and all the associated tools. To further support the prevention of harassment in the workplace, accompanying the policy are comprehensive guidelines on prevention, roles and responsibilities, complaint handling,

alternate dispute resolution, and workplace restoration. Other tools include guidance for managers' delegated responsibility under the policy and a handbook for all employees, which provides a description of the entire policy and program.

Additionally, all employees are required to take a Department of National Defence course on harassment awareness and prevention for employees or harassment awareness and prevention for supervisors. A similar course is also delivered through the Canada School of Public Service, or they may take one through the joint learning program of the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Public Service Alliance of Canada.

- (0900)

While our policy and training are applicable to all Department of National Defence civilian employees, it is important to note that the prohibition of sexual harassment is reinforced by its inclusion in the majority of the collective agreements covering our employees. Grievances under these provisions can be referred to the Public Service Labour Relations Board, and this board is empowered to issue awards under the Canadian Human Rights Act.

There are several forms of recourse available to employees who feel they have been harassed. Employees can submit a complaint to the Canadian Human Rights Commission under the Canadian Human Rights Act. They can submit a complaint to the delegated manager under the policy framework that we have established. They can also file a grievance under their collective agreement. It goes without saying that sexual harassment complaints are covered by these mechanisms.

From a statistical perspective, for the Canadian human rights complaints, we had information from 2007 to date. In total there were three sexual harassment complaints, only one of which is still open. The other two were settled.

For harassment complaints under our policies, we have information from 2000 to date. There were 14 sexual harassment complaints, and nine were founded during that period. In total, there were 316 harassment complaints filed for various reasons in that same period.

For labour relations grievances, our statistical information covers the period from 2008 to date. During that time, there were four sexual harassment grievances filed. Two were partially founded, one was dismissed, and one remains open.

We acknowledge that all of these statistics have been generated by different tracking systems and do not permit any further in-depth analysis. The current Government of Canada human resources management system has its limitations, but an upgraded version will be coming in 2013 and will enable better capture and analysis of data as part of our human resources modernization program. We, of course, are working in collaboration with the program centre, which is made up of representatives from central agencies and several government departments, including the Department of National Defence.

In closing, I would like to share with you some facts about women in the Department of National Defence. Of particular note is that women are overrepresented in the management group, made up primarily of executives. We consider this to be especially positive, given the nature of our organization and the challenges women face in achieving such levels in the private sector.

The Department of National Defence also has a large blue-collar workforce, performing functions related to industrial trades and equipment operation. In this blue-collar sector, women are well represented. Similarly, women are well represented in the senior administrative and the scientific and professional sectors. Where we are short on the employment of women is in the technical groups that are related to ammunition workers, engineering support, and electronic technologists. Closing this long-standing gap is one of the priorities of our employment equity plan that is about to be published.

We are currently in the process of renewing the DND-CF harmonized harassment policy and will continue to have this issue at the forefront of how we manage our employees. Worthy of note is that the public service employee survey indicates that 73% of the DND civilian population believes that the Department of National Defence “works hard to create a workplace that prevents harassment”.

DND considers harassment in any form to be a serious matter. We have multiple mechanisms to support employees, managers, and the organization with respect to harassment issues. Though we have confidence in the current policies, programs, and initiatives that have led to the relatively low incidence of sexual harassment, we are still very cognizant that even one incident is too many.

This concludes my opening remarks.

● (0905)

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Rigg.

We will now hear from Mr. Gauthier.

You have 10 minutes.

Colonel Alain Gauthier (Acting Director General, Operations, National Defence and Canadian Forces Ombudsman): Madam Chair, I would like to begin by thanking the committee for inviting us to testify today as part of its study of sexual harassment in the federal workplace.

The Ombudsman, Pierre Daigle, has asked me in my capacity as Acting Director General of Operations, to provide you with an overview of our mandate, policies and practices with respect to the handling of sexual harassment complaints brought to our office.

[English]

The office of the ombudsman was created in 1998 to ensure the fair treatment of concerns raised by current and former members of the Canadian Forces, both regular forces and reservists; by current and former employees of the Department of National Defence; by family members of service personnel and civilian employees; and by Canadians applying to become members of the Canadian Forces.

The ombudsman has a mandate to investigate and make recommendations to improve the overall well-being and quality of life of the members of the defence community. While our investigators attempt to resolve complaints informally and at the lowest level possible, some complaints require thorough investigation, leading to a formal report of findings and recommendations that are made public.

Last year we received more than 1,400 new complaints from our constituents. In total, our investigators and intake officers closed 1,471 cases, including new cases, reopened cases, and cases from previous years. Among these, 65 were related to harassment and three were specifically related to sexual harassment.

The ombudsman’s office also acts as a direct source of information, referral, and education. It is in this capacity that we address sexual harassment complaints. We ourselves do not investigate allegations of sexual harassment. In such cases, our office works closely with individuals to advise them of the various avenues of recourse available to them.

When an individual feels that he or she has not been treated fairly by the existing mechanisms within the Canadian Forces or the public service, the ombudsman can launch an investigation to determine if there are indeed issues or concerns related to fairness that need to be brought forward to the department on the individual’s behalf.

As a matter of policy, complainants with unresolved or ongoing complaints are requested to maintain contact with the ombudsman’s office so we can follow up on further questions or concerns.

● (0910)

[Translation]

To conclude, although complaints of sexual harassment make up a very small fraction of the 16,000 complaints we have received since 1998, we are keenly aware that they need to be treated with sensitivity and compassion. With that in mind, we do everything that we can to ensure individuals obtain the assistance they need and deserve.

Madam Chair, I have provided the committee clerk with the details of the disposition of harassment cases the Ombudsman’s Office has handled over the last six years. The information is appended to Annex A of my speaking notes.

I stand ready to address questions from committee members.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

I thank all of the witnesses for their presentations. They were very interesting.

We shall now proceed with our questions.

Ms. Truppe, you have seven minutes.

[English]

Mrs. Susan Truppe (London North Centre, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I’d like to thank all of our witnesses. This is the largest group we’ve had all at one time. Thank you for being here.

I have a question for Madam Rigg. You mentioned that the current Government of Canada human resources management system has limitations but that an upgraded version will be coming in 2013. When you mention that there are some limitations in the existing system and that you're looking forward to this new system, what are some of the limitations you would say it has?

Ms. Jacqueline Rigg: When we were collecting data for this appearance, we had to go to three different sources to receive the facts on this. We're trying to harmonize this.

We review actual complaints that come from the Canadian Human Rights Act. We also review all of our labour relations grievances, and we use the harassment complaint tracking system. We have to investigate three different areas. We're trying to make it better so that we have one area of registered complaints and there is no chance of overlap.

Mrs. Susan Truppe: If I were to ask you to describe what this new, updated system would be like, will it just condense it all, or are there other benefits as well?

Ms. Jacqueline Rigg: I think the benefits are, first of all, that there will be one area for tracking it, which will make it much easier to eliminate chances for duplication or for things to show up in more than one system. Also, it will be able to better align with all of the other tracking systems we have in place for HR information.

Mrs. Susan Truppe: Great. Thank you. Yes, it does sound as though it will be better for you. It must be cumbersome to be going to three different areas.

I have a couple of questions for Monsieur Wenek.

I understand that you're collecting the information regarding the reports of sexual harassment through the different types of conflict resolution processes available. I think I understand that collecting your data in this way means that some of the cases are reported more than once, and I understand that you're trying to develop an integrated management system for the various conflict resolution procedures.

Could you describe the role of the integrated management system and any progress that has been made towards its development?

Mr. Karol Wenek: Madam Chair, fortunately Commander Crewe is the co-chair of the working group that's looking at the integration of those conflict resolution systems, so I'll ask him to respond to that question. He has some in-depth knowledge of that process.

Mrs. Susan Truppe: Great. Thank you.

Commander Tony Crewe (Director Human Rights and Diversity, Assistant Chief Military Personnel, Department of National Defence): Thank you, ma'am.

Similar to the public service in its reporting, we have exactly the same issues: trying to go to different databases to get the information. Without actually looking at every file, we don't know whether there is duplication or not.

As a result, about a year ago the Vice Chief of the Defence Staff stood up a working group to look at integrated conflict management for Canadian Forces personnel—not solely because of the data tracking, but data tracking was certainly one of the issues that we had leading to the requirement to study it.

We're looking at a system that's fairly complex, with multiple mechanisms, whereby it becomes a little bit difficult for the member at the lower end of the scale who is not quite *au fait* with all the policies to figure out where to turn.

What the working group did was look at the current mechanisms and the issues that are created by those current mechanisms. We're utilizing the business process redesign methodology to map out all of those processes and then to design a potential integrated process that at the moment would combine looking at harassment, grievances, and alternate dispute resolution and merging those three processes into one process, hopefully giving the member one single point of entry whereby they could go to talk to one person. That person would steer them through the most appropriate mechanism, of course starting with alternate dispute resolution as the preferred option.

● (0915)

Mrs. Susan Truppe: Thank you.

Having three different ones sounds confusing for both of you. I would think it would be confusing for the person trying to address their own concern, because they wouldn't know where to go and might even give up.

Do you have an anticipated date on this system?

Cdr Tony Crewe: We are briefing Armed Forces Council next month in hopes to get the approval to stand up a small project team of full-time resources. At the moment, the process managers involved are working this as one of many issues we're dealing with. If we can stand up this small project team, we hope to be able to have something in place, including an information management portion, in about two years' time.

Mrs. Susan Truppe: Madam Rigg, I don't think I asked you. When do you anticipate yours might be completed?

Ms. Jacqueline Rigg: I'm going to refer that to Susan Harrison.

Ms. Susan Harrison (Director Civilian Labour Relations, Assistant Deputy Minister (Human Resources-Civilian), Department of National Defence): Are you referring to the human resource management system?

Mrs. Susan Truppe: Yes, to your new system, which would integrate—

Ms. Susan Harrison: We're starting to work on it in 2013 and we expect the introduction to be concluded within that fiscal year.

Mrs. Susan Truppe: Okay, so yours is a little closer.

Ms. Susan Harrison: That doesn't mean necessarily that it might not be delayed for various resource reasons.

Mrs. Susan Truppe: Okay, thank you.

Going back to Monsieur Wenek, when a formal complaint is about to be filed, are efforts made to encourage alternative dispute resolution methods prior to proceeding with a formal complaint? Do you maintain statistics related to individuals who sought one resolution over the other?

Mr. Karol Wenek: Again, because that's a process issue that Tony is more familiar with, I'll ask him to respond to that.

I'm sorry; I'm not trying to duck this.

Cdr Tony Crewe: The preferred method for any complainant is to approach the supervisor and at that point hopefully engage in informal resolution.

The formal process is always available, and we certainly don't try to steer them away from it. If a member does not feel comfortable approaching their supervisor for whatever reason, we have workplace relations advisers in some units, and harassment advisers. As well, they can approach a dispute resolution centre and discuss the issue with somebody.

The dispute resolution centre will always try to turn it back, to make sure that they engage their unit personnel and the chain of command, depending on the sensitivity and the confidentiality. At some point it will have to be rendered onto paper so that we know exactly the details of who is involved, what the facts of the incident are, etc. The hope is that they'll go to the supervisor and try informal resolution. Early, local, and informal is the way we hope to resolve them.

Mrs. Susan Truppe: Thank you.

[Translation]

The Chair: I am going to have to stop you here, because your speaking time has expired. Thank you.

I now yield the floor to Ms. Ashton for seven minutes.

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP): Thank you very much.

[English]

Thank you very much to everybody who's joining us today and for your presentations.

It's quite clear that both the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces have done a fair bit of work in terms of making sure there's awareness, prevention, and mechanisms to deal with sexual harassment when it takes place. I'm wondering if anyone from the RCMP has been in touch with either the ombudsman's office, or the civilian side, or with any of you or your offices, in terms of learning from some of the work you've done.

Mr. Karol Wenek: I'm not aware of any contact with us.

Tony, have you had any?

Cdr Tony Crewe: We have just recently stood up a foresight study on diversity within the CF, but we expanded that to diversity within the security community and invited reps from the Communications Security Establishment, RCMP, border services, and other related security agencies. We had several RCMP reps. While we didn't discuss harassment specifically, we have been asked to sit down and meet with them to discuss more on our employment equity and diversity policy issues, of which harassment is one that we manage. I'm sure it will come up as we get into those discussions.

• (0920)

Ms. Niki Ashton: What's the timeline for that?

Cdr Tony Crewe: Because we're in the midst of the diversity foresight study at the moment, those discussions will probably occur after the foresight study completes, which should be later this month or early December. Probably early in the new year we'll get to discussing the other related issues.

Ms. Niki Ashton: Okay.

Ms. Jacqueline Rigg: On the civilian side, I'm not aware of any such consultations under way.

Ms. Niki Ashton: I realize the ombudsman's office is a bit different, but I'm wondering—

Col Alain Gauthier: There's nothing from our office, either.

Ms. Niki Ashton: It's interesting. Certainly there seem to be some lessons to be learned from the work you're doing.

One of the issues we've discussed is the importance of exit surveys, which is a gap in the work that the RCMP does. There's no question there are some differences all across the board.

We're aware that in the 2009 national report to the Committee on Women in NATO Forces it was reported that a comprehensive analysis of exit survey data from 2005-2008 was under way as part of monitoring the rate of attrition for female members of the Canadian Forces. The report indicates that the analysis would be used to determine the factors "which prompt female members to leave the CF" and would be used to make recommendations of corrective measures.

Can you tell the committee whether this analysis included consideration of sexual harassment as a possible reason for departure from the forces, and if so, to what extent was it an issue?

Mr. Karol Wenek: The exit survey has been in place for a considerable length of time, I think at least 20 years or more. One of the difficulties in acquiring consistent data, particularly about voluntary attrition behaviour, is that completion of the survey is voluntary. In some cases individuals just don't want to say why they left, so we're not getting an entirely reliable picture of why people leave.

We looked at attrition behaviour as recently as 2008-09 because our attrition rate within the Canadian Forces generally was elevated. We were up over 9%. We're now currently at about 6%. We were concerned about the effect this was having on force expansion and our ability to meet our growth targets.

What the data from a variety of sources tended to show was that particularly for women, but not exclusive to them, it was a sort of work-life balance issue. Particularly as people got into 10-plus years of service, it got to be a big factor. As you are probably aware, the CF imposes fairly heavy mobility requirements on military members and their families. We move them around every few years. For many serving members with families and for members who have spouses or partners who are trying to maintain a career themselves, this becomes disruptive. At some point many of them have to face the decision: do I stay or do I go? Attrition in the later years of service tends to reflect that dynamic.

I don't recall anything that particularly identified sexual harassment or an unwelcoming work environment for women. In fact, in my recollection the attrition statistics show that the rates are about the same for men and women.

Ms. Niki Ashton: Out of the exit surveys, have you been able to make any recommendations around sexual harassment?

Mr. Karol Wenek: It hasn't surfaced as a sufficiently significant issue for us to address.

Ms. Niki Ashton: Okay.

To Ms. Rigg, earlier this year the Department of National Defence had 1,000 civilian jobs cut. We've heard from others, and certainly it's been stated outside, that it could be argued that job insecurity may cause stress and raise tension in the workplace.

Given that situation, which I understand is relatively recent, I'm wondering if you're seeing an increase in incidents of harassment, including sexual harassment.

• (0925)

The Chair: You have 30 seconds.

Ms. Jacqueline Rigg: We've not seen an increase related to that in terms of cuts that are being done in our department right now.

Basically, these cuts are being done minus names, people; it's just the positions. There's no identification of whether the incumbent is female or male when they're doing the exercises of streamlining our processes and our activities. We have not seen anything to this point.

Ms. Niki Ashton: Thank you.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. O'Neill Gordon, you have the floor. You have seven minutes.
[*English*]

Mrs. Tilly O'Neill Gordon (Miramichi, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to thank the witnesses for being with us this morning.

Certainly your presentation gives us a clear understanding of just what is going on in your department, at the Department of National Defence, in terms of how you are trying to prevent sexual harassment. I like your strong stance in the work you do to provide a workplace free of harassment. I think we're all working in that direction.

Your policy is clear and specific, and I'd say that prevention seems to be one of your key mottoes. You have been speaking a bit about training in harassment prevention and resolution that Canadian Forces members receive through their careers. In addition, you noted that the harassment prevention and resolution policy often prescribes training when a complaint is determined to be founded.

I'm wondering, with this focus on training, what sort of harassment prevention and resolution training is available to the members of the Canadian Forces, and at what level of their careers.

Mr. Karol Wenek: Let me approach this with a fairly broad perspective, first of all. I think over the last 20 years there has been a significant change in the culture within the Canadian Forces that has been reinforced by a number of initiatives, which all have this as a central focus: what is appropriate and professional conduct by people in uniform?

That goes back to the mid-1990s after we had some very bad stories about how POWs were treated. We had some bad stories about earlier cases of sexual harassment and sexual assault that led to a process of institutional reform that examined all those issues and tried to identify the gaps in our programs that weren't producing the requisite kind of professional conduct in some of our members—and I emphasize “some”.

That begins, I think, with the development of a defence ethics program that was instituted a little over a dozen years ago, maybe about 15 years ago, which articulates, as its first principle, respecting the dignity of all persons. In its elaborated statement, it emphasizes issues such as fair treatment of others and avoidance of discrimination and harassment.

That program is refreshed throughout the organization on an annual basis, and it's been identified by external agencies as a model program for us. The defence ethics program applies equally to members of the Canadian Forces and to civilian employees of the department.

We have completely revamped our leadership philosophy. Again, that goes back about eight or ten years. One of the central features of our approach to leadership is that while there is and always will be a strong emphasis on getting the mission accomplished, we must pay equal attention to how we accomplish missions: we cannot break the law of war and we cannot violate principles that are central to what we hold dear as a society and as a culture.

It's through those kinds of programs, through acculturation into what it means to be a military professional. We documented that as well, as part of this enterprise, into the development of a manual on what it means to be a military professional, called *Duty with Honour*. Again, it's those principles of conducting yourself in a way that will not bring discredit to the organization or to you as an individual.

All those programs have this theme that runs through them, and they are delivered at various stages and through various venues and career and leadership courses.

As I mentioned, everyone who goes through basic training—and everybody does, unless they have done it previously—gets this exposure to the behavioural norms and expectations that apply to them with respect to harassment and sexual harassment. They are exposed to what it means to live by the charter and the Canadian Human Rights Act, what it means to be a military professional, what's expected of them when they begin their leadership training—which starts very early for military personnel—and what it means to exercise values-based leadership.

Through all those programs, they get this theme of respect for others and treating people equally and fairly.

There are specific courses as well that deal with harassment.

Because most members get the basics—it's embedded in their normal military training—the specialized courses tend to be for harassment advisers, for people who provide advice and guidance to responsible officers, and for harassment investigators.

Is there anything you would like to add, Tony?

• (0930)

Cdr Tony Crewe: No, I think that pretty much covers it.

We have five levels of leadership development training for non-commissioned members and another five levels for our officers. In every one of those levels, any officer or NCM who's promoted into that leadership level will go through a professional development training course that will include and re-emphasize those underlying beliefs.

Mrs. Tilly O'Neill Gordon: As is always said, leadership is the key factor in any training or in any workplace, so if you have good leadership at the top, you can be pretty well guaranteed that everything will run as smoothly as you would like it to be anyway. That's a good method, a good way in which to go.

I don't think we could cover anything more important than respect and leadership, along with training. If you realize that, then I think you are pretty well on the right road, and I want to congratulate you for a job well done.

[Translation]

The Chair: You have finished? Thank you.

Ms. Sgro, you have the floor for seven minutes.

[English]

Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Welcome to all of you.

I have to say I'm so pleased to hear such positive comments, but you've been to war in the sense that you went through it in the nineties. Senator Dallaire has certainly talked about some of the problems that were clearly evident at that time, and the changes, and he holds you up as the example for many other departments and many other areas you have worked on. Congratulations on the work you've done.

Having to have a cultural change is part of the concern. How do you start to see that cultural change? You have thousands of people working for you. We can bring in all of the wonderful policies that are possible, and you can read Treasury Board directives and all the things in the federal public service that talk so well about things that are unacceptable and all that, but it doesn't matter what you put there if people don't even interpret their behaviour as being unacceptable. Their attitude is that it's just their behaviour, and that's just the way it is, I think.

How do you see that cultural change in your organization today versus how it was in the 1990s? What would stand out for people to see and for those who work for you?

Mr. Karol Wenek: I think the major index of any cultural change is behavioural change. It's often stated you have to change attitudes before you see the necessary behavioural change, but that isn't always the case. In fact, through the strong enforcement of the desired behavioural norms, you can change the behaviour first, and eventually the attitudes will move as well to be consistent with the behaviour that is deemed acceptable and desirable.

We use the indices of behavioural change as our primary measure of cultural change. We do that largely through personnel surveys. We survey people in the military, some would say almost to death, but it's the only way we can find out in an impartial and a relatively objective way how people view these particular changes, so surveys on harassment, surveys on the ethics program, and surveys on the efficacy of the policy and program provide very important measures to us about how we are doing.

In that vein, there was a survey sponsored by our chief of review services in 2005 in which members were surveyed about the policy

on harassment and the program. There were some very encouraging results, to the effect, for example, that 90% of CF members indicated they had received some form of harassment awareness training. They saw the policy as clear and effective.

These were very strong indicators to us that we were doing the right thing. That really becomes the motivator for policy or program change. When you have large proportions of a population that are dissatisfied with a policy, program, or its application, that should be the signal that you have to do something about it. That is our primary measure of how we are doing and whether or not we're on the right track.

● (0935)

Hon. Judy Sgro: How much would you attribute some of the change to the fact that you have a significant number of women in senior positions?

Mr. Karol Wenek: For the Canadian Forces, actually that's not the case. Our representation of women in the Canadian Forces is about 15% of the regular and reserve force. Above the rank of lieutenant-colonel, it's less than that. It's about 9%, 8%, and starts to get lower as you get into the rank of general. That's largely because of where women choose to work in the Canadian Forces.

I'll just back up a bit and try to paint the picture for you. If you look at how women are employed in Canada, generally, in industries—and we have this data from Statistics Canada—you see that the goods-producing sector is heavily dominated by men; this is natural resources, manufacturing, agriculture, and those kinds of industries.

In the service sector, a couple of industries are dominated by women; these tend to be health, education, and a couple of others. In a number of others, it's more or less balanced; in business, for example, it is relatively equal.

If you look at the military in comparison, our equivalent to the goods-producing sector is combat occupations. Women are infrequently represented in those occupations, in most cases 5% or less, whereas they are heavily represented in the service occupations.

The key to understanding what that means for promotion and access to senior rank is that the emphasis in the military is fielding combat-capable forces and preparing people for command. Therefore, if people in those occupations are predominantly men, you're going to see predominantly men in the senior ranks as a result, although an effort is made to ensure that women have access to those occupations and to senior rank as much as possible.

Hon. Judy Sgro: Ms. Rigg, go ahead.

Ms. Jacqueline Rigg: Yes, Madam Chair, we never have looked into the correlations—a very good observation—with the increase in women's leadership in the civilian workforce. I think that with that, coupled with the other things we have in place—annual ethics days and the culture and knowledge-sharing around these topics—we are very much richer in our organization now. I think if you couple them together, it could be a reason as to why culture will move along with the different policies we're developing.

Hon. Judy Sgro: Thank you very much.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you.

As the list of witnesses is exceptionally long today, I propose that we take a five-minute break.

• (0935)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (0940)

The Chair: I invite everyone to resume their seats. We are going to continue our meeting.

Ms. James, you have five minutes.

• (0945)

[*English*]

Ms. Roxanne James (Scarborough Centre, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I welcome all our guests. I'm going to direct most of my questions towards Mr. Wenek, but if someone else wants to jump in, please feel free.

Within your opening remarks, Mr. Wenek, you mentioned that the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence have a joint harassment resolution policy that applies to both military and civilian personnel. This is a pretty broad spectrum, a pretty large group, so does a one-size policy actually fit all?

Mr. Karol Wenek: In terms of human resource management generally, no, and that's why most policies are quite distinct. In fact, most human resource policies as applied to military members derive from the National Defence Act and the Queen's regulations subordinate to them, whereas on the civilian side they come from the Treasury Board and the Public Service Employment Act and Public Service Staff Relations Act.

In most areas of HR policy they don't, but there are areas where, particularly because we have mixed work teams, it makes sense to have some commonality of approach in dealing with people who are working together, and where you have civilians reporting to military and military reporting to civilians. This is one area where we felt there was sufficient overlap such that we could have a joint policy. There are some minor differences in terms of application of the policy, but by and large, it tends to work, and it ensures that you have the same kind of outcome for a process that applies equally to military and civilian people.

Ms. Roxanne James: If I understand correctly, the joint policy only covers the areas that are common to everyone?

Mr. Karol Wenek: In harassment, yes, that's right.

Ms. Roxanne James: Okay.

In your statement, you talked about how the new version of the policy dated December 2002 shifted the emphasis to prevention or early resolution through alternative dispute resolution.

Mr. Karol Wenek: That's correct.

Ms. Roxanne James: You made a statement near the end of your opening remarks that "alternative dispute resolution statistics suggest a higher rate of harassment incidents", but that if "most complaints are actually being resolved through the options of self-help, supervisor intervention, or mediation" rather than the other methods, you've indicated that you find that encouraging.

The numbers seem to imply that statistics have gone up. Is it encouraging because we're able to resolve them early and prevent them from escalating? Could you just explain to me why it's encouraging?

Mr. Karol Wenek: Sure, and I think there are two parts to my answer.

The first one is that one of the key changes in the philosophy underlying the most recent version of the policy was to shift from a crime-and-punishment approach to harassment to a restorative justice approach. This means that except in the most egregious cases, what you want to do is restore some element of harmony to the workplace and preserve the sense of teamwork and cohesion that are essential to an effectively functioning defence team.

To keep the resolution as low-level as possible is the desired method. Given what our statistics from the 1998 survey show, which is that most sexual harassment incidents were of a verbal nature involving teasing, inappropriate remarks, and that kind of thing, it makes sense to resolve them at a low level: correct the behaviour, tell people what they're doing wrong, tell them what they should be doing, make restitution, and then get back to work.

Ms. Roxanne James: I'm glad you actually mentioned verbal teasing, making comments, and so forth. As politicians, many of us have very thick skins. We have to, in order to get here in the first place. A comment made to me or one of my colleagues may not be offensive, may roll right off my back, maybe doesn't bother me or stop me in my stride.

However, in your definition of sexual harassment—I'm trying to go back to your page—you say it's "any improper conduct by an individual that is directed at and offensive to another person or persons in the workplace and that the individual knew or ought to have known would cause offence or harm." How do you determine what is reasonable in that particular case? Again, something that may roll right off my back may be "Oh, my gosh" to another person or individual. How do you define what's reasonable to determine whether it should be offensive or not offensive?

• (0950)

Mr. Karol Wenek: That's the million-dollar question, I think.

Ms. Roxanne James: Do you have a two-million-dollar answer?

Mr. Karol Wenek: I don't think you can do that a priori. We establish appropriate social norms of interaction as we go along. It is through the process of social interaction that we determine what's appropriate and what's inappropriate. The important thing, if you think it's inappropriate, is to say it is inappropriate. That was one of the other findings from our survey.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Unfortunately, I have to stop you here, because Ms. James' speaking time has expired. Five minutes really fly by.

I am now going to yield the floor to Ms. Hassainia for five minutes.

Mrs. Sana Hassainia (Verchères—Les Patriotes, NDP): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Wenek, thank you. Your last comment was very interesting.

I wish to thank all of our speakers. The changes in culture that you made over the last 20 years are much appreciated. Clearly, you decided to tackle this problem head on.

My first question is for Mr. Wenek.

Could you define the term “sexual harassment” as it is described in your policy? Does it automatically imply sexual aggression or rape?

[English]

Mr. Karol Wenek: Sexual harassment, Madam Chair, is not defined in our policy because it is included in the kinds of harassment covered by Canadian Human Rights Act. In that sense, our definition of harassment is actually broader than that in the Canadian Human Rights Act because in the Canadian Human Rights Act it refers specifically to the 11 prohibited grounds. We don't define sexual harassment because common sense would dictate that people know what sexual harassment is. It's an element of harassment that's of a sexual nature. That's fairly straightforward. We don't define it for that reason, and because we might then be obliged to define what harassment is based on national or ethnic origin or what harassment is based on sexual orientation. We give a fairly broad definition that includes all those elements that are contained in the Canadian Human Rights Act.

It does not include sexual assault. That is a separate area. That's covered under the sexual misconduct policy and is dealt with by the appropriate military justice and police authorities.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sana Hassainia: Thank you.

In your presentation, you referred to unfounded complaints. Could you tell us what you mean by “unfounded” and what criteria were used to determine that they were unfounded? Would you have some more specific figures to provide to us in that respect?

Mr. Karol Wenek: Tony, could you answer please?

[English]

Cdr Tony Crewe: Once a complaint is lodged, similar to the new five-step process that was introduced by Treasury Board, we've had that same five-step process in place since our 2000 policy.

The first step is to acknowledge the complaint.

The second step is to conduct a situational awareness to see if it meets the grounds. A series of grounds are laid out to say we will consider this to be a case of harassment and move it forward to investigation. That's the first point at which something might be found as unfounded, as not meeting the grounds to be treated as a harassment investigation case.

If it does move to investigation, it could be simply an interpretation of whether it was something that was unreasonable or not. Again, as we've discussed, that's the million-dollar question. Was it reasonable or unreasonable? It could simply be a matter of interpretation or misinterpretation of what was said or meant and therefore, again, could be determined to be unfounded. That's going to be on a case-by-case basis, so it's hard to lump any sort of category of unfounded.

Mr. Karol Wenek: That's why it's important to have a third party make the judgment. If you get into a dispute—he said, she said—who's to decide? They each have, from their perspective, valid points of view. You need a third party to make that adjudication.

• (0955)

[Translation]

Mrs. Sana Hassainia: Thank you. The reply is quite clear.

Do you have any data concerning these unfounded complaints? Could we have access to them?

[English]

Cdr Tony Crewe: In the annex we see that of 31 cases of sexual harassment, 11 have been deemed founded. That doesn't necessarily mean 20 are unfounded. They could either have been unfounded or withdrawn, or they might still be in process. We don't have the numbers for how many were judged to be unfounded.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sana Hassainia: I think I still have time for one last brief question.

What are your processing times for harassment cases, approximately? I know that some are still being processed. Briefly, can you give me some idea of the processing times?

[English]

Cdr Tony Crewe: The database indicates that our average for a founded complaint is about 90 days. The responsible officer has up to 180 days, and I think under new Treasury Board policy it's up to 12 months. We have cases that have been resolved in as little as one day and cases that have taken up to 51 months. It's all situation-dependent—it depends on the availability of the parties and access to them for deployments, etc.

[Translation]

The Chair: I must stop you here, because Ms. Hassainia's speaking time has expired. Thank you very much.

It is now Ms. Bateman's turn.

You have five minutes.

Ms. Joyce Bateman (Winnipeg South Centre, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

[English]

Thank you all for being here. The work that you're doing matters greatly to every one of the members on this committee, and we appreciate it. We're very grateful to be able to learn from you.

Mr. Wenek, perhaps it's my training as a chartered accountant, but I appreciate the data that you have placed in here. They are concrete, tangible. In the previous testimony we heard, we didn't have that precision. It's helpful because it gives us not only something concrete, but also some context.

[Translation]

Thank you for that.

[English]

That's very useful.

I'm grateful that you don't survey your employees to death, because it wouldn't work. It's just close enough. When you speak about surveying people on their ethics and the efficacy of various policies on harassment, that's so useful.

I want to confirm that these are blind surveys. They're not identified.

Mr. Karol Wenek: Right. They are anonymous surveys.

We have two kinds of survey procedures. We have an internal research capability made up of a broad range of Department of National Defence scientists. They conduct specialized, focused surveys, which can be administered on an as-required basis or periodically. For example, a large-scale survey on harassment would be one of these kinds of surveys.

We also do continuous surveys, in which we sample from the population twice a year on a broad range of topics. You could call it a continuous opinion survey, if you like. This way, we can track data longitudinally as well.

One of the reasons, by the way, that I included data is that I'm a behavioural scientist by training. We do policy on the basis of evidence and research and data. I'm quite happy to provide that.

Ms. Joyce Bateman: That's excellent.

How do you work? Clearly, the Government of Canada is investing significant resources in gathering data in these public service surveys. The cost is high, but the information obtained is useful, not only to senior managers but to members of Parliament as well.

How does that interface with your data collection process?

Mr. Karol Wenek: We don't use the public service employment survey because our members are not public servants, so there's a different set of—

- (1000)

Ms. Joyce Bateman: Even civilians?

Mr. Karol Wenek: That's the department. I speak for the Canadian Forces.

Ms. Joyce Bateman: Of course.

Is it a useful tool to compare data?

Mr. Karol Wenek: Absolutely. We do comparisons. I cited Statistics Canada data earlier in terms of the employment of women. We do comparisons with the national databases. We do comparisons with other government departments. We do comparisons with other militaries. We're part of an organization called the Technical Cooperation Program, which includes Canada, the United States, the U.K., Australia, and New Zealand. It's sometimes referred to as Five Eyes. We have an ongoing information technology exchange program with them. We routinely do surveys, and sometimes it's the same survey administered to the militaries of five different nations as a basis of comparison. It's a way of benchmarking what we do.

Ms. Joyce Bateman: I'm very grateful to hear that there's that sharing. Why reinvent the wheel if somebody has the data?

Mr. Karol Wenek: We steal from each other.

Ms. Joyce Bateman: Absolutely, with gratitude.

You spoke at length—

[*Translation*]

How much time do I have left?

The Chair: You have 40 seconds left.

[*English*]

Ms. Joyce Bateman: On the training piece, one of the stats I heard from you was that 90% of your personnel are exposed to harassment training of some sort.

Does that permeate every rank, every level, and how do you do that?

Mr. Karol Wenek: In the survey 90% of the respondents recalled having been through some form of harassment training.

To set the stage for that answer and explain why that might have been the case, during the late nineties—I can't remember when we discontinued the SHARP program—we had a blitz across the Canadian Forces that required everybody who was serving at the time to take part in this one-day or one-and-a-half-day training program on standards for harassment and racism prevention.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: I am going to have to stop you here, unfortunately. I am sorry.

However, the document you are referring to sounds very interesting. The members of the committee would probably be very interested in consulting it, if that is possible. Can you send it to us?

[*English*]

Mr. Karol Wenek: We could do that.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you. Madam Clerk will follow up with you.

I now give the floor to Ms. Day.

You have five minutes.

Mrs. Anne-Marie Day (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, NDP): Thank you, Madam Chair.

First, I want to thank you for being here. Our committee is studying this question in order to gather information. Whatever questions I put to you, my purpose is to obtain information. I am not seeking confrontation. I wanted to make that clear because I have some rather pointed questions to ask.

I was looking at the figures quoted in each presentation. Mr. Gauthier said that there had been 375 harassment complaints out of 16,000 since 2006. We also heard that there were 65 harassment cases out of 1,471. Concerning military personnel—I think it was Mr. Wenek who said this—over 10 years, there have been 513 harassment complaints, and 6% in another file.

I reacted strongly to this. These are undeniably interesting figures. I am wondering about something Mr. Gauthier said. He said this in his brief: “While our investigators attempt to resolve complaints informally and at the lowest level possible [...]” The lowest level possible may correspond to unions, to the immediate supervisor or to military police.

Without wanting to attack you, I must say that the population does not have the impression that this works very well, with respect to harassment and sexual harassment in the Canadian Forces. That is not the image that is being conveyed. I wonder if many cases get settled before arriving at the level in question, and in what order. I am not asking you for figures, since, clearly, you would not have them with you. Are we talking about 80% of the cases, about most cases or complaints? Have you had any feedback? Do you have any information on this topic?

[*English*]

Mr. Karol Wenek: Madam Chair, if I understand the question correctly, I wouldn't say that we don't have any cases of sexual harassment or sexual assault. Every large organization like ours is going to have to deal with that. I would hope that we would get to zero one day, but I don't think that's realistic.

You have new people coming into the organization, and they bring their norms and their ways of acting. When something is wrong, we try to correct it. There's been no special effort to clean up our data. We collected it as it was and we presented it today as it has existed over the past several years.

●(1005)

Ms. Jacqueline Rigg: It's the same comment for the civilian side. We did not take any immediate actions to speed up the closing of any files. We pulled the data as it existed.

Mr. Karol Wenek: The only thing I would add is that if you think the statistics are artificially low, for example—

[*Translation*]

The Chair: I am really sorry to have to interrupt you, but I am going to have to adjourn the meeting so that we can go to vote in the House.

I am going to ask the committee whether we could invite you again, for one hour. You had a lot of information to impart to the committee, and the committee members had a lot of questions for you. We will surely be contacting you in that regard.

Thank you for having come here this morning.

The meeting is adjourned.

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and
Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les
Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>