



House of Commons  
CANADA

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

---

FEWO



NUMBER 017



2nd SESSION



39th PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Thursday, February 14, 2008**



**Chair**

**Ms. Yasmin Ratansi**

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:

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

## Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Thursday, February 14, 2008

• (0905)

[English]

**The Chair (Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.)):** Good morning, everyone.

Today we have before us analysts from the Status of Women who are going to talk about their input into gender-based analysis for the budget.

You each have a presentation of 10 minutes. Are you presenting together? Perfect. They have distributed their presentation in both official languages.

With that, we welcome you. We have lots and lots of questions. Hopefully, if we don't get to questions, as I mentioned, we can submit them. Thank you.

You can begin, Ms. Dwyer-Renaud.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud (Director, Gender-Based Analysis, Status of Women Canada):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

[Translation]

Good morning, everyone.

I'm going to share this presentation with Michèle Bougie.

We'll provide an overview of the activities of Status of Women Canada, the central agencies and departments in terms of gender-based analysis, and provide links between that practice and gender responsible budgets. We believe it is always a good idea to recall the role played by Status of Women Canada.

We work to promote the full participation of women in the economic, social and democratic life of Canada in three ways: by building strategic partnerships with federal departments and with Canadian and international agencies; by assisting agencies and departments in applying a gender perspective to policy development; and by funding specific projects through the Women's Program under the Women's Community Fund and the Women's Partnership Fund.

I would like to draw your attention to the Policy Directorate at Status of Women Canada, which undertakes key activities which are directly linked to the implementation of gender-based analysis. I'm going to use the acronym GBA to designate that analysis. In French, it's ACS.

The Directorate carries on two major activities: it helps include gender equality considerations in current and new policy initiatives,

and generates knowledge and tools on gender issues and GBA practices.

These activities help influence and shape our work with federal and provincial/territorial partners in identifying and supporting the removal of barriers, and in meeting Canada's international commitments and obligations.

What does helping include gender equality considerations in initiatives mean? This consists in helping departments integrate gender-based analysis into the design and implementation of key government priorities.

We are currently working with key departments on issues based mainly on the areas of focus of women's economic security and prosperity and violence against women. We also review departments' Treasury Board submissions. By that, we seek to ensure, with Treasury Board's cooperation, that gender considerations are made visible throughout the process, beginning with the Memorandum to Cabinet.

This is a recent activity, which began last September. Michèle can give you more information on that subject when she takes the floor.

We also provide expertise to the various departments wishing to implement GBA frameworks. For example, we're currently working with Human Resources and Social Development to reactivate its infrastructure and develop an organizational policy on GBA practice.

Incidentally, the basic driver of these activities is the idea of making the departments accountable within an accountability framework. Many activities may be carried on in the field, but, if the departments don't seek accountability, it will be hard to determine the impact of a practice such as GBA on policy and program development.

Our activities include the development of departments' activity and program architecture. I'm sure you're familiar with this architecture. This is the instrument the departments use to manage resource allocation. This instrument is virtually set in concrete because it is provided for three years. If a department does not consider the impact of its activities on women over three years, it will have difficulty demonstrating the results it has achieved.

The architecture must be reflected in the departments' reports on plans and priorities and in the departmental reports. Here too, we're trying to integrate gender notions in order to see real results. The Treasury Board has data collection instruments. If we don't break down data collection by gender at the outset, we won't achieve the desired results. We are working on this with two departments: Indian and Northern Affairs and Citizenship and Immigration. This is a real breakthrough.

What does it mean to support the central agencies in their mandated responsibilities to assess departmental use of GBA across the government? We continue to strengthen their challenge function through training. Michèle will give you more details on that subject.

As for the government's reporting and accountability mechanisms, we must monitor the departments to ensure they collect data. If time permits, we'll talk at greater length about the Management, Resources and Results Structure and the Management Accountability Framework during the question period. At that time, we'll be able to explain to you, for example, what it means to include GBA in the Management Accountability Framework.

For us, the most important component is generating knowledge and tools on gender issues. We do that by conducting environmental scanning and identifying trends and gaps that may have impacts on gender equality. This eventually helps us target deficiencies in the system. However, it has to be based on data. For that purpose, we're currently developing a set of indicators on trends together with a number of departments. We hope those indicators will enable them to set their priorities and report. This is a long-term project.

Lastly, we're drawing on the research and statistics of other departments and stakeholders to gather quantitative information on the situation of women in Canada.

• (0910)

[English]

**The Chair:** Madame Dwyer-Renaud, your time is running out.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Is it?

**The Chair:** Yes. You're at nine minutes and 15 seconds.

We can continue with you, but I think people also have a lot of questions they need to ask.

Can we just wrap up what you have? Then the questions and answers can help that process.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Yes. In fact, I wonder if I could offer another option. I was finished, and I was going to pass it to Michèle, who's going into the more technical process.

So take it away, Michèle.

**Mrs. Michèle Bougie (Senior Policy and Program Analyst, Status of Women Canada):** And I'll do it quickly. How's that?

• (0915)

**The Chair:** Sure.

**Mrs. Michèle Bougie:** Basically, we support the three central agencies in a variety of ways. They also have a GBA steering committee, with the three GBA champions from each agency with our coordinator, so they oversee, they discuss, and they consult. We

have a working group with the three agencies to get into the nitty gritty, which is what I'm going to quickly get into.

With the Department of Finance, for example, the training allowed them to do a GBA of tax policy measures in 2006-07, and you have that from last time. It also allows the finance department to consult with other departments, bringing forward items related to the budget to ensure that they're all thinking GBA. Their analysts have to demonstrate that they are actually applying GBA within their work in the Department of Finance across the board. Again, the central agencies will go into details with you, so these are the *grandes lignes*.

Also, all three agencies are now having GBA training as a central component in their in-house curriculum for staff so that the knowledge is not lost. The Department of Finance in the next few months will be putting up an information site for their employees on best practices on GBA and budgets.

Treasury Board is very technical. As Hélène said, they work with accountability tools. So we've been working on two ends: how to help Treasury Board, through training and experimentation, understand how their tools apply to picking up gender equality outcomes and gender-related outcomes; and working with departments so that they take up their responsibility of articulating their objectives and outcomes in their reporting so that the Treasury Board accountability instruments can pick up the data.

PCO is really intellectual capital, so they are focused on a memorandum to cabinet. Again, we're working with them so that they know how to identify in a memorandum to cabinet if in fact the department has looked at GBA throughout the entire development.

As Hélène said, we also work with the other federal departments, and there's a slide 10, which I'm not going to go into detail in the interest of time, that gives you an idea of what some of the departments are doing. There is a real continuum from gender focal units to networks to business plans to strategic visions and policy guides, and all of them do training. Most of them started with ours, and some have customized for their own needs, but those are all ongoing activities.

I'll pass it back to Hélène, who will conclude very quickly.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** The conclusion is simply that if we have all of the right pieces of the puzzle and we have the right players all working together, we can actually see at the end of the day how GBA, if it's done in a systematic fashion with an accountability framework and with everyone playing their role, could certainly help ensure that we have accurate information.

It helps decrease the probability of after-the-fact types of measures, and certainly it helps with analysis to allocate the resources that one would see in a budget for the right populations and the right issues.

Thank you.

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

We will now go to the first round of questions, starting with Mr. Pearson.

**Mr. Glen Pearson (London North Centre, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Chair, and welcome this morning. I'm glad you're here, and I have a lot of questions for you—all of us do.

We haven't really seen if the GBA within the Ministry of Finance has been effective or really works yet, and I know this takes time to assess and to see.

In your estimation, from the work that you have done there, do you feel it has been effective? Is it moving along in a timeframe that you would hope to see?

**Mrs. Michèle Bougie:** As Hélène said earlier, some processes are very lengthy, and gender-responsive budgets are one of them. It's an incremental process. You need to understand the tools, you need to get the training, and you need to know how to apply it.

It's also incremental in the sense that you can't necessarily apply it to revenue and expenditure at the same time. At this point, the Department of Finance has done actually quite a complete GBA where they have the data to do it. More importantly, I would say to you that although the outcomes and results are yet to come, in fiscal outcomes you don't necessarily see the policy change very quickly. It's more important, from our perspective, that the Department of Finance is thinking outside the box, they're thinking in terms of gender, budgets, and the repercussions. I would have to say, at this point, yes, they are doing quite well.

**Mr. Glen Pearson:** We also don't quite know how things are being monitored. How is that being done?

**Mrs. Michèle Bougie:** There is constant talking at the working level, which is why we have the working group. The steering committee of GBA champions—obviously chaired by our coordinator at Status of Women Canada—can also look at things where perhaps we might say, “We're not sure about this, maybe you need to check with the champion”. So it's a constant process of dialogue and information sharing.

• (0920)

**Mr. Glen Pearson:** One of the things we found from a teleconference we did with somebody from another government in the world was that when they had tried to do GBA amongst their various departments, some of those departments had felt it was sprung on them, that they weren't quite prepared for it and therefore weren't quite as responsive as they had hoped to be.

Do you have any plans within Status of Women for doing a pre-GBA campaign in which you move out into the various departments and say, this could be coming to you, and here's what we're doing within the Ministry of Finance? Are you spreading out to others to get them ready, if we seek to move it in that direction?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** As you know, in Canada—at least in the federal government—the GBA policy has been in existence since 1995. So we have some key departments that have been undertaking GBA on their own and producing their own training packages and those kinds of thing. But to be honest, the Treasury Board submission requirements now and the language of Treasury Board call it a compliance, which has given us a boost to be able to go to the other departments now and basically say, this has been in existence for a while, and although you may have had good reasons in the past not to undertake this....

Also, what has been happening internally in Status of Women Canada is that our policy analysts are now reorganized to do the support for each department as the submissions go through the system. This means that when a department comes calling, they are like a client, and we're giving them a suite of services to make sure they can sustain their practice of GBA, so that they don't come back over and over again. This can be a problem with departments; if you're working with distinct parts of a department, sometimes the points don't get connected inside the department.

So this is something we're starting now. It's a new way for us to operate in terms of ensuring that GBA is indeed being fanned out, if you like, to the different departments. It has made a big difference for us to have the central agencies behind us asking for accountability from the departments.

**Mr. Glen Pearson:** Yes. Part of our concern as a committee is that we have to make sure you have the resources to get the job done. That leads to my next question.

If you are fanning out and trying to move into these various departments, do you actually have the resources required to do that, or do you require more?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I guess it's important to understand the role we play, because you will hear from the central agencies that they do not do the GBA, but they are trained to detect it. We are not doing the departments' GBAs; we are supporting them.

In that sense, the resources make a lot of sense the way we have them right now. You may or may not know that before the expenditure exercise there was a governance exercise at Status of Women Canada, where it was felt that it was time to integrate the practice of GBA. We had been doing a lot of capacity-building, tool development, testing of model delivery, but it was time to put it into practice.

**Mr. Glen Pearson:** You do training, correct?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** We don't do training ourselves. We have 11 anglophone trainers and nine francophone trainers, who we have used these past five years.

Right now our suite is ready to go, which is what we offer to the departments. If they say yes, they'd like some training, they go to our trainers bank to find who they would wish to have—the trainers have all been licensed by us. We give support to the departments in terms of the practicalities around the training. We are now engaging them to do training, not by itself, in some kind of....

**A voice:** [*Inaudible—Editor*]

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Exactly, but tied to some kind of an initiative. That's important, because we can then see that initiative evolve; we can see them report that initiative to Treasury Board and in their departmental reports.

This is a whole new way for us to move into the departments. And like a small central agency, you need the will of the other partner to do this.

**Mr. Glen Pearson:** Yes. And how do you report back, then, as to the success of these training and other initiatives? Do you have a way of compiling that and bringing that back?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Yes, we do it in our own report to Parliament, our DPR, our departmental report. That is how Status of Women Canada reports, but we have also asked departments, when we are doing the training under the initiatives, to also report this in their DPRs.

So at one point the dots should connect. Treasury Board should be reporting on a more strategic level. We report on the practices. The departments report on the results.

• (0925)

**Mr. Glen Pearson:** I see.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Pearson.

Madame Demers, for seven minutes.

[Translation]

**Ms. Nicole Demers (Laval, BQ):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. Dwyer-Renaud, you said in your statement that you were trying to establish partnerships. Is there any resistance to that? If so, what is it?

I'd like to know whether you suggested changes to HRSDC to enable more women to access employment insurance. If so, did they consider them?

You said environmental scanning should be conducted to determine trends and deficiencies. Have you detected any deficiencies? If so, which ones?

I would also like to know whether it is possible to get a guide for the preparation of Treasury Board submissions.

Lastly, what measures has the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs taken to enable Aboriginal women to take charge of their lives more easily and to have more resources to do so?

Thank you.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** There was perhaps more resistance to partnerships in the past. The fact that we now have the support of the central agencies acts as a lever in terms of demands and expectations. The departments cooperate to a much greater degree. We tell them that, if they go before the Treasury Board and are questioned about the funding they're going to receive, it would perhaps be beneficial for them to work with us from the outset to develop their submission. I've been working in the field for a long time, and I can tell you that resistance has declined considerably.

As for human resources, once again, that's not necessarily the role of analysts. We want to give people the tools so that they can better analyze the various programs. It's when you impose an option on the departments that there's a real outcry, but if you tell them that we

want to help them carry out a given program by re-examining the data and possible impacts, things go better.

We're not necessarily an active voice with regard to key policies. Instead we want to provide officials with tools. We hope that outside researchers and women's pressure groups can make various suggestions because that's not really our work any more.

• (0930)

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** If I understand correctly, you don't have a lot of influence on the changes that may be made in the various departments. You're trying to show these people how to conduct GBA, but it's limited to that.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Yes and no. If, for example, the employment insurance people submit a Cabinet memo to the Privy Council Office and the latter sees that the memo doesn't contain a gender-based analysis, the people who prepare that memo will be questioned. If they meet the Privy Council's requirements, then knock on the Treasury Board's door to request funding, but the Treasury Board finds that the potential impact on women is not clearly visible in the memo, the Board will ask those people to go and redo their homework. That's the beauty of the present system.

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** It's hard to calculate, since only 30% of women have access to employment insurance.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I wasn't talking about that system, but about the gender-based analysis system.

I'm going to address the question of deficiencies through the indicators project. That project is based on research on indicators and fields in which it was determined that there really were deficiencies. I can tell you some of those fields. It was determined that additional information was needed in the personal security field. The idea here is to get data in order to be able to develop better policy. Women's security and economic prosperity is another field. An entire set of indicators is related to those themes. These are the two main areas. Under the theme of personal security, we're talking about health and welfare, violence and housing. Under economic security and prosperity, we're talking about income and earnings, labour market participation, segregation, unpaid work and social and political involvement.

That will guide the kind of environmental scanning that we'll be doing based on those indicators. As regards the guide, I don't know whether that's a public document. I'll have to ask and we'll pass on the answer to you. That moreover is a question that you could put to the Treasury Board as well.

[English]

**The Chair:** Ms. Dwyer-Renaud, could we have that information sent to us?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay, perfect; thank you.

[Translation]

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** What is the situation regarding the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** We work a lot with the people from that department. As for reviewing Cabinet memos, they have a very good internal system. They also handle key subjects in issues concerning Aboriginal women, including what's called matrimonial real property. We're working together with them in the education and housing sectors.

Sisters in Spirit is a project spread over five years and is currently in its third year. Over the next two years, we'll try, in cooperation with the departments, to address subjects that the Native Women's Association has identified as causes of poverty and violence against Aboriginal women. These individuals have recommended—and we support the recommendation—that we work with the departments on issues such as housing, education, employment and access to justice. Two of those topics are the responsibility of the Department of Indian Affairs. So we'll be working together with the people from that department.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Go ahead, Ms. Davidson.

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would like to thank you for coming this morning and helping to clarify what to me is a confusing issue.

As I listen to your presentation this morning, what I'm taking from it is that a lot is already being done. That is an impression I didn't have up until this meeting this morning. As a matter of fact, at the last meeting—although I may have misunderstood—I thought the statement was made that the GBA champions in the three agencies were no longer doing the GBA championship role, that they were either not there any more or they had been reassigned, but I think I hear you saying that is not correct.

• (0935)

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** That is not correct. People change, of course, so we've had a turnover in the champions, but the functions are very much present in the three central agencies.

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson:** Does Status of Women Canada take the lead role on GBA? Does SWC define what GBA is?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Yes, we do.

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson:** Are all three agencies using the same definition?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Yes, they are.

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson:** How are the departments held accountable? Who analyzes the information to see whether or not the GBA has done what you feel is proper? Does your department do that, and how is success and/or compliance measured? What are the controls?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** It's a good question. Because of the role we've now undertaken, we are going to have to develop. We have a project right now comparing how we do things in GBA in the Canadian government compared to the European Union. So we're going to use that to be able to see how we can do a better job at monitoring the practice.

Status of Women does that. Our responsibility is vis-à-vis the practice within the departments: how that is happening, what kinds of infrastructures are being created within the departments.

The results vis-à-vis the policies developed with GBA are being monitored by the central agencies, by PCO and Treasury Board. When we talk about MRRS, which is the management of results, resources, and structure, that structure is the responsibility of Treasury Board. We are encouraging and trying to get Treasury Board to collect data from the departments from a gender perspective. When an initiative goes through cabinet, goes through Treasury Board, and then gets reported by the department, we should see the notion of gender woven right through that, and at the end of that, the result it has for women.

That kind of accountability is now being fostered inside the central agencies, and we must say they're very willing to do this. I'm looking forward to your meeting with them because I think they're quite excited to let you know what they've been doing, but it's a real breakthrough for us to have central agencies work with us that way.

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson:** In your presentation you indicated that something was first launched in September, but I'm not sure what that was.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** That's the Treasury Board submission Madame Demers was asking for. It is, if you like, the requirement. The departments have to follow a template, and you can certainly grill Treasury Board on this. I'm just giving you an overview. All departments have to follow a template when they go for a Treasury Board submission, when they ask for money, when they have received the policy authority from cabinet, and you also have to consider the things in there. For a long time, until last July, you never had to consider the impact on gender and now you do.

You have to show Treasury Board that you've taken into consideration how this program or this policy you're requesting funding for will have an impact on women versus men.

I don't know if you want to add a note or two to that, Michèle.

**Mrs. Michèle Bougie:** It's interesting, because the tool, the MRRS, is able to discern, through the evidence presented—and I'm sorry it's bureaucratic—in RPPs and DPRs, the allocation of resources to the strategic outcomes identified by the department. They can see the resources allocated to the activities that are being driven to reach those key outcomes. The trick with the tool is to be able to discern where gender has been woven through activities to achieve the key strategic objectives of the department. It gets quite technical at that point because you're not necessarily looking at quality outcomes but outcomes in other policy areas that have an impact on gender or gender-related outcomes.

That's why we're working with departments at the front end and Treasury Board at the back end, so that departments make visible what they're doing in terms of GBA and gender equality work of any sort. This will enable Treasury Board to pick it up with the tool, because the tool is only as good as the input. So you have to look at a whole loop. It's really bureaucratic; you roll up your sleeves and get into the machinery.

● (0940)

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson:** Thank you.

You also referred to the trainers. I think you said you had trained so many francophone and so many anglophone people who were going to be doing the training in the different departments.

Do they go to the three agencies, or are they available to all the departments?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** They're available to all the departments. We've had them for quite a few years now. We did a train the trainer program about three or four years ago. Those trainers have been available to all departments, and they are actually available even to the provinces and territories. We have had NGOs come asking for our trainers. That case was interesting, because they wanted to be trained to be able to converse with public servants in the face of the bureaucratise that Michèle talks about. They have been training inside the central agencies as well.

**The Chair:** We now go to Ms. Mathysen for seven minutes.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

And thank you so much for being here. I think slowly but surely the mystery is unravelling, and the web is becoming clearer.

I have some quick questions. It seems that Status of Women Canada has a great deal to do in terms of monitoring the departments. From what you described, it sounds like an incredible body of work that you do.

Do you have enough people to do this? How many people at SWC are available to do this monitoring? How effective do you feel you are with the staff you have?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** We now actually have more staff than we used to have to do this, because of the merger of the three sections—I think I was starting to say that a while ago. The directorate now has 15 people, and I think about 10 of us do this kind of work now. We used to do just capacity building, and now, because we are integrating departments, issues, and the capacity building, we've gained people to help us do that.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** You talk about the fact, in regard to economic security, that we need a lot more information. As you know, this committee looked at the economic security of women—older women, younger women. You talk about their personal security, the need for housing, unpaid work, social and political interaction.

Madame Demers mentioned employment insurance, but did you look at child care as well and at the impact the lack of child care has? What kinds of things are you telling the Department of Finance about these very important things? Gender budgeting isn't—none of this is—going anywhere if it doesn't really create security for women.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** The indicators project that I was referring to has not started yet, so we have not collected this data yet. We are about to start doing so. Child care is under the unpaid work theme.

The concept or notion of child care is also being looked at through our federal-provincial-territorial forum of ministers responsible for the status of women. They are looking more at the caregiving issue, but it's caregiving from children to elderly parents. They are looking at that, and we are participating in that in our position.

The issue is that until we have good information and some options we can look at from that group, there is really not much work being done. HRSDC have indicated that they want to work with us from the GBA perspective on the caregiving work they're doing, so there are some linkages being done that way.

There's an openness from departments—we've talked a bit about the resistance—to work when it comes from a GBA perspective, because they see it as a tool and a methodology, and it has rigour. They can provide good evidence-based information when they are developing policies. We seem to be able to go through the door that way with them.

● (0945)

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** It sounds as though we have a long way to go in terms of policy when it comes to caregiving and housing, if that information hasn't been gathered. We have a lot of work to do in regard to the policies government develops. I appreciate that. I'll certainly keep that in mind.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I should say that the work on the indicators is also building on data that's already been collected. A lot of data is being collected on housing. A lot of data is being collected on caregiving. It's putting all those pieces together, which is, as you may know, not an easy task inside of a bureaucracy. We're trying to pull together all of these banks of data people are collecting.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** How am I doing, Madam Chair?

**The Chair:** You have two minutes left.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** I'm quite curious. I know you're the watcher, and you're doing the watching in terms of the department. When Status of Women Canada was reorganized or restructured recently, and there were layoffs and cuts to programs, was there a GBA done for the watcher by the watcher? Did you look at what impact the changes would have?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** It would not have been something we, at the GBA level, would have been involved in or asked to do.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** That's odd, inasmuch as those changes would have a profound impact on women and equality. Was there never any thought of perhaps looking at the impact of those changes?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I couldn't answer you in a direct way because I wasn't part of that process. It's not something I can answer very clearly. Having been a member of the staff, I know it was not necessarily worked that way or done that way.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** I understand, but I think it would have been interesting to ask, before we did this, what the impact would be.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

To answer Ms. Davidson, you said there is a definition, and it is used consistently throughout. Could you provide us with the definition? We are confused as to what the definition is as well.

We now go to the second round.

Ms. Minna, go ahead for five minutes, please.

**Hon. Maria Minna (Beaches—East York, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you for coming today.

You said earlier, Ms. Dwyer-Renaud, that there are some areas of research and some challenges with respect to that. You mentioned that we need more information and research on economic security.

Does every department do its own research in terms of desegregated data, or does the Status of Women do some of it? Where does it come together? It's a real frustration.

After the last budget, when we met with Finance, they said that the segregated data was actually not available, but when we spoke to consultants who came before us, they said of course it is and from various academics. I just want to get at the core.

I have a couple more questions, but could you answer that one first?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** That's what the gender equality indicators project is trying to get at. There is a myriad of data collection going on everywhere in the government. I can't speak for the Department of Finance, but my understanding is that they will collect it where they can. I would say that is probably the situation for many departments—that they will do it where they can. We're trying to burst that bubble and understand that better ourselves through the gender equality indicators project.

• (0950)

**Hon. Maria Minna:** Is Status of Women pulling the strings together? I don't mean pulling strings to make people do...but knowing what everybody is doing. Someone has to be doing oversight, otherwise everybody is off in their own little corner. If Status of Women Canada is doing the oversight, what are the accountability measures and the power it has? At the end of the day, what are the consequences if stuff isn't being done or it's not coming together? Do you have the power to actually do something, or does that power reside with Treasury Board? If Treasury Board has it and you don't, then we have a different issue to deal with. I just need to understand. My sense is that we don't have a core somewhere.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** The core for the programmatic data, I would say, is at Treasury Board. The Treasury Board, under that management of resources and results structure, requires data collection and requires data to be given to the different departments. They can probably give you quite a good briefing on that system. That is what we call programmatic information, which is a fairly important term of information because it's on any program that exists in the federal government.

**Hon. Maria Minna:** It's not broader in terms of—

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** It's not broader exactly. It's not the societal-type of.... That's what that gender equality indicator project is trying to do. It's trying to combine both the programmatic information and much more of that societal information that we're trying to pick up.

**Hon. Maria Minna:** I know Finance gets in on the act as well. I know that at Finance there are champions, as you mentioned earlier. A champion could be one individual, but depending on which champion has—I know what it's like in structures, and all structures have their politics, and some champions are more powerful than others, depending on their agenda.

What I'm trying to get at is this. Is there at Finance, or Treasury Board and some of these other places, an actual unit, not just an individual champion, where expertise resides—if one person leaves, there's still expertise behind—with some real mandate? Maybe this is not a fair question to ask you, so I won't go there. Do we need that? I don't get the sense that.... What's driving it to get at the information. The reason I'm saying that is, for instance, some of the items that were in the previous budgets were in fact proper gender-based analysis that had been done. With things like tax credits, we wouldn't continue down that road because they don't favour women at all in terms of a way of doing social policy. I think my colleague mentioned child care and other things. There is a problem, obviously.

I'm trying to get at how Finance and Treasury Board get at those things with you.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I think that's the \$64 million question, because there's an ongoing debate about this. That project I was mentioning about the analysis that's being done between the Canadian experience and the European experience is on this question of whether, let's call them, gender focal points—it's an expression we use—are useful inside of departments or not.

**Hon. Maria Minna:** Which one are we using, by the way...?

Sorry, am I over?

**The Chair:** Yes, you are over.

**Hon. Maria Minna:** Sorry.

**The Chair:** What I'd like to do is this. Ms. Minna asked the question, and you were saying that you are doing analysis of projects. Could you provide us with a sample of what you've done, the gap analysis that she's asking for, so that we understand how you operate—you take your mandate, you look at the department, and determine what it has met and what it has not met? If you give us the gap analysis, perhaps we will be able to move forward with that.

Thank you, Ms. Minna.

We'll now go to Madame Boucher, *cinq minutes*.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC):** Thank you very much for coming here today, Mesdames.

The debate is very interesting. It's complicated, but less so than one would have thought at the outset. We are getting answers that inform us a little.

Some mechanisms for Treasury Board submissions have been implemented since September 2007. This is quite new, but these analyses were implemented a number of years ago. Would you say that a certain amount of education still has to be done in each department for gender-based analysis to become automatic?

I'd also like to know how many departments, in your opinion, are examining gender-based analysis, and what are the results of that initiative.

● (0955)

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I forgot your first question.

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** I wanted to know whether a lot of educating had to be done in the departments.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Yes, there's still a lot to be done. However, the approach has changed. We get better results by relying on accountability rather than imposition. The fact that people understand that gender-based analysis is part of the work and of policy development, that it's not an ideological position, but simply a way to conduct a good and comprehensive job of analysis, helps us much more in getting the departments on our side. When they sense that we're trying to impose a position on them, they immediately offer resistance. When we stay in the world of methodology and rigour, and the analysis is perceived as an aid or a tool, the doors open and it's very easy to work in collaboration with the departments.

As to the other question—

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** In your experience, how many departments are sensitive to gender-based analysis? Are tangible results being achieved by some of them?

**Mrs. Michèle Bougie:** We currently have an interdepartmental GBA committee. It consists of people from the departments where there are GBA duties, whether it be a network, a responsibility centre together with a network or duties. At the federal level, there are 17 who have some kind of capability, which doesn't mean that each department covers the full range of work in the field.

As for results, it's hard to generalize because there are a lot of factors and pressures involved in the departments. However, we know that Citizenship and Immigration Canada officials started working with us on training in 2001. They're the ones who have the most extensive implementation experience. They've become much more sophisticated. So we can see results at CIC.

As we said earlier, this takes time and awareness efforts. The knowledge and expertise have to be disseminated within the departments. We see results in small areas. In terms of accountability, the Treasury Board can now conduct an evaluation. So we can identify the elements much more precisely and determine whether equality-related results have been achieved.

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** When the departments resist gender-based analysis, to what is that due? Is it related to the fact that the budget is feminized? Is it due to the fact that they feel... I don't know how to put it—

[English]

**The Chair:** Madame Boucher, please wrap up.

**A voice:** We're getting near the end.

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** Wrap up?

**The Chair:** “Resistance to change”, that's what you want. Are they resisting change?

[Translation]

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** Is the resistance due to the mentality, to the fact that the budget is being feminized? Do the departments feel that it's an obligation?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I don't really know. Workload is sometimes mentioned. Once again, I think the approach is at issue. In the past, when women's issues were dealt with, people perceived the matter as additional work that they were being asked to do, and they opposed it. Now it's part of the analysis and training they receive. I believe we've already distributed kits to you on that subject, but we're going to distribute others.

The training is modelled on each process involved in policy development. For those who do this kind of work, it's not really complicated. We simply tell them that when data is collected, that they must ensure it's broken down and that, if they do research, they must ensure they expand the pool of researchers they call upon in order to include female researchers. It's really disarming in the sense that they can't simply refuse to do it.

● (1000)

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[Translation]

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** It's simpler that way.

[English]

**The Chair:** I thank you because I think there are so many other questions.

A question that was posed by Madame Boucher was, could you provide us with a list of departments that have GBA capacity?

**A voice:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We now go to Madame Deschamps, *cinq minutes, s'il vous plaît.*

[Translation]

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I may be a bit of a sop, but I'd nevertheless like to welcome you and take this opportunity to wish you a Happy Valentine's Day.

**An hon. member:** That's nice!

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** Now I'm going to be more pragmatic and ask you how many years Status of Women Canada has been developing the implementation of gender-based analysis.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** The policy was issued in 1995. I would say that implementation of the tools and training started in 2000.

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** Before proceeding with changes to the Women's Program, did Status of Women Canada conduct a gender-based analysis of budgets?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** That brings us back to Ms. Mathysen's question. We're not asked to do that work. We didn't take part in those talks within the department.

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** I'd like to know and understand how the priorities in your mandate are set. It seems to me that, since 1995, the primary objective has been to achieve equality in concrete terms. To develop tools, you focus on personal security, economic security and so on. By preparing indicators in that way, how can we see, in concrete terms, whether we're achieving equality?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** That remains to be done. I don't know how priorities were set in 1995, or even in 1975, when Status of Women Canada was created, but it's for sure that, since 2005, with accountability and indicators, we've said to ourselves that we need a set of indicators to do what you want: planning based on priorities that are selected fairly, not simply because we get the feeling we should give priority to one field or another. It may seem strange that I'm saying we've done a lot of work on various projects and various issues over the years. There have also been events that were highlighted in certain situations, like those of Aboriginal women and battered women. We have enough data and information to show that something must be done in that area.

I believe that, where we are now, we must detect the systemic deficiencies or issues that are somewhat invisible and that we don't know very well. Indeed, we need better data in order to know them well. That's why we're setting up our indicators project, in order to establish priorities better.

Moreover, Status of Women Canada relies on the government's priorities. If the government has priorities, then we put the accent on gender-based analysis to ensure that those priorities won't have an unfair or negative impact on women.

• (1005)

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** The government's priorities tend to stray from the primary concern, which is equality, since equality is no longer part of the mandate of Status of Women Canada.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** We see that more in considering prosperity and economic equality. It's mainly for those issues that we conduct an analysis, in order to ensure we have results in the end. I've been in the field for a long time, so it's hard for me to talk about that in terms of gender equality.

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** Have those priorities been among your concerns for two or three years?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** The concerns of—

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** The standpoint from which we—

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** No, it's been a long time.

**The Chair:** That's it, Ms. Deschamps.

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** Really? You're tough this morning.

[English]

**The Chair:** Ms. Mathysen, for five minutes.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I've been listening. Would it be useful for Parliament to oversee or monitor the GBA process? Would that be a useful thing?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I don't know. I would probably have to go back and look and see if there's any kind of experience like that anywhere else in the world. I'm sure it has its pros and its cons. I don't really know.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** It would seem that, ultimately, Parliament has responsibility for what happens. Perhaps we do have a role, perhaps through this committee, to do some monitoring and reporting back. It's certainly something to think about.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** It is. We have this grid that we use with departments that want to develop their infrastructure. We call it an organizational capacity tool, and we try to do an assessment of what they have in the department that could facilitate the work and the integration of GBA. There's always an area for what is the role of senior officials and what is the role of parliamentarians in this way. We've never really activated it in that sense, but it certainly is something worth exploring.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** In that vein, then, is there a role for civil society in the GBA process, that external group that looks at things with perhaps fresh eyes or a community perspective?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Definitely. GBA is a tool, but it is a tool within the confines of the practices of the government. In a democratic society, it is very refreshing, as you say, to have groups on the outside who can put pressure on different issues and from a much different perspective. It really is the combination of these different sources of information that can help Parliament, the cabinet, take a decision and develop the policies they wish to develop. But certainly it's something we welcome.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** It sort of fits in with the statement, on page 4, that SWC generates knowledge and tools on gender issues and GBA practices. I was wondering how you generate that knowledge. Is it all internal, or do you go outside and seek external advice, from women's groups, organizations, women doing the research in this field?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Definitely.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** Is there a problem now that this research component has been cut off? Is there a concern that the knowledge won't flow as it once did?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** No, I wouldn't say that is so. I believe you're referring to the policy research fund. The policy research fund had a very different role from the one you are describing. As we say in the presentation, we are drawing from all the different sources, and it is quite feasible to do it with stakeholders, departments, other organizations—quite feasible, quite doable, right now.

•(1010)

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** All right. Thank you.

There was a discussion about the three champions and the fact that the positions are still there, and you mentioned that there was turnover in regard to that. Does that present any problems in terms of consistency or perspective?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** We haven't seen that, because what's interesting is that it is not tied to the individual. It's not like the position leaves with Robert, for example. It seems that the central agencies, if I'm correct, have entrenched the function of it within their department. So it's as if it was almost a position—we can't really use that term—but it is very much a responsibility that is there as a permanent responsibility inside the central agencies.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** Would that be true of the analysts, too, within departments? We did hear on Tuesday that analysts come and go, and there was that possibility that the consistency might not be there or that the perspective that once was applied might change and shift.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I come back to how I was answering Ms. Minna. That's the \$64 million question. Does having an infrastructure, a gender focal point inside a department, work better than, for example, a department that doesn't have one but has made it a responsibility for all the officials in the department to have the training to become experts and to put it into their job? Depending on my days, sometimes it's good to have a gender focal point and sometimes it's not.

I've worked as a gender focal point in a department, and you do sometimes get ghettoized in a situation and you're not always part of what is going on in terms of the important issues that you'd like to be able to sink your teeth into, whereas when you have the accountability very high in a department and you have a deputy minister who basically says to all of his or her officials, "You must practise gender-based analysis, I want to see proof of this, and I want to see it in my business plans"...that's the model of CIC, for example.

I think it was Madame Bougie who commented about CIC. You can go to CIC's website, and every year they post their annual report. In their annual report—it's getting better and better—they provide their gender-based analysis as part of the report.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Now we go to Mrs. Grewal, for five minutes.

**Mrs. Nina Grewal (Fleetwood—Port Kells, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

How do we ensure that gender-based analysis is being appropriately done in central agencies and in government departments? Could you please comment on that?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I think that's where we know that it is happening. Where we want to become more expert is in following the practices. In the future, we would like to improve our monitoring.

For many years, Status of Women Canada played a capacity-building and support role. We continue to do that. But now, with the relationship we've built with the central agencies, we have permission to become a little bit stronger in our resolve to get

better reporting on the practices. I see this as an important part of our future approach.

**Mrs. Nina Grewal:** I see.

In your view, is it important to have research related to budgets, government expenditures, and government revenues? If so, why?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I'm sorry, you asked if it was important to have research?

**Mrs. Nina Grewal:** Is it important to have research related to budgets, government expenditures, and government revenues? And why?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** The argument would be the same as for any issue that comes through government. One needs to know the impact on women compared with men. One needs to know if this will make a difference in respect of the legislation or the budget that is going to come through. It's definitely an important part of the process. It's not the only part, but it's an important part.

**Mrs. Nina Grewal:** Thank you.

Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** Do you want to share your time?

**Mrs. Nina Grewal:** Yes, I'd like to share my time with Mr. Stanton.

**The Chair:** Mr. Stanton, you have a few minutes.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton (Simcoe North, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I was just looking at the government response to this committee's report on gender-based analysis in the 38th Parliament. There was also a second report that this committee obtained from the minister at that time, Bev Oda.

In the September 2005 government response, the government of the day made reference to an interdepartmental committee on gender equality. Then, in the second response, the government referenced a similar structure, and they called it a steering committee on gender equality. Could you give us an update on where either of these two sit? Is there still such a thing?

•(1015)

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** The names have changed a little bit. There has always been what is called an interdepartmental committee on gender equality. It consists of about 24 departments and is chaired by Status of Women Canada. Its purpose is to bring the departments on board, to let them know what's going on, and to effect an overall exchange of government initiatives from a gender equality perspective.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** How often does it meet?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** It usually meets about once a year, but it can be more often. For example, when we have years like the years of review under the UN, we may have meetings more often. The work is a little more entailed, and Status of Women Canada has to report on the work of 24 departments. But it touches base at least once a year. It should meet soon, so it can look at the project on indicators, because that project affects all departments.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** Sorry, go ahead.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** There is also an interdepartmental committee on gender-based analysis. It's smaller and has always included the more active departments. But we certainly don't stop any membership. We accept any department willing to sit there. The newcomers that we're all excited about are the central agencies. We have the cascading effect of the gender equality group and the gender-based analysis group.

With gender-based analysis, we have the steering committee that includes the three central agencies. In the 2005 response there was a call for champions across the board in all departments. By 2006, we realized this was not feasible, but the three central agencies said they could continue to have champions and agreed to be on the steering committee.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** I have one final question.

**The Chair:** You have time for a very quick one.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** In the last two years, has there been any diminishing of the structures around which GBA is provided, in the system of checks and balances, to ensure GBA across the departments?

**The Chair:** You may give a very short answer.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** From an accountability point of view, no, I think it has increased. From a practice point of view, that's the \$64 million question.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We now go to Ms. Neville for five minutes.

**Hon. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.):** Thank you to both of you for being here. I have many questions, probably more than five minutes' worth, and many comments.

I've been around this dance several times. I'm looking at the recommendations from the 2005 report, and quite clearly, the recommendation that the central agencies be involved was a pivotal one.

I'm also aware of the interdepartmental committee, and I was interested in your response that it meets once a year. In my mind, that's not nearly enough.

I'm also aware that one can put these structures in place. It's a wonderful graph on paper and it looks marvellous, but unless there's a real commitment to make it happen, not much is going to move forward. I look at the four departments that you've highlighted here, and you talked about how Citizenship and Immigration, which is mandated through legislation to do GBA, did a report. But we know that they've dismantled their GBA secretariat. If you look at Health Canada, their focus seems to be only on women's health.

You raised the issue of Indian and Northern Affairs. I have some concerns about that in terms of the consultation processes that are going on and the whole incorporation of the collective and individual rights of aboriginal women there—how you're dealing with GBA there.

I guess my point is, the structures are there, but unless they're really meaningful and effective and used appropriately, I throw up my hands.

You've restructured in terms of your training. You don't do the training any more; it's contracted out to the departments after you certify the trainers. Is that correct?

• (1020)

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** We've never done the training.

**Hon. Anita Neville:** Okay.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** We've created the training.

**Hon. Anita Neville:** You've created the training and certified the trainers, and the department retains them and pays for them and does the training.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** That's right.

**Hon. Anita Neville:** Okay.

I guess my real concern is with the substance of the structure and whether in fact it's really working.

The researcher has prepared a number of really good questions, and one that I want to focus on is this. Have you funded research relevant to gender budgets, government expenditure, and government revenues? If so, can you describe what this research involved? Do you in fact conduct your own research on gender budgets? Have you funded analysis of the budget under a gender lens, and if so, I'd like to know who, how, where, when, and do you think this research is important?

I recognize that you're not involved in policy decisions, but many of the policy decisions have a profound impact—in my mind, negatively, at the moment—on women. What's your role in that process?

I have lots of questions and probably a minute and a half left.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** As far as I know, we've never done any research on gender budgets. We have internal documents where we have done...it's not seminal research on gender budgets, but environmental scanning of gender budget exercises around the world, so we can better understand what we could embark on at the Canadian level.

I think the last time I was here on gender budgeting, in December, the coordinator expressed the fact that if departments do a good job at gender-based analysis, one will find that initiatives will reflect the impacts and will direct their analysis that way. We don't see this as an entity unto itself.

**Hon. Anita Neville:** But that's a big "if".

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** It is a big "if", but I think it would be worth asking the finance department what they think about that.

**Hon. Anita Neville:** We've tried.

**The Chair:** Ms. Neville, do you have one last short question?

**Hon. Anita Neville:** My question is this. We have all these structures. Is it making a difference? My understanding of the past and with the knowledge I have now is that it's not really. The charts are great; the reality isn't much different.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** First of all, I need to correct: CIC has reactivated its position. I think CIC is a good example of where the question is whether you need a lot of infrastructure or you need commitment and accountability within a system that does the work it should do. That's the \$64 million question—I keep repeating.

We are now doing an analysis of this compared with the European situation, to guide us better in the coming years.

**The Chair:** You talked about the European situation. Could you tell us what the European situation is? You could provide a response later, when you're giving us your closing remark.

I think the question that has been consistently coming back to haunt us all is this. You train the trainers and you certify them. Finance, the central agency, does what it claims is a gender-based analysis. Who looks at the analysis? Do you look at it, or does somebody else look at it? Does an economist on your staff look at it to tell us the impact on women?

If you could, just give us that answer at the end, so that I can continue with Mr. Rajotte.

It's Valentine's Day, go ahead.

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. James Rajotte (Edmonton—Leduc, CPC):** Happy Valentine's Day.

Thank you very much for being with us here this morning. I'm looking at the recommendations and the report that was done, the response from the government. It seems to me the discussion is quite focused on structure and process and putting in place a system that will ensure GBA.

Perhaps I can go beyond that to get some more information for myself on how it actually works. On page 7 of your presentation you talk about GBA applied to policy measures, particularly to tax policy, where data permitted, on tax proposals presented to the Minister of Finance for budgets 2006 and 2007.

Could you describe for me how that worked and perhaps what the results were?

• (1025)

**Mrs. Michèle Bougie:** Basically, the finance department did what we always do with GBA. You take an issue and break it down into its components in terms of comparative results, comparative situations. It always depends on data, and that's not just for Finance; it's for any department in any country where the data is available.

In some cases, they could look at the exact percentages and ratios. Where dollar amounts might show up higher for women and lower for men, in terms of the relationship to income, the ratio would all of a sudden reverse the situation such that maybe women were actually better off than men, or benefiting more, etc. It was just applying that tool.

But as I said earlier, it became more interesting for Finance to ask, and I hesitate to use the word “philosophically” in economic and fiscal things, but almost with that approach: if there is a discrepancy here, where does it lie, and is it significant? What can we do with it or about it, or do we know enough about it to really distinguish that there should be changes made?

I guess it's a work in progress. If you compare the 2006 to the 2007 analysis, there's a degree of sophistication that has evolved from the first year to the second. They are enlarging; they're not stuck on the numbers as much. They're actually looking at the impact: if someone makes a choice to do this, is it the responsibility of the taxation system to work with that, or support it, or whatever? It's that kind of process that they did for the two past budgets and will be doing for the upcoming one.

They are also extending it beyond the taxation branch. The training is now available for the whole department, so they're looking at all of the different areas and asking, does it actually make sense?

**Mr. James Rajotte:** One of the measures put in place, which a lot of parents say to me they appreciate, was the tax credit for sports. How do you analyze that? People say to me that this is anecdotal.

**Mrs. Michèle Bougie:** They actually did do an analysis of that. They looked at it from the perspective that it is a family expenditure, in the sense that it's household oriented. Is it disproportionately impacting women or men? Well, they can't really tell, because it's a household expenditure and it's focused on children. Then they looked at whether there is a differential impact in terms of beneficiaries, i.e. the children. Boys tend to play hockey more than girls, and hockey has more expensive equipment than perhaps basketball. They did actually go to that degree. But again, it always depends on what kind of data you have, and if you don't have data what kind of assumptions you can legitimately make.

**The Chair:** Mr. Rajotte, are you done?

**Mr. James Rajotte:** Do I have any time left?

**The Chair:** Actually, you're running out of time. But you asked a question that raised a gender issue. Classes for girls do not get a tax credit and sports for boys get a tax credit. You can answer that later on.

Madame Demers.

[Translation]

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. Dwyer-Renaud, you told us that you hadn't been asked to evaluate the changes to the Women's Program from a GBA standpoint. Don't you find it a bit disturbing that the body that is supposed to implement GBA in the departments doesn't practise those measures in its own programs? Isn't that a bit paradoxical? Isn't that like the shoemaker with worn out shoes?

• (1030)

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** As I explained, I wasn't involved in the talks because I was on staff. It's a bit difficult to request that kind of thing. I don't know. I don't really have an answer. It's as much a mystery for me as it is for you. I can only assume, because I don't know.

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** Isn't it disturbing that Status of Women Canada doesn't apply its own measures, whereas it asks others to do so? Personally, I find that disturbing. It's very peculiar. How can we ensure that the departments are doing it if we don't do it? What credibility do we have?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** That doesn't seem to have bothered the departments. They cooperate very well with us. I can add nothing more.

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** Thank you.

That's all, Madam Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** *Merci.*

Madam Mathysen.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

There was some discussion about the indicator project. I wonder whether you could explain that.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** For many years now, Status of Women Canada, along with Statistics Canada, has come out with a report called "Women in Canada". It provides a lot of data in terms of different resources, but it never really pointed to a set of indicators.

It's a product that exists in many countries. For example, in Sweden they have a whole product that gives you a set of indicators. Indicators are also used internationally. The UNDP, for example, uses indicators in terms of education and well-being and those kinds of thing. Canada never really had its own set of indicators from a gender perspective.

So the idea was what we could do to start to have this set of indicators. Could we play a role in creating that? The group is made up of people from key departments that have major data collection exercises, so you can think of HRSDC, Health Canada, and CIC. I don't have all of the people there, but these are the people right now who are working with Status of Women Canada to bring forward the idea of what these indicators would look like.

I am not a statistician so I cannot give you expert advice on that. My understanding is that it's not an easy thing to create, but at least you start from what you have. We are collecting a series of data that we know exists already in government. From that, how can we build these indicators? And from that, are there other sources of information we need to get?

My understanding is that once this happens, there will be an opportunity for some consultation. I believe the offer was made that the standing committee could look at the indicators at one point and engage in a discussion on that. That's quite feasible. I believe a letter had been sent to do just that.

For those of you who may remember, there were some consultations across Canada with groups in 2005, and the indicators project was something the groups were asking for as well, in terms of understanding the progress being made in Canada.

We have difficulty really showing the progress being made in Canada, so it's a bit difficult to select priorities and to then work on

those priorities, because it should be a feedback cycle that we do. We have difficulty doing that right now without the indicators.

**The Chair:** Do you have a quick question?

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** How would you say we stack up against the European countries? You referenced them. How are we doing when you look at that comparison?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I don't know. I'm looking forward to those results.

In the past, I'd have to say that I think Canada has been seen as a leader in terms of what the Europeans would call gender mainstreaming. We now have accountability frameworks and we have our central agencies, and that is a point to which a lot of countries have not yet gone.

Interestingly enough, it is, however, at the request of a lot of the organizations such as the World Bank or the IMF. When they go into a country, they do require this type of accountability. In a sense, Canada is doing a very good job at showing we are practising this type of process, if you like, in terms of GPA.

We receive invitations from many countries to provide training. We send our trainers around the world. They're not only in Canada or in the federal government. Our trainers go around the world. Our material has been translated into Spanish, into Russian, into Korean. Michèle was in South Africa a couple of years ago. I was in Korea. We are asked because Canada is seen as a leader in this area.

• (1035)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

There was a question that Ms. Mathysen asked and you responded that you had sent us an invite to look at the project indicators.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** I think so. It was a while ago.

**The Chair:** I just checked with the clerk. We haven't received anything and therefore a question was posed here. Could we please have some information, in writing, if you could, as to the resources allocated to these project indicators, who the individuals are and which department, and what data is being gathered?

Thank you.

*Madame Boucher, trois minutes.*

[Translation]

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** A number of questions come to mind, including the following. Is the training that you give within the departments spread out over a number of days, a number of weeks? Is it very complex training?

**Mrs. Michèle Bougie:** That depends on the version.

I'm teasing you a little, but we have roughly seven different versions. The training was created so that we would have a tool that could be adapted to the needs and mandates of the participants receiving the training. We look at all the stages, from policy development to delivery, including program and service development, up to evaluation. So we look at the entire cycle. Afterwards, with the departments, we conduct a needs analysis. What is the mandate? What are the problems? What are the issues? What experience do the analysts have? Are the individuals taking the training researchers, evaluators, and so on?

So we adapt precisely to the needs, which includes the time. To do 10 steps, the training can last one full week, two days, one day, three days, a half day or an hour and a half. As I said, there are now a number of versions. All that's designed to meet the needs of the analysts in their day-to-day work. Obviously, we take a look at the theory and concepts in order to provide the overall social context, but that's really done in order to be able to apply GBA rigorously in the field where the people work.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** We previously gave a training session to the parliamentary committees, a number of years ago, and we can do it again.

[English]

**The Chair:** We'll go to Ms. Minna.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** You answered my question.

[English]

**The Chair:** What I'm suggesting is that once we have finished this, we can have a little debriefing ourselves and see if we need to have them come again. I know, from what they have responded, that we have more questions to ask. That's probably a discussion we can have.

Ms. Minna, you have two minutes, and then I'll end with Ms. Demers.

**Hon. Maria Minna:** You said three minutes.

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

**Hon. Maria Minna:** Thank you.

I'll be very quick.

First, Madame Bougie, earlier in your response to Mr. Rajotte, with respect to the sports tax credit, you said it had been looked at from the family perspective, and I guess boys and girls and families are not.... The problem with that, of course, and this is really the core of GBA, is that lone-parent families are primarily women. And they don't have money, in the first place, to buy the stuff, and therefore they can't claim it and therefore their children aren't.... This is really the core of GBA, when policy isn't looked at properly. It shouldn't have been looked at as a family; it should have been looked at from a gender perspective.

I have three quick questions. I just want to read them, because that way it's easier for everybody.

Does the training in GBA require a formal agreement, known as an MOU, a memorandum of understanding, between Status of Women Canada and the agencies you're working with or training?

Do you maintain any statistics on how many departments have dedicated GBA units or analysts? If so, could you provide that for us? That would be helpful.

What needs to be done to ensure that disaggregated data is available for GBA? Again, that's an issue that has come up over and over again.

How do we ensure that GBA is being appropriately done in the central agencies, and what are the accountability measures there? I think that's important too.

Those are kind of rapid questions. I have lots more, but maybe we can get it together....

To finish off, the importance of understanding how we do GBA, and the broader perspective.... You see, on the one policy, the assumption is that it's family, but it's not. It's also GBA. When you go that route and we get the results, they're skewed, and they're missing a whole population of women. That is a problem.

•(1040)

**The Chair:** You have a minute to answer.

**Mrs. Michèle Bougie:** I'll let Finance explain in more detail, but when I say family household, it depends on the composition. "Family" is the all-inclusive grab-all. It's two-parent families, lone-mother families, and lone-father families, just to clarify that. So they did look, and they do make the assumptions. If you're a lone mother, chances are, based on what we know of income levels.... I just wanted to clarify that.

**Hon. Maria Minna:** That means the policy is—

**Mrs. Michèle Bougie:** Finance can explain in more detail.

On MOUs for training, no, we don't have them.

I'm not sure if you were asking for the number of departments with GBA capacity, because that's the number we said earlier. It was 17 departments. And yes, we'll be providing the list.

On the disaggregated data and how we make it more available, Statistics Canada has a lot of data banks, and they do tend to collect things and disaggregate subpopulation groups and various cohorts. The trick is that departments have to ask for it and departments have to pay for it. When the departments have asked for it, are they asking for questions and things like census runs, or are they asking for the data broken down to meet their needs? So you have different approaches. But the departments have to ask for it in order to get it. And once they have it, they have to use it.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

*Madame Deschamps, vous avez deux minutes.*

[Translation]

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** I have a brief question to ask you in closing, Mesdames. I refer to page 5 of the presentation you made and I'd like to know whether Status of Women Canada has reporting and accountability mechanisms that take GBA into account.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Not yet, but that's what we're aiming for.

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** As we say back home, no one is a prophet in her own land.

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** Exactly. As I explained, we've focused on developing tools over the past five years. We're now putting that into practice. What we're trying to determine is precisely whether practice makes a difference. We also want to know whether the departments are putting this into practice or whether it's simply infrastructures and nothing else. That's how far we've gotten; that's our juncture, but you'll have two results, because we'll be able to study practices, and the Treasury Board results. There has been perhaps one year of shortage in five years, but now we have a lot more information than we've ever had in the past.

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** Are you practising at Status of Women Canada now?

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** We're going to act as the central agency on practices, and we'll know whether people are using the training they've received. For example, when the training is given in a group, we not only conduct an evaluation at the start, but we do one six and 12 months afterward to observe the continuity and durability of that training in the departments. This is a new practice. That's what we're going to start doing, and we'll be able to report on that in our departmental report. We're not there yet.

[English]

**The Chair:** *Merci.*

I thank you very much for being here.

I think the outstanding question was on the European system. If you could wrap up, I'll give you a minute each, because we have committee business to continue.

Madame Dwyer-Renaud.

• (1045)

**Ms. Hélène Dwyer-Renaud:** On the European system, we can certainly give you an overview of what's going on from a gender mainstreaming perspective across Europe.

But what I was referring to is that right now we are doing an analysis comparing the Canadian system and the European system, and that will not come out until August.

**The Chair:** Fair enough.

Madame Bougie, would you like to make some closing remarks?

**Mrs. Michèle Bougie:** Thank you for inviting us to appear.

Short and sweet: Happy Valentine's Day.

**The Chair:** Happy Valentine's Day.

Now, I'm not going to let you off the hook very quickly. I can hear a lot of anxiety and questions, and everybody has a thousand more questions from the answers you've given.

February 26 is budget day, but we can squeeze ourselves into a small room and still have, if we have to, a huddle, our own meeting. We could let you know that on February 26 you might be back, if you don't mind. I am just letting you know, in case the committee decides to do so.

I thank you very much, and I'll suspend the meeting for one minute.

• \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

•

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Ladies and gentlemen, we have to start with the motions.

Ms. Demers, are you introducing a motion? Yes?

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** Madam Chair, following the minister's testimony last week on the under-funding of shelters, I received a note from Ms. Arnaud from Quebec Native Women requesting more substance, because she isn't satisfied with the minister's response. She says that something absolutely has to be done now to ensure that Aboriginal women have resources.

That's why I prepared this motion, Madam Chair. Do you want me to read it to you?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** It reads as follows:

That the Standing Committee on the Status of Women call upon the Minister for the Status of Women to:

Increase recurrent core funding for Aboriginal women's shelters, as is already the case for shelters in Quebec;

put a stop to the delays in the evaluation of Aboriginal women's shelters, scheduled for March;

reinstate the former criteria for the Women's Program, because many advocacy groups, including Femmes Autochtones du Québec, are penalized under the new criteria; and

have the criteria clarified and the government's approach modified so that Aboriginal women's organizations can benefit from Status of Women Canada funding.

[English]

**The Chair:** Any questions for Madame Demers?

Yes, Ms. Neville. Let's keep it brief so that we can then do the second motion, and I'd like to go through the work plan quickly.

**Hon. Anita Neville:** Madam Chair, I have no problem with the motion. My only concern is that some of the funding comes through INAC, and I think it's important that INAC be part of this motion.

If we're just calling upon the minister, I guess that's fine, but my concern is that there be appropriate consultation with aboriginal women's groups. Perhaps Madame Demers has done it, but we need to know what their needs are from them as well.

**The Chair:** Are you suggesting an amendment to the motion, by any chance?

• (1050)

**Hon. Anita Neville:** I'm not sure.

**The Chair:** Okay, fine.

Mr. Stanton, did you have your hand up? Then Ms. Davidson.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** Yes, thank you, Madam Chair.

I have just a couple of things. In the French version, we use the word *demande*, which is "to ask", as I understand, and that's translated into "call upon". I wonder if Madame might consider whether in the English version that is really "to recommend". On the English side there's a difference.

**The Chair:** “Request”?

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** “Request” is okay, or “recommend”. That would be one question.

The next question I have is that in the first bullet point we talk about the recurrent core funding for aboriginal women's shelters. Is this in reference to shelters on reserve, or is it to do with, presumably, shelters that are outside of a first nations reserve?

[Translation]

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** Aboriginal women's shelters in the Aboriginal communities currently have only \$90,000 a year to meet their needs, whereas battered women's shelters in Quebec have \$300,000 a year. We consider the problems of Aboriginal women even more significant. In the Aboriginal communities where there are shelters, it's even more difficult because women no longer go to the shelters anonymously. They therefore need additional resources to meet the needs of women who seek their help and assistance.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** All right, I understand.

[English]

I'll wrap up with that, and I'll go to Madam Davidson.

**The Chair:** Ms. Davidson.

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'd like to ask Madame Demers if it would be possible to split her motion and vote individually on the individual points.

[Translation]

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** You're suggesting we split it in two?

[English]

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson:** Pardon me?

[Translation]

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** The first two concern Aboriginal women's shelters.

It doesn't bother me at all to split the motion in two parts and vote on them individually.

[English]

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson:** Thank you very much. I'd appreciate that.

**The Chair:** Ms. Neville, and then Madame Boucher.

**Hon. Anita Neville:** Further to my comments earlier, Madam Chair, and particularly if we're splitting the motion in two, I would ask Madame Demers if she would include in the motion, for one, that “the Standing Committee on the Status of Women call upon the Minister for the Status of Women and the Minister of Indian Affairs”.

**The Chair:** Agreeable?

[Translation]

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** Absolutely, Madam Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** Madame Boucher.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** I have a question for Ms. Demers.

You said \$90,000 and \$300,000 for battered women's shelters. Is that correct?

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** Currently in Quebec—

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** Does the money come from the federal government? That's what I want to know.

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** No. The Quebec government has made an addition, but not for battered Aboriginal women's shelters, which are under federal jurisdiction. Battered women's shelters are a provincial jurisdiction.

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** The provincial government gives \$300,000 to battered women's shelters.

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** Yes, it grants \$300,000 for Quebec's battered women's shelters, not for Aboriginal women's shelters.

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** All right, that's good. You've enlightened me.

[English]

**The Chair:** I have a technical question for you, Madame Demers. I will give it to you.

If we put in the words “the Minister of Indian Affairs” and you split the motion into two, then “the reinstatement of the criteria” is only for the Minister for the Status of Women. So that's where the next sentence would be put, because you can't have two ministers responsible for that.

Mr. Stanton, and then Ms. Minna.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** I'm glad you raised the point.

If we were going to split the motion, I would suggest points one, two, and four could be in the first part. And point three in this proposed motion would be the second part; it would begin with the preamble in the motion as it was circulated. In other words, we go with the amended preamble for points one, two, and four, and the second motion, *la deuxième partie*, would be the existing preamble plus point three.

I say that principally because I don't see any difficulty with the points and including the changes that Madam Neville has suggested; these would be things we could probably support. Having said that, point three is objectionable, from our point of view.

●(1055)

**The Chair:** We need two motions.

Ms. Minna next.

**Hon. Maria Minna:** Two things, Madam Chair.

One, does Madame Demers want this reported to the House? I think this would obviously make sense.

The other is that Mr. Stanton just said number four would be put in with numbers one and two, but that doesn't work because it refers to criteria that follow point three, just referring to reinstating criteria for the Status of Women. So it really doesn't work to move it. By moving it, then you essentially are killing...so I think those two go together.

**The Chair:** The two together and the other two together...okay.

So can we vote on the modified motion, which reads that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women request the Minister for Status of Women and the Minister of Indian Affairs to...bullet one and bullet two—and report to the House.

**Hon. Maria Minna:** And report to the House.

**The Chair:** The second motion is that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women request the Minister for the Status of Women to reinstate the former criteria.

So points three and four are the second motion and points one and two are the first motion.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** We have to include the words “and that the Committee inform the House” in this motion as well.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** All those in favour of...?

Yes, Mr. Stanton.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** I don't mean to delay this, but a potential hitch is that in this amended form we're asking the Minister for the Status of Women...she would not have any jurisdiction on the first two points, would she? Because these programs are on reserve and....

**Hon. Anita Neville:** Sure she would.

**Hon. Maria Minna:** Her job is across the board.

**The Chair:** I'm glad you asked for the clarification.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** It is? Okay, I just wanted to be sure.

**The Chair:** All those in favour of amended motion number one?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** It's unanimous.

Now, on amended motion number two, do you want me to repeat what the amendment is?

The second amended motion reads as follows: that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women requests the Minister for the Status of Women to reinstate the former criteria for the women's program. That's bullet number three and bullet number four.

Having reread it, all those in favour?

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** Wait a minute; I need clarification.

**The Chair:** What clarification do you need?

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** “That the Standing Committee on the Status of Women call upon the Minister [...] to reinstate the former criteria [...]” That's the third point, but the fourth point isn't there.

**The Chair:** Yes, this motion contains the third and fourth points.

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** I just woke up.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** A recorded vote.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** I'll vote against it. It's already there. I won't vote for something that's already there.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** It will be a recorded vote.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 6: nays 4)

● (1100)

**The Chair:** The motion is adopted.

We have to leave because the next committee is coming in and we'll be thrown out.

There are two things that I need to do quickly. Ms. Mathysen, can we leave your motion for next time? Normally we have the luxury, but we don't have that today. Can we leave it for the next time?

Number two, do we want to have a meeting on the 26th so we can do that—

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** We have the budget on the 26th. I have to study. I'm sorry, but I cannot be there.

**The Chair:** The meeting is in the morning. The budget comes out at 4 o'clock.

**The Chair:** We didn't have a room, but the clerk tells me we can have a smaller room. It is not as big as this one; it is half the size of this room. If we want to do it we can. We can request the witnesses who came to respond to a few questions, and we can go through Ms. Mathysen's motion as well.

What's the will of the committee? I'm not making a decision to tell you to come. The meeting is scheduled anyway. Do we want to meet in a smaller room?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**The Chair:** The meeting is reinstated and the clerk will let us know what room. Thank you very much.

The meeting is adjourned.





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

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

**Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada 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.**