



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on the Status of Women

FEWO • NUMBER 060 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, March 10, 2011

—
Chair

The Honourable Hedy Fry

Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Thursday, March 10, 2011

• (1100)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon (Miramichi, CPC)): I call the meeting to order.

Welcome, everyone, on this nice March morning. It's a messy morning. I'm glad to see you all.

To begin with, we'll be looking at committee business. The first business is the motion from Anita Neville, and I will ask to resume debate.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC): Since Ms. Neville isn't here—

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Oh, just a minute.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Since Ms. Neville is absent, perhaps we could wait until her return to debate this. There is a motion we wanted to debate.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): The clerk says we can go ahead without her. She has someone here to represent her, so that person who's representing her will take her place.

[Translation]

Mrs. Lise Zarac (LaSalle—Émard, Lib.): I am the one who tabled the motion, Ms. Boucher.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I was surprised to see you.

A voice: Ah, ah!

Mrs. Lise Zarac: I tabled it at the last meeting.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): The motion for Anita Neville reads:

That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender audit of all federal funding of sport, including Sport Canada funding programs, funding of infrastructure projects by Infrastructure Canada, as well as contributions to international athletic competitions hosted in Canada, to ensure that funding is being distributed on an equitable basis;

That the conclusions of this audit be made publicly available and tabled in the House of Commons; and

That this motion be reported to the House.

Go ahead, Madame Zarac.

[Translation]

Mrs. Lise Zarac: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would just like to refresh members' memories about the motion. We had decided to change the wording. If you don't mind, I'd like to read the motion to you:

[English]

That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding...

[Translation]

Everything that follows stays the same in English. In French, the wording is: “*Que le Comité recommande que le gouvernement effectue une analyse comparative entre les sexes concernant le financement fédéral dans le domaine du sport [...]*” The rest of the paragraph stays the same.

In the second paragraph, it says: “That the conclusions of this analysis be made publicly available[...].” We had agreed to replace the word “audit” with the word “analysis” at the last meeting.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Could you repeat the motion, please?

Mrs. Lise Zarac: In French?

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Yes, please.

Mrs. Lise Zarac: The motion in French reads as follows:

Que le Comité recommande que le gouvernement effectue une analyse comparative entre les sexes concernant le financement fédéral dans le domaine du sport selon le sexe, y compris les programmes de financement de Sport Canada, le financement des projets d'infrastructure par Infrastructure Canada ainsi que les contributions aux compétitions sportives canadiennes et internationales tenues au Canada, pour garantir que le financement est distribué sur une base équitable;

Que les résultats de cette analyse soient rendus publics et soient déposés à la Chambre des communes;

Que cette motion fasse l'objet d'un rapport à la Chambre.

Madam Chair, I'd just like to add, since this is International Women's Week, that the Minister responsible for the Status of Women has encouraged young girls and women to participate more. It seems to me this would be a way of opening the door to them and setting an example, to ensure that this is the direction we want to move in.

• (1105)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Madame Boucher, were you next?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I missed part of it. It says: “That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding of sport, including Sport Canada funding programs [...]” I missed what came after that.

Please forgive me; I still think I'm in the Standing Committee on Official Languages. I'm a little confused.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Do you want to read that again?

[Translation]

Mrs. Lise Zarac: Without reading the entire motion again, perhaps I could explain what it's all about to Ms. Boucher, since she was not at the last meeting. We were told by government members that the data is already available, but hasn't been compiled yet. So, we're asking for an analysis of all that existing data.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I understand. It talks about Sport Canada.

Mrs. Lise Zarac: Yes.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: All right. But I missed what came afterwards. After “Sport Canada funding programs”, what does it say...?

Mrs. Lise Zarac: It's exactly the same thing. The rest of the wording stays the same, Ms. Boucher.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I see. All right. So, we're keeping the rest of the wording, which is “funding of infrastructure projects by Infrastructure Canada, as well as contributions to”, and everything after that.

I understand now.

[English]

Mr. Ray Boughen (Palliser, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm not sure what it is we're asking for that we can't already find. Most of this information is on the Internet right now; it's listed there. If we're talking about funding for women athletes or men athletes, it doesn't really matter, because unless there's been a change, the funding is put together on a performance base.

If a young person is an Olympic-level athlete, their funding is much more than it is for a person who is just starting out. We can argue one way or another as to whether that's good or bad, but that's currently the way it's done. Carded athletes are given more funding than athletes who are not carded. It has nothing to do with gender; it simply has to do with performance. If you're in the upper 10% of the performing athletes, you get more dollars than if you're not.

I'm sure those figures are available from the minister of sport and athletics. They've been compiled for the recently completed Olympics, and they should be fairly current.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Thank you.

Is there any further comment?

Mrs. Nina Grewal (Fleetwood—Port Kells, CPC): Mr. Boughen said the information about Sport Canada funding is already on the Internet. It's available and it's public, so even I'm wondering what this motion is all about.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Go ahead, Ms. Simson.

Mrs. Michelle Simson (Scarborough Southwest, Lib.): Well, it isn't specific programs or athletes who get it. If you read the motion, it's a recommendation from this committee that the government conduct a gender-based analysis.

I don't think the website says everything compiled here has gone through a gender-based analysis. That's the whole point of the motion: to recommend that this be done on a go-forward basis.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Go ahead, Ms. Boucher.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Last week, I wanted to propose an amendment to have it read:

That the Committee recommend [...] a gender-based analysis [...] and that the committee invite departmental representatives and the Minister of State (Sport) to discuss funding programs and contributions to Canadian and international athletic competitions [...]

The idea is to have the minister provide a thorough explanation of how gender-based analysis works in his department.

The minister is willing to come and meet with us. I know that he would be very pleased to provide information to committee members about what Sport Canada is doing and what is being done by his own office in that regard. We often ask to meet with ministers. I think this is important and it would be an opportunity for us to hear his explanation.

I would like that to be considered and that is the amendment I am proposing.

● (1110)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Ms. Simson has a comment.

Mrs. Michelle Simson: With all due respect, it's not that I'm in favour of turning down a minister from visiting—we've had difficulties getting him to appear—but hearing what he's doing isn't the point. It's a recommendation for the government to conduct gender-based analysis. He could even write to us to say it is being done or it isn't being done. We don't necessarily want to take up the minister's time on this motion. That's the way I see it. I don't know how the rest of my colleagues see it.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Again, with all due respect, for once that a minister is agreeing to come and share his vision with us, I think we should take the opportunity to meet with him.

We are all aware of the fact that Status of Women Canada has carried out this kind of gender-based analysis. We know that certain departments have not done this kind of analysis; but now there is a minister who is prepared to come and talk to us about what his department is doing for women. I think it would be important for us to be aware of that, particularly if we want our young women to be more involved in sport and become better integrated into society.

So, I think it would be very worthwhile to meet with the minister and a representative of Sport Canada. We have never invited them to appear before this committee.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Go ahead, Madam Demers.

[*Translation*]

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

I would like my colleague to tell us whether the amendment she is proposing would be part of Ms. Neville's motion. In other words, in addition to the request that she has made, we would also be inviting the minister to appear before the committee to explain how his department is distributing funding on an equitable basis.

I think it's always a good idea to ask a minister to come and talk to us. Would my colleague agree to our also asking the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities to do the same?

We're talking about two different things. This refers to sport, but it also talks about Infrastructure Canada. Would everyone agree to our asking officials from Infrastructure Canada to come and explain how that works?

As far as I'm concerned, our colleague's idea is an excellent one.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I'm talking about Sport Canada. As far as Infrastructure Canada is concerned, I don't really understand the point. I discussed this briefly with Ms. Neville, but she didn't have time to fully explain it to me. In terms of that part of the motion where it says "funding of infrastructure projects by Infrastructure Canada", I would like Ms. Neville to explain to us what she is looking for there.

When they build new arenas, for example, as far as I know, they have washrooms for girls. When they build roads, the assumption is that women will be driving their cars on those roads. I certainly hope roads are not being built just for men.

It's all very well to aim for gender equality in all things, but when I go on the road, I don't start asking myself whether the road was built for men or women. When you build Olympic infrastructure, you're thinking about everyone. There are washrooms for women, for children.

Ms. Neville didn't have time to explain exactly what she meant with her reference to Infrastructure Canada.

If we're talking about gender-based analysis of highway construction—I don't even know whether such a thing exists—well, as a woman, I'm not sure I'm really interested in it. The fact is that the road belongs to everyone.

That is what I was asking Ms. Neville. That's why I wanted us to come back to this when she was here, so that she could explain what she meant with her reference to infrastructure projects by Infrastructure Canada, and exactly what she was aiming for there.

•(1115)

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Go ahead, Ms. Simson.

Mrs. Michelle Simson: There are two separate issues with respect to having the minister on this particular motion. First, I think we have a full calendar in terms of the types of things that we're going to get into. There are various studies that we want to get into. I don't necessarily see it as a priority.

The entire issue with respect to Ms. Neville's motion is to ensure and recommend that gender-based analysis is being done. The reality is that in the 2009 spring report for the Auditor General of Canada, she concluded that:

As stated earlier, there is no government-wide policy requiring that GBA be performed.

That's in the Auditor General's report of 2009.

It flies in the face of the federal government's key policy document concerning gender equality. The title was "Setting the Stage for the Next Century: The Federal Plan for Gender Equality". It was introduced before the Beijing conference in 1995.

Personally, as much as I'd like to hear about what the minister for Sport Canada is doing, it isn't the issue. It's gender-based analysis that's key here. I don't know why we would waste the minister's time. It's a simple answer: we are either doing it or we're not doing it, or we're going to look at the recommendation or we're not going to look at the recommendation. It's that simple.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nicole Demers: When you talk about developing infrastructure, you're not necessarily talking about washrooms in arenas. When you're talking about infrastructure development, you're talking about the impact that infrastructure has on the population as a whole.

In this case in particular, I think the idea was to see to what extent women are involved in developing infrastructure in terms of the construction itself, their participation in infrastructure work, the opportunity for women to get involved in non-traditional work and to be represented within the different construction trades that are involved in infrastructure construction.

I think that's what it really refers to. I'm not sure whether that's the case, but it seems to me it's something along those lines.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Ms. Mathysen is next.

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

I would like to say that I think that this is an important motion inasmuch as we do need to know what the level of gender-based analysis is in regard to these programs.

In terms of having the minister, I don't understand why it would be difficult to have both. Ministers are rare in terms of their appearance here, so perhaps it could be later in the spring, but before that I'd like to see the data, the information, so that I can ask good questions once the minister gets here. I don't like operating in a vacuum. I would certainly support this motion.

Second, I think that Madame Demers makes an excellent point. When we talked about infrastructure in connection with non-traditional jobs, we heard that less than 8% of the benefits in terms of jobs went to women. That is a very salient point. Infrastructure was there not just to improve communities, which of course is a very good thing, but to stimulate the economy and create those jobs. Women were excluded, and we need to take a very serious look at that.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: In that case, we should be looking at two separate motions. The first one could deal with Sport Canada, reflecting the points you raised.

However, the kind of infrastructure you refer to is not really an area where gender-based analysis applies. The fact is that when you build infrastructure, the work is on a contract basis. When you hire people, it's on a contract basis.

We have looked at non-traditional occupations. We could look at another motion dealing with infrastructure, with a view to finding out how female workers are hired when projects start up, and how they go about including women workers in their plans. Do you understand what I mean? That could be the subject of another motion.

In this motion, it talks about sport and infrastructure. If I understand you correctly, you're not talking only about sport infrastructure; you're talking about all infrastructure. Is that correct? Is anyone listening to me?

A second motion could be drafted dealing with Infrastructure Canada, as a means of finding out more about how Infrastructure Canada ensures that contracts provide opportunities for women to access non-traditional trades and occupations. Perhaps we could study that.

This time, we could hear from officials from Sport Canada along with the minister. The minister will not be wasting his time. He is prepared to come and meet with us and has already accepted the invitation to appear and explain how things work in his department.

With respect to Infrastructure Canada, Ms. Demers' comments clarified things for me. I think it would be important to find out how Infrastructure Canada includes women and facilitates their access to contracts. Infrastructure Canada provides funding for infrastructure, but from that point on, it is not the government doing the work; rather, it's individuals who do it. What is being done to ensure, in partnership with contractors, that women have a definite place in the construction industry?

•(1120)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Madame Boucher, you have a motion or an amendment there. What you just finished would be another amendment, or should we deal with the first amendment you put forth, and where would you want it to go?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I would like to move an amendment to have the motion read as follows:

"[...] and that the Committee invite departmental representatives and the Minister of State (Sport) to discuss funding programs, as well as contributions to Canadian and international athletic competitions [...]"

We can keep the word "analysis"; he will explain that to us. In addition to that, we should be asking what Infrastructure Canada is doing to include women in its contracting. Do you follow me?

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Thank you.

Whereabouts in the motion...? We missed where you wanted to put it. I'm trying to follow it in English.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I'm also trying to read it: That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding of sport [...] and that the committee invite departmental representatives and the Minister of State (Sport) to discuss funding programs, as well as contributions to Canadian and international athletic competitions [...]

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Funding programs—is that where it goes? It would read,

That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding of sports, and that it invite officials and ministers to discuss Sport Canada funding programs.

Is that it?

•(1125)

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Excuse me.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Can you repeat it, please?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I'll start all over again: That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding of sport, including Sport Canada funding programs, and that the Committee invite departmental representatives and the Minister of State (Sport) to discuss funding programs, as well as contributions to Canadian and international athletic competitions [...]

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): That's what you want to put?

Mrs. Michelle Simson: Madam Chair, that's an entirely different motion.

I would suggest that we deal with the motion at hand. If my colleague wants to propose that we extend an invitation to discuss with the minister of sport, that's an entirely different issue. I don't think we have to have the fact that this committee would like to extend an invitation to a minister inserted into a motion, and it does change it to the degree that I would argue it's not an amendment in any event.

It sounds to me as though Ms. Boucher has already extended the invitation or had a discussion, because she did say he was willing to appear, which is an entirely different issue. There's nothing wrong with that, but I don't believe that every time we invite a minister, we do a motion.

I'm proposing that what Ms. Neville suggested, together with the changes, is the intent. That's my feeling.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Let's ask Madame Demers, and then we'll come back to you, Ms. Simson.

Go ahead, Madame Demers.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nicole Demers: Madam Chair, things are getting rather confusing. The intent of the motion is what has to take precedence. The purpose of this motion is what we should be focusing on in our discussions. The way Ms. Boucher has re-written the motion changes its intent, as well as the actual content of the motion. So, we are no longer dealing with the same motion.

By inserting in there the idea of inviting the minister, she is changing the content of the motion. If she wants to invite the minister, she can add that at the end of the motion. That way, she would not be changing the content. We would simply be adding that the minister is to come and respond to the concerns of the committee that are raised in the motion. However, if we include the invitation in the body of the text, we will actually be changing the content and scope of the motion.

So, I can't vote on a motion where the actual content has been changed.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I would like to make a correction.

I mentioned the invitation there because I wanted infrastructure to be separate. I don't understand why there is a reference to infrastructure projects. And I am not the only one. It seems to me we are mixing apples and oranges. We're talking about sport, about infrastructure, and yet we don't know what the idea is behind the reference to infrastructure projects because we have not been given an explanation.

That's why I inserted the reference to inviting the minister there. I would have liked Ms. Neville to be here, because we need to know what she means when she says "funding of infrastructure projects by Infrastructure Canada". It's all very well to ask for gender-based analysis, but for what reason? For the trades, for the building? Why? That is what is missing here.

When we did our study on non-traditional occupations, a lot of women came before the committee saying that things were fine in the construction industry.

The reason I added that is that, as far as I'm concerned, infrastructure has nothing to do with sport. I don't know in what connection we would be discussing infrastructure. If we're talking about gender-based analysis, would it be in relation to trade, to buildings, to programs?

We're mixing apples and oranges. The motion talks about "[...] funding of infrastructure projects by Infrastructure Canada, as well as contributions [...]" So, as far as I'm concerned, either we amend Ms. Neville's motion, or we do things differently. I have to know what she's seeking to achieve with the reference to Infrastructure Canada.

I talked to Gary Lunn to see whether he would be willing to come and explain how that works in his department. This is not about

wasting his time; he is prepared to come and meet with us. We have always moved motions to invite ministers, at least in this committee.

• (1130)

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Go ahead, Madame Demers.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nicole Demers: Madam Chair, I would like to propose a friendly amendment to the motion tabled by my colleague, Ms. Neville, so that Ms. Boucher can wrap her brain around the motion.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Are you suggesting there is something wrong with my brain?

Ms. Nicole Demers: No.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: You'd better not. Ah, ah!

Ms. Nicole Demers: On the contrary, I want to be sure she uses it effectively.

I would like to move an amendment, as follows: "[...] funding of sport infrastructure projects by Infrastructure Canada [...]" That way, it would be clear that we're talking about sport infrastructure.

Since the motion deals specifically with sport, Ms. Boucher would then know that we are talking only about sport infrastructure, and not about highways or the Bell Centre in Montreal.

I don't know whether my colleague is prepared to accept that friendly amendment.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Madame Boucher, you'd have to withdraw that amendment before we could have another amendment from Madame Demers.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I just want to be sure I understand. When you talk about sport infrastructure, are you talking about buildings, trades or analysis?

Ms. Nicole Demers: I'm talking about building construction. So, for the construction of the building...

Pardon me, Madam Chair.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: No. Please explain.

Ms. Nicole Demers: Sorry, Madam Chair; I didn't mean to carry on a two-way conversation.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Please excuse us. I simply asked Ms. Demers a question with a view to getting a full explanation.

In terms of construction, it's important to realize that the government provides the funding, but companies are responsible for the actual construction. It's important to be aware of that. That's why I have a problem with this.

Mrs. Lise Zarac: I can support Ms. Demers' amendment because it would actually make the motion clearer. I don't understand why it's all so complicated. We were told several times by departmental officials that gender-based analysis is carried out systematically and that the data already exists.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: That's what I was saying.

Mrs. Lise Zarac: Ms. Boucher, I would also be prepared to accept the amendment you have moved. If you don't mind, I'd like to read the motion with the inclusion of Ms. Demers' amendment:

That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding of sport, including Sport Canada funding programs, funding of sport infrastructure projects by Infrastructure Canada, as well as contributions to Canadian and international athletic competitions hosted in Canada, to ensure that funding is being distributed on an equitable basis;

That the conclusions of this analysis be made publicly available and tabled in the House of Commons;

That the Committee invite the ministers responsible for these departments; and
That this motion be reported to the House.

• (1135)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Just a minute, now; we have too many amendments on the floor. This is not in order until we deal with Madame Boucher's amendment.

Go ahead, Madame Boucher.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I'm thinking. Could you read the whole motion again, please?

Mrs. Lise Zarac: Perhaps I could explain it to you.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: No, please read it. I want to hear the exact wording.

Mrs. Lise Zarac: I will read it more slowly:

That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding of sport, including Sport Canada funding programs, funding of sport infrastructure projects by Infrastructure Canada, as well as contributions to Canadian and international athletic competitions hosted in Canada, to ensure that funding is being distributed on an equitable basis;

That the conclusions of this analysis be made publicly available and tabled in the House of Commons;

That the Committee invite the ministers responsible for these departments; and
That this motion be reported to the House.

That includes the amendments proposed by both Ms. Demers and Ms. Boucher.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: You did say “the ministers”? I'm completely lost now: I wrote “official languages”.

Mrs. Lise Zarac: Can we speak to the motion, Madam Chair?

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Just a moment. I have another question.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): First of all, that is not in order. Second, someone else has to make the motion, because you moved the original motion.

What's your comment there, Madame Boucher?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I apologize; I'm not always like this. I'm just trying to understand.

Mrs. Lise Zarac: It just clarifies what the other one was saying.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Do you want us to vote on your amendment, do you want to withdraw it, or do you just want to...?

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I'd like a vote on my amendment. I will lose, but I'd like a vote on my amendment first.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Okay. You mean before we go on to the next one.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Yes, please.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Okay.

Could you read it again, please?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Oh, really? All right; here it is:

That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender audit of all [...]

• (1140)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Are we saying “audit”? When we did it this morning, we said “analysis”.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: No, you're right; it is “gender-based analysis”, and not “audit”: That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding of sport, including Sport Canada funding programs, and that the Committee invite officials from the Department and the Minister of State (Sport) to discuss funding programs, as well as contributions to Canadian and international athletic competitions [...]

That was my amendment, and I would like it to be put to a vote.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): I'll read it out in English:

That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding of sport, including Sport Canada funding programs, and that the Committee invite representatives and ministers of sport to appear before the committee...

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: That is not what I said.

A voice: Do you have a copy of it?

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I only have this copy. I will write it out.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Let me try it again:

That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding of sport, including Sport Canada funding programs, and that the Committee invite the representatives and minister of sport to discuss funding projects, as well as contributions to international athletic competitions hosted in Canada, to ensure that funding is being distributed on an equitable basis, that the conclusion—

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: It's "contributions"; not "competitions".

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): You're saying, "contributions".

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: It's "contributions", but she said "competitions".

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): What did I say?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: It's "contributions". The translation was wrong. I'm sorry.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): It should read, "as well as contributions to international athletic competitions..."—that's where I had the word "competitions".

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: It's "contributions to competitions". That's right.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Yes, that's what I said. It reads:...as well as contributions to international athletic competitions hosted in Canada, to ensure that funding is being distributed on an equitable basis;

That the conclusion of this gender-based analysis be made publicly available and tabled in the House of Commons; and

That this motion be reported to the House.

We have two more speakers on this.

Ms. Dona Cadman (Surrey North, CPC): I'm fine.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Okay.

Do you have something else to say, Mrs. Demers?

I'm going to try to read it straight through one more time. This is the motion—

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: That's fine.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding of sport, including Sport Canada funding programs, and that the Committee invite representatives and the Minister of Sport to discuss funding projects as well as contributions to international athletic competitions hosted in Canada, to ensure that funding is being distributed on an equitable basis;

That the conclusions of this gender-based analysis be made publicly available and tabled in the House of Commons; and

That this motion be reported to the House.

Madam Boucher, you heard the motion. Is that what you want to vote on?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: That's right.

•(1145)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Okay. We've heard the motion.

(Motion negated)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): We're still on debate for the motion from Anita Neville. We're resuming debate.

Mrs. Michelle Simson: I'd like to put forward an amendment to the original one submitted by Anita, which would cover off Ms. Boucher's concerns with respect to the invitation to the ministers.

How I'd like this to read is:

That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding of sport, including Sport Canada funding programs, funding of sport infrastructure projects by Infrastructure Canada, as well as contributions to international athletic competitions hosted in Canada, to ensure that funding is being distributed on an equitable basis;

That the conclusions of this gender-based analysis be made publicly available and tabled in the House of Commons; and

That the relative ministers be invited to appear before this Committee.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Starting from the top, I'll make sure everybody knows what we're voting on.

Ms. Simson has moved:

That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all federal funding of sport, including Sport Canada funding programs, funding of sport infrastructure projects by Infrastructure Canada, as well as contributions to international athletic competitions hosted in Canada to ensure that funding is being distributed on an equitable basis;

That the conclusions of this gender-based analysis be made publicly available and tabled in the House of Commons; and

That the relative ministers be invited to appear before the Committee.

Is that what you want said?

•(1150)

Mrs. Michelle Simson: We have to add, "And have this motion reported to the House". Yes.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Oh, yes, I'm sorry.

Is there any debate?

There being no debate, I'll call for the motion. I'll read it once more and say it's moved, then, by Michelle Simson.

[Translation]

Ms. Nicole Demers: Keep up the suspense, Madam Chair.

Voices: Ah, ah!

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): I'll just keep going on.

You all understand it. You have it in your mind. You know what I said and you know what the motion includes.

I'll call for the motion. All those in favour?

Oh, my God, it's unanimous. All that arguing, and in the end we're all unanimous. That's wonderful.

(Amendment agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Now we go to the main motion as amended.

(Motion as amended agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Wonderful. That's done.

So now we go down to the notice of motion from Anita Neville.
[Translation]

Ms. Nicole Demers: Madam Chair, before we consider another motion, we do have to study the report on violence against aboriginal women. We took the trouble of asking the analyst to draft it quickly because we wanted to look at it before leaving on break week. She has done that work.

So, I would like the time for debating any motions to be limited. We spent two days on a single motion, only to end up agreeing unanimously. Are we now going to spend two more days on the other two motions? That's ridiculous, Madam Chair.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: It was two days per motion.

Ms. Nicole Demers: I would like you to limit debate on the motion, along the lines of three in favour and three against. These are simple motions.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): No, I cannot. I cannot limit the debate, but if there's a motion, then....

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I have a suggestion to make. It's very personal. I hope you won't be upset with me. I would really like to discuss Ms. Demers' motion before we deal with Ms. Neville's, for the simple reason that in the motion from Ms. Demers I have in front of me, it proposes that the committee ask every federal minister to inform it, before Monday, April 4, 2011, of the status of implementation of the gender-responsive analysis in his or her department.

I like that wording better because it would be easier, since all the ministers are being asked to do that, not just the Ministers of Justice and Public Safety. So, if everyone agrees, perhaps we could deal with Ms. Demers' motion first.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Okay. That makes sense.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Also, Ms. Neville is not here to introduce her motion.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Okay, it's seconded. It's a motion.

All those in favour of Ms. Boucher's motion....

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I'm voting in favour of dealing with Ms. Demers' motion first. That is my motion.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Are you in favour? I'm looking for all those in favour of Ms. Demers' motion coming first, before Ms. Neville's.

(Motion agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): I'll move on, then, to Ms. Demers' motion. It reads:

That the Committee ask every federal Minister to inform it, before Monday, April 4, 2011, of the status of implementation of the gender-responsive analysis in his or her department.

Is there any debate?

• (1155)

[Translation]

Ms. Nicole Demers: Could I explain my rationale, Madam Chair?

Madam Chair, we heard from officials from several different departments, who did not seem to be aware of what is going on in their respective departments with respect to the gender-based analysis that is now being done, or is supposed to be done.

Of course, departmental officials cannot be aware of everything. However, we also heard from official from Status of Women Canada, who told us that they help departments to take ownership of gender-based analysis, so that they can make it a normal part of their everyday way of working when they develop new programs, initiatives or legislation.

It would be interesting to see how far along that process is, whether it's working well, whether the people who are supposed to be in charge of that have all the necessary tools, whether those tools are being used appropriately—that's probably the case—and whether there have been other meetings like the one that took place in February. It was a year when all departmental officials met to debate gender-based analysis and the status of that analysis in their respective departments.

I think that would be a good thing to do, before the Auditor General comes and tells us that it hasn't been done. We may want to ensure that this has started to be implemented in the different departments.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Go ahead, Madame Zarac.

[Translation]

Mrs. Lise Zarac: I simply have a question for Ms. Demers. I'd like to know whether she really wants to use the expression "*analyse sexospécifique*" or whether she would agree to saying "*analyse comparative entre les sexes*". I believe the government always uses the latter expression. In French, the expression is "*analyse comparative entre les sexes*", or ACS, as opposed to "*analyse sexospécifique*". In English, it's "gender-based analysis", or GBA, as opposed to "gender-responsive analysis".

Ms. Nicole Demers: It's a question of semantics, as Mr. Cannon would say.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Is there any further debate?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Could you repeat that, please?

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): I will read it.

That the Committee ask every federal Minister to inform it before Monday, April 4, 2011 of the status of implementation of the gender-based analysis in his or her department.

The only word that is changing is “gender-based”.

(Amendment agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Now we will go for a motion to pass the motion.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: What is the motion? What did we just vote on?

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): You just voted on the amendment.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: I had another amendment. I raised my hand. We just voted on Ms. Demers' amendment, but I had raised my hand previously to propose another amendment.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): I think I need a motion.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: When Ms. Suzanne Clément came, she suggested passing a motion that would say: “That the Committee ask Status of Women Canada to inform it, before Monday, April 4, 2011, of the status of implementation of gender-based analysis [...]”

Ms. Nicole Demers: It was supposed to be addressed to the minister and to Ms. Clément.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: She told us that Status of Women Canada provides assistance to departments. In fact, she has the tools to provide that assistance.

So, it really should say: “That the Committee ask Status of Women Canada to inform it, before Monday, April 4, 2011, of the status of implementation of the gender-based analysis [...]”

• (1200)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): So where it says every federal minister, it already includes the Status of Women.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Status of Women Canada is not a department. There is a minister responsible for the Status of Women, but Status of Women Canada is another entity.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): No, but she's a minister.

It's already included in the motion, because the safety minister will inform all the other departments and other....

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: It would be preferable to say: “That the Committee ask Status of Women Canada to inform it [...]”. If we say that it's Status of Women Canada, everything is included; she will have all the analysis.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): On your note, what I'm hearing is that Status of Women is part of the heritage department, so it will automatically respond to our request.

Go ahead, Madame Demers.

[Translation]

Ms. Nicole Demers: Madam Chair, I believe Ms. Boucher is misinterpreting the role of Status of Women Canada, which is not to implement gender-based analysis in the departments; rather, it is to provide the tools with which to carry out that analysis. Status of Women Canada does not even provide the staff to implement it. Indeed, the different departments appoint champions or individuals who are well acquainted with this type of analysis to do that work.

So, Status of Women Canada provides the tools and leaves it up to the different departments to use them as they see fit, or as best they can. That's why we are asking the departments and the ministers to come and explain how far along they are in the implementation process. It is possible that some departments are doing this systematically, as is the case for CIDA. We also know that it is part of their usual way of working at the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs.

However, some departments are struggling a little more with this. How can we help them improve implementation of gender-based analysis? We can have a look at the obstacles that are preventing them from moving forward. That's the only reason.

I think that once we have heard from the various ministers, we could meet with officials from Status of Women Canada and make them aware of the specific obstacles the departments are encountering as they attempt to implement gender-based analysis.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Is there further debate?

Go ahead.

Mr. Ray Boughen: Madam Chair, I have a question. How do we define this? Is it a number count? How's our definition around the...?

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): For how many departments, you mean?

Mr. Ray Boughen: Well, for individual ridings. If we're talking about ridings, is it the implementation of more women in the workforce? What's the definition of what it is we're doing?

[Translation]

Ms. Nicole Demers: That isn't relevant, Mr. Boughen.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Go ahead, Madame Demers.

[Translation]

Ms. Nicole Demers: That's a good question, Mr. Boughen, but at this stage, it isn't relevant, because we are not interested in knowing what the status is in your riding, although we would like to know who is going to win the election. We want to know what is being done to implement gender-based analysis in the different departments—for example, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada. We want to know how far along they are in the implementation process.

• (1205)

[English]

Mr. Ray Boughen: What's GBA? How do you define that?

[Translation]

Ms. Nicole Demers: Status of Women Canada has identified certain factors to try and determine what the impacts of a specific measure or initiative are on men, women, children and the population as a whole. Using that analysis by Status of Women Canada, tools have been developed that the departments are to use when they are designing certain measures, programs or legislation. They have to look at whatever they're planning through that lens—in other words, the future impacts on the population as a whole, and not just one segment of the population. That is what gender-based analysis involves, Mr. Boughen.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Go ahead, Madame Zarac.

Mrs. Lise Zarac: Just to maybe answer your question, if you go on the Status of Women Canada website, you will find the definition of GBA. It is very defined on the website.

Mr. Ray Boughen: Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Is there further debate?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): It's unanimous.

Madame Zarac, do you want to go on to the next one?

Mrs. Lise Zarac: Yes, please. I hope it will go more quickly than the first one. I'll read it first and explain it after, because I understand that you have a good report that we need to go through.

The motion is as follows:

That the Committee recommend that the government conduct a gender-based analysis of all legislation introduced by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Public Safety before it is introduced to Parliament, and that this analysis be tabled in the House of Commons after each bill is adopted at first reading; and that this motion be reported to the House.

The reason I'm putting this motion forward, Madam Chair, is that we've seen through Bill C-59—and this was strongly reported by the Elizabeth Fry Society—that it had a big impact on women, and not

only on women, but on women who had financial difficulties, women who were *autochtone*.

[Translation]

Here we are talking about women in very difficult circumstances.

For all those reasons, I think it's important, when we are asked to vote on motions and bills, that we be aware of their impact on women. That is the reason why we are tabling this motion today.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Thank you.

Go ahead, Madame Boucher.

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: To be perfectly frank, I'm not sure whether I want to vote for or against. I just voted in favour of Ms. Demers' motion which includes all the ministers. That's why I wanted all the ministers to be included. We just passed a motion that includes all the ministers. I don't see why we're necessarily talking about these ministers.

Mrs. Lise Zarac: As I explained earlier, Madam Chair, the important thing is that we be made aware of the impact. This deals with motions and bills that are tabled. It specifically refers to motions and legislation, the idea being to have an understanding of the impact of these motions and this legislation on women. This will provide us with important information about the decisions we have to make.

• (1210)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Is there further debate?

[Translation]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Well, quite frankly, I just voted in favour of Ms. Demers' motion, which includes all the ministers. Based on Ms. Demers' motion, we will be able to invite them, and they will be there as well. We will have an opportunity to put the question to them. With all the analysis, we'll have a chance to see what's being done in terms of implementation. I see no reason to vote in favour of this. We will be able to look at this with all the other ministers. We have asked all the ministers to provide that information to us. I see no reason to vote in favour of something like this, when we have just asked all the ministers to do that.

Mrs. Lise Zarac: They are two different things.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Do you want to explain again, Madame?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lise Zarac: I will try to be more specific. This only deals with motions and legislation. It's completely different from all the reports that ministers are required to make. This is specifically addressed to the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Public Safety, because this can have a very significant impact on the decisions they have to make. It's completely different from what every department has a responsibility to provide. In addition to that, we are asking that, when a bill or motion is under consideration, that a study be done to determine the impact. It's more specific than the last one. It's not the same thing; it does not deal with the reports that departments are required to make. Here we're asking that a specific analysis be done with respect to any motion or bill brought forward by these ministers.

I'm not sure whether that helps you, Ms. Boucher.

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Yes, to a certain extent.

Can I go and get something to eat before making my comments? I will make them afterwards.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Go ahead, Madame Demers.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Nicole Demers: Thank you, Madam Chair.

It's important to remember that, two weeks ago, when officials from the Departments of Justice and Public Safety appeared the committee, they explained that they were not able to provide us with answers about some bills that were brought forward, particularly with respect to incarcerated aboriginal women. We noted that aboriginal women represent 70% of the female prison population, even though they only constitute a small proportion of the total population. So, there are a lot of aboriginal women in prison.

At that point, Ms. Neville must have been thinking that if the minister were to carry out a prior analysis, before actually proposing a bill, a motion or a measure dealing with justice or public safety, it would be an opportunity to assess the impact of these measures on aboriginal women, children and men.

If the work were done upstream, rather than downstream, we would see better bills come forward. In fact, we would be in a position to know what kind of impacts these bills would have. We would be in a better position to vote on them as well, because we would be aware of those impacts.

Too often, we may think of one thing without seeing all the rest. We don't see it, because there are too many things happening at the same time. When we consider a bill that may seem appropriate, we need to know what impact it will have on aboriginal communities, on women and on children. We have to know what the outcome will be, and whether that is the outcome that we seeking. Otherwise, the outcome may be completely different and come as a surprise to us. Then we will be thinking that this is not what we were hoping to do with the bill, nor is it the outcome we were seeking.

That's why I think asking the minister to conduct an analysis prior to bringing forward a motion or bill is a good idea. I believe that must have been Ms. Neville's intention when she tabled her motion.

● (1215)

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Thank you, Ms. Demers.

Go ahead, Madame Boucher.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: In any case, I will be voting against the motion.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): Is there any further debate on the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon): That's that, and then we're going down to the report. We have to suspend for a moment or so because we have to go in camera now.

[*Proceedings continue in camera*]

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

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

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

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

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

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