



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

PACP • NUMBER 009 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, April 19, 2016

—
Chair

The Honourable Kevin Sorenson

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Tuesday, April 19, 2016

• (0845)

[Translation]

The Chair (Hon. Kevin Sorenson): I now call the meeting to order, dear colleagues. Good morning.

[English]

This is meeting number nine of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, Tuesday, April 19, 2016.

I remind everyone that we are televised today, so we should take our cellphones and put them on silent mode or shut them off.

Today we are continuing our consideration of the fall 2015 reports of the Auditor General of Canada. We are studying “Report 1—Implementing Gender-Based Analysis”.

We have two groups of witnesses, a full house today. The first group will have up to seven minutes to provide us with opening statements and answer the questions from the members of Parliament on our committee.

The second group of witnesses are also here. They're sitting in some of the chairs just in behind our witnesses, and they're also available to answer questions should you have any.

I'll take a moment to introduce all of our witnesses. From the Office of the Auditor General of Canada, we have Richard Domingue; from the Privy Council Office, we have Les Linklater, deputy secretary to the cabinet, operations; from the Treasury Board Secretariat, we have Renée LaFontaine, assistant secretary, corporate services and chief financial officer from the amended section; and from Status of Women Canada, we have Meena Ballantyne, head of the agency.

The witnesses available for questioning are the following: Department of Industry, Mitch Davies, assistant deputy minister, strategic policy sector; Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Nicole Kennedy, director general, strategic policy, cabinet and parliamentary affairs; Department of Employment and Social Development, Jacques Paquette, senior assistant deputy minister, strategic and service policy branch; and from the Department of Natural Resources, Neil Bouwer, assistant deputy minister, science and policy integration.

I welcome you all here this morning. Most of you, maybe, have already appeared before committee.

We'll begin with the Office of the Auditor General.

Richard Domingue from the Office of the Auditor General, please begin.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Domingue (Principal, Office of the Auditor General of Canada): Mr. Chair, thank you for this opportunity to discuss our 2015 Fall Report on gender-based analysis.

Gender-based analysis (GBA) is an analytical tool for assessing the gender-specific impacts of policies, legislation, and programs on women and men. This tool is intended to help policy makers consider gender issues and support decision-making. Implementing gender-based analysis can help integrate social, economic, and gender differences into policy development.

At a United Nations conference in 1995, the Government of Canada committed to analyzing gender-specific policy impacts on women and men before making decisions. Our audit focused on the implementation of GBA, an area we first examined in 2009. Our 2015 audit included Status of Women Canada, the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, the Privy Council Office, and four departments. At the time, they were known as Employment and Social Development Canada, Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, Industry Canada, and Natural Resources Canada. In our audit, we selected and examined a total of 16 recent policy initiatives from the four departments.

In our audit, we observed that gender-based analysis was still not fully deployed across the federal government, although 20 years had passed since the government had committed to applying this type of analysis to its policy decisions. In other words, gender considerations, including obstacles to the full participation of diverse groups of women and men, are not always considered in government decisions. This finding is similar to what we found in our 2009 audit.

We also found in our 2015 audit that a gender-based analysis framework was not implemented in 6 of the 25 departments and agencies that had committed to implementing the 2009 government-wide departmental action plan on GBA.

● (0850)

[English]

We found that the analyses conducted by the sampled departments were not always complete nor of consistent quality. A complete GBA was performed by the four departments for half of the 16 sampled initiatives. In examining the family violence prevention program at Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada, we found evidence that the completion of GBA contributed to program development.

We found that Status of Women Canada, the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, and the Privy Council Office made progress in promoting and supporting the application of gender-based analysis in the federal government. For example, Status of Women Canada developed guidance, documents, tools, and online training materials for departments and agencies. It also drafted a new GBA strategic plan. The secretariat and the Privy Council Office clarified their expectations about what information on gender issues needed to be reported in cabinet documents.

Despite all these efforts, departments and agencies face barriers to including gender-based analysis in policy development. These barriers can include the absence of mandatory requirements to conduct GBA, tight deadlines for developing policy initiatives, and limited review by senior management of the completeness of GBA.

The central agencies and Status of Women Canada have agreed with our recommendations and have prepared an action plan to address them.

Mr. Chair, this concludes my opening statement. I would be pleased to answer any questions the committee may have.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll move to Ms. Ballantyne from the Status of Women, please.

[Translation]

Ms. Meena Ballantyne (Head of Agency, Status of Women Canada): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning everyone. I am very pleased to be here with you today.

[English]

Thank you for the invitation to appear and to talk about our response to the fall report of the Auditor General of Canada.

[Translation]

I believe the committee has received copies of the action plan that was developed by Status of Women Canada, the Privy Council Office, and the Treasury Board Secretariat in response to the Auditor General's report. It covers the next four years, from 2016 to 2020.

The Government of Canada has a longstanding commitment to implementing gender-based analysis, or GBA, throughout federal departments and agencies. GBA is important because it helps us advance gender equality by ensuring the federal government considers women and men's different experiences when we create new policies, programs and legislation.

● (0855)

[English]

All federal departments and agencies are expected to incorporate GBA into their decision-making processes. As an agency, Status of Women Canada has a specific role in supporting the use of GBA across federal organizations. We act as a centre of excellence or expertise on gender issues within the federal government. This includes providing departments and agencies with the training tools and guidance they need to effectively incorporate GBA in their decisions.

The government's support for GBA as a priority is reflected in our minister's mandate letter and was underscored by budget 2016, which provides for increased investments in Status of Women Canada over the next five years. These new resources will enhance the agency's capacity to implement our GBA mandate, which is central to helping galvanize action across federal departments and agencies.

[Translation]

As I indicated earlier, we welcome the Auditor General's report. Status of Women Canada along with the Privy Council Office and the Treasury Board Secretariat will continue working closely together to respond to the Auditor General's recommendations. In a few moments you will hear from my colleagues about their respective actions.

[English]

With your indulgence, I will highlight a few of the actions that Status of Women Canada is taking to respond to the AG's recommendations.

The first one is enhanced tools and training. Beginning this year, Status of Women Canada will begin working with PCO and TBS to identify, analyze, and address barriers to GBA implementation as a way to understand what tools, training, and other resources are needed to better implement GBA.

This process has started by consulting with other federal departments and agencies at all levels, including at the deputy level, on current barriers that are preventing more consistent use of GBA in the development of new government initiatives. Based on these findings, we will be working with PCO and TBS to address these barriers by enhancing our GBA tools and training. This includes developing new training for different sectors such as the science and security sectors, or functional communities across government, such as the research community or the evaluation community. It also involves updating and modernizing our online tools and resources that other departments can use in their own capacity-building.

Second, we'll also be strategically influencing some key government initiatives. The three of us, Status of Women Canada, PCO, and TBS, will work together with the departments and agencies to provide greater focus to intervene very strategically to provide gender advice on some of the key government initiatives moving forward. This will include working with the central agencies to identify in which areas GBA is particularly relevant.

For example, when an initiative has a potentially significant impact on women and/or diverse groups such as health research, or when it is related to one of our agency's priorities—our priorities are preventing violence against women and encouraging economic prosperity and leadership among women—or when it's a government high-priority initiative, such as infrastructure and shelters for women fleeing violence, which I'll expand on shortly, we'll identify priority initiatives in collaboration with our colleagues and other departments. We'll work together on GBA collaboration for these and provide whatever support is needed. Also, internally within Status of Women Canada, we'll have analysts who will be assigned to various departments, portfolios, or issues and really drill down deeper into some of those GBA issues.

I have a couple of practical examples of how we're playing this role.

For example, we worked very recently on the federal government's social infrastructure strategy. We provided some data that showed how many women and children are turned away every year from shelters, which then led to a greater investment in shelters and transition housing to better meet the needs of women and children. We're also working very closely with the Canadian Armed Forces, which has recently released a directive integrating gender perspectives into military planning and operations, with the understanding that operational effectiveness is enhanced when diversity is considered. These are just a couple of examples of concrete actions where we were able to work with the relevant departments and impact programs and policies to reflect the realities of women.

Our third area of focus is going to be on monitoring and reporting on progress. We're going to continue to work with PCO and TBS to develop and implement a more robust framework for monitoring progress in GBA capacity and implementation across government. We need to put enhanced structures in place so that we can more systematically monitor and reflect on our progress.

Some of the actions to support this initiative will include surveying all deputies on an annual basis to collect information on GBA implementation. In collaboration with my colleagues, I've recently sent out a letter to all deputies asking them to identify issues, such as what are the barriers to implementation, what are some of the training and tools they're working on or need help with, and what are some of the initiatives that they are going to apply to GBA to in moving forward.

We're also going to be looking at indicators. This is work that is just beginning in terms of how we are going to define success and how we are going to attract progress as we continue to monitor and report. Again, the Auditor General's office did the audit in 2009 and then in 2015, and now it's up to us to report on progress within the government. We're looking at various ways of doing that at least periodically and certainly in the next five years.

One of the key reasons for improving our ability to report progress on the application of GBA is to demonstrate to Canadians how doing so can improve the decisions government makes, which in turn can make a real difference to their lives. This is true whether we're talking about a program, a policy, or a piece of legislation that is related to security, safety, health, the economy, or another area.

● (0900)

[*Translation*]

Better monitoring and reporting will also provide us with practical examples of GBA success stories that we can share with Canadians, provinces and territories, and our international partners, many of whom look to Canada and the federal government for leadership in this area. The plans we are describing today reflect the federal government's renewed commitment to supporting the full implementation of gender-based analysis.

[*English*]

Through continued collaboration with all our colleagues in PCO, TBS, and across federal departments and agencies, using a whole-of-government approach, we will be better able to meet the needs of all Canadians while advancing gender equality across our country.

Thank you very much. I'm happy to answer any questions.

I'll turn it over to my colleagues.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Ballantyne.

Mr. Linklater, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Les Linklater (Deputy Secretary to the Cabinet, Operations, Privy Council Office): Thank you, Mr. Chair, for the opportunity to speak with you today about this important government commitment.

I also wish to thank the Auditor General of Canada and his office for their report and recommendations.

Thank you also to my colleague from Status of Women for outlining the overarching framework under which we will work collaboratively together, and with all federal departments and agencies to improve the implementation of GBA across government.

As was noted, we are seeing a renewed commitment to GBA within the federal government. This is evidenced in the Prime Minister's mandate letter to the Minister of Status of Women, which instructed our departments to work together to ensure GBA is applied to proposals for cabinet decision-making.

[*English*]

With this renewed commitment, the recommendations of the Auditor General's report are coming at an opportune time to provide an assessment of the progress we've made as well as the challenges that remain to fully implementing our GBA commitments across government.

The Privy Council Office supports cabinet decision-making through providing leadership, coordination, advice, and analysis on policy, program, and legislative proposals. In this role, we play a critical challenge function in ensuring that departments and agencies take into account all relevant factors, including gender, in the development of policy and program proposals being submitted for consideration by cabinet. This is done to ensure that the impacts on diverse groups of women and men are given due consideration in decision-making.

While the audit found that we have made efforts to promote and support GBA, and to clarify our guidance to departments and agencies in this respect, the audit also provided us an opportunity to reflect on how we can do better. You will have seen our proposed actions in the plan we've distributed.

My colleague from Status of Women has highlighted a number of areas for joint action, so I will focus on some of PCO's specific commitments. As she mentioned, one area we are looking at is enhanced tools and training.

Acknowledging the need to build our internal capacity with respect to GBA, we have already moved forward on making GBA training mandatory for all PCO employees who are tasked with playing a challenge function, as well as for executives. This will ensure that PCO employees are able to meaningfully engage with departments and agencies on GBA, making sure that the gender and diversity impacts to proposals are clear, that these inform policy options, and that any appropriate mitigation strategies are identified.

To support this work, we've committed to further strengthening our guidance on the inclusion of GBA in proposals to cabinet. We will ensure that departments and agencies are linked to relevant tools from Status of Women, and encourage their use.

The process of the audit also made clear to us that we can improve the documentation of GBA and PCO's challenge function. To this end, we are developing a policy consideration checklist, which will include GBA as a mandatory section. Rather than a checking-the-box exercise, we see this as a tool to help departments walk through the key considerations required when drafting policy or program proposals. Our goal is that this will be used to identify gender and other diversity impacts early in the policy development process, when they can meaningfully inform the development of options, mitigation strategies, and advice.

• (0905)

[Translation]

Finally, we are committed to continuing to work with Status of Women to identify good practices in GBA, as well as to identify departments and agencies who are struggling to meet their GBA commitments. For these, we will continue to link them with the support required—for example, by reaching out to Status of Women on key policy files—as well as to encourage them to build their internal capacity, recognizing the strong and renewed mandate for implementing GBA moving forward.

Strong and effective GBA practices have guided government over the years to ensure greater equality between women and men in all areas of government programming. We will both continue and

strengthen our efforts to ensure that policy and program proposals are meeting the needs of all Canadians.

Thank you for your time. I will now turn to my colleague from the Treasury Board Secretariat.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Ms. LaFontaine, please.

Ms. Renée LaFontaine (Assistant Secretary, Corporate Services and Chief Financial Officer, Treasury Board Secretariat): Mr. Chairman, thank you for the invitation to appear before your committee.

I'm delighted to speak to you today on behalf of the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat. I'm also pleased to be here with my colleagues from Status of Women Canada and the Privy Council Office.

[Translation]

The government recognizes the importance of conducting gender-based analysis because it informs decision-makers of the impacts government policies, programs and initiatives could have on the diverse groups of men and women that make up Canada today.

In light of the Auditor General's fall 2015 report on implementing gender-based analysis, I would like to take this opportunity today to update you on the progress TBS has made in challenging federal departments and agencies to use gender-based analysis and our plan of action going forward.

[English]

GBA+ is the analytical tool that helps us understand why certain groups are not benefiting from our programs and services in the same way that other groups may be. It's only after knowing why this is happening that we become equipped to adjust our policies, programs, and services to achieve the gender parity we're seeking.

As you know, ministers seek Treasury Board approval for their proposals of new policies, programs, and services through Treasury Board submissions. The Auditor General talked about that in his report.

As part of the challenge function performed by TBS program analysts on all aspects of these proposals.... What I mean by that is that they assess whether the costs to implement the program are complete and accurate. They actually look at the capacity of departments to deliver the programs that are being proposed to Treasury Board. TBS staff, during this challenge function that they perform, also ask departments if there could be a negative gender impact on the program being put forward, and whether there would be any implications for the Canadians who are supposed to benefit from those programs.

[Translation]

As the Auditor General observed, TBS has been supporting federal organizations to implement GBA+ by clarifying our expectations of departments and requirements for conducting gender-based analysis where applicable, and by providing guidance throughout the development process for Treasury Board submissions.

● (0910)

[English]

Detailed guidance to federal departments and agencies for considering GBA+ when drafting Treasury Board submissions has been posted on the secretariat's website so that departments understand what we're expecting. Training for TBS analysts and their executive directors, who work directly with departments on this every day, is refreshed every year to help better identify gender impacts of policy and program proposals through casework, best practices, and lessons learned.

[Translation]

In 2011, TBS conducted a baseline survey of the degree to which gender-related issues were identified and addressed in the departmental submissions considered by Treasury Board that year.

[English]

Of the 618 submissions, about one third were selected for an in-depth review and the potential for gender impacts. Of these, only 41 had identified gender-related issues in the content of their submissions. Encouragingly, in all 41 cases the programs had been adjusted to ensure that the programs were accessible and benefited both genders.

[Translation]

Not surprisingly, we also found evidence that the level of adoption of conducting GBA+ as a standard business practice varied by department.

[English]

Getting at the root causes of gender issues can be difficult, in our experience. In many cases, departments did not have the gender-disaggregated information and data about the recipients or the beneficiaries of their programs. As a result of that, collecting that information would have been costly, and most likely would have delayed the implementation of a very good program. For other proposals, gender implications of the work are not immediately obvious.

[Translation]

Recognizing these issues, TBS enhanced analyst training to identify gender issues early in the TB submission process in order to give departments extra time to conduct full, evidence-based analyses. However, we and departments continue to struggle to make it all work.

In addition, TBS has been working closely with Status of Women Canada and PCO to promote the value of GBA+ during meetings with senior executive committees and in conferences and workshops with departmental GBA+ champions.

[English]

Going forward, we are committed to continuing to reduce barriers and build capacity across the public service to ensure that GBA+ is solidly embedded in TB policy development, program analysis, and evaluation. We will engage deputy heads to discuss progress towards public service-wide implementation, including any barriers they may encounter, in consultation with our colleagues here at the table today.

[Translation]

We will also review our guidance and if necessary adapt it to the needs of federal departments and agencies so that it is more helpful in achieving better gender outcomes. We are also planning to orient TB ministers on the value of GBA+ findings to inform their decision-making on relevant TB submissions.

[English]

To measure our progress, TBS will conduct another review by the fall of 2017—just like we did in 2011—of the extent to which GBA+ findings influence decision-making by the Treasury Board between September of this year and June 2017. Because we know that federal regulations impact both genders in Canadian society, we will train regulatory analysts who work for us as well and will also challenge departments and agencies to conduct GBA+ where applicable in the federal regulation development process.

Finally, as program evaluation is another effective means of assessing programs and policies, the secretariat will assist Status of Women Canada to develop guidance and tools to help program evaluators across the public service identify gender impacts when evaluating the performance of federal policies, programs, and services.

● (0915)

[Translation]

Mr. Chair, Treasury Board Secretariat is committed to working with our partners to strengthen the development of informed, evidence-based, and gender equitable policy and program options for decision makers in order to provide better results for Canadians.

[English]

We welcome any input you'd like to provide.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. LaFontaine.

We now have heard this morning from the Auditor General's department, the Status of Women department, the Privy Council, and the Treasury Board Secretariat.

A number of other departments are not going to be giving presentations, but they were named in the Auditor General's report, both as doing some good things as well as there being areas for improvement. We want those folks to be able to answer questions you would have in regard to specific departments.

We'll begin with Ms. Shanahan, please.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan (Châteauguay—Lacolle, Lib.): Thank you very much to all the witnesses who have appeared here this morning.

I think I'm a little confused around who exactly is responsible for implementing, for making sure gender-based analysis happens. I think we're all agreed that the purpose of GBA+ is to produce better policy right from the get-go. I'm seeing a number of things that to my mind would make this a better case, that it would go back to the educational formation of analysts in terms of just original thinking, when somebody gets an idea to produce a program, around what elements go in there.

I'm a little skeptical about top-ending it, where at the end of all of that process it's, "Oh, wait a minute. We didn't do GBA+. Let's go back again." It's too late there, but at the same time, somebody needs to call it and say whether or not it's been done.

I'd like to hear a bit from the Auditor General about what you found in the process, then from Status of Women about how you're finding that supporting role—I thought you all were in charge, but it's not the case—and then of course from Privy Council Office and Treasury Board. As a new MP, I'm certainly learning about the chain of command.

The other thing I want to throw in there is that I did the online test last night for fun. I didn't get 100%. I went back and I did it several times. There were a couple of questions there specifically around, as an individual, what are you responsible for? Was it all of it? Was it none of it? I couldn't get to that answer.

The Chair: Mr. Domingue.

Mr. Richard Domingue: Mr. Chair, I'll go back to some of the issues we saw in the report. The first thing we saw was that the framework to introduce GBA was not applied uniformly across the sample departments. At the end of the report, in paragraph 1.58, we suggest a number of barriers that could explain that. One of them is that there's no mandatory requirement to do GBA.

For example, for environmental issues, they have what they call strategic environmental assessments, for which there is a cabinet directive. In this case there's no obligation to do any GBA. That's the first thing we noticed. The framework is not applied properly. This might be explained by the fact that it's not mandatory.

We also noticed that when it's done, it's not done equally. Some do it well, some don't do it well. For some initiatives it's very well done, for others it's done quickly. The challenge function by senior management is not always there. We saw one example where in a TB submission there was no gender impact reported, but there was no analysis performed to reach that conclusion.

I think what you saw today in the action plan appears to be.... We didn't assess the action plan in detail, but it looks as if it's steps in the right direction. What remains to be done, and I think the main challenge, is those barriers. Will this action plan address the challenges associated with those barriers? That remains to be seen.

● (0920)

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: First of all, thank you for taking the online course. That is great. I would encourage all of you to take it, because it really does help people think about GBA, not as a specific resource or program, but as a way of thinking about the impact on men and women.

To answer your question about who is responsible for GBA, I do it as a shared responsibility across government departments. Yes, Status of Women Canada.... I don't think we were ever in charge, but we are the ones who live it and breathe it because this is about achieving gender equality. GBA is a tool to achieve gender equality. We can provide our courses, tools, and guidance to departments.

Our colleagues at PCO and TBS can provide the challenge function. You are absolutely right that, by the time it comes to an MC or a Treasury Board submission, it is kind of late to say that we are going to go back and really look at this program differently because of that.

We are trying to work very strategically at the front end, trying to invest more resources, time, and effort to see the areas where it makes sense to look at GBA and say, "Does it have a disproportionate impact on women? Does it create barriers for participation of women?" It is not just women in general, but specific age groups, income levels, or ethnicities. That is a GBA+.

We are going to try to do that through this new action plan, but really, it is a shared responsibility because we can try as much as we want, but if there is no uptake by departments, it is not going to work.

In terms of what has actually changed this time around, first of all we have the AG's report, which has galvanized all of us into action. We have the government's commitment to gender equality. We have our minister, who has been charged by the Prime Minister in her mandate letter to pay attention to GBA, and she is very willing and active. She has written to all her ministerial colleagues, and I have written to all my deputy colleagues, to talk about some of the details on it.

We also got the investments in budget 2016. I would just like to say that it is not about resources. We could have double the resources but still not be effective. It is not about money. It is about buy-in and commitment.

We have the three of us as the central agencies, so to speak, steering this and really taking a look at it. Departments are very engaged. Now, it is basically about how we are going to monitor and report on it. What does success look like in five years? What are the indicators? What policies or programs did change because we did an effective GBA?

To me, those are all the success factors. Yes, time will tell whether we are able to do it, but certainly all the conditions we needed are there to make a difference this time.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Shanahan.

We will now move to Mr. Godin.

[*Translation*]

You have seven minutes.

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am not going to name all of you because you are quite numerous this morning, but I thank all of you for being here and for participating in this exercise with us.

Like my colleague, I would like to know who is responsible for GBA. It is an existential question and I think it is very important that it be answered.

Perhaps I will address my question to the representative of the Treasury Board Secretariat. Who is responsible for implementing GBA? I consider equity to be very important. I would also like to know who is responsible for developing the necessary mechanisms to make GBA effective.

Ms. Ballantyne, who represents Status of Women Canada, has just said that there is a shared strategy. How can we put in place measures, tools and an action plan that will be effective? We have with us representatives from three departments and the Office of the Auditor General. You are all people of good will, but you cannot impose these things. Ms. Ballantyne mentioned that you need a model and a structure more than you need resources.

What would be the best structure to ensure that GBA is effective? GBA has existed since 1995. An assessment of it was done in 2009. We are in 2016 and are now looking to 2020.

Can you assure me that measures will be put in place? In the documents I read, they always use the conditional and we find the words “we believe”. The words used are very broad, which as an MP does not reassure me. Our responsibility is to optimize the use of public funds. I would like someone to reassure me this morning by telling me what the best means would be to make this effective.

Several witnesses may reply to my question.

● (0925)

[*English*]

The Chair: How about if we begin with Ms. Ballantyne, then perhaps go to our secretariat, and then go back to the Privy Council?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: Thank you for the question.

You are quite right. It is not mandatory to do these things, but I would say that this time there is a lot of commitment. The government has placed this matter very high on its priority list. There are now structures in place and committees in the three main agencies. There are also the initiatives my colleagues will describe. We are also working quite closely with the departments.

I am going to continue in English.

[*English*]

I'll ask my colleagues to expand on that.

With monitoring and reporting, I think we'll be able to have more focus, share more best practices across departments, and then have it out there publicly so that people will see whether they're doing what they said they were supposed to do or whether it's had an impact. With all these measures in place, I think the system should adjust.

In terms of whether mandatory is the question or not, I see these as the comply-or-explain kinds of policies that are out there in terms of leadership on boards. Instead of going to quotas, different countries are saying, “Show us what you're doing, make it much more open and transparent, and then explain if you haven't done it and why you haven't done it.” That should create the pressure in the system for us to be able to advance.

Ms. Renée LaFontaine: It is a very good question. In my remarks, I think I mentioned that this is complex stuff. One of the programs cited in the Auditor General's report is from the former Industry Canada. They talked about the computers for schools program. One of the challenges we're facing is the complexity of the way these program structures are designed.

So while you're quite right, in that the best way to go is to identify it in the policy research stage so that by the time the MC gets to PCO we know the gender implications of the program, and by the time it gets to Treasury Board we understand how it's going to affect Canadians—and that would be perfect—I guess one of the things that happens is that, through this process, program structures are complex. We often use third parties or other NGOs that work with us to deliver our programs and results, and sometimes the gender implications are not always obvious up front. It takes a bit of experience and understanding that the departments learn about implementing their programs.

One of the things I wanted to add to what my colleague from Status of Women Canada was talking about is that another way we can help with this is that we have a whole community of program evaluators who work in departments across government. They look at the stock of programs. Once every five years at least, programs need to be evaluated. We're going to better train that community to be able to look at GBA implications if we miss them the first time around. It's not the ideal solution, but it starts to close that circle, so that before a program becomes renewed, we can understand better the gender implications and make those corrections that are necessary if we missed them the first time around.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Linklater, did you have anything to add from the Privy Council Office's perspective?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Les Linklater: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to add that the Auditor General's report has led to the adoption of relevant measures by the agencies responsible for developing policies as well as the departments.

I would say that the action plan that is being developed will include a broader range of activities than before and that our agencies' commitment to following up and producing reports will be very important. That had not really been done in the past.

The Prime Minister and the government have made gender-based analysis a priority. When she sits at the Cabinet table, the Minister of Status of Women has the opportunity to put forward this perspective during discussions or the development of policies. And so I believe that this action plan will bring about improved results and will allow the departments to demonstrate their commitment.

• (0930)

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

We'll now move to Mr. Christopherson, please, for seven minutes.

Mr. David Christopherson (Hamilton Centre, NDP): Thank you all very much for your attendance today.

I have to say that among things that make me angry, this one is getting close to the top of the list. Twenty years ago we made a commitment at the United Nations, to a great deal of fanfare, that we were committed to this. Here we are, 20 years later, with an Auditor General report saying fail, fail, fail.

All I'm hearing, quite frankly, is, oh, we'll do better this time. I'll return to that, because that's not acceptable. That's not nearly enough. We went down that road once already, back in 2009. We're not going down that road again.

The government said, in their opening remarks.... Madam Ballantyne, on behalf of Status of Women, said, "The Government of Canada has a long-standing commitment to implementing gender-based analysis...." And we know how serious that was. She continued, "GBA is important because it helps us advance gender equality by ensuring the federal government considers women and men's different experiences when we create new policies, programs, and legislation."

Therefore, it suggests, if this is important to gender equity and you didn't do this, then gender equity has not been a priority to any government up till now. Because you can't have it both ways. You can't go bragging and say you think GBA is really, really important to get gender equality in Canada and then not do it, because then it speaks to how strong the commitment is to gender equity. At this point, it doesn't look very strong.

Moving on, Chair, this is the stuff that really makes public accounts committees go through the roof. We've been here before. The 2009 audit found almost identical problems. What's interesting is that the recommendations are oh so similar.

I mean, in 2009, we see from the Auditor General's report, in paragraph 1.16, that the Auditor General recommended that "Status of Women Canada, in consultation with the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat and the Privy Council Office, establish a plan for facilitating implementation of gender-based analysis, and clarify expectations", blah blah blah.

Then we have almost the identical wording, or at least the concept, in today's document, where they're saying, "Beginning this year, Status of Women Canada will begin working with the Privy Council Office and the Treasury Board Secretariat to identify, analyze, and address barriers to GBA implementation, as a way to understand...." Look, this is exactly the same thing we had last time.

I heard Madam Ballantyne say that this time we have engagement. What does that mean, "engagement"? Oh: comply or explain. Why are we dancing? We heard very clearly from the Auditor General that one of the main barriers to not having GBA in the federal government in Canada is because it's not mandatory.

I want somebody there from the government—I don't care which one of you—to give me a really good reason why it shouldn't be mandatory. Then we don't have to worry about all this engagement, and it will be different, and comply or explain.

Why don't we just make it mandatory and be done with it? Please.

Through you, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Christopherson.

Everybody take a deep breath.

Ms. Ballantyne, I defer to you first, perhaps, or Mr. Linklater.

Mr. Les Linklater: I think the issues that are raised are very important, and I think the fact that there's frustration with progress would flag the need for redoubled efforts on the part of all government officials to ensure that gender-based analysis is informing policy and program development.

The experience in the past I think has allowed us to learn that there are barriers to implementation across government, that departments may not necessarily have the tools and the capacity to be able to advance gender-based analysis to a level that is going to make a difference in their program and policy development—

● (0935)

Mr. David Christopherson: Please answer my question.

Mr. Les Linklater: In terms—

Mr. David Christopherson: Give me a good reason why we aren't going straight to mandatory, please.

Mr. Les Linklater: In terms of making GBA mandatory, I think that as my colleague from Status of Women was saying, as we look at developing this suite of tools to respond to the Auditor General's report, there are a number of opportunities we have to engage with departments to ensure they're actually doing GBA. I think the Auditor General would say that there were probably some challenges with the audit in terms of actually documenting the work that departments do—

Mr. David Christopherson: Sorry, Chair, I don't mean to be rude. You know we have limited time.

I asked a very simple question, sir. Give me a good rationale and public policy reason why we don't go to mandatory. You're dancing around it, sir, with respect. Give me the argument. Why aren't you doing mandatory?

Mr. Les Linklater: Go ahead.

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: What I would say is that it is mandatory for departments to tell PCO and tell the government in the MC process. In the Treasury Board submissions, they have to say if they've done a GBA, what the analysis is to back that up, and what was the impact. They have to explain. As my colleague—

Mr. David Christopherson: So the Auditor General is wrong? Excuse me.

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: No—

Mr. David Christopherson: The Auditor General's department just said that one of the things that would clear this up is mandatory. You're not going there. I'm asking you to give me an explanation why, and I am still not hearing it.

The Chair: Go ahead, Ms. Ballantyne.

Remember, all comments through the chair, please.

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: What I'm saying is that it is mandatory for all departments in the MC development process to say that they have done a GBA. It's going to be much more intensive now. They'll have to explain that they've done it and what is the impact or what changed. They'll have to show the data. It's the checklist that my colleague was talking about.

It is mandatory in that sense. They won't be able to go past the gate without giving that.

Mr. David Christopherson: Well, let's ask the fellow right beside you.

It sounds like they're saying, "Hey, we're already doing it." Maybe I'll give you a chance to correct the record, because clearly you misspoke yourself.

The Chair: I don't think that's what she was saying. I think she's saying that they don't—

Mr. David Christopherson: Chair, I'm fine. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. David Christopherson: I can guide myself.

The Chair: You have 30 seconds to answer the question.

Mr. Richard Domingue: There is no policy that requires GBA to be performed.

That being said, it is true that when the departments prepare an MC or a TB submission, there is in the template a section that they have to fill out showing that they did perform a GBA. What we saw in the report, however, is that some of those sections are not based on what we consider a complete GBA. We saw evidence that no gender impact was identified, but there was no gender analysis to support that conclusion.

Mr. David Christopherson: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

We'll go to Ms. Murray.

Ms. Joyce Murray (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Thank you very much for your testimony.

I was struck by the comments about where in the process this could be placed. Policy programs and legislation are long, complex processes that can take years, and the later it is in the process, probably the more complicated it would be to do an analysis. But at the front end, it can actually drive the design of the plan and the program. I noticed that the PCO representative, Mr. Linklater, did mention that.

Could you talk about the process currently? What is the process and where in that cycle currently does the GBA tend to happen? What do you think would happen if this were to be inserted earlier in the process? Also, if there is a chance, maybe I could have a quick comment from one of the departments if they've experienced doing it earlier and what that led to.

Mr. Les Linklater: I am happy to respond.

Depending on the initiative and the department, I think you will find a variety of approaches in terms of the application of GBA. Some departments have the tools and the capacity to understand, from the outset, what the data collection needs are, and what the evaluation framework would be to enable them to capture the gender implications of their policy or program development.

Those departments tend to do it up front, which leads to better outcomes. The Auditor General may have views in terms of quality. I wouldn't want to speak for his office.

In other cases, as the Auditor General said, when we do get the draft of a memorandum to cabinet, there may be a line saying, "No gender considerations were assessed as part of this proposal."

One of the challenges we have is for our analysts to be able to know when to go back to the department to engage with them and to make sure they are asking the appropriate challenge function questions, which is why, as part of our action plan at PCO, we are now making GBA+ training mandatory for our analysts, so that it becomes part of their policy development and challenge function process. It's automatic: "What are the gender considerations around this proposal?"

My sense is that, as we work together on the action plan, if we can move departments along with us to begin to take those considerations into account from the outset, that is going to lead to better outcomes, both in terms of departmental capacity and reporting to Canadians.

• (0940)

Mr. Mitch Davies (Assistant Deputy Minister, Strategic Policy Sector, Department of Industry): I would just add to what my colleague said by explaining that we have decided to make investments in improving the data, the evidence base, which would apply to a whole host of policy decisions. It is getting to the point about when you need to do this. You need to have some investment in the disaggregated data that you need to drive good policy development.

Part of this is making it happen, but also having the information and the evidence you need to do a good job at it. For example, last fiscal year our department funded Status of Women Canada to develop a specific chapter in its "Women in Canada" report on women, education, and technology, which will be published in June. There are a lot of issues with respect to the participation of women in STEM fields, technical fields—the kind of fields that are going to drive the industrial revolution we are undertaking—and ensuring that all Canadians participate in that kind of future.

We really need better data. We need to have much more information analysis done. We have funded that sort of thing because it speaks to the point of being able to do this early so that, when you are actually conceiving of having a dialogue about policy, you have the information you need. At the point in time when you need to do the analysis, you have the evidence at hand to make good decisions and design the programs properly.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mrs. Zahid, go ahead.

Mrs. Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre, Lib.): My question would be for the Auditor General's Office.

Given that there was no obligation for departments to implement gender-based analysis into their policy and decision-making, were you able to identify any common elements that characterize those departments that you elected to take part in that process?

Also, do you have any sense of any factors that led some departments to adopt these practices and some not to?

Mr. Richard Domingue: Mr. Chair, in regard to the barriers that explain the reason why GBA was not always performed.... Actually, I think I will answer your two questions in one answer. I think it is easier for some departments to do GBA than it is for others. It is easier if it has a social component, if it touches human beings

directly. Then the gender impact is easier to quantify; the data probably exists.

When you are looking at, for example, the automotive innovation fund, the impact on gender is less direct. There is an impact on gender, but the data might not exist.

Some departments have a better reflex than others to do GBA. This could explain why some departments did better than others.

Also, in paragraph 1.58, another potential barrier we mention is the tight deadlines. Some departments find out, through the budget process, that they are responsible for a new initiative, and then they have to prepare an MC at the last minute, or sometimes even after the budget. Deadlines are tight, and pressure is on the system to produce and deliver rapidly that new initiative. Sometimes it happens that GBA will not take place at that moment.

This doesn't prevent the department from doing GBA at a later stage, when the program is renewed. There is a lot of variation in when to do GBA and what the reflexes are in the departments.

Again, going back to the issue of no mandatory requirements to perform GBA, even though there are no mandatory requirements, some do it very well. Maybe the answer is that there is no need for a mandatory requirement, but maybe you need a mandatory requirement for those for whom GBA is more challenging.

I am not sure if I answered both of your questions in my single answer here, but....

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Albas, for five minutes.

• (0945)

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you to all the people who are here to present. I appreciate your service to our country.

I'd like to start first with the Auditor General. Has report structure, the way the report is written, changed in this previous report, year over year?

Mr. Richard Domingue: We've introduced a new reporting format, I believe, the cycle before this one. The May 2015 report would have adopted that new reporting format.

Mr. Dan Albas: The reason why I raise this is not specific to this issue, but I hate the new report structure. I really would wish the Auditor General would survey and ask members of Parliament. Maybe that's something that should be done because I really found these reports, the way they're structured, to be much more difficult to get information out.

That being said, I'd like to move on to PCO and Treasury Board Secretariat. I do share a lot of what Mr. Christopherson said, in terms of Groundhog Day, revisiting some of the same issues. There's legitimate criticism in that and there are no easy outs on many of these things. As I think you said, it's complex stuff.

However, there is some talk about capacity building at PCO, some capacity building for Treasury Board Secretariat staff to more firmly challenge departments as they do their MCs, as they do their Treasury Board submissions. That's correct, is that right?

My understanding is that, ultimately, parliamentarians can hold a minister to account. I was a little surprised at the government's response, considering that there was so much around gender parity in the cabinet because it's 2015/2016, that there were no requirements based on the Auditor General's reports to make it mandatory for government ministers to understand and take mandatory training on GBA. Whether through their capacity as the head of the agency or head of the department, they could challenge their deputies and staff to ensure that gender-based analysis is being done because they hold their departments accountable.

The second part is that, as many ministers serve on Treasury Board Secretariat, there is a huge challenge function there as well because they check both the work of the Treasury Board Secretariat and the individual departments.

Has there been any discussion on making training mandatory for ministers when it comes to gender-based analysis+?

Mr. Les Linklater: I would start with the Minister of Status of Women's mandate letter where it's been made very clear by the Prime Minister that he expects all ministers to engage in this. He provides a particular charge to the Minister of Status of Women to work with her colleagues to improve the GBA process.

Mr. Dan Albas: I agree that would be a helpful step, but I don't necessarily—

Mr. Les Linklater: In terms of specific training for ministers, I'm not aware of any particular formal program in this regard.

Mr. Dan Albas: Even providing a two-day program or even a two-hour program, so that they can ask the questions of their deputies when these things are coming forward.... If you look at what the Auditor General said with regard to barriers: "limited senior management review of the completeness of gender-based analysis, and limited capacity in departments and agencies for conducting gender-based analysis".

If a minister were to ask the question before an MC was formed or before something was going to Treasury Board, he or she would be able to say to the deputy, "Have you made sure this is part of the MC?" To me, that is just a natural step.

I'm going to move to capacity building and the challenge function. I've always considered Status of Women to have a little bit of both. It seems to be that the role of Status of Women seems to be more effective on capacity building. I don't know if it's because you're an outside agency, unless it's in someone's mandate letter, or they've been told that they have to co-operate, it doesn't seem to be very effective as far as a challenge function because you're not a natural player the same way that PCO or Treasury Board would be.

As far as capacity building, and Mr. Davies actually mentioned this, has there been any discussion about having a Status of Women go-to source at Statistics Canada where you can actually start to pull some of the data and then disperse it to different agencies?

I would hate to see every department go through that process. Having someone at Statistics Canada who's aware of those issues and makes that information available would be helpful.

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: We actually work with Stats Canada on these Women in Canada chapters. There are 14 chapters and we work with various departments. Everybody pools the money together and we decide collectively in terms of the data that we need, which is aggregated statistics. That's something that we've been working on and we intend to work on it in the future, in prioritized ways.

• (0950)

The Chair: We'll now move to Ms. Mendès and Monsieur Lefebvre.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès (Brossard—Saint-Lambert, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Surprisingly, or not, I am going to take over where Mr. Christopherson left off and continue in the same vein.

Thank you to all of you for being here with us today.

I think the biggest problem we have is indeed the absence of mandatory requirements regarding GBA in the various departments. They are not obliged to submit policies and programs to the GBA process.

Making it a mandatory part of the process would be important.

You tell us that this already exists and that it is included in part of the questionnaire. It is already part of the process. What penalty is imposed on a department if that part of the questionnaire is not completed?

That is the issue. There are no consequences. Have I understood this correctly?

Mr. Les Linklater: To answer that question, I would say there are no penalties as such, unless this is reported to the public and to Parliament.

[*English*]

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: "Comply and show" is the term you used.

[*Translation*]

However, that does not seem sufficient to oblige the departments to conduct the necessary analyses.

Do you agree with that, Mr. Domingue, that this has not placed an obligation on departments to consider GBA when they prepare submissions?

Mr. Richard Domingue: The Office of the Auditor General cannot and does not make recommendations regarding specific policies like these. We have noted that the lack of mandatory requirements could be a barrier.

In her opening statement Ms. Ballantyne explained that the agency was going to survey the departments and agencies in order to find out what barriers they face. Perhaps the analysis will show that the GBA reflex is not always there. It is possible that given this situation the government or central agencies may decide that it is necessary to make gender-based analysis obligatory. That said, it is not up to the Office of the Auditor General of Canada to promote that idea.

At this time, you are correct, there are specific sections in memorandums to cabinet and submissions to Treasury Board where departments and agencies are supposed to report that information. Central agencies like the Privy Council Office and the Treasury Board Secretariat are supposed to challenge the departments if they feel that the gender-based analysis that is supposed to inform this section of cabinet documents is weak. So there is a theoretical exchange. It is theoretical because the Office of the Auditor General cannot observe it because cabinet deliberations are secret.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: There are no penalties imposed on departments if this is not done. Is that correct?

Mr. Richard Domingue: At this time, indeed, there are no penalties if the gender-based analysis is poor. There may be penalties later, if we see that GBA was not considered in developing policies. At that point, there could be poorly designed policies. That said, it comes after the fact. It is only over time that we will be able to determine the impact on men and women.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Lefebvre, you have about two minutes left.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Lefebvre (Sudbury, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In 2009, no one was responsible for GBA. This responsibility was still shared by different bodies. Moreover, it was not mandatory. In 2016, the situation is the same. The responsibility is shared and implementation is not mandatory. We expect to obtain a different result, brought about by people acting in a good faith. That is all well and good, but there is still cause for concern.

If cabinet makes this mandatory, what would change, Mr. Linklater?

Mr. Les Linklater: I thank the member for this question.

I think that with the tools that are being developed, we will have the opportunity to improve our capacity to help the departments conduct gender-based analysis.

At this time it is very difficult for us to check or to provide data to the Office of the Auditor General given the nature of the policy development process. Sometimes we have verbal exchanges or meetings. We don't ask for much written proof.

But tools have now been developed. We want documents to be tabled to show that the process is being followed and that the departments have provided information on GBA.

• (0955)

Mr. Paul Lefebvre: Do I have time for one last question, Mr. Chair?

[English]

The Chair: Go ahead.

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Lefebvre: I am trying to understand what you are saying.

People have mentioned that this is not mandatory and that concerns me. If GBA became mandatory, what would change? If we ask cabinet to make this mandatory, what would change?

Mr. Les Linklater: If it becomes mandatory, the quality of the programs and policies would improve, since we would have data. As Mr. Davies mentioned earlier, we would have the opportunity of developing assessment frameworks in order to ensure, when a policy is developed, that the incremental impacts are taken into account.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll now move back to Mr. Godin for five minutes.

[Translation]

Mr. Joël Godin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Unfortunately, one gets the impression that all of the departments reacted to pressure from the Office of the Auditor General audit and that they then accelerated the process. My colleague across the way spoke about making this obligatory. Currently, however, the only penalty comes from the court of public opinion. If the departments do not reach their objective, there are no consequences.

Mr. Linklater, you said that making this mandatory would improve the quality of programs and policies. For my part, I don't want quality so much as effectiveness.

If this is made obligatory, will it be effective?

Mr. Les Linklater: It will depend on the circumstances. As Mr. Domingue said, the departments may have had little opportunity to deliver the merchandise, if I may put it that way. If there are time constraints when you have to present the analysis or the draft policy, it may be that there is not enough time to do all of the necessary analyses. That said, we can go back to the policy and ensure that the comparative analysis was done.

Mr. Joël Godin: Thank you. I understand that making this mandatory will not guarantee success.

From a more positive viewpoint, could you tell us how Canada compares to other countries on this? Are we at the top or at the bottom of the list?

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: I think we are in the middle. The other countries

[English]

look to us for examples of GBA. We've been sharing our GBA work with other countries as well as with the provinces. For example, Alberta has just established a new department of status of women. They have adopted our GBA course and are making the course mandatory for all their civil servants and their ministers. There are examples of that, of where we're looked to for our GBA by other countries.

As I said, GBA is just a tool in terms of achieving gender equality. In terms of Canada's ranking internationally on gender equality, it varies, but we're not in the top 10 countries in terms of having achieved gender equality. We're in the middle of the pack.

[Translation]

Mr. Joël Godin: If other countries consult us it would seem that we are not doing so badly.

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: Yes, in a way.

Mr. Joël Godin: It could be expressed that way.

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: Yes.

Mr. Joël Godin: Could you tell us what tools the top 10 countries have which you do not? What are the tools that allow them to get a better ranking?

[English]

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: I would say it's the various levers these countries use to achieve gender equality. It's part of policies, programs, and legislation—for example, having child care; having parental leave that is for fathers only, daddy quotas as they call them; quotas for women on boards; women in senior executive positions in the private and public sector; or the wage gap. Those are the various factors that compose the index for gender equality. Then GBA is a tool.

We can look into what other kinds of tools they use. Do they use GBA or other ways of making sure their policies and programs take gender considerations into account?

We would be happy to provide that to the committee in terms of an international scan of where GBA is used by the top 10 countries. We can get back to you on that.

As I said, it's a tool to make sure you look at the impact on men and women, and make sure there are not barriers to full participation or they're left out.

•(1000)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll now move back to the government side to Mr. Arya and to Ms. Shanahan for five minutes.

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Sorry, I have to go back to the mandate requirements.

Ms. Ballantyne, you mentioned that all federal government departments and agencies are expected to incorporate gender-based analysis into their decision-making processes. The PCO, in their action plan, said they will implement a policy consideration checklist as a mandatory component, and it goes on to talk about GBA+.

I'd also like to hear from the Treasury Board if now it's mandatory, will be made mandatory, or should it be made mandatory?

Mr. Les Linklater: I mentioned in my opening remarks, Mr. Chair, that the audit provided an opportunity for us to look at what we could do better. One of the tools that we are developing is this mandatory checklist. As the Auditor General stated, there is, in the memorandum to cabinet template, a requirement for departments to state whether or not a GBA has been done on a specific policy proposal. Depending on the quality of the work that's behind that, it may be more developed in the actual memorandum to cabinet or not.

One of the issues that we had, and I think the Auditor General discovered as well, is that, in performing our challenge function, PCO was not documenting our interaction with individual departments on the GBA aspect of the policy in a very systematic or helpful way. What we are thinking is that, now with the checklist, we'll be able to ask departments to put in writing whether or not they've conducted a gender-based analysis and if not, why not, at a very high level, to inform us as to why they believe there are no gender implications with the policy. If there are, they will actually attach the GBA work that they've done or make reference to what they would have in their records.

As we move forward with the reporting under our action plan that my colleague was referring to, we will have, ourselves, this very rich inventory of information to be able to go back to for reference purposes to say, yes, in terms of x number of policy proposals, x per cent had a GBA completed, y per cent did not, and here's why. I think one of the key aspects of the audit is getting PCO and Treasury Board to that next question of why.

The Chair: Ms. Shanahan.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Of course, this is very important. It's important that GBA gets done, but what I'm really excited about is that it makes better policy. I'm very excited about some of the examples that we see here in the Auditor General's report, one that worked very well and another that worked not so well. I'd like to hear from our witnesses on that. That would be Aboriginal Affairs, Ms. Kennedy, and then from Monsieur Paquette about the apprenticeship program.

The Chair: Very, very quickly. We have about two minutes.

Ms. Nicole Kennedy (Director General, Strategic Policy, Cabinet and Parliamentary Affairs, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): I'd like to just speak to you quickly about the family violence prevention program. It was evaluated in 2012, and as part of the evaluation for the program renewal, it was actually discovered that there were elements of the program that needed a bit more nuancing. The prevention side of it wasn't really targeting any of the issues that men and boys face once they've been victims of violence. There was concerted effort to shift the program somewhat to make sure that we're addressing those needs as well as the other fundamental parts of the program, which are to fund the 41 shelters across the country.

I would just note in wrapping up that the GBA policy has been mandatory at Indigenous and Northern Affairs since 1999, so we do take it seriously.

•(1005)

The Chair: Mr. Paquette.

Mr. Jacques Paquette (Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, Strategic and Service Policy Branch, Department of Employment and Social Development): Yes, very quickly, the same. In our department, Employment and Social Development, you cannot develop policy without doing GBA. The example that was used in the report was a typical example where we were pressed for time, so we had to do this development fairly quickly, so there was some assessment that was done but not completed. We kept working on it afterwards to make sure that we would have a full picture.

We also used other tools to continue to work on increasing the participation of women in the apprenticeship sector. Part of the issue here is that it's a low participation to start with. Some of the programs that we are funding through the provinces and territories, for example, were used as well to promote trades among women. The same thing with a federal ad campaign that was targeted towards women to increase their participation.

Of course, when we look at participation in the trades, it's lower, particularly compared to college or university enrolment where women in fact are the majority there.

The Chair: Thank you.

We'll now move to Mr. Christopherson.

We're in the next series for three minutes.

Mr. David Christopherson: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Godin asked about where we were. The answer was, we're not in the top 10, which is not very good at all given that we're a G7 country. Belgium is an example where their gender mainstreaming act, which is another term for this, not only has the legal basis for compulsory identification of the analysis, they also do a follow-up and evaluation of the actions afterward. There's a real commitment, not the wishy-washy stuff we're talking about here.

I wanted to mention our friend from the Privy Council. Here's what he said this morning: "Strong and effective GBA practices have guided government over the years to ensure greater equality between women and men in all areas of government programming. We will both continue and strengthen our efforts to ensure that policy and program proposals are meeting the needs of all Canadians."

You'd almost think he hadn't read the Auditor General's report to come out and say something that cheery. The Auditor General said 20 years had passed since the government committed to applying this type of analysis. In other words, gender considerations, including obstacles to the full participation of diverse groups of women and men, are not always considered in government decisions. This finding is similar to what we found in our 2009 audit. That's the world we're in, not that kind of fluffy nonsense.

There was a reference to one piece of federal legislation that has this as mandatory. I'm aware that another one is the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, which has Canadian legislation that has a legislative requirement to provide GBA in terms of the impact, and they have to report on that impact. It's mandatory, and it's a piece of federal legislation that exists right now. My question is very specific. Has this been a problem because it's mandatory? We now have an example in the government where it's mandatory. Has that been a

complete disaster? Is there a problem with this? Would you back away from the mandatory aspect in this act if you could?

Mr. Les Linklater: My experience with the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act is that the legislated GBA requirements have been helpful and have led us to look at IRC as a department that does GBA well.

Mr. David Christopherson: I want to end on a positive note, because that's twice now you've given answers I really like, but not so much in what you wrote.

You were asked point blank, what would happen if mandatory was brought in? I'll review the Hansard, and we will do so when we do our report. I have to say, sir, I thought when you answered that you were answering straight up that it would do this. I understand the political dance of where you can go on the recommendations, and I'm beginning to maybe get a sense of where we are, but I like that answer. I'll give you a chance to correct the record if you want.

Your answer, when it was put to you directly... I have to say, and it seems to me, if a professional bureaucrat—take that as a positive compliment—is asked the direct question, does mandatory reporting on GBA give us better legislation, I'm hearing yes.

Mr. Les Linklater: That's my experience, yes.

Mr. David Christopherson: Thank you, sir.

The Chair: Now we move back to the government side.

Mr. Lefebvre.

● (1010)

Mr. Paul Lefebvre: I'd like to take out the action plan you have provided us.

My first question is, from 2009-16, was this action plan similar, or was there an action plan?

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: Yes, there was a departmental action plan that was tabled with this committee in 2009. This one is different. With the other one, we were starting out in terms of engaging with departments, and we had—

Mr. Paul Lefebvre: You mean in 2009, or in 2015?

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: In 2009 we had a phased implementation working with various departments. From 2009-15 that's what all of us did. We worked together with the departments. What we found was that we still need to continue to do that, work with departments, but we're adopting things like a cluster approach. We're taking all the science departments and bringing them together, so they can learn from each other in terms of sharing best practices, and what's worked with the health department, public health agencies, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, or security.

There are differences from the last action plan to this one.

Mr. Paul Lefebvre: I'm seeing target dates. We have the response to the recommendations, we have the action plan, and we have the target dates. Some are open. On page 2 we have ongoing, and then on page 3 a lot are ongoing as well. Is it possible to provide us with fixed dates as to when the action plans are going to start to be put together, or are these already put together and these are going to be ongoing all the time?

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: Yes. For example, on page 3, where we're talking about having these various governance structures to monitor this, it's having the steering committee with the three of us meeting with folks, or having our champions network. Those are meetings that have started, and we're going to increase them in some cases.

Mr. Paul Lefebvre: Mr. Chair, just to make sure of that, I know that there are also some documents that we'll be providing, so can we can keep tabs on what is going on there so we can see the progress on this?

The Chair: We can also put that into the report.

Mr. Paul Lefebvre: Yes, please.

Mrs. Zahid has a question.

Mrs. Salma Zahid: My question is for Mr. Linklater. Further to our discussion on making GBA a mandatory requirement, it has been more than 20 years since Canada committed, as part of the 1995 United Nations fourth world conference on women, to analyzing gender-specific policy impacts on women and men before making any decisions on policies, legislation, and programs throughout all the government departments and agencies.

I think the Auditor General's report shows that we have made fairly minimum progress in the last two decades. This is I guess unsurprising, since it seems that GBA is more a request of a government department, rather than a requirement mandated by PCO or the Treasury Board.

What consequences are there if managers do not have their performance or that of their department measured and evaluated based at least in part on their implementation of GBA? Of course, implementation will be incomplete and spotty.

I have to ask, if PCO is not going to make GBA mandatory, just how seriously should we take your commitment to its wider adoption? As you mentioned in your opening remarks, the Prime Minister's mandate letter to the Minister of Status of Women called for GBA to be applied to proposals for cabinet decision-making. Is this enough to make GBA mandatory? Or do you need further policy direction on that?

Mr. Les Linklater: I don't think we need further policy direction. What we do need is a focus on implementation.

As the audit has pointed out, progress has been limited since 2009. The tools that we're looking at developing and the processes that we're putting in place across government have to be more meaningful and also ensure that we are working with departments to gather the data that's required, the disaggregated data, for them to improve their policy development process, and then, as proposals are coming forward either to the cabinet table from a policy perspective or to Treasury Board for implementation, that our analysts have the training to be able to challenge departments on the GBA system-

atically, and that we're documenting systematically that challenge function, which we have not been doing to date.

Mrs. Salma Zahid: So you think that you really don't need any further policy directives?

Mr. Les Linklater: I think that in terms of the tone and the expectations that the Prime Minister has set, and the fact that the Minister of Status of Women is at the cabinet table to challenge all policy proposals that are coming through for ratification, there has been a significant improvement in raising the profile of the need to do this. The fact that the minister has written to our colleagues and we're putting in place the more rigorous oversight among the central agencies around these processes I think is going to help us with information sharing and also bring along departments that have been struggling with the barriers to advancing GBA.

• (1015)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We now move back to Mr. Albas, please.

Mr. Dan Albas: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to go back to the discussion we were having earlier regarding Statistics Canada.

You were suggesting that Status of Women is working on a set of tools that could be dispersed. One of the challenges I have.... I sit on the pay equity committee right now, and we've heard from a number of departments. They know that the situation of pay equity has gotten better in the last 10 years, but no one has been able to identify why. They're not able to tell us.

I think that one of the issues—again, I think it was described as “complex stuff” that we're dealing with—is that we don't necessarily have the data, or the explanation behind the data, to be able to adequately address the issue. When is this Statistics Canada project that you're working with going to come to fruition? When is it going to be made available to different departments?

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: I should clarify. The Statistics Canada project that I was talking about is the “Women in Canada” publications that we've been working on since—I can't remember the exact date—before 2009, I think, in terms of having reports on sex-disaggregated data for gender, with overall stats on women and then in specific populations.

What I think you're referring to is something in the departments. As my colleague Monsieur Paquette was saying, each of the departments is also looking at sex-disaggregated data in their departments for their policies and programs.

Mr. Dan Albas: The suggestion I would make here is that I do see an opportunity for Status of Women to embed a small operation, and then be a liaison with all the different agencies. Rather than their trying to establish that in-house, you have a go-to hub of information that will help with gender-based analysis. To me that's a logical step.

You mentioned earlier regarding the Province of Alberta that it's mandatory for ministers to take gender-based analysis training. Is that correct?

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: I believe so. I'll have to confirm it. I certainly know in the Alberta civil service all deputy ministers, ADMs, and senior management have to take this course. I'm not sure about the ministers, but we can get back to you on that.

Mr. Dan Albas: Yes, that would be helpful. Again, if we're going to take a whole-of-government approach—and this government seems to continue to say that they want to do that—why would you just make it whereby the Status of Women minister was that check and balance at Treasury Board or whatnot? Why wouldn't you want every minister making those same demands of their deputy ministers and the deputy ministers of their senior staff? That's how you build accountability and direction.

Getting back to the barriers side—maybe I'll ask this of the Auditor General's office—I don't disagree that an absence of mandatory government requirements is an issue, but I would also say that even if you put in place.... I used to be a municipal councillor. We always used to say if you can't enforce a bylaw, if it's an information gap, a capacity gap, a lack of management training, how do you solve that? You can require all you want, but if the capacity isn't there to be able to bring each department to an adequate level, where it can lead off with that department, from a management perspective what would be...? I think we all agree gender-based analysis is a critical tool, but from a management perspective how does just making it a requirement do it?

The Chair: We'll start off with our Auditor General's department, please. Mr. Domingue.

Mr. Richard Domingue: Mr. Chair, I think you're right: mandatory requirement would not solve the GBA issue by itself. Training is key here. I've mentioned the word “reflex” a few times. When departmental officials design policies, what's important for them is not so much that there's a requirement, they should fill the box and do a GBA, what's important is that they do a good GBA, that they think by themselves that there's a requirement to do that. As I said, it varies greatly from department to department. Again, we're not there to promote a policy decision. That's not my job. If the government were going to say mandatory requirement is only part of the solution, you need training, you need a proper challenge function at the centre.

• (1020)

Mr. Dan Albas: Going back to PCO and Treasury Board, we have the Canada School of Public Service. It was founded to help create excellence in the public service, do academic publishing, and whatnot. Have we or any of your offices asked for a study to be done? The side-of-the-desk issue, where things always get shunted to a side of the desk.... To me it would be nice to have some quasi-independence from people who know management within the federal public service who could look at the issue. Has there been any contemplation of asking them to do a report on this?

The Chair: Reply very quickly, Ms. Ballantyne.

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: We are working with the Canada School of Public Service in making our training, our online course, available as the core curriculum for all policy and program officers. They're going to be rolling it out for us, but I think you're referring to a study.

Mr. Dan Albas: Like filling the gap, outlining what exactly, because again there's the complex stuff you referenced earlier.

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: No, we haven't talked to them about a study, but we can certainly explore that idea.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll now move to Mr. Christopherson for five minutes.

Mr. David Christopherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It seems to me that the Auditor General's representative pretty much summed up where we are, acknowledging that the mandatory is only part and that the training is in there and then the proper analysis. I think the back two pieces are already in the action plan.

It seems to me that of the things the Auditor General's office is saying will make a difference the one that's still missing is the mandatory, and that's clearly what this is going to come down to. I can only hope that the committee will ultimately make that recommendation, which is step one. Step two is that the government listens and brings in that change. If not, politics will take over from there, and we'll deal with it in the public arena.

I really don't have a whole lot more to say. I've said my bit, and I'm satisfied that the action plan deals with most of the issues that need to be looked at. I think it's a good action plan. I'm satisfied with it. The timelines seem to work. I was listening to Mr. Lefebvre ask about the time frames, and I think that looks fairly solid.

It just seems to me that the piece that's missing is the mandatory. The bureaucrats representing the staff can't make that recommendation. Also, the Auditor General's made it clear that he can only go so far. It only takes just a smattering of common sense to get to the part where it looks like the key thing we need to do is the mandatory piece, especially since we've already got it in at least one, if not two, pieces of the existing legislation and nobody's lighting their hair on fire, saying this is causing the world to collapse around us.

I'm going to end on that note, that it seems to me that our job now, in my opinion, is to convince ourselves collectively that we can get a unanimous report that would speak to moving to a mandatory reporting system. Then from there it's up to the government to respond. If we can't get that in the report, then I can assure you, Mr. Chair, that this matter will not die. It shall find its way into other public arenas. Of that I can guarantee you, sir.

With that, I thank you, and I thank all our participants. This has been a good session. Now it's time for us to do our job.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Christopherson.

We're taking special note that he actually left two minutes on the table. I know he could back off on that, too.

Ms. Mendès.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I absolutely concur with what Mr. Christopherson just said. Yes, it is our job now to pursue it as a committee. But I would also take on many of the comments Mr. Albas made. Surprisingly, I actually agree with a lot of them.

Since 1995, we're at two audits, if I'm not mistaken. This is the second audit in a very short period, six years. Why was there never an audit done before?

Mr. Richard Domingue: Do you mean from our office, as opposed to an internal audit from Status of Women?

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Yes, not their internal audits.

Mr. Richard Domingue: Because we, as an office, decided that time was required for the 2009 action plan to mature.

• (1025)

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: No, I'm talking about the commitment in 1995, because from 1995 to 2009 14 years went by after Canada made the commitment to engage in active gender-based analysis, and we've never had an audit before. The first one was in 2009.

Mr. Richard Domingue: It was at the request, Mr. Chair, of Sheila Fraser, who at the time was the Auditor General. I was attending, I think, a hearing of the status of women committee, and the GBA file was discussed then. It was when she left that meeting that she tasked the office to perform a GBA audit. That would have been 2009.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: For that way of measuring what had been done from 1995 to 2007, we have nothing that—

Mr. Richard Domingue: No. The 2009 report, Mr. Chair, is a snapshot of the situation as of that year. We don't see how the file evolved over those 14 years.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Would you, in any of the departments, know what had been implemented, attempted, or tried?

The Chair: I think—and I'm not certain of the timeline here—perhaps even the formation of the Status of Women department might have been in response to the 1995.... Is that right or wrong?

A voice: No.

The Chair: No, okay.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: I'm curious to know why we suddenly had this first audit when the policy had been in place since 1995. This had been a commitment by Canada. We only had the first audit in 2009, but what happened meanwhile? Were any of the departments already conducting gender-based analysis in their policy-making? Were they by then, when you went in the first time in 2009?

Mr. Bouwer.

Mr. Neil Bouwer (Assistant Deputy Minister, Science and Policy Integration, Department of Natural Resources): Mr. Chair, I know that at Natural Resources Canada we did not do gender-based analysis, certainly not systemically. It's only been since the third phase of the action plan that Natural Resources Canada has done that. Today, for all of its Treasury Board submissions, all of its memoranda to cabinet, and all of its budget submissions to the Department of Finance, NRCan conducts a gender-based analysis, and that's new. I don't have the history to go back—

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: How new?

Mr. Neil Bouwer: It's new for Natural Resources Canada.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Yes, but new since when?

Mr. Neil Bouwer: In 2014, it became de facto comprehensive. We made the commitment in 2013.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Okay, thank you.

Madame Kennedy.

Ms. Nicole Kennedy: I just wanted to point out that for Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, the GBA policy was adopted as a mandatory requirement in 1999. At that time we established a fairly deep capacity-building exercise.

At this point in time, we have GBA representatives throughout our department and all the programs who advise on program renewal, policy development, and research. We are actually in the process of drafting negotiation guidelines for GBA for self-government and comprehensive land claims. We've made a fairly deep commitment and it's quite long-standing in our department.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Mr. Davies, is there anything at the Department of Industry?

Mr. Mitch Davies: We made it mandatory last year that all employees in the department take the training. When they do, they gain the insight that this is about doing their jobs well and applying rigorous thinking. It's about seeking data sources and thinking things through. It's extremely well done. I would imagine that product could be exported to many jurisdictions that would benefit from it, because it's been prepared in a very professional way.

For me, that is a materially important step towards making this something that is embedded in the organization when you have 3,800 employees. We're at 90% now. We have to figure out where the last 10% are, but we'll follow up. When they have taken this, and they actually start to ask questions such as where they might find the data they need or how they might prepare themselves so they have the tools available when they are doing their work, I think that's when progress really takes hold. It's not just in a document; it actually becomes embedded.

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: [Inaudible—Editor] part of those agreements you have with Statistics Canada.

Mr. Mitch Davies: That's exactly why we provided the funding to supplement information on particular women in education and technology, to have more facts on hand when we're doing the work we do.

The Chair: Mr. Paquette.

Mr. Jacques Paquette: We've been doing it for quite a while. We have training in place. We have a centre of expertise that we are revamping as well. I would say that, at this point, we are also updating the guidelines and the tools that we have, because that's something that we need to do. One thing I would underscore is that data is always a challenge. Sometimes we do have data and sometimes we don't. Probably the first question is where to get the information. We are going to establish a network of policy analysts. We realize that some of the policy questions they're facing are difficult, even with training. This is especially true of some sectors that are not necessarily doing it very often, versus others that are used to it. Creating a community of practice where they can ask a question and seek some advice from those who have greater experience, we think, will help to get better results out of these assessments.

● (1030)

Mrs. Alexandra Mendès: Those are elements that are interesting for us to take into account.

Thank you.

The Chair: Yes, certainly, as we move forward in our report. I don't have any other questions on this side. We will come back to Ms. Shanahan.

I do have just one follow-up question from the chair on a passing statement that you made. That was in regards to—I think, from what my analysts also say—equality in hiring and percentages of equality in the workplace. I think that is where you, Ms. Ballantyne, were suggesting that we may or may not be in the top 10 in the world but that gender-based analysis goes much beyond percentages of different genders in the workplace. For every policy coming through, we need to ask if there is an analysis on it and if there has been adequate analysis.

Going back to the gender-based analysis, what are the leading countries? I know from speaking with you in the past that Canada is perhaps one of the guiding lights for other countries, and certainly our provinces look to Canada. Who is in that top 10? What other countries are there? Where is Canada when it comes to gender-based analysis?

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: You're absolutely right in terms of differentiating between the tool and the actual goal it's trying to achieve. In terms of gender-based analysis as a tool, we have one of the best in the world. We've modelled it after the Europeans. That's where the "plus" came from. It's not just GBA; it's actually going deeper than the impact on women and men, and is looking at the ages of women, the income levels of women, the ethnicity, the language. Our tool has been modelled after some European tools, and we're now basically looked to as a model by other countries.

As I was saying to you, when we were at the United Nations committee on the status of women, we heard a lot about Canada, about the tools and the structures we have in place over here to advance us. The GBA tool, with the online course that my colleagues were referring to, has been looked to as a model in terms of how we're carrying this out in Canada.

We're all learning from each other. Basically we try to have this continuous improvement cycle so that as we get more feedback, or as we learn from other countries what they're doing with regard to

the tool they started with from us, we then adopt their best practices as well.

The Chair: Again, I'm not putting words in anyone's mouth, but it's not where the whole program of gender-based analysis is a fail, fail, fail. It's more in response to the Auditor General: how can we move it always to more enhance the program that is already viewed very well? That's why we appreciate reports from Auditors General and then responses from the different departments.

We'll move back to Ms. Shanahan, please.

Mrs. Brenda Shanahan: Thank you, Chair.

Yes, I'm interested too in really the component of how we are going to build better policy using gender-based analysis. We don't want to just give lip service to it, we want to really make it happen.

What I'm seeing is that it's a culture change within departments, with long-standing employees coming from very different places. I very much like this idea of the champions network and the community of practice that I'm hearing here.

Ms. Ballantyne, perhaps you could talk a little bit about how we're going to get behaviour change in the workplace here.

● (1035)

Ms. Meena Ballantyne: I think you've pointed to a number of initiatives that we're all working on, but I think the most important culture change is the leadership from the top—from the government, from our minister. Our minister is a very activist minister. She is really gung-ho. She's taken the course, all her staff are taking the course, or have taken it. I know that at the standing committee on women, there will be a recommendation, or they're considering whether all ministers and their staff take this course so that they can then play the challenge function with their deputies.

I think it's coming from the top. There is a real sense of movement here. As I said to my deputy colleagues, because my minister has written to all her colleagues and is not shy about pressing them, as my colleague said, at the cabinet table or earlier on.... For example, on the infrastructure funding for shelters for women, that was a concerted effort made by her and all of us to really push and say that this was really important for women's issues, which bore fruit early on.

On some of the work that colleagues at Treasury Board will be doing in terms of the regulatory frameworks, we'll be looking at the regulations, which is different from legislation. There is a real rigorous impact statement and cost-benefit analysis. I think if we can tap into the regulatory side of things, and we can tap into the evaluation, which can then inform policies, I really feel very optimistic that this time around we'll be able to make progress.

You know, I'd like to say that there is this will, there is this engagement, there is this leadership, and nothing precludes us, as the democratic process unfolds, from going down the mandatory route. As our colleague has said, I think if it is mandatory, as might be necessary but we don't know yet, it's certainly not a sufficient requirement. We need the training, we need the capacity, we need all that. You could make it mandatory and it could still fail.

So let's try this approach and let's see where it goes.

The Chair: All right.

Thank you very much. I think that concludes our meeting for today.

We had many departments, along with the Auditor General, appearing before our committee. We appreciate all of you being here.

Thank you for the good work you do. We look forward to hearing in the future, where the report has been issued from this committee... and that the different departments are looking at it as well.

We are adjourned.

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.

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.

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