



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on the Status of Women

FEWO



NUMBER 006



1st SESSION



38th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, November 23, 2004

—
Chair

Ms. Anita Neville

All parliamentary publications are available on the
"Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire" at the following address:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Tuesday, November 23, 2004

•(1110)

[English]

The Chair (Ms. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.)):
I would like to call this meeting to order.

Good morning, everybody, and welcome to the Honourable Liza Frulla, Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

Minister, I know you've been appearing before a number of committees over the last week or two. This is yet another one of your responsibilities. I would ask you, if you wouldn't mind, to introduce your delegation.

Hon. Liza Frulla (Minister responsible for Status of Women):
Thank you, Madam Chair.

I have with me Jackie Claxton, who is in charge of all the programs. If you need any detailed explanation, Jackie is here. Of course, Florence Ievers is here. You've met Florence; she's in charge of the department. Nanci-Jean Waugh is here. Nanci was also with Madam Finestone at the time. So I have very experienced people with me.

It's an honour, Madame la présidente, and all of you, to speak to you today. I'm very pleased that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women has been established. It provides a parliamentary forum for advancing the future development of gender equality, and it will be a beacon to guide Parliament.

[Translation]

Further, the Standing Committee exemplifies this government's commitment to ensuring the human rights and equality of all Canadians. It reaches across party lines. And it brings us together for work we all care deeply about—that of advancing gender equality. Gender equality is everybody's business—inside and outside government, in non-governmental organizations and in the private sector. It is a partnership process.

As minister, my role is one of leadership, to champion, across government, our forward-looking strategy and our current focus—the Agenda for Gender Equality. Together, we are working to implement our strategy, which has the following objectives.

[English]

The objectives are to engender new policies and programs, to accelerate the implementation of gender-based analysis across government, to engage Canadians in the policy-making process, to meet Canada's international commitments, and to enhance voluntary sector capacity. In meeting these objectives, Status of Women Canada and I remain squarely focused on our ongoing key priorities

of improving women's economic autonomy, eliminating violence against women, and advancing women's human rights.

Status of Women Canada meets these priorities by acting as a catalyst on gender issues, engendering key policies across government. For example, over the years Status of Women Canada has collaborated with departments responsible for justice, health, employment, social development, immigration, and statistics. These partnership efforts have resulted in improvements to family law, child support, Criminal Code amendments, taxation, employment and pay equity, immigration legislation, and the evidence base needed for policy development in all areas.

[Translation]

It is a work in progress. Much has been accomplished, but we still have a long way to go in achieving women's human rights and full gender equality for all.

Canada is a world leader in advancing gender equality and women's human rights. We have in place a solid foundation of legal commitments and obligations, both domestically and internationally, which underpin and facilitate our ongoing efforts to advance gender equality, at home and around the world.

Indeed, Canada has one of the world's best legal frameworks for equality, and one of the longest-standing systems of government machinery for the advancement of equality for women. Together, they constitute invaluable forms of accountability—a legal framework that ensures Canada remains on target in the journey toward equality for all.

[English]

Canada has entrenched such key equality-building legislation as the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Human Rights Act. Status of Women Canada is also an actor on the world stage, promoting and negotiating the integration of a gender perspective to advance women's equality in international organizations.

For example, Canada played a key role in the development of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, CEDAW, adopted at the United Nations in 1979. Canada ratified CEDAW in 1981 and presented its last report in 2003. Often described as an international bill of rights for women, the convention sets up a standard for nations to eradicate discrimination against women. Canada was also instrumental in developing the more recent optional protocol to CEDAW, a further accountability mechanism.

• (1115)

[Translation]

While Canada has been a world leader in gender equality, and a role model for other countries, there is still work to do. In 2003, following Canada's presentation to the CEDAW Committee, the committee made recommendations to Canada, highlighting the need for further action in certain areas, particularly the high rates of poverty among women, the situation of Aboriginal women and the application of gender-based analysis. We have taken measures to address the issues the CEDAW Committee raised.

For example, economic measures include compassionate care leave, an increased investment in the Canada Child Tax Benefit to \$9 billion by 2004, and the government's pledge to build a national system of child care and early learning, using \$5 billion to create 250,000 new spaces by 2009 in English Canada.

[English]

Measures to address the issue of violence against women include the introduction of legislation to strengthen the protection of children and the addition of a trafficking offence to the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act to help address the serious crime of trafficking in humans, particularly women and girls, who are more vulnerable.

In developing a number of these measures, the use of gender-based analysis provided information and data that proved invaluable to policy- and decision-makers.

In 2005, ten years after women met in Beijing to draft the *Platform for Action*, they will gather again, this time in New York, at a meeting known as Beijing+10. There they will evaluate progress made on the *Platform for Action*.

[Translation]

The Beijing+10 process represents a critical opportunity for exchange among representatives of the international community, including governments, non-governmental organizations and experts, on experiences and challenges in achieving results in gender equality.

Along with other countries, Canada will highlight best practices in implementing the Beijing *Platform for Action* and other commitments. Canada will also highlight the challenges, such as high rates of poverty among certain groups of women, discrimination Aboriginal women face and the need to improve accountability for gender equality.

In Canada, the situation of women has evolved significantly. For example, the growth of women's employment has contributed to Canadian society. Women have joined the labour force in growing

numbers, from 42 per cent in 1976 to 56.4 per cent in 2002. This is closer to the employment rate for men, which was 67.4 per cent in 2002. The incidence of low income among single mothers, after tax, has dropped from over 49 per cent in 1997 to 38.7 per cent in 2002.

[English]

The incidence of low income among lone mothers, after tax, has dropped from 49% in 1997 to 38.7% in 2002. Women are also a fast-growing segment of self-employed workers and entrepreneurs in Canada.

[Translation]

Women own close to half of small- and medium-sized enterprises. They provide jobs for almost two million people in Canada. By 2000, women earned about 70 cents for every dollar men earned, shrinking a wage gap that 20 years ago had women earning about 52 cents for every dollar men earned.

[English]

In spite of gains such as these, work remains to be done. Women continue to do the lion's share of unpaid work, such as caregiving and household work—fully two-thirds, a rate that is almost the same as it was over 30 years ago. Women's incomes are slowly improving, but the increase is mainly due to the fact that they are devoting more time to paid work.

[Translation]

Women are still concentrated in the infamous "pink ghetto", in occupations that have always been female-dominated. Women who are self-employed and have insecure work have limited access to measures like maternity benefits, to help them balance work and family responsibilities. Violence and discrimination against women, based on gender, race, sexual orientation and other factors, are persistent challenges, and we are continuing to work to eliminate them.

• (1120)

[English]

Such factors as age, race, ethnicity, family status, sexual orientation, immigrant status, and aboriginal status also affect women's economic status. For example, aboriginal women are concentrated disproportionately in lower-skilled and lower-paying occupations and have lower rates of unemployment in the wage economy than do aboriginal men or non-aboriginal women. They also tend to have higher rates of lone parenthood than do non-aboriginal women.

[Translation]

In September 2003, the Federal-Provincial and Territorial Ministers Responsible for the Status of Women made Aboriginal women, both on and off reserve, a priority. In September 2004, they focused attention on violence prevention for Aboriginal women, agreeing to take action in such areas as access to programs and services, public education and awareness, capacity-building and policy enhancement, addressing the respective priorities and needs of Aboriginal women across Canada.

Status of Women Canada has also committed to using its Family Violence Initiative allocation of \$1 million over four years to support initiatives of Aboriginal women's organizations working on violence against Aboriginal women. In particular, these initiatives include access to programs and services, public education and policy development.

[English]

In the face of all these challenges, we need more women in elected decision-making positions. But there is no critical mass of women in the House of Commons, as we know. Right now we're at 21% of the House of Commons. That's up from 10% in 1987 and 18% in 1995. Critical mass is generally believed to occur at around the 30% mark. We still have a way to go before we achieve critical mass, and even further before 50% representation seems possible, which would more accurately reflect the female share of population numbers.

Clearly, the full picture of the status of women in Canada and in the world presents key opportunities and challenges for the standing committee—the opportunity to build on our successes and the challenge to advance equality in areas where discrimination and disadvantage persist.

There remains the urgent need to continue to mainstream gender in all areas of the government through programs, services, and legislation. We must also continue to develop accountability mechanisms for our gender equality commitments to ensure that we have meaningful goals and measurable results. That includes working with other government departments to create building blocks that advance women's equality, laying the foundation for a future where equality is a reality for all and where no one is left behind.

[Translation]

The work of this committee will contribute to our efforts to mainstream gender across government. The committee provides a forum within Parliament for identifying and discussing existing and emerging issues, sharing experiences, insights and ideas, and determining what courses of action to pursue.

The challenge before us is clear—we must increase our efforts in all areas of gender equality work. And we must do so with accountability and measurable results as our watchwords. Only by being open, transparent, and results-oriented can we ensure better cross-government coordination of gender equality-building measures. We must learn from our experience and successes in other areas, such as climate change or the plan of action for children, where horizontal coordination has proved successful. We can also learn from other countries that have achieved success where we are still challenged.

[English]

It's fitting, therefore, that early in this new session of Parliament, the Standing Committee on the Status of Women is getting under way, helping to unite the voices of Canadians in a common purpose, on their journey towards real and lasting equality in the interest of all—women, men, and children, who are our future.

I would like to congratulate all of you for being on this committee, and Madame la présidente, my congratulations goes to you as well.

Thank you.

• (1125)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Minister.

We will begin our first round of comments and questions, starting with the Conservatives.

Ms. Grewal.

Mrs. Nina Grewal (Fleetwood—Port Kells, CPC): In 2002, females accounted for eight in ten or 85% of all victims of spousal violence reported to the police departments. Young females aged 25 to 34 experienced the highest rate of spousal violence. The work of the status of women committee is focused on improving women's economic autonomy and well-being, eliminating systemic violence against women and children and advancing women's human rights. Could you comment on progress that has been made in these areas over the past decade and identify outstanding challenges in these areas?

Thank you.

Hon. Liza Frulla: If you permit me, I will go from French to English. I'll try to assess it in French, but sometimes it's hard for the translator to go from one to the other. When I can't find a word in English and I revert to French, they have trouble following me.

When addressing the issue of violence against women and girls, we include trafficking. Here in Canada, I think this is really one of our priorities. When we were in St. John's, I was with Madam la présidente at the federal-provincial-territorial meeting, and this was one of our priorities.

Of course, now we try to focus our programs on violence. For example, we disbursed almost \$4 million in grants to organizations in Canada that work to address the root cause of violence. It's \$4 million out of a \$10.5 million contribution that we give every year, and this is general. Our focus is really on violence because everywhere we go, at all international forums, there's gender equality, poverty, and violence. Usually, it's violence, gender equality, and poverty.

We can say that we're contributing, but of course it is systemic. We can't do it alone. We are helping groups to contravene violence in the milieu, but there's the Department of Justice also. There are justice programs to address that specifically with a gender-based analysis on what they're doing in Justice to contravene violence against women.

We also have committed \$1 million over four years to family violence initiatives to support organizations working to address the issue of violence against aboriginal women. You'll tell me it's not enough, and I agree, but we're also working with the Department of Justice and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to develop a whole program specifically targeted to violence against aboriginal women.

You have to understand that our committee is a vertical committee. We're there to coordinate. We don't have specific authority over the others, but we are now developing tools to coordinate and to make gender equality and gender issues more and more present in the analysis of their programs. Justice is doing quite well. Immigration is another example that is doing really well. We're working now with Human Resources and Skills Development Canada on all the questions involving unemployment.

I'm digressing, but only to tell you that we are horizontal. Half of our programs go towards violence, but then again, we have to also induce the others to follow the trend.

• (1130)

The Chair: You have two more minutes.

Ms. Guergis.

Ms. Helena Guergis (Simcoe—Grey, CPC): Thank you for being here today.

Page 8, I believe, of the priorities report provides the current status of women and speaks to spousal homicide. I don't have it with me, I'm sorry. The report mentions that spousal homicide increased by 23% in 2001, due almost entirely to men killing their spouses. How did the government acquire these statistics? What has the government done since to improve the situation? We are approaching 2005. Do we know whether spousal homicide has decreased or increased since 2001? What resources were or are allocated to prevent this type of violence?

Hon. Liza Frulla: First of all, on our side, we do general statistics on violence, but I know that Justice has a provision to also analyze this kind of crime and situation. I know it affects us all. I know that in my riding I had a couple of cases just last year, and I know that in all your ridings.... Every time we women hear this, it makes us freak out.

But this is more pertinent to the justice department. We are there to work with Justice so that they acknowledge it as an emergency, if you want. But as far as their analysis and their targeted action specifically toward homicide is concerned, that is really their core responsibility.

Do you want to add something, Florence?

Ms. Florence Ievers (Coordinator, Status of Women Canada): If you'll allow me, Minister, I just want to say that the statistic of 23% comes from Statistics Canada, and that at the FPT meeting of

ministers responsible for the status of women, the ministers agreed to work with Statistics Canada to do another round of statistics so that we have better benchmarks in order to evaluate the amplitude of some of the problems.

But as you and the minister mentioned, 23% is a very high number and very worrisome. The government has a number of policies; the minister mentioned initiatives in the Department of Justice. There is a responsibility at the federal level but also at the provincial and territorial levels. Each level of government has to act in its own sphere of jurisdiction in order to find solutions to this very disturbing statistic.

Hon. Liza Frulla: I forgot to tell you that the last federal-provincial meeting was in St. John's about a month and half or two months ago. All the provinces were there, including your province; everybody was represented there.

We said, okay, our main goal is to combat *la violence*; defeating violence is our main goal. We are organizing the next fed-prov meeting with our Minister of Justice with us. It is true that Justice has to adapt, but there are also a lot of provincial responsibilities. That's why we're saying that we'll do it all together, and we'll bring our Minister of Justice with us specifically to discuss that issue.

The Chair: We'll come back to you in a second on the next round.

Madame Brunelle.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Paule Brunelle (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Good morning, Minister. We are very pleased to have you here today.

You talked about poverty and violence, which are both significant problems. Clearly, poverty is frequently an exacerbating factor. Where there is a great deal of poverty, there is of course violence.

In its report on actions taken in the volunteer sector, the Canadian Council on Social Development concluded that grassroots organizations devote a great deal of time to seeking sources of funding, time that could be used for working towards the welfare of women. I believe that grassroots organizations are in the best position to help women in their daily lives, and can certainly complement your activities.

Why, in 1997 and 1998, did Status of Women Canada decide to focus on project funding at the expense of community funding, forcing the originators of grassroots projects to work harder to find funding and solutions? Do you believe that this is having repercussions on those groups?

• (1135)

Hon. Liza Frulla: Whenever we have travelled to meet these groups, this is a comment we heard repeatedly, not only about the status of women but in other areas as well, particularly official languages.

The purpose of the changes made in 1998 were to make the rules of the game fairer by eliminating the two categories of groups. Groups in one category would receive operational funding. Groups in the other category would obtain funding only on a project basis. Since the budget is limited, many groups would submit excellent projects but would have their applications automatically refused because the funding they needed would have to be taken out of allocations made to other groups.

In 1998, we decided that, rather than funding only 118 groups, we would simply fund projects and make it possible for more grassroots organizations to have access to public funding. When we fund projects, groups can include part of their operating costs within that funding. We don't fund operations, but we do fund some operating costs by funding a project. As a result of the change, more groups had access to funding, and more work was done in communities. We will be conducting a review in 2004-2005, and we will be looking at relevance and cost-effectiveness.

I should point out that consultations were carried out before we made the changes. A number of groups complained, saying that the set up was like an elite club, that the same groups always had access to funding, that they did a lot of work as well but never received any money. These things are difficult to manage.

We plan to submit a report to you at the end of 2005, and at that point we will be in a position to determine whether the changes were good, what their results have been, whether positive measures have been taken, and whether remedial measures are necessary.

Ms. Paule Brunelle: Once projects are completed, are results analyzed? I would imagine that to be the case, since at the outset there seem to be many women's groups. I would imagine that you assess the results to determine whether you should continue their funding.

Hon. Liza Frulla: We provide what we call contributions, so we need to have oversight and a report. Groups don't necessarily like the oversight, but we follow Treasury Board rules and we have to apply very stringent monitoring that is often difficult for organizations like these. I've seen it with women's groups and Canadian heritage groups. These organizations sometimes employ two people working for \$19,000 a year, who have to fill out form after form to meet monitoring requirements. This monitoring is much like that imposed on major corporations, who have 12 vice-presidents and 18 full-time accountants. At present, we are working with Treasury Board to see whether we could, without upsetting the Auditor General, improve monitoring methods in order to adapt them more effectively to these grassroots organizations.

[English]

The Chair: You have a little bit of time, about a minute and a half.

[Translation]

Ms. France Bonsant (Compton—Stanstead, BQ): Good morning, Minister.

During the regular session in March 2005, the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women will be evaluating progress made on the Beijing *Platform for Action* 10 years after it was

adopted. What is Status of Women Canada doing to prepare for Beijing+10?

• (1140)

Hon. Liza Frulla: At Beijing+10, we plan to assess to what extent each country has complied, on a national scale, with the requirements in the declaration and *Platform for Action* adopted in 1995 and reviewed in 2000.

We will be presenting our own action plan, as well as our achievements. We will be talking about statistics that I will provide to you—statistics on poverty among women, aboriginal women and our gender-based analysis. We will also highlight the action plans we intend to implement to meet needs.

As I was saying, we and the departments of Indian Affairs and Justice are working on an integrated plan for aboriginal women. Frequently, international organizations like the UN—I've already seen this at Social Development—have difficulty in seeing exactly how a country works. It is a matter of jurisdictions, and it is difficult for them to analyze the management of responsibilities.

Let's say we want to compare Canada and France, and France decides to set up a national day care system. No problem—France implements a national day care system. If France decides to implement a program to prevent violence against women... As we were saying about homicides, provincial security is an area of provincial jurisdiction, while some components of justice are also areas of provincial jurisdiction. These are areas of shared jurisdiction. That can make things difficult. When international organizations do their studies, we have to help them understand how our country, which is a decentralized federation, works. So, at Beijing +10, it is important to say that we are not alone in working on a plan to prevent violence against women. We are working with the provinces.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Powers, and then Ms. Crowder.

Mr. Russ Powers (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Minister, for your attendance here today.

I would like to ask questions, and perhaps some of the answers can't be provided right here at this moment but could be provided after the fact.

I want to talk about the funding envelopes that are available within your department. You have prefaced the ability or the horizontal involvement, you could call it. Perhaps sometime in the future you could expand on these horizontal involvements. In other words, you've made reference to Justice, and I'm sure there is involvement with Health and things like that. I think what we want to see is where the involvement of your department is in cooperation with.... You've referenced it somewhat in your remarks, but perhaps it could be fleshed out to the point of extending not only the participation and the involvement but also the dollar values associated with that.

The other area I would like to see being built on is what I would call catalytic involvement, in other words, strategic investments out of Status of Women to perhaps fund those external organizations, and, correspondingly, the values of the community as a whole and Canada from that standpoint.

The one I'd like to touch on right now is the funding envelope for the department, in other words, the element within your portfolio with regard to Status of Women. If you wouldn't mind taking a couple of minutes just to tell us what the dollar value is and how it is divided, obviously now within the budget process we as a group might be in a position to encourage enhancement of that funding envelope.

Hon. Liza Frulla: Thank you. I appreciate that very much.

First of all, you're right to say that you can't look at the status of women in our department only. I'll come back to our department in a few seconds.

The last department I had was social development, which is great because social development, having been divided since December... Having a full-fledged department called social development is I think a big plus. I'm not speaking for...because I've become really quite attached to this department since we started it.

We now see all the social measures, not just the big HRDC, which was so huge that the social development part was lost; the focus was usually on employment—unemployment insurance and certain opportunities or problems that emanate from that.

Social development, for example, has national childhood and child care. We also have the early childhood development. Those are initiatives that are there specifically to answer to...families, yes, but they're also really adapted to women.

Now, the national childhood program implemented by my colleague Ken Dryden also helps women. I know that *monoparentalité*...women, often being the sole supporters of their children, really need that support. I know that. Then again, it's shared responsibility. The provinces also have to be on board. That's why, with Ken Dryden and Lucien Robillard, they're negotiating with the provinces, because the provinces have to be as enthused as we are and feel the necessity as much as we all do.

In health, first of all, there is the new public health and safety agency that has been formed. We know that for women prevention is key—to osteoporosis, to everything. So we have to talk about prevention, because once you're sick you're at the same level as everybody else. It has to be adapted to women's health. In Health there is a specific part of the department that is focusing on health issues for women.

Justice is the same. It would be a help if you could have my colleague, Irwin Cotler, talk about what he's doing in targeting violence, violence against women and children. There are also all the human resource and unemployment issues. There are measures; there could be more.

So it would probably be useful for the committee to have those colleagues talk about that too.

It would be useful for us too, as we're trying to coordinate the action for all the departments, to have them appear in dialogue with the committee so we won't feel we have the unique responsibility within the government.

Now, for us specifically, we have \$23.9 million. This is our credit—knowing that we share responsibilities. Of this \$23.9

million, \$10.8 million, 45%, is allocated for grants to the women's program; \$11.6 million is allocated for operating expenditures, and the remaining \$1.5 million is allocated to contributions to the employee benefit plan.

The \$11.6 million supports the work of 131 people, 7 directorates, and 15 regional offices. There's \$1.2 million for the policy research fund; \$5.5 million for key functional operations, the research directorate; \$3.2 million for the women's program and regional operations; \$1.5 million for policy and external relations; and \$0.5 million for gender-based analysis. There's \$4.9 million for corporate services and consultation and communication.

• (1145)

The thing is, we're horizontal. Now we have \$20.8 million allocated for grants for women's programs. Tomorrow we could have \$30 million, \$40 million, \$50 million, \$60 million allocated for grants. The operational cost doesn't grow. To do the coordination, to do the research, to be involved in the region and have our regional department people there, there are some operational costs.

On the \$10.8 million allocated for grants, \$4 million goes to organizations in the field that are focused on eliminating violence.

• (1150)

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Crowder, I apologize. I went out of order.

Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP): No problem.

I'd like to thank the minister for coming. I'd also like to acknowledge the challenges the department faces in addressing some of the deep systemic issues for women on gender equality in Canada with such a small budget.

I'm going to talk about gender-based analysis.

I have the 1995 "Setting the Stage for the Next Century: The Federal Plan for Gender Equality". The plan specifically talks about the fact that the objective of implementing gender-based analysis underpins all of the other objectives set out in the plan, and that it is absolutely critical that this happen. The plan also talks about how the federal plan places a high priority on implementing a systemic gender-based analysis, and as part of the federal government's commitment they are committed to evaluating the effectiveness of the gender-based analysis process.

Then in the CIDA report of 2003, it talks about the fact that they're recommending gender-based impact analyses become mandatory for all legal and program efforts at the federal level throughout its respective consultative continuing committees. So it reinforces the importance of that action.

In its performance report in 2004 the government talks about the fact that although some work is being done, there is still more that needs to be done. The analysis in the 2004 throne speech, the "Status of Women Canada: Gender Equality Review" talks about the agenda for gender equality as a framework. This is the document I'm coming to.

My question around it is that it's referenced in a number of different areas. I would assume that since there is something called an agenda for gender equality, and it's referenced as having been developed in 2000, we could actually have a copy of that agenda. But when we contacted the Status of Women department, we were told that there was never a formal document.

So I wonder how effective a program can be when it was never articulated, yet it was referenced in a number of different areas as something.... People would expect there's a document that states objectives, that outlines priorities and gives us a mechanism for determining effectiveness.

I wonder if the minister could comment on that.

Hon. Liza Frulla: First of all, the document is a strategy, and this is what we're aiming at. When we sit down and say, what did we do....

• (1155)

[Translation]

We are assessing ourselves.

[English]

We ask ourselves questions, and we have to say that between 1995 and 2000 the implementation of the gender-based analysis was slow because of the lack of resources and the lack of funds. There was no obligation to report and we didn't have the authority or leverage to ensure compliance. That's why in 2000 the government reacted and said, enough of this, we can't refer to all the documents without giving some funds at least to be able to work. Funds of \$20.5 million were given in 2000 over five years.

What did we do in 2000? We customized training to go case by case. We developed and delivered the training. The train the trainer program was developed in both official languages. We have a specialized resource centre, case studies, and an e-bulletin. We also produced 8,000 information kits. There was the creation of a self-assessment tool for organizations to determine the GBA capacity and the creation of a tool to measure the impact of GBA on policy development and gender equality outcomes.

Once we had the tools, we could go to organizations and communicate that we did have the tools. We went to the departments and started to work with them, saying it's not our sole responsibility. A GBA analysis is a governmental responsibility; it's not only us.

In terms of the accountability measures now, we're monitoring departmental GBA activities via an interdepartmental committee, and we have periodic surveying; we're encouraging outcome-based pilot projects with measurable resources versus only training; and we evaluate the mechanism tied to the information kit and the training delivered. Now that we have developed the kit, we have the interdepartmental committee watching departmental activity with trained people in the departments.

Future direction. We want the GBA to be an obligation. We have that in Quebec and we would like to apply that in the government. It's an obligation tied to an overall gender equality accountability framework, including a formal reporting mechanism. This would be the ideal. This is what we're aiming for.

There are two ways of working. You can oblige or you can convince. We're in the convincing mode. Why? Because it's much stronger to convince and have everybody feel an obligation to do it because they are convinced this is the right way to do it. I revert back to my previous experience, and I know in other provinces, not only in Quebec, this is what happened. Now it's automatic. We're not forcing...it's not departments saying, we have to do this analysis. It's automatic and within the way of doing things. All the programs are analyzed through gender-based analysis, and it's done. All the departments have one person accountable for it.

It is done automatically. Nobody was forced. At one point in time, because of the demands from the grassroots, the government felt that was the right thing to do.

The Chair: We'll get back to you for a follow-up.

Ms. Guergis, do you want to continue?

Ms. Helena Guergis: Sure. Thank you.

I've heard a great deal about growing concern for violence against aboriginal women. Minister, I volunteered for over seven years at a district sexual assault centre, going back maybe a little over eight years ago. I recall at that time we were talking about this issue, which was a growing concern then, and we were working to broaden our mandate and attempting to reach out to aboriginal women, realizing that they were either not aware or not able to access the services and the help that a sexual assault centre could provide for them. There were many reasons, including fear. It doesn't sound to me like we have made a great deal of progress. I'm hoping that we have and I'm hoping that you might be able to give me some of this information.

The report I had mentioned earlier, the plans and priorities, speaks to building on the preliminary consultations, which you have also mentioned yourself, which I suppose was the groups that met in December 2003 talking about developing, implementing, and evaluating strategies for using the \$1 million in additional resources. How much right now is specifically allocated for aboriginal women's issues, and how far along is this development process?

• (1200)

Hon. Liza Frulla: I would like to do this analysis and come back to you. I'll ask Florence to answer this, but I'd like to come back to it and really assess this within the government, because aboriginal issues are spread out. It's also a vertical issue, so it's spread out all over government, and it's hard for us. If I tell you that for us, yes, there is this \$1 million working specifically with aboriginal groups, working on violence...\$1 million is not much, but this is our contribution, plus within the \$4 million targeted to violence, a lot of it is targeted to aboriginal women's issues. Our budget for contributions is \$10.8 million, so I can tell you that half of the budget goes to at least issues on violence, and I'd say that half of the half at least goes to aboriginal women's issues.

We do have within the heritage department \$2 million for aboriginals living off reserve. I do have a certain responsibility. Is it violence? No, it's global issues, but to know what is allocated in the aboriginal affairs ministry and what is in Justice we would have to make a count to say what is really focused on violence.

Florence, do you want to add to that?

Ms. Florence Ievers: If I may add to that, when assessing government funding to combat violence against women and assessing the sums of moneys that are expended by governments on gender equality, it is always hard to put a dollar figure on it. The minister mentioned the initiatives we've taken in our agency, the \$1 million that goes to the family violence initiative. She also mentioned the amounts that are given to the aboriginal women in her Department of Canadian Heritage.

There are a number of departments, as the minister mentioned, that do address the issue of violence against women. I think it would be tricky to put a dollar figure on exactly what the federal government spends, particularly on violence against women.

But I'd also like to point out to you that the federal, provincial, and territorial status of women ministers are working to develop an action plan to look at different areas that contribute to violence against aboriginal women. You can't put a dollar figure on that work, but that action plan is being implemented by not only the minister at the federal level but by provincial and territorial ministers at their own levels.

If you look at the total amount of resources that are expended to address the issue of violence against aboriginal women, you'd see that there are considerable sums. Are those sums making a difference? That's where we need to put our efforts, and that's why ministers in September at their FPT meeting said they wanted to look at those, to look in their own jurisdictions to see what they were doing, what actions they were taking, and then come back to the table and see if those are making a difference. I think it is too soon to be able to bring results. This meeting and the action plan was presented to ministers in September, but hopefully by next year we will have a better idea of what's going on.

The Chair: Ms. Kadis.

Mrs. Susan Kadis (Thornhill, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

It doesn't take too long a period of time of meeting as a committee, Madam Minister, to see that we need more money allocated to this area in general terms. I just wanted to ask you this, as well as one

other related question. Have you requested additional money for this year's coming budget?

Hon. Liza Frulla: We have this process called reallocation. It is a process that is imposed on all of us, to look at all our programs. The objective that Revenue and Finance gave us was that we have to find 5% in all the programs, in all the organizations we have. We have to find 5%, put it on the table, and then prove to everybody that we need it back.

Why do we do this? In certain departments, of course, it's a little bit more complicated than in others, because our department, the whole global heritage department, has a lot of organizations, and also we reach out. We do have stakeholders directly, compared to others. We don't work either with the provinces developing policies or where others are responsible. We are responsible, so we see the consequences of a cut, a non-cut, or adding to the budget.

In this case, we have to do the same process. We've done our homework, and I believe in doing that kind of homework because we have a lot of programs. It's fine to say we'll analyze all the programs that we're into, but we're asking all the organizations that depend on us, like the Conseil des Arts, Patrimoine, or whatever, to do their homework and tell us if all the programs work. If yes, fine. If no, tell us, and we either revert or we cancel.

This is how we function. We have to do it, and it's a discipline the government wants us to have every year, so that we can question ourselves. Honestly, between you and me, we do it all the time because we dispense a lot of programs, and we don't want to have *la vérificatrice générale* coming and saying we've missed this and that, because it's not fun.

With the overall, it can and it will happen, but we try to be as efficient as possible, so this is a discipline that we impose on ourselves in Heritage. It's easier perhaps for us than it is for others, but we've done it, and I have to admit that while now we're pleading our case saying that we don't want to have groups cut...we don't need those cuts, really, but that's the case and we do have to plead. It's within the government, though. I'm not the only one, because others are pleading the same thing. That's the stage we're at.

Of course, if we had more, we'd do more.

•(1205)

Mrs. Susan Kadis: I heard you expressing frustration a few times, I guess, and I believe you are passionate about encouraging a better quality of life for women. With all the issues that have been raised today, like violence against women, poverty, etc., I do believe that, and you are showing leadership.

I guess what I'm getting at is that it seems to me, with respect—and I don't think it's just you, I think it's the general state of affairs—that progress has been made for a long period of time, but I think it has not been comparatively substantive in comparison to what the needs are currently today.

I'm not positive about this, but it seems to me that it warrants a great, comprehensive review of the current status of women across Canada. I'm not sure the last time that was done, but if we can make a case for why more funds are needed, I think we're going to have a much better chance of having that approved.

Hon. Liza Frulla: I'm going to tell you that if you're talking about funds, of course, there's capacity and there are other departments that will come with demands. I'm just looking at Social Development, where he's demanding \$5 billion. That \$5 billion goes directly, I'd say, to families and women, so we have to take this into account too.

For our whole department, of course, if you have more, you do more. Do we say yes to everybody? In all of your ridings, you know how many demands we have. We accept some, but we have to refuse others, and sometimes we're really heart-broken about it. But where do you stop? In those kinds of issues,

[*Translation*]

the demand is neverending.

•(1210)

[*English*]

Mrs. Susan Kadis: If I may, have we made the case?

Hon. Liza Frulla: Oh, we're making the case, but the committee could make the case also.

Mrs. Susan Kadis: Absolutely, and I believe there is a keen desire to go in that direction and to work together with you. But I think it's very important that we know exactly where we're at, based on today's current needs.

Hon. Liza Frulla: First of all, the case is made by not only... There's a committee, a women's caucus, as you know, and I'm sure your women's caucus is very adamant in this.

We have to make the case in two things. First of all, gender-based analysis is not only a discipline, as I said, an obligation, but gender-based analysis should be enthusiastically applied in all departments. I really put an emphasis on “enthusiastically”. This is the objective I really am adamant for. Here's something that you have to...as we do with official languages. We do it with official languages. We have the responsibility—part of the responsibility—for official languages, and it's done. So we should do exactly the same as a government and be happy to do it. This is one.

Two, as far as resources, we also have to look at the entire government action. Since we fund organizations doing things in the milieu—we're not the only ones, because there are other depart-

ments, and again, the social development department has a community program, but for us specifically, we fund organizations in the entire milieu. That's what we're pleading, saying the demands are there. They're doing wonders, and much better than a government can do.

As you said, these are the best people to do so. They deliver, knowing what they deliver and who they talk to, and at a much lower cost than what government can do. This is the argument we're making.

I'm sure that, for example, Mr. McCallum would be really pleased to be here, to come to the committee and talk to you about it.

The Chair: I just want to advise the committee that in fact Minister McCallum is coming on December 14, so we can pursue this further with him.

Thank you, Madam Minister.

Madame Brunelle, it's your turn.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Paule Brunelle: Minister, I'm happy to hear that you consider gender-based comparative analysis very important. Our enthusiasm aside, the analysis is an excellent way of assessing the practical results of measures we take. You also talked a little about official languages, the Official Languages Act, which requires you to report to Parliament every year. Should there not be a similar requirement for gender-based analysis? Do you think that's a good idea?

Hon. Liza Frulla: Some departments are being asked to prepare a comprehensive report. Given past experience, I believe that the objective is to have this done with enthusiasm and goodwill. At this point, the tools are ready and we are convincing the departments to implement them. Training is being given and departments are being urged to hire experts in these areas. It is not easy. It seems relatively easy to us, but it is not. It is not always easy to carry out a gender-based comparative analysis. You really have to know where and when to do it.

One of our objectives is to do a comprehensive report, and we are really going to work on that. Our objective is to work in cooperation with you. Like all other committees, this committee will do research and make recommendations. If you do that, we will be guided by your good advice and suggestions.

Ms. France Bonsant: Minister, you have opened the door by talking about employment insurance and related issues. There are many young women working for minimum wage, and when they decide to have a family, they get 55 per cent of their salary. Fifty-five per cent of \$8.00 is not very much. I know that there are a lot of programs to help people, but there are none in place right now to fill the gap for someone earning minimum wage who decides to start a family. Could the government make any improvements in that area? How could we help these young women earning minimum wage who want to have children and stay home for a year, the way people do who earn more money?

•(1215)

Hon. Liza Frulla: On the question of parental leave, I first want to point out that family policy is under provincial jurisdiction. For example, the national daycare program is currently being established by my colleague, Ken Dryden. The federal government is using the Quebec experience as a model and adapting it to the provinces. Quebec has 200,000 daycare spaces: that has been achieved. According to Mr. Béchard, Quebec wants to develop a solid family policy and support families.

Since Quebec already has its daycare spaces, the federal government will transfer the money to the province. Now, the federal government will not impose this, but Quebec society as a whole will have to make sure that this money—we are not talking peanuts, after all, when the figure is one billion dollars—is given to Mr. Béchard to develop a family policy. Quebec imposes its minimum rate, and Mr. Béchard has to negotiate with the finance minister to ensure that part of that money will be applied to his family policy. That family policy is his responsibility.

Our responsibility is to ensure that when the daycare program is rolled out, Quebec gets its share. Once again, this is a provincial jurisdiction, but...

Ms. France Bonsant: The money is transferred from the federal government to Quebec.

Hon. Liza Frulla: That is right. It is transferred as part of the Canada Social Transfer.

Ms. France Bonsant: Thank you, Minister.

[English]

The Chair: Ms. Crowder.

Ms. Jean Crowder: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm perhaps not as hopeful as the minister is that educating versus legislating will result in sufficient gender-based analysis. Thirty years ago, when I was an optimistic university student, I didn't think we were going to be talking about violence against women, poverty, homelessness, and women in the workforce. Although the numbers have increased, we still have significant working poor. So I'm not as optimistic, and I'm thinking we need to have more concrete results.

What I specifically want to talk about is the CEDAW report. In 2003 the report was tabled outlining a significant number of recommendations that Canada was cited on, including not only gender-based analysis but certainly violence against women, the plight of women in British Columbia around child care, and a number of other initiatives that talk about the difficulties in federal-provincial relationships around transferred dollars.

I've been looking for a document that talks about the progress we've made when looking at those recommendations and developing an action plan. I was wondering if there had been any work around other government departments, if it's been written down, if we're reporting against it, and if there has been a progress report, what that looks like, and how we can access that information.

Hon. Liza Frulla: As far as a progress report, we don't have a choice. We do have progress reports. CEDAW has four objectives—poverty, *femmes autochtones*, *responsabilisation*, and gender-based analysis. That's for the whole of Canada.

As far as the measures, we revert to CEDAW for the measures. I remember working in social development why we decided to go for a national child care plan, because when you look at poverty and when we look at poverty in women's situations, you don't take very long to say that you do have to take this responsibility because others don't. That's why the objective of this national child care plan—and we finance it—is to start this movement to say it is so important. This is in reply to CEDAW.

As far as *femmes autochtones*, we're working now with aboriginal affairs to develop a plan. This plan will ask other departments about violence against women. There's the Department of Aboriginal Affairs that is *impliqué*. There is Justice and Health also.

•(1220)

Ms. Jean Crowder: Sorry, Minister. What I really want to know is where is the action plan that specifically addresses CEDAW? Where can I access that?

Hon. Liza Frulla: Is 2007 the action plan, Florence?

Ms. Jean Crowder: That's the next report that's due. I want to know for the 2003 report where I can find the action plan that responds to that report and lays out the mandate across all government departments to respond to that. I know there are isolated initiatives that are happening, but I want to know what our response has been and how it lays out the action plan to address those specific initiatives.

Ms. Florence Ievers: This is an issue that Status of Women is working on with the key departments, notably Canadian Heritage, Foreign Affairs, and a number of key partners around the table.

When we came back from New York, after having presented the CEDAW report, obviously we were very much interested in the comments that CEDAW had to say about Canada.

Ms. Jean Crowder: Can you send me a copy of what you're working on then?

Ms. Florence Ievers: We don't have a document, much like the agenda for gender equality is not a written document, but there is ongoing work within the federal government on that.

You can find some of the answers you're looking for in the Beijing +10 questionnaire that Canada has submitted to the United Nations, where we worked in collaboration with the provinces. As you know, implementation of CEDAW is not just a responsibility of the federal government. It's also a responsibility of other jurisdictions. We are working very closely with the provinces and territories in order to be able to address the concerns expressed by the committee, not only for policies at the federal level but also policies at the provincial level that were seen to be less than adequate to improve women's status and gender equality.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Phinney, please.

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): I'd like a very short answer to a question that I've never quite understood.

You are the Minister of Status of Women. Do you have the right to write bills, pass bills? You can't pass them, the House of Commons passes them, but is it a full ministry, like every other ministry? Just like Heritage is a ministry, is Status of Women a ministry?

Hon. Liza Frulla: Status of Women has its own responsibility, yes.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Does it have all the powers of every other ministry?

• (1225)

Hon. Liza Frulla: Of course.

Ms. Beth Phinney: So you can write and pass bills?

Hon. Liza Frulla: Absolutely.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Okay. That's my first question.

The Immigration and Refugee Protection Act has built right into it that they have to report annually on gender-based analysis. If that's built into that act, my first question would be, if you are the Minister of Status of Women—I don't know where our act is, or what the Status of Women's act is—but if there is an act, since you are a minister, why don't you have it built into at least your act, our act, to say that we have to report?

Hon. Liza Frulla: I don't understand.

Ms. Beth Phinney: If the Department of Citizenship and Immigration has to report on gender analysis, shouldn't your department have to report on gender analysis? You're the one who's trying to promote it. Shouldn't you have to report every year to the House how Status of Women...or how the projects you're working on to make all the ministries have to report...? Shouldn't you have to report on that progress?

Hon. Liza Frulla: With gender-based analysis, and the Department of Immigration is an example, it's the responsibility of all departments. It is a specific responsibility of all departments.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Excuse me. Is it not only Immigration that has it written into their act?

Hon. Liza Frulla: It's only Immigration that has it written into their act.

Ms. Beth Phinney: That's what I'm asking. If that's what this Status of Women stands for and is working towards, shouldn't the Status of Women have to report even on themselves, internally, as to how they're progressing on gender equity and gender analysis? Since I understand from what you're saying it's the responsibility of Status of Women to make sure everybody else is doing it, that all the other departments are doing it, shouldn't you give in your report a report of how everybody else is doing?

Hon. Liza Frulla: No. That's what we want to do. We're not there yet.

Ms. Beth Phinney: All right. Then who gave permission? If you have to go somewhere else to give permission, who gave permission to the immigration and refugee—

Hon. Liza Frulla: Immigration.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Who gave permission to the immigration department to insert that in a bill? If they've inserted it in a bill, why can't you insert it in a bill?

Hon. Liza Frulla: No, Madame Robillard inserted it in her bill.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Okay. Can you as minister insert it in a bill, saying that Status of Women Canada is now going to be reporting on their own gender-based analysis—but write it in a bill—and that because you're studying this, you're going to report on every other department, how they're doing?

Hon. Liza Frulla: Status of Women Canada gives an annual report, reporting what we're doing. Since we're Status of Women Canada, if we don't do the job, I don't know why we have a department called Status of Women.

[*Translation*]

It is a basic part of what we do.

[*English*]

But in regard to the other departments, up to now we've been trying to convince the other departments to do it. We don't have the authority, if that's what you mean, to ask the human resources department, for example, to build in their bill—

Ms. Beth Phinney: No, I'm not asking you to tell them they have to do it. I'm asking you to write in your report that you are studying this issue for all departments. Then you should be accountable in your report every year to show how you're doing in getting this study finished, to bring it up to date.

Do you, in your report every year, make a statement saying this department is doing this well, and this department...?

Hon. Liza Frulla: Who did and who didn't? No, we don't do that.

Ms. Beth Phinney: That is what you're studying and you're getting government money to study that. Shouldn't you have to report on what you're doing?

Hon. Liza Frulla: We're not doing it now. What we are suggesting is the other departments now...because it's exactly the discussion I had before.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Yes, I understand that. I'm just saying—

Hon. Liza Frulla: We want them to make the use of the gender-based analysis an obligation. We have an interdepartmental table—this is new—and now we'll work specifically with departments that I'd say have more of a natural partnership with us than others.

Whether it be the departments of social development, human resources, health, justice, or immigration, these are sort of first-line departments. We're working with those departments so that they feel an obligation, like Madame Robillard felt that obligation.

But I have to tell you, Madame Robillard comes from Quebec. In Quebec, as I said, we did it enthusiastically. So she enthusiastically applied it to immigration.

Ms. Beth Phinney: The reason I'm suggesting this is that they have to be given a push. The new policy in government during the last two or three years is that we not only say we spend this much money, but we have to say how we spend that money and if we're spending it well.

• (1230)

Hon. Liza Frulla: And we do.

Ms. Beth Phinney: But if your department is studying this, then you should report on it, and you shouldn't be so gentle with all the other departments and say, well, we're not going to mention in our report that only one department does this. You should be reporting to the public and to the House of Commons how the departments are doing on this, because you are spending government money to study it. I feel you should have to account for the money you're spending.

Is it worthwhile what you're doing? If we're getting nowhere, then maybe you shouldn't be spending it.

Hon. Liza Frulla: You can't say we're getting nowhere, because that is being extremely negative. We can't say we're getting nowhere, because there are policies being taken by departments now that are really helping. We're working with aboriginal affairs on a whole plan on violence against aboriginal women. It comes from that too. So we can't say—

Ms. Beth Phinney: No, I'm not talking about you. I'm talking about the government, the other departments.

Hon. Liza Frulla: I know what you mean, but we can't say that the government is not responding. With \$5 billion on a national child care plan, I think it is responding. Just dividing social development is an action exactly toward social responsibilities, and as you know, in that department, it's almost all targeted to women.

Ms. Beth Phinney: Then that could go in your report.

The Chair: We're well over the time, and I've been generous, so I think we're going to move on here.

Mrs. Yelich.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich (Blackstrap, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Minister, for appearing.

I have some questions mainly about the granting programs. I want to know whether you evaluate the effectiveness of the granting programs. Do you have an internal audit function? How does the Status of Women ensure that the grant funds are being expended in a cost-efficient, publicly accountable manner?

I also want to talk about regional differences. The budget in my province is shared with the prairie provinces in the north, and I think my last question to you at the committee of the whole...I always have my region's interests at heart, because it happens with a lot of the heritage fund.... I don't think that under your umbrella...for example, I brought up the Canada Day inequities and the moneys given in comparison to—

Hon. Liza Frulla: And I told you we were fixing that.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: Yes, you did, and I was really happy, so I have more for you to fix.

When you talk about that \$5 billion child care program, do you see anywhere in that portfolio to help with what's in the papers right now with autistic children? I do think if there's ever an area that would be worthwhile to pick up on under your portfolio, it would be to help those parents. They are desperate. With autism on the rise and being very difficult to diagnose, it is also very difficult for the parents, very burdensome. It's desperate in many situations. We ourselves lost a family to the Province of Alberta just because they offer what every other province does not seem to.

As you brought it up and talked about this child care program, it sounds really good, but \$5 billion wouldn't go far across Canada if we ever talk about regional inequities. Do you see any room for autistic children?

Hon. Liza Frulla: First of all, it's hard for me to respond to that, and I'm going to tell you why. You should ask the question to Mr. Dryden or the Minister of Health. I can't talk for them, but knowing some parents myself...we all share the despair of some of the parents.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: I will check my questions.

Hon. Liza Frulla: Now, coming back to the program and the audits, there's an evaluation going on now, 2004-05. As I said before you came in, we have \$10.5 million given to various projects all over Canada.

As far as just evaluating and auditing are concerned, I'll ask Jackie to answer that.

Ms. Jackie Claxton (Director General, Women's Programs and Regional Operations, Status of Women Canada): Thank you, Madam Chair. The evaluation will look at the relevancy: is there still a need? It will also look at the impact: what is happening as a result of the support we're providing? Then there is another section where we will be looking at issues related to cost-effectiveness, and that will include looking at the way the program is delivered now and whether there are other models that should be looked at. We're just in the process of launching that. We're about to hire the consultants, and that will unfold over the next number of months, with a final report coming out in 2005. That's an independent process.

On an ongoing basis, though, when we provide funding for initiatives, groups are required to report. They're required to provide us with an evaluation plan up front, and our staff at the national and regional levels prepare it right in the funding recommendation. We identify what, if any, risks might be associated with the funding, and we identify the monitoring plan that will be implemented to ensure that things are unfolding in the manner in which they were anticipated to unfold.

I have to say just in general terms that in all my years of dealing with the program and the moneys invested, we spend a lot of time working with the groups in advance of the funding submission, and you've heard that from the groups, about how much work it takes. Once we have provided the funding then we're sure we have very good documentation. We know who we're dealing with and staff are in ongoing contact.

We had an audit of the program done by Consulting and Audit Canada in 2001, and that information is on the website of the department, or we'd be happy to provide that to you.

I just want to touch on your question about regional differences in the budgets and the figures I think I provided last time. As I mentioned, there is a formula. I won't go into the details now, but there is a formula that is used that allocates the 68% of the budget that's given out regionally. Everybody starts on the same basis and then there's an addition that is based on population. As far as the prairies go, which represents three provinces and the northern territories, as you've indicated, the additional resources they would receive would be based on the population in the three provinces and the territories. I can give you the detailed breakdown afterwards.

• (1235)

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: I want to pick up on that before I lose my line of thought. I would like to know, is there a way we can find out where some of this money is going? Anything under \$100,000 is not listed, for example, and I would be interested in seeing where some of the money does go.

When you talk about putting us in with the territories, there's quite a bit of cost to serving a territory compared to the centre of the prairies or to the bigger centres in either side of our province, so I

really don't agree that we be put in with an area that would take a lot of funding to service.

Anyway, you may answer that, and you will provide.... I think I need access to information in order to get any moneys spent over \$100,000, I believe. I'm just trying to go through the estimates and do what my job is, and that is to.... Okay?

Ms. Jackie Claxton: No problem.

Mrs. Lynne Yelich: Thank you.

The Chair: Madam Minister and all members of the department, I want to thank you for coming out today. I appreciate it. We may well choose to ask you back for further information as time moves on and we get more familiar with the issues. As you're undoubtedly aware, we're going to begin having meetings with a whole host of community groups, and I'm sure there will be many other matters that come before us that we may want to follow up on. Thank you very much for coming out for the day today.

We're going to go in camera for just a few minutes. I would ask those who are here if they could adjourn for about three minutes to allow the room to clear.

Hon. Liza Frulla: Madam Chair, I just want to thank the committee. As I said before, we also now have a committee of our own, so we really look forward to the recommendations of the committee—sincerely.

We're all pushing in the same direction. I'm not saying it's easy pushing uphill sometimes.

The Chair: Thank you.

The meeting is adjourned.

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

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

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.