



House of Commons  
CANADA

## **Standing Committee on the Status of Women**

---

FEWO



NUMBER 024



1st SESSION



38th PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Tuesday, March 22, 2005**

—  
**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, March 22, 2005

•(1525)

[*English*]

**The Chair (Ms. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.)):**  
Good afternoon, everybody.

Let me say thank you to the witnesses for agreeing to be here today. I think each of your presentations has been eagerly anticipated. As you know, we're doing a study on gender-based analysis. We're looking for some response from you in terms of how it is or is not being implemented, from your perspective.

I gather you've agreed to a speaking order. I'll ask Daphne Meredith to begin, please.

Thank you.

**Ms. Daphne Meredith (Assistant secretary, Corporate Priorities and Planning, Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat):**  
Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I should note, to begin with, that I'm here on behalf of Ruth Dantzer, the associate secretary of Treasury Board. I expect Ruth to join us shortly, but she has asked me to go ahead with her introductory remarks in her absence.

I'm very pleased to be here today with my colleagues from the Public Service Human Resources Management Agency of Canada and the Privy Council Office. Monique Boudrias is executive vice-president at the Public Service Human Resources Management Agency, and Joan Atkinson is from the Privy Council Office.

After my brief remarks, Madame Boudrias will take the opportunity to make a statement. At that point in time, we will be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

We've also prepared a package of information that provides more details on some of the policies and programs we'll be discussing today. I believe you have received that package at the table.

Monique and I represent two agencies within the portfolio of the Treasury Board. The Treasury Board is both the government's management board and the employer of the public service. We hope we can provide members with helpful information about the respective roles of our two organizations and their place in the machinery of government.

[*Translation*]

Treasury Board Secretariat, as the management and budget office of the government of Canada, sets policies and standards on managing the public service, and oversees expenditure management and resource stewardship.

Through negotiation or consultation, it also sets wages, working conditions, benefits, and insurance plans for its employees, and it manages their pension plans.

[*English*]

The agency, as the human resources management office for the Government of Canada, sets HR policies and standards and oversees the implementation of HR policies and programs that pertain to the well-being of employees in the public service workplace as well as any workforce renewal initiatives. Both organizations support the ministers and the President of the Treasury Board as a committee of cabinet.

I understand the committee is undertaking a study of gender-based analysis in various government departments, which will include a review of the challenges of implementing this type of analysis as well as the adequacy of the government's accountability mechanisms. Given this committee's interest in accountability mechanisms, I propose to begin by briefly describing the current accountability regime in the public service of Canada.

First, accountability for both management and program performance rests squarely with ministers, their deputies, and departments. Departments like the Canadian International Development Agency, whose programs routinely have gender-based implications, are accountable to have in place the means to systematically assess them. The outcomes that programs are accountable to achieve are defined through the cabinet policy-making process that the Privy Council Office coordinates and supports. Our colleague from the Privy Council Office will be able to discuss this in greater detail.

Treasury Board sets the management conditions according to which departments are resourced to deliver their programs. It does so through a process coordinated and supported by the Treasury Board Secretariat. In their submissions to Treasury Board, departments are required to flag any gender issues germane to their consideration. Treasury Board Secretariat is also mandated to define the standards of sound management, the means of measuring program performance, and the procedures for reporting to Parliament to enable the government and Parliament to hold departments accountable.

Broadly speaking, that is how the accountability regime operates, but the government is committed to strengthening accountability and has taken several steps to do so. Treasury Board Secretariat is currently engaged in implementing three broad new instruments of accountability to make departmental performance more transparent. The first is Treasury Board's new policy called Management, Resources and Results Structure Policy, a copy of which is included in your information package. This policy requires that departments have a stable set of programs with clear outcomes to which funding is aligned and performance measures for each program. Where programs have an explicit gender-related objective, Treasury Board Secretariat will insist on appropriate performance measures. It is not the job of the Treasury Board Secretariat to determine which program should have gender-related objectives. That is more the domain of the public policy-making process and therefore the purview of cabinet and the Privy Council Office.

[*Translation*]

And it is the job of Status of Women Canada to advocate for gender consideration in policy-making, and to conduct gender-based analysis of public policy as required by the Privy Council Office and Cabinet.

[*English*]

Departments are currently implementing the management, resources, and results structure policy, and members will shortly see its impact on departmental performance reports. That was our first initiative.

The second initiative is Canada's Performance, an annual summary of Canada's performance across a broad array of social, economic, and environmental indicators. We have included a copy of this report in your information package.

Intended to provide context for assessing departmental performance reports, Canada's Performance uses measures like community well-being, infant mortality, educational attainment, and volunteerism, but it is evolving, and Treasury Board Secretariat would welcome members' recommendations on how to improve it.

The management, resources, and results structure policy and Canada's Performance are part of a broader effort to improve reporting to Parliament. Treasury Board Secretariat will shortly begin consulting members on a blueprint for doing so.

The third Treasury Board Secretariat initiative intended to strengthen accountability is the management accountability framework. Again, a copy is included in your information package.

As budget 2005 described it, the management accountability framework sets out a comprehensive and coherent management accountability regime. It summarizes Treasury Board Secretariat's expectations of deputy ministers for creating the conditions of sound management in their organizations. Departments are using the management accountability framework to analyze and challenge their management practices and as context for public reporting on management. Elements of the management accountability framework include governance, analysis, and performance information. It also includes human resources, which my colleague Madame Boudrias will discuss at some length.

Treasury Board Secretariat is currently using 30 management accountability framework indicators to analyze management capacity and practice at the departmental level and across the public service, but the indicators will evolve. As they do so, balance will be the watchword. Treasury Board Secretariat requires sufficient high-level indicators to assure the government that management is sound. The management, resources, and results structure policy—the first initiative I talked about—Canada's Performance, and the management accountability framework are three significant new initiatives designed to strengthen public service accountability; and to the extent that gender figures in the policy intent of a program or the standards of management practice required of every department, these initiatives should support and help promote gender-based analysis.

As mentioned earlier, Treasury Board Secretariat also supports the Treasury Board as general manager and employer of the core public service. The overall responsibility for human resources management is now shared by the Treasury Board Secretariat, the Public Service Human Resources Management Agency of Canada, and the Canada School of the Public Service, which are called the Treasury Board human resources portfolio partners. Together we ensure the effectiveness of the public service by creating human resources policies, setting compensation levels, and offering terms and conditions of employment that help attract and retain talented, skilled, and dedicated employees while ensuring a continuous learning environment.

In its human resources management, Treasury Board Secretariat pays close attention to gender-based analysis and to the risk of adverse effects to other disadvantaged groups to ensure it provides an egalitarian working environment.

I believe the initiatives I've spoken about today are key, and I assure you that senior Treasury Board Secretariat officials are eager to maintain this dialogue by supporting you in any way we can. I'd like to take this opportunity to wish you all the best as you undertake your study of gender-based analysis, and I look forward to reviewing the results of your study when they are available.

Thank you, and now I will turn to Madame Boudrias.

● (1530)

**The Chair:** Go ahead, please.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Boudrias (Executive Vice-President, Public Service Human Resources Management Agency of Canada):** Good afternoon and thank you for inviting us.

It is a pleasure to speak to you today about the Public Service Human Resources Management Agency's role and commitment concerning the status of women in our work force and the federal public service as a whole.

I will also share with you examples of how we incorporate gender-based analysis into the development of policies, programs and other initiatives that have an impact across the public service.

In December 2003, the government of Canada established the Agency to carry out the government's agenda for renewal of human resources management throughout the federal public service. Our primary programs include human resources planning and accountability, implementation of the Public Service Modernization Act, organization, classification and employment policy, leadership development, values and ethics, employment equity and official languages.

The Agency is part of a portfolio that also includes the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Canada School of Public Service and for which the president of the Treasury Board is the responsible minister of Cabinet. At the Agency, we provide leadership in implementing the government's human resources modernization agenda.

The Agency exercises its leadership in a number of different ways and one of our critical roles is our responsibility, under the Employment Equity Act which commits the government to achieving a representative and inclusive public service of Canada. This means ensuring that women are appropriately represented at all levels of the public service.

• (1535)

[English]

Our engagement on gender-based issues stems not only from the law, it's also central to our values as an institution. Our values of equality and equity are broadly shared in the public service and are reflected in our goals to make full use of the talents and skills found in the Canadian population and to remove barriers to the full participation of women in our workforce and in federal workplaces.

The Public Service Human Resources Management Agency works with the Treasury Board Secretariat to strengthen the policy framework and to develop policies for delivering high-quality programs and services to Canadians. Among our policies that have a clear and distinguishable gender component are our employment equity policy and anti-harassment policy.

An employment equity lens is also applied to new policies to ensure that they do not result in adverse impacts on women and others in the employment equity designated groups. We are making steady progress toward improving the participation of women in the federal public service. Women make up 53% of all federal employees, surpassing our workforce availability of 52%. One in three public service executives is a woman, almost twice the proportion of a decade ago. Women received nearly six of every ten promotions in the public service last year. Nearly four in ten of all Canadian federal employees abroad are women.

[Translation]

We believe that the Agency should be a role model for the management of human resources in the public service. This includes demonstrating leadership on representation.

Our two most senior officers, the president and myself as the executive vice-president, as well as two thirds of all our employees and half of our executives are women. Women also comprise close to two thirds of our executives around the senior management table.

As part of our employment equity responsibilities, we monitor the performance of departments and agencies for which the Treasury

Board is the employer. This information is reported annually to Parliament and the most recent annual report was tabled by the Treasury Board president, Reg Alcock, in early February.

The first annual report analyzes gender participation from a variety of perspectives and provides a wealth of statistical information across the public service and by department or agency for the last ten years. I will leave copies of the short version of the report, for distribution to members after this session.

On March 8 and 9, 2005—just two weeks ago—the Agency hosted an employment equity conference to bring together public service leaders, managers and employees in a discussion of employment equity within the context of the government's modernization agenda.

As you may recall, March 8 was also International Women's Day and a fitting one on which to start our dialogue. It was also the day we re-issued an important booklet entitled "Employment Equity for Women Still Matters". And it does. The booklet provides suggestions for managers, human resources professionals and women in four areas: recruitment and selection; career development and advancement; organizational culture; and supportive employment policies and practices.

[English]

Our analysis and reporting on performance to Parliament seeks not only to address how we are doing with respect to women overall, but also with women who are in other employment equity designated groups, such as visible minorities, aboriginal people, and people with disabilities. Women now account for 61% of our aboriginal employees, 54% of visible minorities, and 51% of employees with disabilities.

At our agency we are strengthening our research capacity to ensure that we can improve human resource planning in the public service by facilitating the identification of current and future needs. Such analytic work will continue to include a gender dimension as we seek to capitalize on higher female participation rates in our labour force and as we respond to challenges in the area of recruitment, demands for alternative work arrangements, and the learning and career progression of our employees, including persons in all employment equity groups.

We are finalizing an environmental scan of the major human resources challenges that we expect the public service to face in the future. One of the issues clearly identified is that we will need to examine new options for flexible working arrangements to address the needs of those raising families and those providing care to the elderly—and we know very well that women, more often than not, are those primarily involved in providing such care.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

Our research analysis has also demonstrated how women are making gains in occupational groups where they were historically under-represented.

Over the past ten years, there has been a 33% increase in the number of women in the scientific and professional group. Women now occupy over 30% of positions in the technical category—up from less than 20% in 1994—and nearly 60% of those in the administrative and foreign service category are women.

However, progress is still required if we are to address the under-representation of women in the executive and middle management groups. The leadership network, which is the part of the Agency dedicated to development of public service executives and managers, has integrated the objective of improving representation of women into its programs.

For example, in the career assignment program, which often leads participants to the EX group, there is equal representation of men and women. And 67% of those prequalified for an EX position are women.

Women have accounted for 47% of the promotions from the accelerated executive development program for middle level—EX-1 to EX-3—executives to the ranks of assistant deputy minister.

All selection boards for these programs must have an appropriate gender balance.

[*English*]

As we seek to modernize the public service of Canada and strive to sustain the delivery of excellent service to Canadians, we are also strengthening our accountability framework and incorporating gender analysis in it. Our efforts are coordinated with those of the Treasury Board Secretariat under the management accountability framework, which has a specific component addressing human resource management, as well as values and ethics.

We have developed a people component in the management and accountability framework, which identifies seven strategic outcomes. Each outcome will have multiple indicators, which will enable us to assess, monitor, and take the pulse of the overall health state of human resource management in the public service. We want to know whether we have achieved the desired outcome of a workplace that is fair, enabling, healthy, and safe, and a workplace that is productive, principled, sustainable, and adaptable, to provide the best service to Canadians. This will contribute greatly to the planning, analysis, and advancement of diversity in the workplace and workforce, including gender issues.

The reporting on the state of public service human resource management will be presented as an annual report to Parliament under the auspices of the Public Service Modernization Act. Discussion based on these outcome measures will take place equally with deputy heads of departments and agencies to further communicate, plan, and formulate necessary actions on the government's priorities in human resource management on an institutional basis.

I would be happy to answer your questions with respect to this opening statement or on any area in the federal government's human resource management agenda for which we are responsible.

Merci beaucoup.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Ms. Atkinson, it's nice to see you again.

**Ms. Joan Atkinson (Assistant Secretary to the Cabinet, Social Development Policy, Privy Council Office):** It's nice to see you too, Madam Chair.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear today to discuss the role of the Privy Council Office in furthering gender-based analysis in the overall policy development process.

I'd like to start by outlining a bit of what we do at PCO. I think that will go some way to further the committee's understanding of the policy development process as well of the various issues, such as gender, which are taken into account as proposals come forward for cabinet consideration.

• (1545)

[*Translation*]

Essentially, the Privy Council Office is the prime minister's department and the Cabinet Secretariat. The primary responsibility of the Privy Council Office is to provide public service support to the Prime Minister and to the Cabinet. Our main role vis-à-vis the Cabinet is to facilitate the smooth and effective operation of the Cabinet decision-making process. This ultimately leads to the elaboration of government policy.

As you know, at the opening of each session of Parliament the government lays out its agenda in the Speech from the Throne. Ministers identify and propose priorities and initiatives on the basis of their portfolio and other responsibilities. Certain individual ministers exercise special coordinating functions on behalf of the ministry as a whole, such as minister Frulla who is the minister of Canadian Heritage and the minister responsible for Status of Women.

A major focus of the Privy Council Office is to ensure policy coherence, complementarity between new proposals, existing policies and the government's overall objectives.

As a general rule, the Privy Council Office does not develop policies or programs. Our role is to support departments in their effort to implement the agenda set out by the government in a way that is practical, fiscally prudent, achieves the necessary compromises and is sustainable.

[*English*]

As a policy proposal begins to take shape, the lead department consults with the Privy Council Office on the timing for bringing forward the proposal to cabinet.

As part of this process we provide a challenge function hand in hand with our other central agency colleagues, primarily the Treasury Board and Finance. The challenge role is a crucial aspect of the policy development process. Our objectives are twofold. First, we ensure that all affected ministers have been consulted, and through the relationship with stakeholders, they ensure that the impacts, favourable or unfavourable, of new programs or policies are taken into account. Secondly, we ensure that a full range of options are outlined for ministers. Proposals must achieve overall policy objectives while balancing the various interests.

PCO is a small organization by design. This is because it must always balance the provision of effective support to the cabinet process and the Prime Minister against the need to avoid duplication of the expertise and the activities of the line organizations that support ministers in carrying out their portfolio responsibilities. Ultimately it is the department leading a proposal that is responsible for ensuring that all the pertinent considerations are taken into account and carefully assessed. There's also a certain degree of responsibility on the part of other departments to ensure that their issues are considered. To a large extent the onus is on the minister responsible, supported by their department, to ensure that any impact of a proposal on their portfolio is addressed in the policy development process.

To help guide departments in developing proposals, PCO has developed templates as guides for the various documents that are presented to ministers at cabinet committee. The best known of these is likely the memorandum to cabinet or the MC. The MC template is available on our website. Under the consideration section we have set out the following key issues, which we encourage departments to assess: legal risk, including charter risks and trade implications; privacy impacts; official language considerations; provincial, territorial, or regional considerations; gender issues; private and voluntary sector implications; sustainable development aspects; and results of strategic environmental assessments and international perspectives. So you can see that there is a clear expectation that gender issues will be taken into account as policy proposals are developed and as they are brought forward to cabinet for consideration.

One aspect of furthering the analysis is the interdepartmental meeting that occurs in the lead-up to a proposal coming forward to cabinet. It is at this point that all departments are invited to participate in a discussion of the proposal and to ensure that any concerns they have are addressed. When the item reaches the cabinet table, ministers have the opportunity to register points, including highlighting issues pertaining to their portfolio responsibility. I can assure you that it's not only Madame Frulla who raises issues of gender at the cabinet table when this happens.

In performing our challenge function we are always mindful of the government's overall agenda, which is committed to equality for women. In that context we look to our colleagues from Status of Women Canada, who are the policy experts, to work with other departments to ensure that a gender-based analysis has been conducted where necessary.

Although there a number of challenges that remain to advance gender equality, the government has made some progress in recent years. For example, the government has introduced strong measures

that are having a positive impact on the lives of women and their families, initiatives such as child support reforms, improvements to student loans, child benefits, compassionate care benefit, extended parental benefits, and the women's health strategy.

• (1550)

[*Translation*]

I am aware that Status of Women has provided you with a briefing on their work with other government departments on gender-based analysis. Status of Women has one of the finest training modules on gender-based analysis in the world. In addition, Status of Women Canada leads an interdepartmental effort in the development of gender equality indicators.

I would argue that training, horizontal policy coordination and sharing of best practises are the best means of advancing cross-cutting issues, such as gender equality. Careful attention by departments to such issues leads to stronger proposals for Cabinet consideration and ultimately improved results for Canadians.

[*English*]

This concludes my opening remarks. I hope they have been helpful to you, and I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

I have a speaking order. We'll begin with Mrs. Smith.

**Mrs. Joy Smith (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC):** Thank you.

First of all, I have a question to Monique, if that's okay.

Monique, you were talking about a booklet you had issued called Employment Equity for Women Still Matters. Do you have a copy of that? It sounds really interesting.

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** Do we have it here? If we don't, we'll make sure to bring a copy to you.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Excuse me. Could you provide it to the clerk, who will distribute it?

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** Absolutely, yes, I will do so.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Sorry.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** That's okay. May I ask another question?

**The Chair:** Go ahead. You have lots of time.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** I found that very helpful and very interesting to have. It sounded as if you had to redistribute it. It was popular and it was used. It doesn't say that here, but it sounded as if that's what happened. That's good.

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** Yes. I think the conference was a very exciting conference because there were a lot of different under-represented groups there, not only women but visible minorities, people with disabilities, and natives.

The women issue is still on the front burner. Women are still interested today in moving ahead. They want to know how to take care of their careers and how to prepare themselves for promotional opportunities. It's a good retention tool for us to continue to promote this with women from different groups.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** Thank you.

May I ask a question of Joan?

**The Chair:** Yes, go ahead.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** Joan, you were saying that the PCO is a very small organization. It seems to be mostly a support system for the cabinet ministers and the Prime Minister. How big is the organization actually right now?

**Ms. Joan Atkinson:** I don't have a number in my head in terms of how many employees we have. I can speak to my own part of the PCO, which is the social development policy secretariat. We cover all of the so-called social departments, ranging from Indian and Northern Affairs to Health Canada, Heritage Canada, Justice Canada, etc., the social policy agenda inside of the government. We have approximately 15 to 20 employees, including our support staff.

I don't have the numbers for the entire organization in my head, but we can clearly provide that to the clerk.

•(1555)

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** Am I okay for one more?

I found this a very interesting presentation today. You said that you have an interdepartmental meeting that leads up to a proposal being forwarded to the cabinet. There wasn't much said about the actual proposal. Can you explain how this process happens, what actually happens in cabinet, and the timeline in which it happens?

**Ms. Joan Atkinson:** When a minister decides to bring a policy proposal forward and needs to come into cabinet committee for discussion before going to full cabinet, a department needs to be able to provide details of that policy proposal to its colleague departments around town. This interdepartmental process is very important, as I said, to ensure that all perspectives and views from different government departments are and can be reflected in the policy proposal.

Normally what happens is that a smaller group of departments, primarily central agencies—that is, PCO, Treasury Board, the Department of Finance, and often the Department of Justice—will meet with the department first, to help that department flesh out its policy proposal and ensure that all the different issues are taken into account. Then there is a broader interdepartmental process that involves the broader range of departments across government. That needs to take place, at a minimum, three weeks before the policy proposal goes to cabinet committee. This is to ensure that all the perspectives can be taken into account and that the policy proposal itself can be modified and amended as appropriate.

These interdepartmental meetings take place, obviously, with officials. Officials need to be able to brief their ministers. Not only the lead minister for a particular policy proposal, but other ministers that sit around the cabinet committee table need to be briefed by their officials so they understand what the policy proposal is, what the perspectives are, what points they may want to register, and so on. The proposal then, in the form of this memorandum to cabinet, is distributed a few days before the cabinet committee meets.

We have a number of cabinet committees. The one I am responsible for is the domestic affairs committee, where primarily the social and economic policy proposals of the government come forward. Before the cabinet committee meeting, the ministers are all provided with a final copy of the memorandum to cabinet. Then the minister responsible for the policy proposal makes the presentation and there is a discussion—the ministers having been informed by their officials, having been through the interdepartmental process, and obviously, having read the memorandum to cabinet.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** You said that Status of Women has one of the finest training modules for gender-based analysis in the world. Could you tell me how you apply this module, or this model, to what you're actually doing in the paperwork you're bringing forward that will eventually land up in policy?

**Ms. Joan Atkinson:** Having worked in line departments before coming to PCO, I know that Status of Women offers, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, an excellent training module that is adapted to meet the different needs and circumstances of different line departments, and it works with those line departments to provide gender-based analysis training to policy analysts who are working on the actual policy proposals in the line departments.

I think a big part of what we are trying to achieve in the policy development process across government is awareness of the need for policy-makers to take into account the impacts of policy proposals on men and women—because there may be differential impacts—and to include that in their analysis of proposals and the advice they provide to ministers. What Status of Women Canada does is provide a tool kit to departments that analysts can use in terms of looking at how to go through an impact analysis of their different policy proposals.

In PCO we ensure that when the policy proposals come forward, the gender-based analysis has been done and makes sense—not that we are policy experts in each of those areas—in terms of being coherent and in terms of the information and research the department has relied on to do the gender-based analysis, and that they have in fact done a robust analysis. In some areas, obviously, it's more important than in other areas, but we do require departments to have demonstrated in their memoranda to cabinet that they have conducted the appropriate analysis. Status of Women provides a very critical support, across government, to policy-makers. We in PCO try to ensure that as those proposals come forward to cabinet, those tools have been applied in the analysis and in the subsequent recommendations that are put forward to ministers for consideration.

•(1600)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Brunelle.

[Translation]

**Ms. Paule Brunelle (Trois-Rivières, BQ):** Welcome, Ladies.

It was cheering to hear your words today. I see that the Public Service Human Resources Management Agency of Canada has achieved impressive numbers that are proof of its success.

I would like some information on the way in which it went about its work so as to spread the good news and implement it everywhere. You said that the Employment Equity Act helps ensure that women are appropriately represented at all levels of the public service. You also said that you are working towards removing the obstacles to women's maximum participation.

How will you arrive at this? Are there some elements that other organizations might borrow from you?

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** Thank you for the question. It must be said that this is an effort made over several decades.

The women's issue emerged at the end of the 70s and at the beginning of the 80s. We have been investing energy into this for many years.

How have we succeeded? Through very clear strategies for the recruitment plan outside of the public service and through emphasis on recruitment strategies targeting women, at the time, because we were not reaching our representation objectives.

How do we go about setting our objectives? Based upon the labour market availability index, which gives us the number of women in the market or available.

We began 20 years ago. Women were very well represented in support staff categories. We saw that they were less represented in the professional group and even less so in the technical group and in the operations group, such as blue collar occupations.

We thus adapted our recruitment methods to the different groups. We also carried out comparative analyses with other governments and what we call best practices. We realized that it was not just a matter of quantitative recruitment. What was required was a work place favourable to women. We also understood that we had to do more small group recruitment rather than individual recruitment. In the case of individual recruitment, women arrived at the work place, were alone in their occupational group and encountered adaptation difficulties. We also did a lot of work on the acceptance of diversity in the work place. We developed various approaches in this regard.

We also carried out other analyses that led us to other observations. First of all, we noted that in the case of selection committees with representation of both women and men, more women were chosen. Indeed, the way in which women answer certain questions is different from the way in which men answer.

We therefore increase our research work and comparative analyses. That proved to be very helpful over time. There is also, obviously, training. Our analyses also showed that initially women had less access to training and professional development than men. With regard to performance measurement indicators, it is important to say that for a given percentage of women in the population, women should have available to them a given percentage of training budgets.

We established all of these criteria over the years. I believe that this is why today's public service is very well represented by women.

• (1605)

**Ms. Paule Brunelle:** Regarding blue collar jobs, that are less traditional for women, do you consider that what is required is a critical mass, a certain number of women, so that other women become interested in joining their ranks?

In your view, does the fact that the two highest positions in your shop are occupied by women, yourself and another person, impact on certain orientations and on the impressive number of women that you have managed to gather together?

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** In answer to your first question, I would say that the number of women recruited in a given situation is very important. This is particularly the case today in the technical and professional groups, as well as in the operations groups, with blue collar jobs.

At the time, we did some comparative analysis work with Hydro-Quebec, because over there the women were having the same problems as the linemen. The women arriving in a work place that was highly represented by men faced tremendous difficulties. It is important to remember, when one wishes to not only recruit a woman but also retain her in her position, that there must be more than one woman in that particular work place. One must also take into account the whole question of discrimination and harassment at the work place. We must ensure that there are no such problems in these work places, which is not always easy.

You brought up the issue of models, which is an important one. With regard to management positions, women's representation clearly has an impact on the women involved in supporting activity. It is important to note that there are women who moved up the ladder from different professional groups. Whether they come from the professional or scientific sector or from the pool of support staff, young women want to know if there is, within the organization, someone who could serve as a model for them. We must therefore ensure that it is women who supervise the younger women, be it within the institutional framework or through mentorship. This will encourage young women to climb up through the hierarchy and to understand the various challenges.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

You have another minute if you...

[Translation]

**Ms. Paule Brunelle:** As we can see, there are aboriginal women as well as visible minority women. If we look at these marginalized groups, be they men or women, and their representation throughout the hierarchy, are they to be found a little bit everywhere or mostly at the bottom?

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** In order for women belonging to the visible minority, handicapped and aboriginal groups to be adequately represented within the upper and middle management categories, we have some sizeable targets to reach and progress to be made. There is much work left to be done. These people face hurdles not only because they are women but also because they belong to minority groups. All of this makes gender balance even more difficult.

It is very important for all of us, in the context of this exercise we are carrying out in the area of employment equity, to target approaches that are adapted to the culture of these women, which is different. I am thinking here of their cultural or social identity.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Ms. Bulte.

**Hon. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.):** Thank you very much for coming today, and I must say I've learned quite a bit.

I'd like to confine my comments to Ms. Meredith and Ms. Atkinson.

Ms. Meredith you said the Treasury Board as such is not responsible for determining which policies or gender-based analysis...that's up to the different departments. Is that correct?

**Ms. Daphne Meredith:** I would say the departments are primarily responsible for doing that.

**Hon. Sarmite Bulte:** But within your own department, for things your department is responsible for, do you do a gender-based analysis?

**Ms. Daphne Meredith:** Yes, in terms of Treasury Board as employer, we would do a gender-based analysis with respect to—

**Hon. Sarmite Bulte:** Let me ask you a specific question. Treasury Board tabled a report on crown corporations, and within it you go through the nomination process, how people will be nominated to that board and how that whole process will take place. It says each board will constitute a nominating board within the board.

Having served on many boards in my private sector life, I know that when you put a nominating committee within those boards you tend to perpetuate your own in that, and since most of the boards are still predominately male, I'm wondering what gender-based analysis was done on that. That question is to you.

Ms. Atkinson, I was also reading about what happens at cabinet. I notice the words you used, even in your brief, are very cautious words: you encourage departments to assess gender issues; you try to ensure that the tools have been applied; it is a clear expectation that general issues will be taken in account.

Then I believe you said it's not just Madam Frulla who raises these issues at the table. Who does raise them? Is that part of Madam Frulla's job as Minister responsible for the Status of Women to say, has this been analyzed? Is there a section within the MC that says what gender analysis has been done? I believe there is a section in one of your precedents that says what parliamentary action plan there is. Have you consulted with the opposition and things like that? I'd be interested in that.

Then you said, in that context, we look to our colleagues from the Status of Women Canada. Do you then send those MCs to Status of Women to have a gender-based analysis done on this? It certainly seems like that when I read this through, and I just wonder which is the reality and which is the perception.

I'm really interested in that crown corporations report, because I have grave concerns that that was not gender analyzed at all.

• (1610)

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer (Associate Secretary, Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat):** I'm sorry I was late.

**The Chair:** That's fine. We knew you were coming late.

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** The clerk called a meeting and I was asked away. We were trying to finalize the budget bill.

On the report on crowns, you raise a really interesting issue. I would argue that actually the fact that the government chose not two boards in this new report—basically, they withheld the ability for boards to appoint their own board members. In fact, the government kept to their prerogative. The boards are being asked to set the criteria in terms of what competencies are required for that board to function well.

The government has said that with this criteria they're going to have an open and transparent process where people can apply through websites. So instead of having the board members choose their own, because I think that was a major concern—certainly for my minister, but also for other ministers—they want to have a more open and transparent process.

In fact, the big debate they had with those boards and the fact that the government held to themselves that they would do the final appointments for those board members, because they do represent the shareholders, indicates the government is very committed to having gender balance. That is a criterion that through the senior personnel is very much a condition in making appointments. It's reflective of Canada and is a key criterion we use. While the document itself might not say the Government of Canada will use gender-based analysis in terms of analyzing each board, I'd suggest to you the reason this was held back, as opposed to letting every board pick their own, was that the overarching oversight was absolutely kept to the government, and not just for gender equity, I would suggest, but also for much broader overarching reasons.

We saw it, frankly, as a big step forward. Did it go as far as saying that senior personnel would have to do gender-based analysis for every appointment they make? You're absolutely right. It doesn't say that. But does it actually allow and keep the prerogative after the board has made the competencies known of what they need for that board to be functioning? Has it withheld that ability to government where they can look at those broader issues? It does that.

That's all I can answer to that. We'll have to see how that new process works as to whether we should have been more explicit with the principle that I think the government certainly wanted in that crown, which was to have those appointments reflective of Canada.

**Hon. Sarmite Bulte:** What you're speaking about is just one part of it. I understand that executive function is still there to a point. I'm not saying that, but in that report itself, it talks about having a nominating committee of the board. It talks about using a search firm. But have we really analyzed it? Do the Caldwell Partners really represent and take into account women when they searching? When you use those big search firms, they basically perpetuate the all boys' network. Did anybody think of that when they were doing it?

Women network differently than men do. We don't belong to the same networks. A lot of people don't belong to the CFIB, a lot of women don't, because that's not how we network. But I think it's something so important—it's crown corporations. It's not just the arts boards, but the crown financial corporations, such as the BDC and EDC, where women are completely unrepresented.

I don't see where this report goes anywhere to making sure.... Out of 14 board positions on the EDC, we have only one woman there.

This was to be such a great, important report. How could the gender analysis not have been taken into consideration?

•(1615)

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** I didn't say it hadn't been taken into consideration. What I guess I did say, and just to correct, is that it was not explicitly in the report.

I'd raise two issues. One is the very fact, and you're absolutely correct again, that one of the failings that report tried to correct was that the interim process insisted that every board, large or small, had to have a search firm. That was seen, and you're absolutely right, as being too heavy and not getting the right results.

The crown corporations paper actually said you don't necessarily have to use a search firm. We went back to the board for designating the criteria, and the government would then be able, in addition to an open...advertise the position through a website, so women who felt, reading the competencies, that they were qualified could self-identify. Instead of having only a pool of two people to choose from, they can have more.

It doesn't go as far as explicitly requiring gender-based analysis, but I would not accept or go as far as to say that the analysis wasn't a key part of how the key components of that report went out.

**Ms. Joan Atkinson:** Thank you.

In terms of the MC process and so on, and who raises gender issues, and how we make sure those get covered, there is a part in the MC where departments are required, in terms of putting their MCs forward, to demonstrate that they have done a gender-based analysis. So it is a part of the MC.

If it's not done, who does it? And what is the role of Status of Women Canada? First of all, we expect the departments to do the gender-based analysis, and again, I think the objective of gender-based analysis across government is to not have it all done in one place, because if it's all done by Status of Women Canada, if all policy proposals go to Status of Women Canada, then departments will not own that process, and departments need to own that process.

Policy analysts throughout the government need to know that they have to take gender into account when they're developing policy proposals, when they're advising their ministers, when they're looking at the policy proposals that impact on their ministers' mandates and responsibilities. If we said, "Well, it's only Status of Women Canada", then I'm afraid the tendency would be for policy analysts to say, "Well, I don't have to worry about that. That's somebody else's job." It's not somebody else's job. It's the job of policy analysts across government.

**Hon. Sarmite Bulte:** I understand that, but the way it's written here it's a bit confusing. I guess my concern is, is it mandatory, and

will the MC be turned back if the gender analysis is not satisfactory? I guess that's my key question.

**Ms. Joan Atkinson:** That's part of our challenge function. In our challenge function in looking at what the department has brought forward, if the gender analysis is completely missing and it's very relevant to the policy proposal that's been brought forward, then, yes, we will send it back to the department and say, "You haven't done the job properly. We can't bring this forward to cabinet because you haven't completed your policy analysis. You're missing the gender-based analysis, or you're missing the legal risk assessment, or your figures don't make sense in terms of your financial analysis, etc'". And we will send it back to the department and say, "You need to do more work".

At the end of the day our role is to try to make sure that ministers around cabinet committees can make an informed decision. We don't stop ministers from bringing their policy proposals forward, but what we do is try to make sure those policy proposals, as they come forward, have all the relevant information ministers need in order to make informed decisions. So if that piece is missing, we go back to departments and say, "You don't have a complete package".

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Go ahead, please, Ms. Crowder.

**Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP):** Thank you.

I would like to follow up on Ms. Bulte's question to Ms. Atkinson. And I just want to thank everybody for their presentations, but I'm going to come back to a witness we had back in February, Professor Pauline Rankin from the Pauline Jewett Institute of Women's Studies.

I would agree with Ms. Bulte's comments. Your language around here is very tentative. And from the number of witnesses we saw, I think I have a lack of confidence that people have demonstrated a commitment to and an understanding around gender-based analysis, and I think we've seen that in various pieces of policy and legislation that have come out over the ten years that we've been talking about a commitment to gender equality.

I'm not going to re-read Professor Rankin's testimony, but she clearly indicated there's a gap. A couple of things she talked about were the need for strong champions and the need to have structures and mechanisms in place that are stable and well positioned within the bureaucracy. She mentioned that many countries are far beyond what we're doing around gender-responsive budgeting, and we've seen a number of critiques over the last few weeks around the lack of gender-responsive budgeting in the last budget. In fact, the finance department was one department that clearly didn't demonstrate a clear understanding of gender-based analysis.

I wonder if you could comment on what you think is missing in order to have meaningful gender-based analysis put in place, because I don't think it's meaningful.

• (1620)

**Ms. Joan Atkinson:** I guess I would go back to my comments about the need to ensure that we're working on, number one, making all policy-makers in the government aware of the need to do gender-based analysis. But it has to move beyond awareness. You have to have the tools and the mechanisms in order to do proper gender-based analysis.

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** If I could just interject, though, Status of Women is recognized internationally for their training and their tools, and they've been recognized internationally for a number of years. They do a very credible job, yet we can't bridge that gap within. It's not that we need to develop it. We've got it.

**Ms. Joan Atkinson:** Let me go to the tools, because I think that's a critical part. In order for a policy department or an analyst or anyone in the department to do that kind of analysis, they need to have the right data. They need to have the right information. They need to understand what the differential impact is of a particular policy proposal on men versus women versus other groups, and I think what is oftentimes missing in departments is the data to inform the research and the policy-making that comes out of it.

That's a struggle that I think we have across government in all of our policy areas: ensuring that we've got robust data that we can draw on, because if you don't have the data to start with, it's very difficult for you to make an informed analysis of what the differential impacts might be in a particular policy proposal.

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** But what about occasions where we do have the data? Employment insurance is a really good example. There's sufficient data and analysis done that the Employment Insurance Act disadvantages women for a variety of reasons. Part of it is non-standard employment. There are a variety of reasons. We have the data, so why aren't we doing something about it?

**Ms. Joan Atkinson:** I'm not an expert in employment insurance, but I think some of the initiatives that have been put forward by the department recently, some of the changes we have made, such as enhanced parental leave, and so on, are in fact advantageous to women—not just women, but also men, and that is a result of some of the analysis that has been done in terms of impact on men and women as a result of those policies. But I can't comment specifically on what further changes might be desirable in the context of employment insurance. I think that is, as I said before, the responsibility of the lead minister and the department to be looking at those issues and those elements as they put forward policy proposals to change the EI system.

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** I'd like to talk to Madame Boudrias.

When we had the Human Rights Commissioner here on the employment equity report and the federal public service and the annual report, there was no specific reference around the retention numbers. I know that's an important factor. It's not just good enough to hire and promote, but it's the retention. For example, I know there has been a struggle with retaining aboriginal people. Do you have information?

The Human Rights Commissioner did indicate that many departments are gathering that information. It's just not required as part of employment equity to report out on it.

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** If you are interested in getting that information, I'm not sure if we have the retention statistics for all the departments, but I will certainly go back and see if our researcher can find some elements of it, and I will be pleased to bring that information back to the committee.

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** You have another bit of time.

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** Under the labour program annual report and the Employment Equity Act, one of the things I wonder if you could comment on is the fact that women are still earning 77.6% of the average salary for men. This is higher than the Canadian average, so it is a slight improvement, but it's still less than what men are earning.

I know pay equity and employment equity are not considered in the same framework, despite the fact that Madam Abella did recommend that pay equity be included in employment equity. I wonder if you could speak specifically around what measures are being taken to close that wage gap.

• (1625)

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** I can talk a little bit about employment equity and the classification system, but there is also an issue of pay equity, and I might want to have our colleague who is specialized in pay equity, who is here in the room, answer that question.

Just so we're clear, in the Government of Canada we have classification standards that have been developed, and we are meeting the four elements that the Human Rights Commission is asking us to look at in terms of not having bias against women and building in pay equity.

The reason we are facing those statistics is we still have a lot of women in support jobs. So the salaries are not as high as men's. It's because of the number of women we have in a lot of support jobs, compared to the higher level, and so on, but we have worked very clearly in terms of reducing the pay inequity by the classification system. So our classification system is not biased by elements between men and women in terms of having their fair share of salary.

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** But my understanding is that there's also an issue of equal pay for work of equal value that still isn't sorted out.

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** I will leave it to my colleague who is responsible for pay equity to answer that question.

**The Chair:** Could you identify yourself and what your responsibilities are, please?

**Ms. Hélène Laurendeau (Assistant Secretary, Labour Relations and Compensation Operations, Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat):** Indeed, I will. I am Hélène Laurendeau, assistant secretary, labour relations and compensation operations for the Treasury Board Secretariat.

When we talk about a wage gap between men and women, there are many contributing factors. As Madame Boudrias pointed out, there is the issue of the distribution of women within the workforce, whether women occupy highly paid positions compared to lower-paid positions. That's the element that employment equity is trying to address in order to make sure the distribution of work is equal between men and women.

Another element that contributes to the wage gap, as you pointed out, is equal pay for work of equal value. With respect to that second element, we do a fair amount of cross-referencing, if you will, between the demographics of the workforce as we know them right now and the wages paid to women as groups within various occupational groups.

That is supported by the classification system, as Madame Boudrias pointed out, which helps us to make sure that traditional women's work is appropriately valued and therefore appropriately compensated.

So it's the combination of those three key factors—properly evaluating women's work, properly compensating once it has been evaluated, and having appropriate representation in highly paid jobs and lower-paid jobs—that will contribute to reducing the wage gap. But as you pointed out, there is still work to be done in that respect.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I think we're at the end of that.

Ms. Yelich.

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich (Blackstrap, CPC):** Thank you.

You said you would evaluate women's work and you were talking about equal pay for equal value of work. How would you do that? It's easy if the job is the same, but to find the equal value of work....

I was asked this myself not long ago. How would you actually do that? Everybody values their work differently. If we have a housewife who is sometimes under a lot of stress if she's taking care of her own special needs children—I'll give a scenario that causes a lot of stress—and then we also have the person who is working in an industry that might be very dangerous.... I'm wondering, how do you actually do that, when you use the words “value” and “equal pay for equal value” of work. I just want that clarified.

**Ms. Hélène Laurendeau:** What is interesting is that equal pay for work of equal value has two elements: the pay side and the job evaluation side. The way to address how we value work is to try to derive as much as possible from common standards for evaluating work using the criteria developed in the equal wages guidelines by the Human Rights Commission, which include responsibility, skill, effort, and working conditions. When you start from those four basic factors, you can actually derive subfactors that will allow you to evaluate work globally in a gender-neutral fashion. That's what is done through our classification system.

Once that is done, you can then overlay the job evaluation with the pay structure to make sure the pay corresponds to an appropriate job evaluation, and therefore you can compensate appropriately.

So the two elements are important: to have an objective, gender-neutral system of evaluating work, and then to overlay that with an appropriate compensation system that corresponds with it.

But it's basically by using building blocks—the four basic factors—that you develop and refine various elements within the job evaluation system you use, which is basically what our colleagues at the agency are doing in classification. Maybe Madame Boudrias wants to expand a little more on that.

• (1630)

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** In the Government of Canada right now we have 72 different classification standards. Each one of them represents a different group of work. We have a different standard for support staff, blue collar, professional, scientific, and technical. We're making sure that each employee has a job description in government.

Each job description is reviewed by the manager, who makes sure the work that is being performed is well described. Then we classify them. It's not arbitrary; we classify them against standards and we have jobs that are already there as models to make sure we have the right level.

As Hélène was mentioning, the most important part is that those criteria from the Human Rights Commission have been included in all of our evaluations. That's the way we are assured that men and women doing the same type of job will be paid the same salary.

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich:** I guess that really wasn't clear. It was painted with quite a broad brush when you were looking across professions, so it was good.

In your presentation, an employment equity lens is applied to new policies to ensure they do not result in adverse impact on women and others. Then your percentages are very good. It would appear that you have succeeded very well in employment equity in the workplace. You say that 53% of all federal employees are women and one in three public service executives is a woman. Women receive nearly six out of every ten promotions in the public service. I'd say that's fairly successful.

Can you take this model into other areas, other departments? Do you have any suggestions on where you can improve to have this model throughout...? Obviously this is one of the more successful examples.

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** The model we're using is applied in each department. The result of this is certainly not the effort of our agency alone. Our agency is a policy agency. We work with the departments, so the deputy heads who are delegated to staff the different positions in their own organizations follow our policy and suggestions in looking at their recruitment strategies, their representation, their retention, the learning and development investment, and so on.

So this is an effort of all the departments across the country. We've put the training together by working with the employment equity coordinators across government and the deputy heads. So it's a government-wide application of the model.

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich:** Do you find that some departments are easier than others? Are some really very accommodating, while others are very difficult? Are there some areas where Status of Women should perhaps be examining more than other departments? Do you have any thoughts on that?

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** I would say that from a women's perspective we've come a long way throughout the last two decades. Where we need to help more is certainly in the departments that are male dominated due to the kinds of jobs they do. There are still some challenges in the scientific-based departments, in terms of representation of women.

What we're seeing now in terms of post-secondary education is that women are getting more educated and they're graduating. So the workforce now available to the departments that are recruiting the youth and women is there. The capacity for those departments to now move ahead and bring their representation higher is there. There is no barrier, and we're working very much with them to reduce the systemic barriers in terms of the new modernization act we'll be putting in place in December 2005.

We're going to have a new Public Service Employment Act, and we have changed the way the approach to merit has been applied. There will be more flexibility for the deputy head to look at their current and future needs. So they will analyze barriers based on their policies, programs, and representation if they need to focus more on women or other employment equity groups. They may identify some weaknesses in terms of visible minority women and native women. Then they will have the capacity to look at their needs and say, in that very specific case, I'm going to hire a biologist, but within that pool of qualified biologists I'm going to bring that visible minority person, woman, into my group because I don't meet my requirements.

● (1635)

**The Chair:** I'm going to have to ask you to wind up now. Thank you.

Ms. Kadis.

**Mrs. Susan Kadis (Thornhill, Lib.):** Thank you. I think you were reading my mind. I hadn't asked to speak, but I want to thank you very much, and thank you for coming.

Building on one of the other comments or questions on the male-dominated departments, how do they implement gender-based analysis, or is it a vicious circle?

You're not the first deputants to say we've come a long way. I think there's truth in that, and we all agree, to a certain extent. My kind of overriding issue is whether we're hitting a wall and why that might be. In other words, have we gone to a plateau, and what would it take us to get to the next plateau? Or is it a time issue?

**The Chair:** Who would you like to answer that?

**Mrs. Susan Kadis:** I guess Ms. Boudrias—on the issue of the male-dominated department.

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** In terms of the male-dominated departments, my colleague may have some additional information about that.

I think where we have operational work, such as at the Correctional Service; Parks Canada, which is a separate employer; National Defence; and Fisheries and Oceans, or work that is normally technical or operational in nature, or blue-collar-type jobs, these are the departments facing some challenges in terms of recruitment and having a balance. The social and economic departments and the administrative type of departments don't have a problem at all in terms of representation.

**Mrs. Susan Kadis:** The other question could be for anyone, including yourself, because I think you made the point or commented that we've come a long way. But others can respond as well.

The issue is, what does that really entail? Does it mean we are now at a point where we're not seeing as much progress as we have for the last decade?

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** No. I think we still have to continue in terms of progress. We have to make sure we consider women from the other designated groups—visible minority women, native women, and women with disabilities. I think we have to focus on these women.

We have a good balance in terms of the official languages, French and English. I think we're very well represented in Canada in terms of the two official languages. I guess it's more in terms of helping those women who are already facing different types of challenges in terms of their cultural backgrounds, which don't give them the same capacity for performing at interviews and being promoted upward—and not just being moved around. In some regions, mobility up the ladder is not as great as when you are in Ottawa or large urban centres. That also has an impact on the ability of women to move up.

● (1640)

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** I guess I would add one piece to that relating back to the earlier comment.

I wouldn't say we're hitting a wall, but one advantage is that the networks in the public service for women now are far more refined than they were. They are something you wouldn't have seen 20 years ago. There's a critical mass, I would say, at the ADM level in policy shops. It's not uncommon to go to meetings where you're just meeting women in some of the policy shops, which would have never happened 20 years ago.

Those examples are anecdotal, but I think those networks are something we're going to build on to some extent. Those networks are a key component. I think Joan would see a lot more people in policy at the Privy Council Office.

**Ms. Hélène Laurendeau:** If I could add a footnote to that, on top of recruitment, there is also the important role we feel we have to play as a central employer in promoting some of those measures that make the public service an attractive employer for women. For example, Madame Boudrias was referring to the challenges facing the departments that are male dominated. One of the things we feel it is our duty to do in the domain of collective bargaining is that when we have an improvement that has been characterized to us by one of our union partners...or we have a demand articulated that addresses a particular need of women, we make sure we bring back that same demand in groups that are primarily male dominated. For example, in recent years, we made improvements to maternity leave, which came from the portion of our workforce for whom it's very important, because it is predominantly female. We brought back those same demands as employer demands by reopening our collective agreement in groups that are male dominated to make sure the same measures would be accessible to everybody, despite the fact that it may not have been an issue for some of the other groups that are either male dominated or for whom it was not an equal pressure.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Madame Bonsant.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. France Bonsant (Compton—Stanstead, BQ):** Good afternoon.

I have a three-pronged question. If I understood correctly, you have a process for job descriptions, for employees and most probably also for annual appraisals.

Do you have, further to the annual appraisals of your employees, an accelerated promotion program?

Why, in our man's world such as we know it, are women more prudent and why do they move up one step at a time rather than climbing directly to the summit? I do not know if you have done any polls with regard to this issue. Someone already asked some woman why she wanted to become city counsellor and not mayor. It is as if women were more prudent.

Given that there are laws in this regard in Nordic countries, would that not be a possibility? Should we not be asking the Canadian government—or demanding of it—that it pass a law to accelerate the process in order to attain equality at the higher levels in the hierarchy?

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** I will begin by answering your first question. You talked of processes for job descriptions and annual appraisals. In the case of annual appraisals, obviously, the manager and the employee have discussions with regard to the professional development program. When one works within the public service, one is assigned to a position. The Accelerated Executive Development Program is not tied to a position per se. We have various programs. The program aimed at career promotion, entitled Career Assignment Program or CAP, allows first-level supervisors to participate in a development program so as to become middle managers.

There is also a new three-year accelerated program that allows young first-level managers to be promoted to second and third-level positions within a three-year timeframe. There are therefore various programs. For certain technical fields of specialization, there are programs where people enter at the first level and move on to the fourth level within a four-year span. We have various programs of this nature.

With regard to the issue of women's prudence, we looked at trends and surveys carried out over the years both within and outside the public service. I believe this phenomenon is not limited to civil servants. Women tend to be very prudent. The same characteristic is found in women entrepreneurs. Certain statistics from Industry Canada and other departments show that women take longer to launch a business. They are more careful in their preparation for launching a product. Some statistics even show that there are fewer women in the business world who go bankrupt. This is a trend that we see. I do not know if it is a genetic or societal issue. I have not done enough research on the matter. I would not like to put my foot in it. These are anecdotes, things that we see and perceive, but scientifically speaking, I do not know if this has been proven.

With regard to legislation to move the process ahead, I would come back to what Joan was saying earlier with regard to something else. Accountability is very important. Managers and deputy ministers must be made accountable for the choices they make and

the promotions they grant. The more we legislate with regard to their ways of doing things, the less we hold them accountable. The Public Service Modernization Act, passed by Parliament in November 2003, gives much greater flexibility to deputy ministers in a sense, but it also gives them more direction with regard to the elements to consider, namely present and future needs of the public service, employment equity plans, official languages plans, operational and future needs and new policy trends. If we take into account all of these elements, we should have a representative work force at all levels.

We have adopted an enabling approach based on values rather than passing restrictive legislation based on regulations.

• (1645)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Ms. Crowder.

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** Thank you.

Ms. Atkinson, in your document, one of the things you listed for the memorandum to cabinet was international perspectives. I wondered if, through the PCO, there was some other mechanism to ensure that Canadian obligations to international treaties was considered—for example, CEDAW, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, or the Beijing declaration and Platform for Action. I know there have been a number of critiques raised about Canada's performance in regard to these international conventions or treaties, so I wonder where that performance was placed in the context of decision-making.

**Ms. Joan Atkinson:** It would be placed within two parts. The first would be the gender-based analysis part of the memorandum to cabinet in terms of the impact of the policy proposal's differential impact on men and women. The second would come in terms of international perspectives and Canada's obligations under international treaties, whether a particular policy proposal has an impact in terms of our ability to be able to live up to our obligations under those treaties and obligations that Canada has undertaken on the international scene. In both of those areas, if there is a particular policy proposal that impacts on those, we would expect the department to have done some analysis around them and to have been able to present the impacts in terms of Canada's obligations within the context of that policy proposal.

Departments will rely on not just Status of Women Canada to help them in terms of assessing those impacts, but on the Department of Justice, for example, which does have expertise in terms of international treaties and Canada's obligations under those international treaties, whether they be the ones you've mentioned, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, or other treaties that we have signed onto and have obligations under. Often the Department of Justice is another source of information that departments can go to.

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** How does that get flagged or identified? It doesn't sound like anybody has an overall coordinating role or responsibility around that so the department specifically doesn't identify it.

**Ms. Joan Atkinson:** Well, when we talk about the process leading up to an MC coming forward, the interdepartmental process is a very important part of that, because it's often in that forum that you will have.... For example, Status of Women Canada, in the interdepartmental forum, will raise issues that perhaps the department has not reflected in their MC and will offer their advice and their expertise to that department in terms of providing them with some additional support. The Department of Justice, again, either in the larger interdepartmental forum...or oftentimes we'll have a smaller group of departments, including central agencies, the Department of Justice, and perhaps one or two other key departments, whether it will be the foreign affairs department, if there's an international perspective that is specifically important, or another department that has a particular interest in a policy area.... We will facilitate, as PCO, the coming together of those experts in those departments to help the lead department and the lead minister define their policy options more explicitly to take into account those considerations.

•(1650)

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** I just want to make sure I'm understanding this. Did you say that legislation makes departments less accountable?

**Ms. Joan Atkinson:** No, I don't think I made any comments on legislation.

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** Oh, Monique did. It must have lost something in the translation or I misheard it.

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** No. I said the new legislation on the modernization act was legislation that was value-based and not rules-based, and the deputies will be more accountable in terms of their decision-making because we're not telling them how to do it. They have more flexibility than they used to have, but we are giving them some direction in the legislation in terms of consideration for the employment equity plan, the official languages plan, current and future needs of their department, based on where they are going in terms of policy development of program implementation. So we're being less restrictive, but we're giving them a framework in which they will have more accountability and more flexibility.

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** So will they have to specifically report out on gender-based analysis? I just got this today, so I flipped through it, but I didn't see gender-based analysis specifically mentioned in the accountability framework. I didn't see it mentioned specifically in Canada's Performance report. I just wonder if departments will actually be expected to report out on that.

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** I have to be clear that what I was referring to is very specific legislation that applies only to the public service of Canada in terms of managing people. So, yes, they will be reporting on employment equity and diversity through indicators that we are developing under the people component of the management accountability framework. There is a people component to it. We, the agency, are responsible, with our colleagues at Treasury Board Secretariat, for making sure that when we have HR policies, we make sure, with the employment equity lens, that we do the gender-based analysis for all of those policies. We make sure that there is no adverse impact on women when we develop HR policy for the Government of Canada, whether that is safety and security, harassment policy, employment policy, or classification standards. We do check all of the policies and make sure there is no adverse effect on women.

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** Just to add, certainly the MAF—this document here that you're talking about—does deal with, in terms of our own people, whether we are reflective of Canada. With respect to the policies in individual departments, where we're going to start tracking that—I think Daphne probably mentioned it—is with the management for results framework, the MRRS. In fact, to the extent that any department—I know, too many initials—

•(1655)

**Ms. Jean Crowder:** Can we have a copy of that one?

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** I think we gave you a copy of the policy... but why it's important, and it's in its very early stages—in terms of a tool this committee can use, it is going to be very, very powerful. To the extent any department identifies as a strategic outcome.... I will list some.

One is that aboriginal women and youth are actively engaged in their community. You won't have that, because I am pulling from our database. The fact that a department has identified it as a strategic outcome, has gone to cabinet to say they need money because one of the strategic outcomes of their program is to make sure aboriginal women and youth are actively engaged in their community—we are collecting data, or we will be. We're not there yet; we're just starting with how much money is going to that program. When they've identified that as the strategic outcome, they're going to have to start reporting how they're meeting those criteria. To the extent you can imagine programs five years from now—and we have a list of ones already identifying gender-based analysis, and that would have been done, because that's what they're going to be tracking—we're going to be able to tell you, of the departments that had ten programs specifically trying to engage women in their communities, or aboriginal women undertaking activities that positively affect the lives of aboriginal women and their families.... To the extent a program has it as a strategic outcome, we're going to start tracking it.

We are at the very beginning stages of even getting the cluster of all the programs the government runs. We then have to find performance indicators that are very difficult; I don't have to inform this committee how hard performance indicators are. One can imagine...departments will start focusing, and it gets very much back to what Monique talked about in terms of the accountability. They will make agreements with the board—management board, Treasury Board—in terms of how they are achieving those results. You can imagine a time when the program is not achieving the results, and ministers and cabinet decide the money would be better used in another program that's going to achieve the results better—the reallocation.

To the second part... As my colleagues have described, with respect to the human resources side, we're well on our way. With respect to the programming side the federal government does, we're beginning to track and get the beginnings of the data—and Joan has said we can't work without data—and we're happy to give a more detailed account of what the MRRS database will provide....

There is an expectation we'd be reporting publicly in a number of years. We're not there yet; across government it's very huge, \$162 billion, so we're not there yet, but the frame is pretty powerful. We'd probably come back to this committee.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Powers.

**Mr. Russ Powers (Ancaster—Dundas—Flamborough—Westdale, Lib.):** Thank you very much for showing up. I'd best describe you as perhaps the repository of the final ideas before they actually get moved on, and I'm either right or wrong on that particular one.

This committee is about to write its report on gender-based analysis. Just to wrap it up, I have a simple question, but it's probably a less simple answer for you. Are there any recommendations you think, from your experience, we should consider for inclusion in the report—recommendations, concerns, and things such as that, that we may have already taken into account or need to look at?

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** I'll make two, and I apologize again for not being here at the front.

One is I think it has been recognized that we do have some really strong tools here within Status of Women. To me, what hasn't been discussed enough is that it's a struggle to keep up the policy capacity within the Government of Canada, the public service. At the secretariat, we have what we call a boot camp, to make sure all policy analysts are apprised of major thrusts. We should endeavour to find opportunities to get the expertise Status of Women has, because at the end of the day, it has to be ingrained in every department. That only happens through training and ensuring the policy capacity is reflective of that aspect. I can't overemphasize—those policy analysts are looking at 15 different trade-offs. Every time they look at every policy.... It's a complicated business, and anything to reinforce using the tools available, that Canada leads in, would be tremendously important.

My second recommendation is this management for results and accountability—the MRRS—is going to be a key tool. We are going to be able to hold departments to account with specific programs, and that tool shouldn't be forgotten. As I said, we'd be happy to give more details.

**Mr. Russ Powers:** Before you leave, is there a strong gender-based analysis component in that?

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** To the extent that a program that a department runs.... Obviously, in the Status of Women it's very clear. But I'm more interested in other departments, as I think you are too.

**Mr. Russ Powers:** I'm talking about that document you're talking about, the MRRS.

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** The Status of Women has a program activity architecture that has strategic outcomes. It very clearly delineates their role with respect to gender-based analysis.

What I think is powerful about the MRRS is that for every department, right down to a program activity level, which is way below what you see in the estimates, we have strategic outcomes that delineate, and we're going to be able to track it over time. Not next year, but we're setting up the framework, which will be very powerful, to answer exactly the kinds of questions you've raised as a committee.

● (1700)

**Mr. Russ Powers:** Thank you.

Ms. Meredith, have you anything further?

**Ms. Daphne Meredith:** I definitely support Ruth's comments and again support the point that we can't overestimate the power of this new MRRS structure, which I think will help. It will help us in central agencies, and I think it will help parliamentarians provide the transparency you want to have.

**Mr. Russ Powers:** Ms. Boudrias.

**Ms. Monique Boudrias:** I would like to add to what Ruth said about the learning. We're about to review our learning framework in government right now. I think this is very powerful, to make sure that our policy analysts get trained and sensitized to gender-based analysis so when they do their jobs they provide the right advice to their senior officials and their ministers.

In addition to the performance indicators for departments that are institutionally driven, I would say that performance management, individuals like the deputy heads and the heads of agencies and senior managers, like ADMs and directors general—all the executive group—have performance pay. If we want our country to be a leader across the world on gender-based analysis and what we do for women in Canada, I think from a policy standpoint that is also something you could look at as a committee, an incentive in terms of performance pay for senior leaders and policy leaders in government to make sure we recognize what they do to achieve what we have achieved in terms of gender-based analysis in Canada and for us to be a leader in the world.

**Mr. Russ Powers:** Ms. Atkinson.

**Ms. Joan Atkinson:** Picking up on the theme of policy capacity, because that's what we deal with at Privy Council Office in terms of evaluating and doing our challenge function on policy initiatives that go forward to cabinet, I would certainly echo Ruth's comments about the need for us to continue to increase the policy capacity across government, to continue to provide the tools, backed up by the data and the research, to allow policy analysts across government to be able to do the right kind of gender-based analysis so that ministers can understand the impact of policy initiatives that are being put forward. If there are gaps—and I think no one is disputing the fact that there are gaps in terms of our ability to do that—we need to work to fulfill those gaps and continue to encourage the horizontal approach to policy development where we bring in the international, we bring in the gender, we bring in the financial, we bring in the legal aspects—we bring all of those together in a holistic way in terms of putting forward policy proposals for ministers to consider.

**Ms. Hélène Laurendeau:** I'll be very brief.

I can only echo what has been said so far. I would say that supporting analysis also means, as Joan pointed out, making sure we support the gathering of data and the research. It sounds simple sometimes to cut that, because the use for it is not always obvious. But certainly in managing the employer function we realize there's nothing to analyze if you don't have any data. You can build the analytical capacity, but if you don't have any data to match it with, you will not go anywhere.

**Mr. Russ Powers:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** I think everybody's had a question.

I have a question. We've heard much about the success of the employment equity plan or program within government. There are still things to do, but the program for the most part has been very successful.

We've also heard a great deal about accountability and the importance of accountability. I'm not clear in my own mind. You refer to the MRRS. Whether it....

Let me back up. The employment equity program has a plan. The Treasury Board president has to lay out the results every year, which he's just done in the House. The Human Rights Commission does audits. Then, if it doesn't work, there's progressive enforcement action that comes into play. What I don't understand is whether this MRRS is going to pick up the kinds of difficulties identified by Ms. Crowder in the EI program concerning whether, if a gender-based analysis had been done in a full way on that program, we would be dealing with a number of the issues we're dealing with today, or whether we need the same kind of plan that's in place for the employment equity program, with all of the accountabilities—not necessarily the same, but with all the steps and the accountabilities to find those policy concerns that might inadvertently be biased against gender.

What I'm hearing from you is, if it's a strategic outcome or has been identified, then you can pick it up, but if it's not.... I'm concerned.

• (1705)

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** I'd say you have it mostly right. To the extent the strategic outcomes are identified, they'll be the easiest;

that's what we'll be checking. But as a budget office—the Treasury Board Secretariat performs a role as a budget office in terms of appropriating money—one of the things we look for is what the evaluations have said.

Let's take EI. If evaluations had been done on EI that specifically said there were problems with respect to gender-based issues, that would be a question that would come up three times in my account.

The first time it would come up would be through the policy process. It would be either identified and flagged as indicating that basically the evaluation has shown—and to the extent we see it on the web, evaluation and audits, but internally first with evaluation.... We have third-party reviews of EI too, so to the extent it is something mandated for them to check—and it is through the policy committee's mandate that this fits—we would catch it at the policy stage.

But we envisage that MRRS is going to be able to hotlink to evaluations, so we'd be able to catch it there. Even if it wasn't a strategic outcome, to the extent there was an evaluation or an audit that said this is working fine—the money's being spent, the money's not going missing anywhere—but in fact it's not meeting its objectives, or one of the consequences we never imagined would happen is that there is basically, as we can now show through data, a bias, that would be something that would be picked up by Treasury Board analysts, not only just when they're getting new money, but basically because we have in the system.... I don't know how much Daphne.... It is a complicated system, but we also require that they have an RMAF. They have to have evaluations every five years—and we actually look at them and read them.

We're only getting better at doing those evaluations. Instead of just asking people whether they like getting the program, we're asking what the effects are. I would say there's progress being made on the kinds of evaluations and audits being done, and we will pick this up. It would be a secondary catch through the budget office function that would catch this.

Thirdly, the work your committee is doing, to the extent you raise these issues, is taken seriously, and we'll go back—and you have started a bunch of work that we are going to say this about—at least from my sector, to the assistant secretary social in Treasury Board and say, I was grilled pretty hard about what EI's doing, and could you please check what they've done? The work this committee does is very influential in terms of doing the third level of check that continues to happen—and it does happen.

So MRRS will be a part. It'll be the easiest, to the extent that it's a strategic outcome. But I don't disagree with you that to the extent that of the well over 1,000 programs we have there are probably fewer than 100 that have as part of their strategic outcome gender equity, it's just not a big pool. It'll have to be in some of those secondary levels that we catch it.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I think we have to conclude this part of the meeting right now. I want to thank you all very much for coming. I know there was some anticipation among committee members for your appearance. We might come back to you either as individuals or as a committee to follow up, because as you can hear, we're taking this issue very seriously and want to effect some change in government.

It's not on the agenda, but I would ask committee members to stay behind for some committee business. I know the bells are going to ring very shortly.

**Mr. Russ Powers:** Is this the most current information on MRRS?

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** That is the actual policy that is on the website.

**Mr. Russ Powers:** Is there other information available on it?

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** We can get you lots more detailed information in terms of background, but that is the direction that deputies and ministers are using.

**Mr. Russ Powers:** Thank you.

• (1710)

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich:** On the outcomes, you mentioned that specifically in communities you'd like to have aboriginal and children's issues addressed. I wouldn't mind seeing how you would go about doing that. What programs would you be targeting? What communities would you be targeting?

I'd like to get it down to where I can see where the results would be. If you have a community and an outcome that you're going to target, I want you to walk me through it. I wonder if you could give a sample of how you would do that.

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** I would happily do that. Unfortunately, because we were actually getting ready for this late, we only have it in English. I will get the documents and make sure the clerk gets them. We'd be happy to meet individually in terms of walking you through how it's being structured. It is just at the beginning stage, but I think it's pretty exciting.

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich:** Is that your most exciting one?

**Mrs. Ruth Dantzer:** We have lots of exciting things. Invite us back.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for coming. I hope it wasn't that grilling, but thank you.

The bells are going to ring shortly, colleagues, so I want to move ahead. The subcommittee on agenda and procedure met Monday afternoon to discuss future business of the committee. What we're proposing is that the committee will complete the hearings on gender-based analysis on Thursday when the minister appears. Minister Frulla will be appearing then.

We're proposing that on April 5, after the Easter break, the committee meet in camera to discuss its work schedule up until the summer recess. On April 7, we will consider the main estimates. We're hopeful that on April 12 the committee will consider the summary of evidence and draft recommendations on the report on gender-based analysis, which we can then take in and file in the House once approved.

After that, assuming we're all still here, there are six weeks before the summer recess, which gives us 12 meetings. I don't know whether some of those meetings—one, two, or three—will be required to look at the final report on gender-based analysis.

We have to determine what we want to move forward on. There has been a whole host of suggestions put forward, and what I heard from Madame Brunelle yesterday, and from Ms. Crowder, is that we want something from which we're going to get some concrete outcomes, that we're going to move forward and that we're going to, again, be able to effect change. So what we're proposing is that all members of the committee will be polled by Mr. Rick Rumas on their top three priorities and that we have those back to him by March 29 at 5 o'clock. The results of the poll will be tabulated and we'll have it for consideration at the meeting on April 5 as we talk about future business.

I've heard various agenda concerns from various people, and I don't think we can arbitrarily do it without some fulsome discussion. We certainly heard from the groups that came before us that poverty and violence are serious issues. On huge issues, how do we narrow it down so that we can do something?

That is what we're proposing, and I would welcome some comment and direction.

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich:** Do you have a checklist?

**The Chair:** No, but Mr. Rumas will have one.

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich:** So you would pass that to us. I know aboriginal women are really high on the...

**The Clerk of the Committee:** I think what we're asking you is what your plans are.

**The Chair:** Going back to the summary of what we heard from the various groups—

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich:** The reason I bring that up is that it doesn't matter who speaks to us, aboriginal women always seem to be first and foremost. I think that's really high.

**The Chair:** Put it as your number one and we can then discuss it.

Does everybody agree with that?

The other thing is that Rick is going to poll all of you tomorrow to determine your availability on Thursday, because I'm hearing that you're not available.

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich:** I'm not.

**Ms. Paule Brunelle:** I would like not to be, but I will be if I have to be. It is Easter week.

**The Chair:** We'll confirm with you tomorrow. We do have the minister booked, and I think it's important that we have a reasonable attendance. Accordingly, we may have to adjust the schedule.

• (1715)

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich:** Can I suggest that we move her...?

**The Chair:** I don't know what her time is like. That's the issue that we'll have to consult on with her.

I would advise those of you who come from the west that Air Canada has revised its schedule as of the beginning of April, so it's not making it easier for those of us who fly west. It's getting harder. At least, it is for me, and I assume it is for everybody.

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich:** Could we suggest to the minister to meet us after Easter?

**The Chair:** Let us see what happens tomorrow morning, and we'll get back to you.

**Ms. Julie Cool (Committee Researcher):** If I might, if you wait until after Easter to see the minister, and if that's part of the GBA study, then that would delay the preparation of the report on the GBA study. It would be pre-empting preparation of the report and having it into translation before the meeting with the minister.

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich:** Are these all the witnesses we're going to have on the GBA?

**The Chair:** This is it for GBA.

**Mrs. Lynne Yelich:** Then I think that gives us a little more time to think about what we want to grill her about.

**The Chair:** Let's do a poll tomorrow and see what we come up with.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Paule Brunelle:** If I understood correctly, the clerk will get in touch with us tomorrow, the day after or in the days following, in order for us to give three priorities.

**A member:** He will do so after this meeting.

**Ms. Paule Brunelle:** I find this way of going about things very democratic and interesting.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We're trying.

Thank you. We're 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.**