



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

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

---

FEWO • NUMBER 081 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Thursday, November 30, 2017**

**Chair**

**Mrs. Karen Vecchio**



## Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Thursday, November 30, 2017

● (1100)

[English]

**The Chair (Mrs. Karen Vecchio (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC)):** Good morning, everybody. Thank you for visiting us today. I would really like to thank the minister for coming today.

We have lots of great questions for you as we're moving forward.

Thank you to Gina Wilson and Anik Lapointe from the Department of Status of Women for joining us.

Pursuant to Standing Order 81(5), the committee will now begin consideration of the supplementary estimates (B), vote1b under the office of the co-ordinator, referred to the committee on Thursday, October 26, 2017.

The committee is also taking this opportunity to ask questions on the government's response to the committee's seventh report, "Taking Action to End Violence Against Young Women and Girls in Canada", as well as discussing the implementation of the gender-based analysis plus, which our committee has done such great work on.

Thank you very much for joining us today.

Minister Monsef, I'm going to pass it over to you for 10 minutes.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef (Minister of Status of Women):** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Hello, colleagues. It's a privilege to be with you again.

We are meeting on traditional Algonquin territory and benefit from this land. With those benefits come obligations that I know we are all working hard to fulfill.

I'm joined here today by my deputy minister, Gina Wilson, and our chief financial officer, Anik Lapointe.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of this committee, past and present, and of course the witnesses who have come forward during my time in this role, for all the ways that you are contributing to gender equality. We've heard from individuals who have brought their expertise and lived stories to this table around gender-based violence, around women's economic security, and all those perspectives have been incredibly helpful.

I'd like to extend a very warm welcome and congratulations to the new members of this committee. Martin, Bernadette, Emmanuella,

we've been watching and very much appreciate your contributions to this committee.

Before I dive deeply into the content we're here today to discuss, I want to extend my sympathies to our honourable colleague, Mr. Marc Serré. His father was an incredibly influential person, not just in his life but in Canadian political life. Our thoughts and our prayers are with him and his family.

I'm grateful to be here with you during the 16 days of activism working to end gender-based violence not just here in Canada but around the world. On this final day of November, I think it's very appropriate that we're gathering here and having this conversation. I'd like to speak with you today in my remarks about three things. You mentioned the gender-based violence strategy that we're implementing, Madam Chair. I'd like to speak with you about GBA+, the intersectional gender lens we're applying to the various ways we do our work as a government and you do your work as a committee, and of course supplementary estimates (B).

Let's talk about gender-based violence, which has evolved. Social media is one way that it's become easier for unacceptable behaviours to extend their reach to more unwelcome places than before. There's the #MeToo campaign that we've all heard about in our communities and online. There are more people speaking out. There is more public attention and more dialogue taking place. There are more high-profile cases being discussed. Of course, traditional media is playing an important role in shining light and amplifying the voices that are coming forward. These stories are not new stories.

We thank everyone who is coming forward with a lot of courage and with a lot of hope that we prevent this violence. We have all heard statistically and anecdotally in our communities that there are disproportionate rates of violence occurring each and every day in every community. Too many people suffer in silence.

My thanks go to those whose courage and resilience are shaping this conversation, and of course, our gratitude to those who care for them and their families through their healing journey. We know that gender-based violence is a significant barrier to gender equality, but it's one that can be prevented. That's where your work as a committee has been so important to the government response on gender-based violence.

In June, I was at the YWCA in Toronto, joined by many leaders from the movement, service providers, experts, academics, who have provided input to the gender-based violence strategy. The amount of \$100.9 million was set aside for a strategy that we intend will focus on prevention, support for survivors and their families, and justice and legal systems that are more responsive. There is a focus on individuals who are particularly vulnerable across our communities. That's another area where the intersectional gendered lens we apply has been critical. It includes new funding for Status of Women Canada to support new programming and awareness initiatives.

• (1105)

This is how the funding will break down: about 40% of that money will support organizations and service providers; about 35% will support new research and data collection; about 15% will be focused on a knowledge centre, which I'm going to talk about more deeply here today; and about 10% will support a national dialogue to engage Canadians in the much-needed cultural change that is an important part of the solution we need to be putting forward.

The knowledge centre is a unique piece of the strategy. As you know, this strategy was developed in consultation with our federal, provincial, and territorial counterparts, with people who do this work on the ground. Its purpose is to get the federal house in order, but also to fill in the critical gaps that we know are there and some that we didn't know were there until we started talking to Canadians and those with the expertise.

The knowledge centre will do five important things. The most important element for me, as someone with a background in grassroots work, is its ability to connect service providers with researchers and policy-makers. It will better align Government of Canada resources. It will fill gaps that exist in the evidence and the data that we need to shape our solutions and interventions. It will support federal coordination and accountability on key actions that the federal government is taking, and it will lay the foundation for future work on gender-based violence. We know that this particular issue is far too complex to go away overnight or over a year, and so, if we're going to be proactive in our responses, this knowledge centre will allow us the foundation to thoughtfully think about future planning and interventions.

Through the #MeToo campaign—another hashtag raising awareness—we have heard and know why it's important to share knowledge, why data matters, why best practices need to be shared and elevated so that we can multiply our efforts and improve results more quickly. Through our ongoing work and collaboration with you, with those who do this work on the ground day in and day out, and the international community, we will create safer, more inclusive societies. We will have more people coming forward. We will be able to do better prevention, and of course we will be able to better provide supports and justice to those who seek it.

I'm going to talk a little bit about GBA+, gender-based analysis plus. I know this is an area you've worked on significantly, and I would like to give you an update on the work that's happening in this regard. We remain committed to using gender-based analysis, but enhancing it as well.

In April 2016 we put in place a GBA action plan to enhance the implementation of gender-based analysis among all federal organi-

zations. In March, as you know, we tabled an interim report on that action plan with this committee, as well as with the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, highlighting significant progress achieved so far. Since that tabling, we've continued our work to ensure that systemic application of GBA+ to government activities is taking place within central agencies and also within departments.

This past spring, for the first time ever, we were able to table a budget that included a gender statement. This gender statement was made possible because of the foundational work that GBA+ across departments had implemented. What that gender statement essentially did was set a high standard for openness and transparency as our government works to make more inclusive decisions not just today but in the years ahead.

In May, during GBA+ awareness week, Status of Women Canada launched an updated version of its online course, which has been completed by more than 20,500 federal public servants and political staff to date, and by more than 83,000 public servants and political staff since April 2016. That is real change in just a year, and it's an important part of the cultural change that needs to take place to ensure that it's intertwined with everything we do.

I want to congratulate and thank all parliamentarians and their staff who have been engaged and have been participating in this process. I will also highlight that there has been a significant increase in demand for the expertise and the talents of the good folks within my team at Status of Women Canada.

• (1110)

Regarding supplementary estimates (B), the fall economic statement outlined, as you know, an increase in operational funding for Status of Women Canada, and that's reported in supplementary estimates (B). We'll receive an investment of \$41 million over six years, and \$7.5 million thereafter, to increase capacity and be in a better position to deliver on the government's commitments and priorities around gender equality. These will strengthen our capacity so that we can enhance policy support for government's gender equality objectives. They'll increase our capacity to engage with our federal, provincial, and territorial colleagues, strengthen our engagement and outreach, and of course, support the development of a new results and delivery function.

I'll stop here. I look forward to answering any questions the committee may have, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. I know you had lots to add; I was following the speaking notes. Thank you very much for joining us.

I would also like to welcome Peter Fragiskatos, who is sitting in the chair of Marc Serré.

Today, we will be starting with seven minutes per round.

We're going to start off with Pam Damoff for seven minutes.

**Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.):** Thank you, Minister, for joining us today, and thanks to your department for being here as well.

In my riding, Halton's Women's Place has an amazing program called "engageMENT", which sends people into elementary and secondary schools to teach young men healthy masculinity. We also have a male ally network, run by SAVIS of Halton, the Sexual Assault and Violence Intervention Services of Halton. Just this weekend I joined you, Minister, at the Grey Cup festival, for which you had partnered with the CFL to encourage people of all genders to take the pledge to end gender-based violence.

I know that in response to our committee's report, "Taking Action To End Violence against Young Women and Girls in Canada", the government indicated that, as part of the \$109 million that is allocated over the next five years to the federal strategy, there will be money spent on engaging men and boys.

I wonder whether you can provide some details on how Status of Women Canada and other participating departments are planning to engage men and boys as part of the strategy.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Thank you very much for that question and for your leadership here and beyond, Pam.

Gender-based violence occurs in every place, in every community, across every culture. Our solutions need to be working across sectors. They have to include an intergenerational approach. We have to work in a multi-faith way to encourage other communities. We have to work across cultures. And we have to include men and boys.

We all know men and boys who can be allies, who are allies, who want to be part of the solution. The partnership with the Canadian Football League was a first for us as a federal government: partnering up with football players who are looked to with admiration by other boys and men and having them go into schools and talk to students in high schools or even earlier about why it's important for them to end gender-based violence. Terry and I went to Glebe high school last week to help kick-start 16 days of activism. The B.C. Lions, through the More than a Bystander campaign, are doing this work in certain communities.

Watching them do the work was so powerful. They did it in a trauma-informed way; they did it through an intersectional lens. They relied on the power of their own stories to get their message across, and it was well received. We know that the White Ribbon campaign, for example, is doing great work. We know that the Moose Hide campaign is doing really important work around ending violence against indigenous women and girls. Also, of course, we paid attention to the hearings that this committee had conducted and we heard from the group in Halton, SAVIS of Halton, and noted the really important ways that they're engaging, in a grassroots way, their own communities.

Violence that is gender-based is not a women's issue. Men and boys can and do play a role, and we've seen the Prime Minister, frankly, demonstrate that healthy masculinity in his efforts. I think

we need to do much more than that. We need to consolidate our efforts better. We need to coordinate our efforts better. We need to engage other players who want to be part of this work, not just here in Canada but internationally as well. The gender-based violence strategy provides the framework for us to do that work.

● (1115)

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you for that. You're right. We do need men in positions...who are sending those messages out to young boys and younger men.

On gender-based analysis plus, all of my youth council did the course and surprised me by coming back with their certificate. I got really good feedback from them. It's extending beyond government, where hopefully those young people will take that gender lens and apply it, regardless of where they go in life.

I have a question about how it's being applied. It was interesting. Peter and I just left the public safety meeting. Where it actually came up was a gender lens applied to Bill C-59, the new national security framework, and we were told that it was applied. We're not sure if it's something that can be shared with us as a committee or whether it was confidential.

I'm wondering if you can provide the committee with some further information on how GBA+ is being used, both legislatively and non-legislatively, within the government.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Internationally, I can tell you that one of the new demands being created for Canada is our expertise around GBA+. Other governments around the world want to know how we do it, how we've built capacity internally, and how it's actually applied. Within my team, we're working to ensure that the right tools are available, not just for policy-makers, but for anybody, whether it's teachers, or service providers, or municipalities that want to adopt this. I know that my provincial and territorial counterparts are also working on this.

We're committed to making sure that gender equality—

**The Chair:** You have one minute.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** We'll come back to that.

**The Chair:** No, you can finish. You have one minute.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** GBA+, through an order by the Prime Minister, is mandatory and to be applied in every item that comes before the federal cabinet. It's being applied with a lot of rigour. The quality has risen. That cultural change, which was really essential to it, is happening within government and it is taking place right now. That work can lead to community benefit agreements through infrastructure. That work can lead to a more thoughtful approach around public safety and security. That work can ensure, when we're talking about resource extraction, for example, that we're taking into account what that means for vulnerable communities.

At the front end of the policy-making process—and I've seen committees do this especially—it begins to have a different conversation among policy-makers and that will ensure that the outcomes are different. They are not just aware of how the gender impacts are different, but mitigating factors are included as well.

• (1120)

**The Chair:** Excellent. Thank you.

We're going to move to Rachael Harder for seven minutes.

**Ms. Rachael Harder (Lethbridge, CPC):** Minister, in July 2017, the finance minister came forward with changes having to do with our taxation laws around small businesses. I heard from many people in my riding, particularly women, who are doctors, lawyers, farmers, or who run other entrepreneurial endeavours within my riding. They came back to me and they said that these tax changes really hurt them. They really impacted them. They impacted their ability to take maternity leave. They impacted their ability to save for their children's education, their ability to take sick leave, their ability to take leave in order to care for a sick loved one, and things like that. At the end of the day, these women would argue that they were actually disproportionately affected by these tax changes.

Was GBA+ looked at when this proposal was put forward by the finance minister?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Thank you for that question.

Absolutely, GBA+ was taken into consideration in our consultations, but also in the outcomes that we deliver. The tax reform consultations that you're referring to heard from lawyers, professionals, doctors, and business owners, and we listened. What actually was proposed—

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** I'm going to stop you right there, because I have a document in front of me that was signed off by Mr. Joel Lightbound, who is the finance minister's parliamentary secretary, and it actually says that gender-based analysis was not applied.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** As the Minister for Status of Women, I can tell you that it was and it will continue to be.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Are you saying that your colleague lied, then?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Please allow me to answer your question.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** I would love that.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** What we've actually heard from stakeholders across the country is really valuable feedback. All MPs help contribute to that consultation process. The tax changes that were actually announced were that we're lowering taxes for small businesses.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Minister, I'm sorry, but I'm going to stop you right there, because the document in front of me actually says, based on an ATIP request, that gender-based analysis was not applied when it comes to passive income and the changes that were made by the finance minister.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** At the time, probably—

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** My question is very simple. I'm assuming you were at the cabinet table. Yes?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** As a cabinet minister, yes, I was.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Yes. Excellent.

I'm going to assume, then, that as a cabinet minister at the cabinet table, you were given a voice. Your voice could have been used in one direction or another. You could have advocated for women and the fact that these changes disproportionately had an ill effect on women across this country or you could have remained silent. That's one option.

The other option is that you could have used your voice and taken a stand for women and had your voice ignored, which tells me something about the way your cabinet functions and whether women are actually given a voice.

Minister, these are our options. Which one is it? Did you stand up and speak out on behalf of women in Canada or did you neglect to?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** First, I can't discuss with you what we talk about in cabinet. I'm sure you can respect that.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Can you tell me whether you advocated for the well-being of women in Canada?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** That said, every single day I advocate for gender equality. On the passive investment piece that you're referring to, the reason there was no gender-based analysis at the time that ATIP was done is that there was no legislation to do an analysis on.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** There was a policy that came forward from cabinet.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** I can tell you that work is done and that analysis was taken into consideration. We heard from women who want to save for maternal leave. They want to be able to save for rainy days. That's why we increased the threshold in passive investment far beyond what was expected of us. We reduced taxes so that female entrepreneurs could have further abilities to invest in their communities and to create jobs.

I can assure you that, as a government, gender equality is a priority. Nothing we put forward, for example, in terms of tax measures, is going to contradict that ultimate goal and priority of ensuring that all genders thrive.

• (1125)

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Minister, thank you very much.

With all due respect, I asked you if GBA+ was applied. You said yes. Then you said, actually, no, it wasn't applied to that measure. Are you lying to me?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** No, Rachael, I'm not lying to you, but it's hard to apply GBA+ to something that doesn't yet exist.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** It was a policy initiative. There was a paper written.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** It was a reform that was being proposed to be consulted with Canadians on.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Thank you.

I'm going to go on to my next question.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** I can assure you that, come budget 2018, that budget will have a gender-based analysis done. It's a historic effort that's being done, and I will be sure to keep you in the loop of that process should you remain interested.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Thank you, Minister.

Minister, my next question is with regard to the citizenship guide. Again, I'm going to assume that you've been part of the conversation, that you've been included.

The citizenship guide is being revamped. As part of that, it is intended, or the draft shows us, that female genital mutilation, FGM, is going to be taken out of the citizenship guide going forward. I will read exactly what the UN says about FGM:

FGM/C includes procedures that intentionally alter or cause injury to the female genital organs for non-medical reasons. Beyond extreme physical and psychological pain, the practice carries many health risks, including death.

This is a practice that the former government put in the citizenship guide in order to say that we as Canadians do not stand for it. This is a wrongful practice. It is a mistreatment of women. It's violence against women and girls.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** I agree.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Your government, the Liberal government, came in and said, "No, we're going to take that out of the citizenship guide. There's no need for that to be in there anymore." It's no longer in the draft.

Are you silent on this as well, or did you use your voice and was it ignored?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Rachael, I don't know what "as well" means.

I can assure you that I use my voice well.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Then why are you taking this out?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** I myself, the government, and all Canadians condemn the practice of female genital mutilation and cutting. It is illegal. It has been since 1997. We are revamping the citizenship guide. We are ensuring that it includes a better picture of the history of this place we call home and ensuring that it includes a better understanding of gender equality and rights for women who are coming to this place and calling it home.

We are working with my gender-based violence advisory council to ensure that any contributions we make to that draft lead to more accessible, more informative information. Nothing has been finalized. I appreciate the member's concern, and I'm definitely open to any constructive feedback she has on solutions.

**The Chair:** Thank you so much, Minister.

I recognize that there was a little concern about my cutting off.... I think it is very important, when we have the minister, that we have the opportunity to undertake a very bold and sometimes difficult discussion, so I will allow this to occur as long as it's not actually

attacking the person in a terrible and personal nature. That's just to set the ground rules for you.

I'm now going to Sheila Malcolmson for her seven minutes.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP):** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Minister, for being with us.

I'm going to try to fit three questions in, so I hope we can get "yes" or "no" answers where possible.

One of our first jobs as a committee was to review gender-based analysis. We made recommendations 7, 8, 9, and 10 around national coordination and leadership on the issue of sexual assault and rape on post-secondary campuses. We heard from many witnesses that they would like to see the Government of Canada lead a national coordination of policies to prevent campus rape. That was reflected in the New Democratic minority report. It wasn't in the majority report, but still I urge you, regardless, to take that leadership.

The consensus recommendations were, in all those areas, that the issue of campus rape be raised at the next meeting of the relevant ministers, provincial and territorial, and that was a commitment in the response we got. The federal response—I think it may have been from your predecessor—was that provinces and territories are primarily responsible, that it's a matter of provincial and territorial responsibility, but that the departments of Justice and Public Security have agreed to discuss the issue with provincial and territorial counterparts at the table of the ministers responsible.

We're saddened that campus safety was reduced to an agenda item. Nevertheless, that was the recommendation of the committee.

Could you tell us, was this on the agenda? Did you get a report back? What is the leadership that the federal government is going to take?

• (1130)

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Thank you, Sheila, for all your leadership and ongoing efforts to address gender-based violence and enhance opportunities and choice for women.

In terms of GBA+, that aspect of your question, we will be—

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** I'm just going to be clear. It was campus rape. I haven't asked about GBA+ yet.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** You referred to GBA+, though. I will come back to it later.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** I misspoke.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** The national coordination of campus violence that is gender-based is certainly an item that's not just on my agenda every day, but it is something on which colleagues from provinces and territories have had discussions, ongoing, but also at the FPT meeting. We know that about 40% of the cases of sexual assault that are reported are being reported by students. For any parent out there, when you send your kid away, you want to make sure they are safe, that they are building a better future and not finding violence and insecurities that can scar them for life. This is, accordingly, a priority.

One way we are intervening is through funding that has been provided to various campuses across the country. Some of these I met with over the summer.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** I'm sorry, Minister, I'm going to interrupt—

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** We're developing a tool kit—

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** I'm actually just looking for whether it was an agenda item and whether that intervention was successful.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** The gender-based violence strategy was an agenda item. I can provide the committee with a statement that came from the FPT meeting so that, if you haven't had a chance to see it, you can have a better sense of all the ways we talked about issues that affect women and girls.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** Fantastic. Thank you, I would love to see that.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Sure thing.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** On another matter, the GBA report—this time I'm using the right word—our consensus report, which again your predecessor responded to, made a recommendation that the government introduce legislation by June 2017 to create the office of commissioner for gender equality, based on the model of the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages. The response we got from your predecessor was, “I will consider that and I'll report to you in March 2018.”

Why not have a gender equality commissioner right now, and what are you going to do about it?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Thank you, Sheila.

One of the first steps was having a minister devoted specifically to status of women, so that around the cabinet table and behind the scenes there is someone every single day spending every single hour advocating for all issues that can impede but also promote gender equality.

My predecessor did a wonderful job, and I was thrilled to pick up this work and continue it day in and day out.

I'm open to the idea of legislation on GBA+. I want to make sure it is successful. I want to make sure that years from now it continues; that we're not just focusing on a check mark next to “Was GBA+ done?” but are focusing on the quality. That work requires building capacity and the culture of making it be second nature to apply a GBA+ lens to everything. That work is happening. Come March 2018 we will be reporting back to this committee, as promised, on our plans for moving that forward. Rest assured that this is something we all care deeply about and are invested in.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** You've anticipated my third question, which is, when will you agree to the consensus recommendation of this committee that the government introduce legislation to make GBA mandatory? That way it's not an internal, private, cabinet matter; we all know how it's being done, it's legislated, and it's binding on future governments. All three parties agreed to that.

We asked for legislation to be tabled last June. You're saying you're open to it, so that is good, but still we would have hoped it would have happened earlier.

The question I asked a minute ago, though, was about legislation to create the office of the gender equality commissioner. Can you talk about that, please?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Not too deeply right now, no, because it's part of a larger picture of not just putting in legislation, but making sure the legislation is enforced.

You're right. Right now, we have a Prime Minister who is a feminist, so he said to apply the lens, and we are, but we need to make sure this work continues long after we are gone. All of us around this table will continue with our lives, but the work of gender equality and the federal government's responsibility will continue.

When we provide an update and a report in March, we'll be as thoughtful as we can in how we're going to move ahead. As I said, I'm open to the possibility of legislation, but we need to make sure that it's thoughtful and that we have the capacity to deliver on what is being legislated. We need to have that conversation internally, but also with experts, and that work is going to happen.

● (1135)

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

Now we're going to move to Sean Fraser, for his seven minutes.

**Mr. Sean Fraser (Central Nova, Lib.):** Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and thank you, Minister, for being here.

I've been proud of a number of initiatives that the government has undertaken. At the top of the list is our effort to achieve gender equality, not just in spirit, but by backing it up with funding.

I sit here today, though, with some seriously mixed emotions. I see some important reforms going on in my own community about support for victims: some great initiatives with law reform with the appointment of sexual assault prosecutors in Nova Scotia, and some great work by local RCMP officers like Deepak Prasad in Antigonish, who is actually attending the women's resource centre's meetings on sexual assault.

At the same time, I would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge that just days ago charges were laid at my alma mater, St. F.X., against two young men who allegedly committed sexual assault.

There is some great work going on in my community, but when it comes to the third pillar you mentioned—not just supporting victims and reforming the system, but the prevention effort—how is the national gender-based violence strategy going to specifically communicate the most simple message I can possibly imagine: that it is not okay, as a young man, to commit sexual assault against a woman on campus?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** My goodness, Sean, first, I don't know if the victims of those assaults are paying attention, but our thoughts are with them and their families. This violence doesn't just affect individuals but spills into families and communities. We all know that around this table and beyond.

The focus on prevention is what we heard and you heard clearly from the victims and survivors who had come forward hoping that this would be the result and that the cost of coming forward would be outweighed by the benefits of preventing it for someone else. It's the most effective intervention we can make.



The gender-based violence strategy does that in many ways. One of those ways is that the work isn't just being done out of Status of Women Canada. The work that is being done to prevent, to support survivors and families, and work on that justice and the legal systems you spoke of at the beginning of your question is happening across government.

We're working with Health Canada, through their Public Health Agency, to ensure that we're intervening better through programs for parenting, or through teen-dating violence initiatives, for example, explaining and exemplifying what healthy dating for teens looks like.

Public Safety has a role. With Public Safety, it's about cyber-violence and making sure that some of the dollars are invested towards those measures.

We talked earlier about putting more focus into engaging men and boys. Terry is taking a significant lead on that, as are many members of our communities and colleagues.

The work that also needs to happen, as we've seen through the #MeToo campaign, is that there is a willingness and a need for Canadians to be part of the conversation. This isn't something that we can sweep under the rug anymore. Voices are amplified through social media. Let's leverage this tool as a way to engage everyone in this conversation and ensure that the cultural change that we can't legislate our way through happens through grassroots efforts moving up.

I can tell you that organizations across this country that we have the privilege of working with or of hearing from are doing this work. They have their ears to the ground and they're an important element of the change that we need to bring forward. At the end of it, we have to ensure that whatever we do is done with survivors at the heart of the efforts.

What I didn't get to finish with Sheila's question was that we are developing a tool kit based on all the best practices that we receive from programs that we have funded to other campuses across the country so that we can offer post-secondary institutions a tool kit to do this work. The willingness is there; the leadership is taking place across the country. We also know that our provincial and territorial counterparts, especially the provinces, whose jurisdiction this work really is, are particularly invested in being part of the solution.

I share your grief and your disappointment that this is still an issue, but I'm hopeful that we are in the process of creating and building relationships that will help advance the change that we need.

• (1140)

**Mr. Sean Fraser:** Thank you very much.

To anyone listening at home, we know campus violence against women is endemic to the university and college atmosphere in Canada. I hope this particular case doesn't become about the impact the process may have on the alleged perpetrators. Don't forget the impact on the women who've been affected by this.

Turning to the questions earlier from my colleague Ms. Harder on the issue of the proposed tax changes, my understanding is essentially that our government does gender-based analysis on any

piece of legislation. In terms of the income sprinkling test, GBA was applied, but because there was no legislation on passive investment, it hadn't been applied to that legislation. However, through the consultations, gender considerations were taken into account and that was reflected in some of the adjustments. For example, we'll let a business owner save up to \$1 million before the passive investment piece affects them, to take care of the concerns that I actually heard on the trail as well when I did consultations, such as about maternity leave, taking care of a loved one, and so on. Is that a fair summary of what you were getting at?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Sean, thank you for outlining what actually happened and how things unfold.

Yes, GBA+ is applied to the consultation process to ensure that we're as inclusive as possible in the questions and the way we do our outreach so that we listen to all voices before developing policies. Once legislation is developed, there is another process that we go through around the cabinet table. There's more than one feminist around that table who raises issues such as those that you refer to.

I'm pleased to say that the changes that were introduced as a result of that consultation process have been met positively. Entrepreneurs in my own riding, professionals in my own riding, my stakeholders across the country are pleased that they were heard. It was a courageous conversation. As the chair mentioned, we need to have those conversations. If done right, those conversations lead to better outcomes such as lower taxes for small businesses.

**Mr. Sean Fraser:** Thank you, Minister.

**The Chair:** We're now going to move to our second round, starting with Martin Shields for five minutes.

**Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I thank the minister for being here today—

**Ms. Maryam Monsef:** My pleasure.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** —and for the conversation.

Activism is interesting. Having been a university student in the U.S. in the late sixties, I'd say our activism now pales compared with what I experienced. This is mild stuff.

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** This is nothing, eh, Martin?

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Yes, university students got shot and killed in those days, and I lived through that.

Let me give a shout-out to Cantara Safe House in our community. It's an award-winning women's shelter. It has been recognized. The sad part about it, as the community says, is that it's too bad we have to have it. It is, however, an award-winning one, and people in our community have done an extremely good job of building a first-class facility.

I'm going to return to a process matter. Having been involved in process often with pieces of legislation, and having been involved in doctor recruitment for 15 years, this is a critical issue. In Alberta, outside of Edmonton and Calgary, everything is called "rural" by the government, and it's a challenge for the medical community, and for female doctors it presents a real challenge. It is my experience, in dealing with legislation through many levels, that you work very hard to find the unintended consequences before you run anything out. If you were sitting at a table, the unintended consequences of this were so loud and clear that it's unbelievable for me to see that somebody sitting there with a lens would not see this.

Where was that lens as this policy was developed?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Thank you very much, Martin, for your question and for your work on this committee.

I come from a rural-urban riding, and we work very hard to recruit and retain physicians in my area, especially because we're one of the aging communities across the country, and access to health care is a critical need for my constituents. That's the case also across the country.

In terms of consultations, the whole point—

• (1145)

**Mr. Martin Shields:** No, no, it's policy development. I'm going back a step.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** The policy wasn't developed first. We could have just introduced a policy and thrown it out there—

**Mr. Martin Shields:** No, you did. You ran it out. You ran that policy out.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** —but we decided to listen to Canadians first—

**Mr. Martin Shields:** No, you didn't.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** —to hear from MPs across party lines first. We did that, and the outcome in the end—

**Mr. Martin Shields:** No, no, that's not how you develop policy.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** —took into consideration those realities in rural Canada, took into consideration the voices we heard from female physicians and other professionals. The outcome, as you know, Martin, has led to better results for small businesses and for those physicians who are worried about not being able to save through passive investments. It's \$50,000 a year that they can hold on to without being taxed, for example; that's up to \$1 million. Whether it's retirement or parental leave or saving for a rainy day or caring for loved ones, that threshold has now been highlighted—

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Sure, now it has been.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** —and that's what the consultations enabled us to do. The policy itself, legislation itself, does not yet exist.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** I got that.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** The consultation process brought us to a decision that will now go through the House of Commons, that will go through committee, that will be voted on, that will go to the Senate, and then will come back.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Got it.

"Passive income" is a lousy term, because that money is working. It's not passive. It's working.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** In most places it is, but for the top 3% of corporations across the country—

**Mr. Martin Shields:** No, no, a doctor is not putting money in a bank account. It's working.

**The Chair:** Let her answer the question.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** —which is the focus of the legislation.... This particular intervention was meant to focus on the top 3%, and that's about 29,000—

**Mr. Martin Shields:** If a female doctor puts money aside, are you calling it passive income? That's not passive income; that's working.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** I didn't make that word up, Martin.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** I'm saying you're involved in the process; you keep using it—

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** We all are.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** —and I'm objecting to the term. When you put out there "\$1 million", when you talk about a female farmer and land selling for \$12,000 an acre in my area, \$1 million isn't going to cut it. You're eliminating—

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** We're not changing the capital gains exemption that exists for farms, so rest assured there's no need to touch that aspect of the way things work, whether it's for farmers or other small businesses.

Martin, if you have any amendments you'd like to make to the terminology used or the substance of the legislation when it comes forward, I hope you speak to it in the House of Commons.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Oh, trust me. I really have a problem, though, when you develop policy and say, "We ran it out and didn't see the unintended consequence of this one." That, to me, is not using the lens you should have used when 60% of our doctors are females under the age of 35, and you see how badly this affects them and how much passive income—you call it "passive"—has already left the country.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** I will add that until we came into government, applying this lens was not mandatory.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** I wasn't there.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** We're working to improve it day in and day out. It's good to know that we have a champion in you around this table and within your caucus as well.

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

We're now going to Emmanuella Lambropoulos for her five minutes.

**Ms. Emmanuella Lambropoulos (Saint-Laurent, Lib.):** Thank you, Minister Monsef, for being with us today and for all the great work you've been doing in your position.

My question is one regarding the most vulnerable women. As you mentioned in your opening comments, those women are the ones who are marginalized. Many of them are newcomers coming from countries that don't regard women in the same way, where women are actually oppressed.

Can you inform us about the ways that we're reaching out to these women to help improve their situation?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Thank you very much, Emmanuella, and thanks for all the work you're doing here. I know that we threw you into the deep end in some ways with the work you're doing, but you're excelling, and your contributions to this place matter a lot.

In terms of the focus on vulnerable groups, especially vulnerable women, the way that the intersectional gender lens is applied to any consultation process or any policy or regulation that we put forward is, very roughly, by asking how it affects women and men differently. What about people of different genders? What does it mean for persons living in rural and remote Canada rather than in urban centres? What does it mean for seniors as compared with young people? What does it mean for indigenous persons vis-à-vis migrants to this place? What does it mean for persons with disabilities and exceptionalities, for francophones or LGBTQ2 communities? That's the frame in which the analysis is taken into consideration.

Within the gender-based violence strategy, we heard from stakeholders that it was critical to focus on those populations that are particularly vulnerable to violence, because we know that there's also a confounding factor that happens. If you're a woman with a disability in rural Canada identifying as LGBTQ2 and as a francophone, you have a whole other set of barriers but also vulnerabilities that can make you susceptible to violence.

The way we're intervening is first by making sure that we hear those voices. Many thanks to my gender-based violence advisory council, who help ensure that we stay current, up to date, and aware of these voices and of that intersectional lens that we need to be applying to the work we do.

More specifically, on the ground we rely on expertise from organizations that we fund to do this work for us. We will be focusing on those vulnerable groups with the funding that will be rolled out as part of the gender-based violence strategy. We also need to make sure that we have a better understanding of what is actually happening. Whether it's female genital mutilation and cutting, or challenges that persons with disabilities have around gender-based violence, or trans women and those living in urban centres versus rural centres, data and statistics are going to provide us with a better understanding of the scope of challenges.

Also, the knowledge centre is going to make sure that an intervention in Antigonish, for example, that is proving to be successful for vulnerable communities can be shared with those in a community in the Yukon, for example, so that we're not funding the same projects over and over again but the best practices are being shared and we get to the outcomes we need to get to faster and more effectively.

● (1150)

**Ms. Emmanuella Lambropoulos:** Thank you very much.

I'm a firm believer that gender stereotypes have a lot to do with women's economic security. Regarding that issue, what are we doing for women and girls in our country?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Thank you for that big question. I hope someone else asks, so that we have more time to talk about wage gaps and how stereotypes are an impediment.

We can legislate many things. What we can't legislate is change in attitudes or cultural change. What we're trying to do through our efforts across government is encourage more women and girls to enter STEM; provide more flexible leave options; make sure that, if she's leaving an abusive situation, her job can be protected and she can take leave to put her life back in order. We're working to ensure that we have more child care spaces, for example, so that women don't have to choose between work or taking care of their family.

We heard from the Governor of the Bank of Canada that the Canada child benefit is stimulating the economy in important ways. One of those ways is its ability to give parents the choice and the money to do what they need to do, and what many parents are choosing to do is put that money towards child care so that mothers can go back to work, and sometimes fathers.

There's a lot of work that needs to be done. This is an issue shared by G7 countries. This is an issue we hear from stakeholders and service providers every single day, and it's an issue that we are committed to.

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

We have time for two more sessions, so we're going to carry on with Rachael Harder for five minutes.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm going to split my time with my honourable colleague Martin Shields.

My question for the minister is simple. In commenting on violence against women and girls, I think you would agree with me that it's about taking a stand for equality. It's about taking a stand for choice and respecting a person's choice. It's about allowing women and girls to function on the notion that no means no. We often use that phrase. Standing up against violence against women and girls also means that a person's voice should count. Do you agree?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Yes.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Perfect.

At this committee, we have a chair, Ms. Vecchio, and she is a phenomenal chair, but she was put in place against her will. When she said no to being put in place, her voice was ignored. The six members opposite me, who happen to be Liberal members of this committee, all forced her to take the chair. As Minister of Status of Women, do you agree with this decision or do you believe the choice of the chair should have been respected?

● (1155)

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** First, I want to congratulate you on your chairpersonship and thank you for the leadership role you've taken on. I also want to acknowledge that the committee is the master of its own destiny, so I will not get into that.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** I'm just asking if, as a minister, you agree with the decision or not.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** As the minister for women, I think the person who leads this committee has to be someone who believes in gender equality in the fullest sense of the term, believes—

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Do you agree with the choice of your colleagues to force Ms. Vecchio?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** —in choice for all women and girls in all areas of their lives, including the choice over decisions about their own bodies. Gender equality starts with that basic, fundamental choice. The spokesperson for this committee—

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** It does start with that fundamental choice, doesn't it?

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** —has to be someone who's able to bring diverse voices together and is able to communicate with Canadians the important messages and the work that this committee does.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Marilyn Gladu for the very important and effective way that she provided leadership to this committee, to Canadians, and to the government. I wish her the best in her endeavours beyond this committee, but I also thank the chair of this committee for all the ways she's keeping the ship running and making sure that really important work continues to get done.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** I'm going to go back to the theme that I was on. In a sense, this is one that relates to newcomers. I'm in a community that has probably 100 different countries represented, and it's an economic reason that they're there. However, without female doctors, we have women at risk of some of the most severe things that I have seen in a community. We have a tax policy that's out there being amended, but it's not going to work in the favour of female doctors in rural areas. I'm challenging you to be that voice at that table, to change that so that it does have female doctors outside of our major urban centres. The proposal didn't. What's coming still is problematic, and in terms of doctors, females tell me it's still problematic. You haven't fixed it. You think you have, but you haven't. It puts the most vulnerable newcomers in my community at risk, and this is countrywide where we have a lot of newcomers.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Martin, thank you for that question. I can tell you that health care providers do more than support newcomers. They support indigenous persons. They support persons with disabilities and exceptionalities. They look after our seniors, the people who built this country. They look after my one-and-a-half-year-old niece who had an ear infection and no one could figure out what was wrong with her but the doctor, a female doctor at that. We all know the important role that physicians and health care workers play in our communities in our day-to-day lives.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Right, and the University of Alberta did the study that says that's the problem.

**The Chair:** You have 50 seconds.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** I can tell you that the rural caucus, the women's caucus, cabinet, and all MPs are effective voices for their communities. Those voices, also from professionals themselves, have been heard. The legislation that you're referring to, once it's introduced in the House of Commons, will go through a really important democratic process. It includes debate in the House of Commons. It includes hearing further from witnesses and persons

with expertise. It will include opportunities for all members to provide input and amendments. It will then be voted on. It will then go to the Senate for sober second thought, and it will come back to us. I have a lot of faith in the democratic process. I know that the consultations we began this process with, which is actually new for a federal government to do, will only lead to better outcomes, not just for rural physicians but for all Canadians who depend on them, for entrepreneurs, farmers, and professors.

**The Chair:** I don't want to take away, but we still have some more questions. We need to go to Bernadette.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** I can talk to you later. We can take this offline.

**The Chair:** We will continue with Bernadette for her final minutes.

**Mrs. Bernadette Jordan (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Minister, for being here today.

I have two approaches. First, we saw the census data that says 62% of managerial positions in Canada are now being held by men. As much as we are doing as a government to improve women's involvement in leadership roles, how do we go outside of government? How do we attack that problem? It is a big problem.

When we see those numbers, is there a way we're measuring to make sure that we are making a difference, to see that in two years, five years, or 20 years there is actually movement to having more women in leadership roles and management positions?

●(1200)

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Thank you very much, Bernadette, and welcome. You were a force as the chair of the Atlantic caucus. You were able to move many mountains and you continue to do so. We are very fortunate that we now have you as an advocate around this table.

We are committed to increasing the participation of women, and from diverse backgrounds, in all areas of public life but also within the private sector. Your question was how we can do this beyond legislation. I will highlight Bill C-25, which is at the Senate right now. The focus of it is diversity around corporate boards. That's important because often it is boards that hire executives, CEOs, for example. That cultural change and that diversity of perspectives at the top is going to lead to different perspectives and perhaps practices that end up being applied.

In terms of what we're doing as a federal government, for example, the President of the Treasury Board introduced the name-blind recruitment process. That takes some of the unconscious biases that can sometimes prevent perfectly qualified people from having their resumé and applications moved to the top.

We are investing in ensuring that we do a few things. One of the critical pieces which came up at the G7 ministerial meeting in Italy a few weeks ago is that for our daughters to seek positions of power and influence, one of the most critical factors and often a systemic barrier is lack of role models. If she sees someone who looks like her, who talks like her, who's had experiences and a similar background as she has, doing something such as leading in the House of Commons, leading in a company, leading as a woman in media or other unrepresented fields, she's more likely to dream it and believe it's possible for her. That's a really important piece.

That data showed that women don't negotiate, for example, for higher salaries. We don't always believe we can reach that next promotion. Part of that work is internal, in mentorship and coaching. Championing is important. This is work that individuals can be part of, but also that the government can do through highlighting great women.

**Mrs. Bernadette Jordan:** I'm going in the other direction now, with regard to gender-based violence. Like Sean, I'm also an alumnus of St. F.X. University, so it has been a rough week. Regarding your comment that 40% of rapes reported happen on campus—

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** They're reported by students.

**Mrs. Bernadette Jordan:** By students, okay. They happen on campus.

We have to do better. Is there any way that we as the federal government can be involved with things such as making sure that a sexual violence strategy is in place before funding is released? I don't know. I'm throwing that out there as something, because there has to be some type of movement to lower that number to zero.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** I agree, and hopefully, to have more women step up. The same data from Stats Canada shows that those who actually step up make up about 5% of the actual reality, so 95% of those affected will never come forward. We need to up those numbers.

**Mrs. Bernadette Jordan:** There's a reason they don't come forward—

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** Absolutely.

**Mrs. Bernadette Jordan:** —which we also have to deal with.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** The process can be traumatizing, and it doesn't always lead to better outcomes, which is why we have a gender-based violence strategy.

We have to work with provinces and territories. Provinces are where the jurisdiction for this work really exists, but they are willing partners and we are sharing knowledge with them.

We're also in the midst of 16 days of activism to address and prevent gender-based violence. This year's theme is #MYActions-Matter. Every individual, whether a bystander, an educator, a parent, a business owner, or a politician, has an obligation and an opportunity to be part of that change. We see that happening. Right now, on the Status of Women Canada website, we've had about 10,000 people take the pledge to end gender-based violence. That number is growing. The Canadian Football League partnership helped. Beyond legislative work, beyond working with provinces and territories, with indigenous elders and multicultural leaders, we

also need to recognize that as individuals we have power to be part of that change.

● (1205)

**The Chair:** Excellent. Thank you very much to the minister for staying those extra few minutes. We wanted to make sure that everybody got the opportunity to ask questions.

Please go ahead, Sheila.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** Madam Chair, with the committee's consent, having just realized that the student group Our Turn is in the room, I would love to ask a very fast question on their behalf.

**The Chair:** Do I have consent of the committee?

**A voice:** I think the minister has to go.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** It will be so fast. Could I even get it on the record?

**The Chair:** Could I get consent of the committee to ask the question?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** Thank you so much.

Our Turn is a student-led group. Caitlin Salvino is in the room. They are a group trying to develop a national action plan to end campus rape. They just issued a report. It's fantastic.

They asked me to ask you about there being no youth representation on your advisory council to end gender-based violence. Can you let me know the age of the youngest person, and if you don't know, would you be able to commit to revisiting the membership? They would love to have a youth voice advising you.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** First, I want to thank student leaders like you for stepping up and being part of the change. Second, I want to let you know that you are part of the movement of young leaders on campuses across the country who are saying "Enough", who are recognizing their agency, and who are applying their creativity and talent and resourcefulness to be part of the solution. Third, I want to assure you that the....

First, I don't know people's ages specifically, and they are not for me to disclose; however, absolutely I'm open to enhancing the diversity of voices around that advisory council. We're actively working on it.

The answer to your question is yes.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much once again, Minister Monsef. We have a very active group, as you can see. They are very passionate on these issues. I would like to thank you for coming and speaking to us today. Of course, there's always going to be turmoil. That's what makes committees so exciting. Thank you very much for your time today.

**Hon. Maryam Monsef:** It's my pleasure. Thank you.

**The Chair:** We'll take about two minutes or less to switch up the panels. We're going to make an addition. Justine Akman and Nancy Gardiner will be joining us, and the minister will be exiting.

We'll be suspending for two minutes.

• (1205)

(Pause)

• (1210)

**The Chair:** We're going to reconvene now.

Thank you very much, Justine Akman and Nancy Gardiner, for joining this panel.

Welcome, all of you. Today has been an excellent discussion. Let's continue that excellent discussion.

We're going to do that with Bernadette Jordan, for seven minutes.

**Mrs. Bernadette Jordan:** I thought there were going to be comments first.

**The Chair:** No, there are no comments at this moment.

**Mrs. Bernadette Jordan:** Thank you. I will be splitting my time with Sean Fraser.

First of all, I was looking at the supplementary estimates (B). They indicate that we're going to transfer \$50,000 to the Department of Industry, also known as Innovation, Science and Economic Development, to support networking opportunities for women entrepreneurs.

Is there a specific program or is it just a general pot of money? I'm looking for some guidance on what this is going to be directed towards and whether there is an actual program in place that the funds are going to go to.

**Ms. Gina Wilson (Deputy Minister, Office of the Deputy Minister, Office of the Co-ordinator, Status of Women):** Thank you to the committee for having me. This is my first appearance as deputy minister of status of women, which is a new position, and it's a great honour to be here.

In response to that particular transfer, \$50,000 being transferred to the Department of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, it is intended to support networking opportunities for women entrepreneurs. In budget 2015, we announced support for an action plan for women entrepreneurs, and a key component of that included the development of an online platform to foster networking opportunities for women entrepreneurs. To deliver on this, actually this was part of a larger package that was in place, \$200,000 in fact.

In budget 2017, we announced support for women entrepreneurs. To capitalize on that larger initiative, we took the opportunity to transfer \$150,000 to ISED, the institution that would lead the initiative. That initiative was not in place in 2016-17, so we were not able to transfer the funds at that time. We have now transferred the remaining \$50,000 planned for 2017-18 to the initiative.

**Mrs. Bernadette Jordan:** Also, can you give us an update on the new gender-based violence knowledge centre, when it's going to start, when we can expect to see some movement with it, and the priorities for research in that centre?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** From my perspective as deputy minister, I see the actual start when we actually begin to have people in place in the knowledge centre. We're at a point in time where we're staffing those opportunities and looking at various individuals.

Also, we're looking at finalizing a research plan for the department. Perhaps I could ask Justine if there's anything else,

because this falls under the responsibility of her particular part of the department.

**Ms. Justine Akman (Director General, Policy and External Relations, Office of the Co-ordinator, Status of Women):** Sure.

We do have a team. About half of the people who are anticipated are staffed. Some of them already were in Status of Women and have many years of expertise in the area of gender-based violence across all the different tentacles and all the initiatives going on in different departments.

We are planning for some type of, at least, online presence, a light one, early in the new fiscal year. We are very actively working already with our key stakeholders, which are other federal departments, the provinces and territories, civil society organizations, and the minister's gender-based advisory committee to develop thorough action plans for each component of the gender-based violence strategy, with a focus, of course, on the ones under the responsibility of the Minister of Status of Women. That process is unfolding.

In terms of the research, as Deputy Minister Wilson said, we do have a strategy, and some of the products, which were part of the gender-based violence strategy, are quite deep into their development already, including a national gender-based violence survey for the first time in many years.

• (1215)

**Mrs. Bernadette Jordan:** With regard to the staffing and the research, we just heard from the minister that 40% of reported rapes are on campuses. Is there a designated research staff to deal with the problem we're having on university campuses right now?

**Ms. Justine Akman:** It is part of the gender-based violence strategy to fund a survey of post-secondary education. It's a population-based survey, so it is different from what's going on already in several provinces that do have jurisdiction over universities and campuses.

I'll just add that this is a sensitivity for the federal government. When we start actually taking action on campus, we have to be sensitive to jurisdictional issues, but, yes, we are just in the very early stages of designing a survey on violence on post-secondary campuses. As I said, it won't be done right on campus; it will be a population-based survey done by Statistics Canada.

**Mrs. Bernadette Jordan:** Okay, thank you.

Sean, did you have some questions?

**Mr. Sean Fraser:** Yes, thanks very much, Bernadette.

Building on the jurisdictional issue, one of the things we heard the minister talk about was the provincial and territorial co-operation necessary to achieve some of the ends that she hopes to achieve. Being sensitive to the jurisdictional issues, are there different ways that the departments identify to actually get through this jurisdictional barrier? We heard at length during our studies that you have to get in schools, that you have to deal with early childhood education, and we've reduced some of our recommendations to observations because of this jurisdictional problem. Is the best way to deal with this maybe to deal with calls for proposals that community organizations can partner with school boards, universities, and the like, or is there another way to achieve this end?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** What Justine was referring to is a Stats Canada population-based survey where there would be an identifier for students per se, post-secondary students. When it comes to calls for proposals, we're absolutely open to those kinds of initiatives.

Justine and Nancy, feel free to comment on that.

We're certainly willing to consider research opportunities that are part of project-based funding.

**Ms. Justine Akman:** I'll jump in there. I'm officially the old-timer at Status of Women Canada. I've been there for two and a half years. I have more corporate memory than some of my colleagues.

A few years ago, there was an initiative to fund civil society organizations looking at the issue of campus-based violence. That was through our grants and contributions program, which my colleague Nancy Gardiner has recently become responsible for. The results of those projects were rolled up, and one of the things we do in our grants and contributions program is make sure we invest in knowledge transfer. That means rolling up the results at a national level and using various fora, including online platforms, to share that information across the country so that you don't have to reinvent the wheel, including for guidelines on campus violence.

**Mr. Sean Fraser:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** We're now going to Martin Shields for seven minutes.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Help me out here. We have some great people on the panel who know a lot of stuff, but I don't know what you do. What I'm looking for—you probably listened to my previous line of questioning—is who advises the minister when we talk about a whole-of-government approach in terms of what legislation is, and in policy, what is being developed. Who works on advising the minister on those pieces of legislation? Who's keeping track of it so that you have a whole-of-government approach to looking at status of women?

• (1220)

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** I would suggest that we do that as a team of senior managers responsible for the agency. As deputy minister, I'm a senior adviser to the minister when it comes to all policy, program, operational, and corporate issues. However, we are divided into different branches in the organization.

Anik is our chief financial officer and is responsible for corporate services. Nancy Gardiner, as mentioned, is responsible for our women's program, our grants and contributions, and our regional operations. Justine Akman is responsible for policy development and coordination and for strategic advice as well.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** As you describe that, you're talking about a lot of the internal things that you're doing. Whose responsibility is it to watch what other departments are doing in the development of their policies?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** I would say again that we work as a team. We're all responsible for elements of that. Certainly, when it comes to policy initiatives of other government departments, we generally can sit on interdepartmental committees or in different fora. We can comment on issues. We can work proactively or reactively with our colleagues in other departments. It really depends on the issue.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** As this is growing in the sense of its priority and importance, in the role that you then provide to other departments, has the awareness, the idea that you're there and you're watching, begun to knock down the silos? Is there a communication that's going both ways, or is it basically one way?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** If I can clarify, Madam Chair, “this” being women's issues, gender issues, sir?

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Yes.

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** Okay.

I would say that definitely I've seen a change. I've been in government for almost 20 years now in various departments, and for six months here at Status of Women. I can say that there has been a shift in culture and thinking, certainly at my senior management tables, around many of these issues. There's certainly been more emphasis on gender-based analysis. There's certainly been more consideration of all of those elements over the last number of years, yes.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** With your 20 years of experience, you have extreme knowledge of the silos that you have to deal with. Can you give me an example of how you're dealing with those silos?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** Silos and the horizontality is a very pervasive challenge across government, I would say, on many issues, gender issues certainly being one of them. I'm not going to say that it's an easy endeavour to undertake. However, it's one that we're consistently working at.

An example would be gender-based analysis. I think the minister very effectively responded to some of those questions in talking about GBA+ and our efforts to create a new culture in government, for instance, with the 80,000 public servants who have taken the online course around GBA+, that being a good example. That begins to shift the conversation around policies, programs, and operations.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** As you look at this committee, what do you think we as a committee could do that would facilitate what you've just described as a process?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** Being new to this role and being new to your committee, I'm not exactly certain as to what you have undertaken so far—and probably my colleagues are—but I know that from my own perspective, certainly, learning for me in this area has probably been most effective in terms of some of the encounters and visits I've had with some of the regions and some of the service-based and non-governmental organizations. I've certainly learned a lot.

My advice to this committee would be to get out and visit some of these entities, institutions, and organizations and interact. I'm sure that the committee and many of you have already.

● (1225)

**Mr. Martin Shields:** You talked about going out there. I'm a sort of grassroots guy who believes the carrot will do a lot more than the stick. If you can get out to the communities, to the grassroots, if you can find mechanisms to take that to the grassroots and incentivize it, you can absolutely get more change, but you also get more creative change.

You've said that you go out and learn. Can you describe that? What did you find when you went out there and learned so that you said because you went out there and saw...? Can you give me an example of where you said, "Hey, I saw something because I went out there"? You're saying that we should do that, so can you give me an example?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** Yes. One vivid experience, I would say, that was a take-away for me was my visit to Prince Edward Island, where I came to understand, by meeting with a number of different representatives of non-governmental organizations, that they work very well horizontally together. This is being on the island, per se, and many groups do work together, but there were definitely a lot of synergies with these organizations working together and leveraging off one another. That was a very good take-away.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** You have 40 seconds.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** I'll pass.

**The Chair:** We're going to Sheila Malcolmson for her seven minutes.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you to the Status of Women representatives and particularly Deputy Minister Wilson. I'm really glad to see your appointment.

Following on my colleague's questions about hearing from the grassroots, from the very beginning in the studies we've done, we've invited a lot of people who are on the front line of providing a service to women in need, whether that's domestic violence, advocating for economic justice, or for an end to the tragedy of murdered and missing indigenous women.

I can't think of a single grassroots group that has not said "what we need is operational funding". They apply for programs, they innovate, they pilot, and they collaborate. Women's organizations have been collaborating for decades, of course, and they say they're exhausted by it. They say that it's speculative and they put a lot of staff time into trying to fit the new criteria of program funding, but that what they really need is to keep the lights on or to renovate so

that they have a safer workplace for their employees in dangerous situations. It's about operational funding.

They say again and again that provincial and federal governments have abrogated to them this front-line service, so why don't they just admit that these groups are the ones who are going to do this work and that they need operational funding? That was reflected in the NDP's recommendation in terms of the violence against young women and girls. It was a recommendation that the federal government provide consistent operational funding for front-line community organizations working to protect victims and end violence against women and girls.

Can you put on the record why not?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** Certainly you've heard that message loud and clear in your travels. The committee has heard it. I would say that Minister Monsef has heard it in spades. I certainly have heard it from organizations. I know that my colleagues here have as well.

I would say that at the current time we provide \$19 million annually, and we look at about 300 projects representing some of the challenges faced by women and girls in the areas of violence, economic security, prosperity, leadership, and advancing equality.

I would also add that at this point we're looking at our terms and conditions for our current program to see how it can more effectively respond to some of those concerns and issues. Those terms and conditions are a tool that will need to be approved by Treasury Board, but certainly that is one activity we are undertaking.

Nancy, I don't know if you have anything more to add. Okay.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** The consensus recommendations of the committee, recommendations 42 and 44, asked that the Government of Canada "prioritize funds for local sexual violence prevention services and sexual violence support services", and said that the government should "ensure its funding programs are working to identify and effectively serve the needs of front-line services".

In the minister's response, those recommendations didn't feel like they were directly responded to; it was hard to follow. I'm hoping that you can respond in more detail about what has happened with those two recommendations: prioritizing funds for local sexual prevention services and all support services, and ensuring that they're effectively serving the needs of front-line organizations. If it isn't possible to respond in detail now, could we have a written follow-up?

● (1230)

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** I'd be more than glad to respond more in detail and in writing to you. At this time, we have a certain set of money that we're allocated by Parliament to run the program that we do. We're doing that as effectively as we can, and we're trying to stretch every dollar to get the maximum impact with the programming that we do have.



I know from my own personal experience, certainly, having run a crisis shelter at the community level, how difficult it is and how challenging it can be to keep the lights on and to keep funding going, and I do acknowledge many of those organizations that do that.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** Thank you for hearing that. It's not that I'm advocating the program...you know, limited funding.... However, given that it's the model we have right now, I have heard from organized labour that they've been declared ineligible for any of the program funding.

I've heard Status of Women staff members say that it was organized labour that kept the women's movement alive during the decade of the Conservative government that preceded this one. We recognize that they have a huge amount of expertise, a huge engagement of membership, and a direct way to poll their membership. For example, I think of organized labour representing women in precarious work and in hotel services. They have an amazing membership that could be drawn on.

Is it true that they're not eligible to apply for some of the program and research funding? If not, why not?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** Thank you for that. That's been very helpful for me to better understand some of those issues, which I certainly have heard about.

I talked about our terms and conditions and some of the adjustments that we're looking at there. I'll ask Nancy Gardiner, who is responsible for our women's program, to reply.

**Ms. Nancy Gardiner (Senior Director General, Women's Program and Regional Operations, Office of the Co-ordinator, Status of Women):** Thank you, Deputy.

As Deputy Minister Wilson said, the terms and conditions for the program are currently being reviewed. As part of the terms and conditions, you review who is eligible to apply, the activities, and the things that are eligible in terms of expenditures. This is one area that we will be reviewing in terms of their eligibility for the opportunity to apply for program funding.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** I would recommend the UFCW, which has a membership of 60% women, especially in front-line food and hotel services, where women are particularly economically vulnerable, particularly reliant on part-time work, and more likely to be racialized. They've noted to me that in the United States the survey that was done by organized labour there on the degree of sexual violence in the workplace for that type of worker was heartbreaking.

The UFCW and, I believe, the Canadian Labour Congress are eager to do an equivalent Canadian study. I urge you, if you do get such a proposal, I think we as a country would greatly benefit from the expertise and data gathering that they could do on behalf of all of us.

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** Absolutely noted, thank you very much.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** Thank you, Chair.

**The Chair:** We're now going to Eva Nassif for the next seven minutes.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Eva Nassif (Vimy, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I also want to thank the minister and the officials from Status of Women Canada for joining us to answer all our questions.

My first question is for you, Ms. Akman. When you last appeared before this committee, we discussed the progress and the implementation of gender-based analysis plus, GBA+. Have there been any recent updates or specific advances you could tell us about?

[English]

**Ms. Justine Akman:** As my colleagues know, it's one of my favourite topics, because when we've appeared here in the last two and a half years, we've talked about this as being like trying to turn a big ship around. I was thinking about it this morning, and I think we're heading kind of southwest at the moment. I think that ship is turning. It has a lot to do with leadership, which does come from the Prime Minister himself, but as well, many members in the current cabinet are speaking very vocally about gender-based analysis.

A huge leap forward has been gender budgeting. Nobody can make people act and react like the Department of Finance can. As long and as hard as we've been trying at Status of Women Canada, just that exercise alone has really changed how Ottawa is functioning. We are working together to think about what results the government as a whole is going to achieve on gender equality, which links back to our gender-based analysis role. If we don't have everybody marching in the same direction, these are hard issues to move on. They're hard societal issues to change and very entrenched issues. So we need everybody marching in the same direction, and part of that GBA work is to work with other levels of government and civil society organizations so that we all have a common vision for gender equality.

In our day-to-day work back at the office, our phones are still ringing off the hook. I continually receive panicky emails at nights and on weekends, but this is a good thing. People are taking GBA seriously, and they want to get it right across all of government. Many of them are doing a much better job than they used to be up front. What we're seeing—and this is a bit “processy”, but it's very profound—is that GBAs used to be done as a side product, as an afterthought to the core policy or program initiative. We've been working with departments across the government to make sure that it actually has an impact on the recommendations and options that are being put forward both for policy development and, very importantly, for implementation. It's still a process. We're not all the way yet. I would like to say that we're trying to work ourselves out of a job. Maybe we need to rebrand GBA a little bit. This needs to be an instinctual process for policy-makers and program implementation across all governments. Without really solid gender-based analysis, you're actually not developing programs and policies that are responsive to gender equality and to the incredible diversity that characterizes Canada. That's our big-picture goal.

●(1235)

[Translation]

**Mrs. Eva Nassif:** Thank you.

I have another question Ms. Wilson may be able to answer.

Could you comment on Bill C-65, which is not related to your department but rather to Employment and Social Development Canada? It does also impact women and has many major repercussions. It dramatically affects their personal and professional lives.

Could you comment on the pervasiveness of sexual harassment in workplaces? If you know, could you tell us how this bill will change the landscape?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** Thank you for your question.

[English]

On November 7 the government introduced Bill C-65. We received a lot of very positive feedback on this bill because, from our perspective, all women in Canada have the right to a workplace free of harassment and sexual violence. Definitely as part of our own gender-based violence strategy, we are looking at issues like workplace harassment. That will be part of our more global approach to the gender-based violence strategy, including things like data collection and working with federal institutions like Treasury Board, the RCMP, and the Canadian Armed Forces, which are very large workplaces as well, and ensuring that those workplaces are free from harassment and discrimination.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Eva Nassif:** Thank you very much.

I will share my time with my colleague Ms. Damoff.

[English]

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you for remaining with us for the last part.

Ms. Akman, you talked a lot about the amount of work we are doing on gender-based analysis. When the minister was here, there were a lot of questions about what is being done with gender-based analysis. Was any of this being done prior to October 2015 when the government was elected?

**Ms. Justine Akman:** There was. Gender-based analysis has been a mandatory function for many, many years in the federal government in the development of policy and programs.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I know. We studied it.

**Ms. Justine Akman:** There was an action plan in place before. Status of Women did advise departments to develop action plans.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I think what we heard, though, when we did our study was that it was there but that even the Auditor General had called out a number of departments for not using it. Before, was there ever a budget that had a gender statement on it?

**Ms. Justine Akman:** This is the first time for Canada that there has been a GBA of a federal budget.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Okay. Are you aware if memorandums to cabinet have ever had gender analysis done on them before now?

**Ms. Justine Akman:** As I mentioned, doing a gender-based assessment has been a mandatory part of memoranda to cabinet for a long time, but there are variations on that theme in terms of how detailed it is.

● (1240)

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Yes, and where it's done in the process too. That is something we heard: whether it was done early in the process, before it came, or when it arrived.

Thank you. I think I have 10 seconds left, so that's good.

**The Chair:** You do, exactly. Thank you very much.

We're going to now move to our second round, with Rachael Harder for five minutes.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Thank you.

Are you able to confirm for me when the PCO guidance on GBA+ was implemented for all departments?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** I cannot personally, so unless any of my colleagues are aware of a date, we could certainly get back to you with that.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Was it your department that oversaw that implementation?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** The development of PCO guidance...

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Yes, did you work in partnership with them on that?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** We would not have overseen it, but we would have definitely partnered with them to develop that.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Okay, but you don't know when that was implemented?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** I don't have a date in front of me.

**Ms. Justine Akman:** As I mentioned, there's been some gender-based analysis done on policy proposals for some time. I don't have an exact date. I think we can easily get that for you. It's probably following Beijing and our commitments to gender-based analysis. In the last two and half years, PCO has issued new advice on gender-based analysis, a few times, including by working with us, and how to ensure that it's being done in a way that's meaningful.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Okay.

In using the authorities and expenditures by vote tool from the Treasury Board, I was looking at this document, and I notice that in 2015-16, you lapsed \$1.6 million. Of that, \$1.57 million came from the advancing equality for women program activity. In 2016-17, you lapsed an additional \$1.1 million, of which more than \$600,000 was lapsed under the strategic policy analysis planning and development program activity.

When you answered a member earlier, you said that you understand—I'm actually quoting you—"stretching every dollar", particularly when it comes to programs. The member was asking you why more money isn't being put into these programs, and you said that the department is already stretching every dollar, but the document I'm referring to tells us that there's actually money left in the pot that isn't even being used in order to advance these programs.

Can you clarify for me why this money is going unused?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** I can certainly clarify what I understand about lapses, and lapses at Status of Women Canada, and I can ask Anik to provide you more detail.

Certainly, there are always opportunities, and every department will always aim to spend all the money they have, invest all the money they have, or transfer money to other departments. Definitely, that is always the objective of a department, of a deputy minister, and of a CFO; however, there are times where there are lapses for reasons that are unforeseen. Certainly, these are lapses that would be, in my view, ones that would be clearly explainable in some of these estimates. Anik can give you more details.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Would it be a valid concern for me? When I look at the \$2.9 million that you're seeking authority to spend in the supplementary estimates that this committee has been given, I'm looking at \$1.7 million that has already lapsed and has gone unspent. Now you're asking for another \$2.9 million.

What kind of faith should this committee or the Canadian public place in your department with regard to spending that money properly and making sure that these programs are well taken care of?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** Perhaps I can ask Anik to finalize the response to the earlier question on the reason for that particular lapse, and parliamentarians can certainly have a comment on that.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** In the same vein, in the quarterly financial report, the department had spent only about 20% of its annual personnel budget in the second quarter, in June. In the first quarter, it spent only 19%.

At this rate, you would lapse \$3 million by the end of the year. Again, we have a lapse of \$3 million. Are you planning on ramping up hiring that dramatically over the next six months or are we looking at another significant lapse?

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** You confused me there with a potential lapse of \$3 million that I'm not aware of.

**The Chair:** I just want to respond to something. Rachael asked a question. I don't know if Anik had the opportunity to respond to the question.

**Ms. Gina Wilson:** Did you want the response, the details to that particular lapse?

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** That was a question that you would have needed to get back to me on. I didn't realize you had it today, so yes.

• (1245)

**Ms. Anik Lapointe (Chief Financial Officer and Director, Corporate Services, Office of the Co-ordinator, Status of Women):** For the quarterly financial report, we spent 50% of our funding for this fiscal year.

For the lapse of 2016-17, the \$1.1 million, there was \$150,000 that was lapsed in grants and contributions, and this funding was earmarked for the women entrepreneurs initiative. The minister had explained that it was because the initiative was not yet in place. That's the reason for that \$150,000.

Out of the balance, \$500,000 was carried forward for this year as part of the 5% that the departments are allowed to carry forward. This is money that is available to spend this year.

The rest is money that was frozen for the collective agreements, so it was a frozen amount that we weren't allowed to spend last year. So not spending it was something that was out of our control, but that was also to allow us to spend it this year when the collective agreement payment came through.

**The Chair:** I would like to thank all the panellists.

We are running out of time because we have to go into business, if you don't mind. I'd really like to thank you, Justine, Deputy Wilson, Anik, and Nancy for coming and giving us your expertise. We really do appreciate it.

We are going to move on to some business. There are some different issues that we need to bring forward.

We would like to vote on the supplementary estimates.

Pursuant to Standing Order 81(5), the committee will now dispose of the supplementary estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2018.

OFFICE OF THE CO-ORDINATOR, STATUS OF WOMEN

Vote 1b—Operating Expenditures.....\$2,997,343

(Vote 1b agreed to)

**The Chair:** We're going to continue on.

Tuesday was a bit crazy for us. We are working with both the clerk and the analysts to make sure we have the opportunity to see those panellists once again because it's very important. We recognize that there was only a short period of time—I believe nine minutes—during which we were able to receive answers, and of course we didn't get to the final panel at all. We are looking at that so we can move forward and make sure they're part of our study and part of our witnesses.

Moving forward, it has been brought to my attention by our clerk that, unfortunately, Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada has indicated they are not going to come for our study on indigenous women. This is going to be a bit of an issue, so I want to work with you on this. I'm putting on my hat to say that I think it's really important that we have them here at the table, but I want to hear how we as a committee would like to move forward on this to make a request from the committee for them to appear, because at this point, they have denied us.

I'm going to pass it to the clerk to provide a couple of options as to how we can proceed, and then we can decide how we will proceed with this.

Ms. Harder, do you have a question?

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** No, sorry, after the clerk speaks will be fine.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Marie-Hélène Sauv  ):** Just as a bit of a clarification, when I spoke with my contact at parliamentary affairs at Indigenous and Northern Affairs, they mentioned that it was their opinion that there were other departments that were in a better position to answer the committee's questions, so given that information, it would be up to the committee to see if we want to move forward, perhaps by way of a motion, to request that someone appear to answer questions.

Another option is that we could hear from a number of witnesses and then perhaps invite them again later in the study if there are still questions to be asked.

**The Chair:** Rachael.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** Are they recommending then which department would be better able to answer our questions?

**The Clerk:** I have asked the question and I'm waiting for an answer from them.

**The Chair:** Pam.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I'm wondering if it's clear. Sometimes you go to one person and it's not clear exactly what we're looking for, and therefore, it doesn't get to the right person. Is there any benefit in talking to them specifically about what we're looking for? Perhaps you've already done that.

**The Chair:** That's where I was hoping you would come in, Pam, and perhaps also speak to the minister on that, to show the importance of this.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** For sure, I will. I'm just wondering, because we need to have them here. In terms of when, I actually don't know when the best time is, and whether we should hear from some witnesses first and then hear from them, or whether it would make some sense for us to get a sense of what some of the issues might be and then bring them in to be able to formulate questions based on testimony. I'm open on that one.

I will give the chair and the committee my commitment to go back and speak to the department and the minister to try to encourage that. I'm just wondering what the committee thinks. Do we want to hear from some witnesses first?

• (1250)

**The Chair:** I'll move right back to you, Sheila.

One of the things, when we're looking at making up the panels, is the fact that a lot of times we have government departments and agencies. We've slated them in for particular times. I don't know if it would be an appropriate use of time to have just one group come forward. I think that's a big important part of our discussion.

Sheila.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** Thank you, Chair.

Which department of the two indigenous-related departments was asked? That's one question.

Insofar as moving forward goes, if all we've done is invited them, then I definitely want us to be on record as requesting that they attend. My understanding is that's ordinarily something that is honoured. I would hope they would see our terms of reference at the

time of the invitation so they know the scope of what we might be asking of them.

Absolutely, I'm happy to work with a time that works for those departmental officials. I agree that there is some merit in our hearing from people on the front lines and inside of the justice system before we hear from the departmental representatives, so I'm happy to be flexible, but absolutely we need them to be with us.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Rachael.

**Ms. Rachael Harder:** I would echo what Sheila just said.

Some of our recommendations from this report, I would imagine, are going to go forward to this department, so it would seem appropriate that they come here.

**The Chair:** Please go ahead

**The Clerk:** Just to answer a few questions, I have been in contact with mainly a parliamentary affairs person at Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada. Both the analyst and I have been in contact with them to explain to them the terms of reference of the study, so they are aware of what it is exactly that we're studying.

What they've been telling me is that they are having a hard time identifying a specific person within either branch of the department to appear before the committee.

**The Chair:** I understand that we do have a couple of options as well, and I think it's up to the committee how we would like to proceed. We can do a letter from the committee to say once again that we are requesting this, or there can also be a letter from the chair. It seems that we have consensus that we want them here, with the variable being at what point in the study.

How would we like to proceed?

Go ahead, Sean.

**Mr. Sean Fraser:** Correct me, Sheila, if I'm wrong. I think your suggestion was to say that if they're flexible and they could come later, we could hear from a couple of witnesses. That would give Pam time to make good on her undertaking to speak to the minister or the department and revisit this issue maybe over the next couple of meetings. I think everybody thinks we should get them here. If we can add a little ammunition to our request by hearing testimony and then saying that we heard X, Y, and Z, and we want the department's perspective, I think that would be a prudent approach.

**The Chair:** Awesome.

Pam.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I would just say that if you look strictly at the terms of reference of our study, we're talking about justice and corrections, and they don't administer justice and they don't administer corrections. Our study is broader than that, though, in terms of access to justice. Those are the kinds of things that certainly would.... I'll explain that to them, because we also want to make sure that we get the right person here. They're not administering justice or the corrections part of it, so that doesn't fall within their area; it's more the before and after. I can explain that to the minister and make sure they can bring someone here who will be helpful for what we're looking at.

**The Chair:** Great.

Sheila.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** So that we don't lose momentum or eat up more committee time on this, I'm going to propose that we give a little bit of time to proceed as Vice-Chair Damoff has suggested, but that we put a motion on the floor directing the chair to request, on the committee's behalf, that the department appear. I'm going to propose that we say by December 14. If we haven't had an answer in the affirmative, then the chair would go ahead and formalize our request.

With that, I move that the committee request that status of women committee Chair Vecchio write to—is it still Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada or do we name the two?

• (1255)

**The Clerk:** We can identify that. We probably should name the two just to be on the safe side.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** It's a request that Indigenous Affairs and Crown-Indigenous Relations appear before the committee to assist us with this study on indigenous women's access and experience in the justice and corrections system.

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

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Are we not supposed to be in camera for committee business?

**The Chair:** We can go in camera if we wish at this time, but there was—

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** We normally do that for committee business. I just looked up and saw that we were not.

**Ms. Sheila Malcolmson:** It's not committee business, period. It's very specified as to what items of committee business we go in camera for, and this is not one.

**The Chair:** Fair enough.

Okay, we have a motion on the floor. It's a votable motion, I assume.

Shall the motion carry to invite, following December 14, through the chair, the organizations to come?

(Motion agreed to) [See *Minutes of Proceedings*]

**The Chair:** Also, there's the budget. Now that we know who the witnesses are going to be with this study, we are now able to table the budget. Everybody should have received it. It was circulated.

We need to vote on the budget.

(Motion agreed to) [See *Minutes of Proceedings*]

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

I will just inform you that next Tuesday, on December 5, we will be having for the first hour, the Office of the Auditor General of Canada, followed in the second hour by the Department of Justice and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

At this time, we do not have Indigenous Affairs, but they were scheduled, so we'll see how we can move forward.

Thank you very much.

The meeting is adjourned.

---





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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

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

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

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

---

Also available on the House of Commons website at the  
following address: <http://www.ourcommons.ca>

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

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

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

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

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes  
à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.noscommunes.ca>