HOUSE OF COMMONS
CANADA

FUNDING THROUGH THE WOMEN'S PROGRAM: WOMEN'S GROUPS SPEAK OUT

Report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Anita Neville, M.P.
Chair

May 2005

FUNDING THROUGH THE WOMEN'S PROGRAM: WOMEN'S GROUPS SPEAK OUT

Report of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Anita Neville, M.P.
Chair

May 2005

STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

CHAIR

Anita Neville

VICE-CHAIRS

Jean Crowder
Nina Grewal

MEMBERS

France Bonsant   Russ Powers
Paule Brunelle   Joy Smith
Hon. Sarmite Bulte   Hon. Paddy Torsney
Helena Guergis   Lynne Yelich
Susan Kadis

CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE

Richard Rumas

**PARLIAMENTARY INFORMATION AND RESEARCH SERVICE
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT**

Julie Cool, Analyst
Lydia Scratch, Analyst

THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
THE STATUS OF WOMEN

has the honour to present its

THIRD REPORT

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), your committee reviewed Core Funding. Your committee heard evidence on this matter, the result of which is contained in this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FUNDING THROUGH THE WOMEN'S PROGRAM: WOMEN'S GROUPS SPEAK OUT

INTRODUCTION

The Women's Program at Status of Women Canada provides over $10 million in grants to women's and equality-seeking organizations annually. When the Committee met with women's groups and equality-seeking organizations in the fall of 2004 to identify priority areas for action, many witnesses indicated that the shift from core funding to project funding had had a detrimental impact on the ability of organizations to mobilize for greater equality between women and men. In its first report, tabled in the House of Commons on 10 February 2005, the Standing Committee on the Status of Women recommended that the federal government increase funding to the Women's Program at Status of Women Canada by at least 25% for investments in women's groups and equality-seeking organizations.

Although concerns about government funding featured prominently among the issues equality-seeking organizations wanted the Committee to consider, the Committee did not have an opportunity to question groups specifically on their funding concerns during its initial roundtables in the fall of 2004. As a result, it decided in May 2005 to invite groups to speak specifically to the impact of the current funding arrangements between equality-seeking organizations and the Women's Program at Status of Women Canada, and on potential solutions to improve the functioning of those funding arrangements. This report is based on the testimony of the diverse women's groups and equality-seeking organizations, from Newfoundland to British Columbia, which participated in two roundtables on funding which the Committee held on 3 May 2005 and 10 May 2005. This report also draws on the testimony of witnesses from Status of Women Canada which appeared before the Committee on 1 February 2005.

CORE FUNDING AND PROJECT-BASED FUNDING IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

A 2003 report on funding of the voluntary sector, prepared by the Canadian Council on Social Development for the Voluntary Sector Initiative, identified the three key distinctions between core funding and project-based funding as follows:[1]

---

[1] Canada. Voluntary Sector Initiative. *Funding Matters: The Impact of Canada's New Funding Regime on Non-profit and Voluntary Organizations*. Accessed on-line at

http://www.vsi-isbc.ca/eng/funding/fundingmatters/03.cfm, 10 May 2005.

- "**Core" funding** refers to financial support that covers basic "core" organizational and administrative costs in addition to program specific requirements. Providing funding to an organization to operate its own chosen programs is a clear example of core funding. By contrast, **program or project** funding tends to focus exclusively on project costs. An organization is typically allowed to include a portion of administrative costs such as phone or rent in a project budget, but there are strict terms and conditions detailing what is an acceptable expenditure and what is not.

- An important distinction between a core and project-based funding model is the degree of autonomy that the organization exercises. Non-profit and voluntary organizations under a core funding arrangement retain a significant degree of independence in selecting and implementing program and organizational objectives. Within a project-based funding model, the control of the content generally lies with the funder.

- Core funding tends to be of longer duration, and is considered a more predictable form of funding. Project funding is invariably short-term. Organizations find themselves gearing up on a project only to conclude, then starting over again with yet another activity.

Over the past decade, federal government departments and agencies have been under increasing pressure to reduce risks and to demonstrate results of programs and funding. Although there has been a resulting trend in federal government funding away from core funding to project funding, certain departments continue to provide core funding or to cover organizational costs.

The Treasury Board Secretariat's *Policy on Transfer Payments*[2] provides broad parameters within which government departments have discretionary power to develop programs, including the definition of eligible recipients and the determination of eligible costs. Nothing in the *Policy on Transfer Payments* would prevent a department from developing a program which would provide grants to cover the core funding needs of an organization.

OVERVIEW OF THE WOMEN'S PROGRAM

The Women's Program has provided funding to women's organizations and equality-seeking organizations in Canada since 1973. Currently managed by Status of Women Canada, the mandate of the Women's Program is

---

[2]   Canada. Treasury Board Secretariat. *Policy on Transfer Payments*. "Appendix A — Definitions."

to support action by women's organizations and other partners seeking to advance equality for women by addressing women's economic, social, political and legal situation. This support includes financial support and technical support (such as linking different groups that share a common goal, helping groups gain access to various parts of the government, or providing access to resource materials and tools that help organizations to work more effectively).[3]

The Women's Program spends approximately $10.8 million per year in grants. Projects funded under the Women's Program must fall within three broad areas of focus, including:

- improving Women's Economic Status

- eliminating Systemic Violence Against Women and the Girl Child

- achieving Social Justice

THE EVOLUTION OF FUNDING THROUGH THE WOMEN'S PROGRAM

The Women's Program has experienced a number of transitions over the past decade which indicate a shift towards an increased focus on measuring the results of funding provided through the Women's Program. These are briefly outlined below:

A. 1995: Women's Program Moved From Human Resources Development Canada to Status of Women Canada

Prior to 1995, the Women's Program had been situated in the department of Human Resources Development Canada. As a result of the federal government's consolidation of women's equality programs, the Women's Program was integrated with Status of Women Canada (SWC) in April 1995. The rationale for this consolidation was that the move would provide a single access point to programs promoting women's equality and thereby create a new synergy between research, policy and programs on women's equality issues.

---

[3] Canada. Status of Women Canada. *Women's Program Funding Guidelines.* Accessed on-line at http://www.swc-cfc.gc.ca/funding/wpguidetxt_e.html#intro on 12 January 2005.

B.   1996: Consultations on Future Directions for the Women's Program

In 1996, Status of Women Canada launched a three-month consultation with close to 400 women's organizations and others interested in advancing equality for women, to seek input on:

- ways to enhance the working relationship between SWC and organizations and individuals interested in the advancement of women's equality;

- the development of a new Independent Policy Research Fund; and

- the future direction of the Women's Program.[4]

In a document summarizing the findings from these consultations, Status of Women Canada reported that "participants strongly urged an increase in funding for the (Women's) Program" and further noted that "program (core) funding should be maintained and extended to women's equality-seeking organizations on a more equitable basis."[5] In a more detailed summary of the discussions on funding mechanisms in the Women's Program, the report on the consultations once again acknowledged that "participants said that program funding (referred to as "core" funding by some groups) is an essential source of support for a number of women's organizations" despite the fact that groups receiving this type of funding had been cut by a minimum of 25% because of reductions in the Women's Program budget since 1989.

The report on the 1996 consultations also indicates, however, that certain participants felt that access to program funding was inequitable. These participants suggested that the cap imposed on the Women's Program budget in 1989 had made it impossible for new organizations to access funding. This concern about equity of access was used by Status of Women Canada to justify the movement away from core funding toward project funding.

C.   1997: Organizational Review

In its *1997 Report on Plans and Priorities*, Status of Women Canada announced that it would explore options about the Women's Program in an organizational review. SWC was aiming to:

---

[4]   Canada. Status of Women Canada. *Report on Consultations and Follow-up Action Plan*. 1996.

[5]   Canada. Status of Women Canada. *Report on Consultations and Follow-up Action Plan*. 1996.

Implement a new framework for the Women's Program. This framework (would) ensure that the Program's resources are targeted to activities which result in concrete, measurable outcomes, related to the agency's priority areas, including violence against women. As well, new funding guidelines will be developed, which will ensure greater equity of access to funding.[6]

D. 1998: Move From Program (Core) to Project Funding

Prior to 1998, one half of the Women's Program funding was spent on "program" (or core) funding, and the other half on project funding.

The *1998 Departmental Performance Report* prepared by Status of Women announced that a new, single funding mechanism would take effect in April 1998, replacing the dual stream of program funding and project funding. In that report, Status of Women Canada claimed that this would replace mechanisms that had created a barrier for newer organizations and would allow the Program's resources to be allocated more equitably to all eligible organizations.

E. 2000: Increased Funding for the Women's Program

As part of the Agenda for Gender Equality,[7] funding to the Women's Program was increased, bringing the total budget of the Women's Program to $10.8 million in 2004-2005.

F. 2002: Audit of Women's Program by Consulting and Audit Canada

The 2002 Audit of the Women's Program prepared by Consulting and Audit Canada made a number of recommendations concerning operational issues related to the monitoring of funding from the Women's Program, in such areas as staff training and the development of tools to help staff monitor funded groups. The audit did not, however, examine the impact of the move toward project funding on recipient organizations.

---

[6] Canada. Status of Women Canada. *1997-98 Estimates: Report on Plans and Priorities Pilot Document.* 1997.

[7] The Agenda for Gender Equality is a framework adopted by the federal government at the time of the Beijing +5 conference. It included additional funding for the Women's Program and for gender-based analysis, with the stated goal of helping the Government of Canada to incorporate a gender perspective in its policy development.

### G.	2003: Implementation of the Results-based Management and Accountability Framework (RMAF) for the Women's Program

Responding to a 2001 decision by the Treasury Board to extend the Modern Comptrollership Initiative to all federal departments and agencies, Status of Women Canada has developed a results-based management and accountability framework which identifies the short-term, intermediate and long-term results expected by the Women's Program. As part of this initiative, Status of Women Canada has adopted an outcome-based approach to funding to ensure that each funding application clearly identifies realistic objectives, strategies to achieve results, expected outcomes and an evaluation plan that is appropriate for the initiative.

### H.	2004-2005: Program Evaluation

Status of Women Canada is currently engaged in an evaluation of the Women's Program which includes a survey of more than 500 groups and interviews with 40 key stakeholders. The Department notes that it will be seeking information from funded groups on their experiences of the changes to the funding mechanism as well as their experiences with other sources of funding. The Department will be exploring alternate models of program delivery, including looking at options for funding mechanisms. The Department notes that this will include a review of other federal funding programs, particularly those which support equality-seeking organizations. The evaluation is expected to be completed in August 2005.

EQUALITY-SEEKING ORGANIZATIONS AND WOMEN'S GROUPS SPEAK ABOUT FUNDING

Many women's organizations today are financially fragile because they depend on a web of unpredictable, short-term, targeted project funds. *(Brief submitted by the Child Care Coalition of Manitoba)*

Many of the groups which appeared before the Standing Committee on the Status of Women described the impact of the shift from **core funding** to an exclusive reliance on **project-based funding**. The Committee heard that the move from core funding of women's organizations toward project funding has made it difficult to sustain a women's movement in Canada and made it increasingly difficult for the women's movement to advocate on behalf of women. The Committee heard that the focus on projects had led to the creation of useful "outputs" or tools, but made it difficult for groups at the national and grassroot level to make effective use of those tools. Most participants agreed on the need to provide both core and project funding; on the importance of consulting equality-seeking organizations in the development of funding models; and on the need to address the many issues which are common to the wider voluntary sector.

A.   Mix of Funding Mechanisms

> Women's organizations have a wealth of knowledge about project-based as well as core operational funding. They should be involved in the design of a new model. *(Brief submitted by Women's Economic Equality Society)*

The groups which participated in the roundtables organized by the Committee on 3 and 10 May 2005 agreed that there was a need for *both* project funding and core funding. They told the Committee that sustaining funding (or core funding) allows them to cover infrastructure costs and to leverage more funding. Witnesses told the Committee that they require stable funding to:

- explore options to address and redress the root causes of women's inequality over and above the short-term responses to inequality;

- leverage funding from other sources; and

- ensure the economic viability of equality-seeking organizations between funded projects.

At the same time, they noted that project funding allowed new organizations to emerge and encouraged organizations to be innovative and to focus on results.

> What is needed is mixed funding that better reflects the actual circumstances in which these groups work, by making sure they have the infrastructures they need to carry out their projects. *(Danielle Hébert, General Coordinator, Fédération des femmes du Québec, 10 May 2005)*

There was general consensus that the pool of funding in the Women's Program would need to be increased in order to accommodate a mix of core and project funding.

RECOMMENDATION 1:

The Committee reiterates the recommendation made in its 10 February 2005 report, calling on the federal government to increase funding to the Women's Program at Status of Women Canada by at least 25% for investments in women's groups and equality-seeking organizations.

Certain witnesses commented that program officers from Status of Women Canada have told them that the Department could reconsider the issue of core funding once the Women's Program budget was increased. Although the

Committee reiterates the recommendation it made in its previous (10 February) report calling for increased funding for the Women's Program, it emphasizes the importance of making changes to how the funding is distributed as soon as possible. Equality-seeking organizations want both core funding and project funding, therefore the Committee recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 2:

That Status of Women Canada immediately take advantage of the ongoing review of the Women's Program to revise the funding to organizations by introducing a mix of core funding and project funding.

B. *Funding Issues Common to the Wider Voluntary Sector*

The Canadian Council on Social Development (CCSD), which has been sharing the findings of the report funded by the Voluntary Sector Initiative, *Funding Matters: The Impact of Canada's New Funding Regime on Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations* since its release in 2003, notes that the funding issues faced by equality-seeking organizations are similar to those faced by the wider voluntary sector. These issues include volatility in revenue; a tendency to be pulled from the primary mission of the organization; the loss of infrastructure; reporting overload; requirements of financial or in-kind contributions from a variety of sources to secure additional funding; difficulties engaging in advocacy activities; and human resource fatigue.

> Advocacy-oriented organizations that seek systemic social change have a particularly difficult fundraising challenge. Their work is almost always rejected by corporate funders, and is rarely supported by foundations and United Way/Centraide. Status of Women Canada is one of the very rare funders that explicitly recognize the value of this change-oriented work. *(Brief submitted by the Child Care Coalition of Manitoba)*

The Voluntary Sector Initiative (VSI) is an initiative between the Government of Canada and the voluntary sector that was launched in June 2000. The VSI is focused on strengthening the relationship between the voluntary sector and the government and enhancing the capacity of the voluntary sector. In 2002, the Joint Accord Table of the Voluntary Sector Initiative released a *Code of Good Practice on Funding: Building on An Accord Between the Government of Canada and the Voluntary Sector*[8] to guide interactions between the Government of Canada and the voluntary sector on funding policies and practices. The Code identifies specific

---

[8]   Canada. Privy Council Office. *Code of Good Practice on Funding: Building on An Accord Between the Government of Canada and the Voluntary Sector.* October 2002.

measures to enhance the flexibility, responsiveness and consistency of funding arrangements between the federal government and the voluntary sector.

The Committee was particularly concerned to hear that, in spite of the adoption of the Code "things have not gotten any better… and in some cases have gotten worse" (Darlene Bessey, Voluntary Sector Forum, 10 May 2005). Because the Code contains concrete commitments to address many of the negative impacts of the current funding environment, the Committee recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 3:

That the Government of Canada, through its central agencies, ensure that all new and renewed funding programs incorporate the commitments undertaken by the Government of Canada in the Code of Good Practice on Funding, particularly the commitment to "reach decisions about the funding process through collaborative processes"; and

RECOMMENDATION 4:

That Status of Women Canada take advantage of the current evaluation of the Women's Program to implement new funding processes which could position Status of Women Canada as a leader in the application of the Code of Good Practice on Funding.

C. Collaborative Process to Determine Funding Process

Change is necessary, it must come soon. The particulars of a formula require a coast to coast conversation amongst women's groups at all levels to come to an understanding of what will foster the achievements of equality guarantees in Canada. *(Brief submitted by the Coalition for Gender Equality)*

There was widespread consensus among witnesses on the importance of engaging equality-seeking organizations in a meaningful consultation on future directions for funding through the Women's Program. Equality-seeking organizations have shown great resiliency and creativity in light of the changing funding environment over the past decade — a creativity which the Committee feels would help the Women's Program become a best practice among federal government funding programs. The Committee recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 5:

That Status of Women Canada immediately engage equality-seeking organizations in meaningful consultation to determine future directions for the Women's Program.

D.   The Human Cost of the Current Funding Process

> I feel as if, " who wants to do this job any more? "…We're supposed to be manager of the project, we're supposed to find funds, we're supposed to do the front line work, and the list goes on. When does it end? *(Sharon Taylor, Executive Director, Wolseley Family Place, 3 May 2005)*

The Committee was impressed with the dedication of witnesses to the valuable work they do in bringing about greater equality between men and women and in meeting the needs of women across this country. It was saddened to hear about the human toll that the current funding environment imposed, both in terms of a reduced ability to serve the population, and in terms of the burn-out of staff. Witnesses told the Committee that they need stable funding in order to

- prevent turn-over of staff and subsequent loss of capacity; and

- provide staff with competitive levels of compensation which recognize the valuable contribution of the voluntary sector.

In a brief to the Committee, the Canadian Council on Social Development noted that in the private sector, "if an organization does not price what it sells in such a way as to completely cover all of its costs, it will soon cease to exist."[9] The same is true for non-profit organizations who are unable to cover all of their costs. This has resulted in the loss of a number of equality-seeking organizations in Canada. For other organizations, the short-fall in funding has been borne out by overworked staff. Many of the witnesses have told us that the funding they receive does not allow them to adequately cover the indirect human resource costs involved with managing a project, making it difficult to hire a full-time executive director and to provide the necessary administrative support for the organization.

> You're writing proposals on weekends and in the evening because you too are working on project-based funding. *(Doreen Parsons, Women's Economic Equality Society, 3 May 2005)*

---

[9]   Canadian Council on Social Development. *Developments in the treatment of Indirect Costs Covered by Contribution Agreements with HRDC*. March 2004.

Status of Women Canada has told the Committee that it plans to examine best practices in funding in its ongoing evaluation of the Women's Program. The Committee suggests that Status of Women Canada explore the best practice developed by the Canadian Council on Social Development and the former Human Resource Development Canada in the treatment of indirect cost. It further recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 6:

That Status of Women Canada develop fair and consistent practices which recognize the indirect costs to be covered by Women's Program funding, and that these practices be developed in collaboration with equality-seeking organizations.

E.   *Who Should be Eligible for Funding?*

Most witnesses expressed a strong desire to avoid funding models which would pit organizations against each other for limited funding dollars, however there was much discussion about how to allocate the limited funding currently available under the Women's Program.

Several of the groups which appeared before the Committee proposed the establishment of general eligibility criteria for Women's Program funding, suggesting that funding should go to organizations with a democratic structure, that are engaged in work leading to systemic change, and which have a gender equality/women's equality mandate.

Groups were less likely to agree about the types of organizations which should be eligible for funding, however. Some witnesses felt that the interests of specific groups of women, such as rural women and visible minority women, would not be advanced if funding were limited to national and regional women's organizations. Some witnesses suggested that service-oriented organizations had access to more funding opportunities, and should not be eligible for funding through the Women's Program. Other witnesses felt that service delivery organizations should be able to apply for funding for their advocacy work. Several witnesses expressed concern that, given the limited funding available, organizations which do not have an equality-seeking mandate are receiving project funding from the Women's Program. While the worthiness of these projects was not in question, there was concern that this funding practice did not help sustain existing equality-seeking organizations.

Groups also expressed frustration that their requests for funding from federal government funding programs were often redirected to Status of Women Canada. As a result, the Committee recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 7:

That Status of Women Canada work with other federal government departments to raise awareness about the importance of funding gender projects relevant to the funding mandates of those departments.

RECOMMENDATION 8:

That Status of Women Canada explore eligibility criteria for Women's Program funding through meaningful consultation with equality-seeking organizations.

RECOMMENDATION 9:

That Status of Women Canada act now to enter into funding agreements for a minimum period of three years.

CONCLUSION

Issues related to funding are evidently very significant for equality-seeking organizations across Canada. On short notice, almost all the groups which the Committee invited to speak about funding issues submitted briefs and made time to appear. The Committee wishes to thank all those who took the time to give careful consideration to the funding issues being discussed, and for the valuable advice witnesses shared with the Committee.

Commenting on the ongoing evaluation of its Women's Program, Status of Women Canada noted in its brief to the Committee that it had engaged in a process of reflection which "will allow the program to develop the foundation for the next iteration of a funding mechanism which has been a key partner in the advancement of women's equality for more than 30 years".[10] The Committee recognizes the importance of ensuring that the concerns raised by women's organizations and equality-seeking organizations in their presentations to this committee are appropriately reflected in the current evaluation of the Women's Program. As a result, the Committee recommends:

RECOMMENDATION 10:

That the Standing Committee on the Status of Women be granted intervenor status in the ongoing review of the Women's

---

[10] Brief submitted by Status of Women Canada. *Report on Women's Program Funding: Part II.* January 2005.

Program to ensure that the comments contained in this report are appropriately reflected in the review process.

As this report has demonstrated, it will be important to ensure that the women's organizations and equality-seeking organizations are meaningfully engaged in the development of the renewed funding mechanism in the Women's Program. In the two meetings the Committee held with equality-seeking organizations and women's organizations, we were unable to resolve the complex issues organizations face with funding through the Women's Program. It is incumbent upon this committee and the Government of Canada, however, to make a strong plea for Status of Women Canada to listen to these groups, and to engage them in a process which recognizes their valuable contribution and commitment to women in Canada. The Committee remains hopeful that such a collaboration could lead to an improved relationship which will allow these organizations to continue to work toward closing the gender gap.

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1:

The Committee reiterates the recommendation made in its 10 February 2005 report, calling on the federal government to increase funding to the Women's Program at Status of Women Canada by at least 25% for investments in women's groups and equality-seeking organizations.

RECOMMENDATION 2:

That Status of Women Canada immediately take advantage of the ongoing review of the Women's Program to revise the funding to organizations by introducing a mix of core funding and project funding.

RECOMMENDATION 3:

That the Government of Canada, through its central agencies, ensure that all new and renewed funding programs incorporate the commitments undertaken by the Government of Canada in the Code of Good Practice on Funding, particularly the commitment to "reach decisions about the funding process through collaborative processes"; and

RECOMMENDATION 4:

That Status of Women Canada take advantage of the current evaluation of the Women's Program to implement new funding processes which could position Status of Women Canada as a leader in the application of the Code of Good Practice on Funding.

RECOMMENDATION 5:

That Status of Women Canada immediately engage equality-seeking organizations in meaningful consultation to determine future directions for the Women's Program.

RECOMMENDATION 6:

That Status of Women Canada develop fair and consistent practices which recognize the indirect costs to be covered by Women's Program funding, and that these practices be developed in collaboration with equality-seeking organizations.

RECOMMENDATION 7:

That Status of Women Canada work with other federal government departments to raise awareness about the importance of funding gender projects relevant to the funding mandates of those departments.

RECOMMENDATION 8:

That Status of Women Canada explore eligibility criteria for Women's Program funding through meaningful consultation with equality-seeking organizations.

RECOMMENDATION 9:

That Status of Women Canada act now to enter into funding agreements for a minimum period of three years.

RECOMMENDATION 10:

That the Standing Committee on the Status of Women be granted intervenor status in the ongoing review of the Women's Program to ensure that the comments contained in this report are appropriately reflected in the review process.

APPENDIX A
LIST OF WITNESSES

Associations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
Association feminine d'éducation et d'action sociale	03/05/2005	30
Lise Girard, Secretary-general		
B.C. Rural Women's Network		
Debra Critchley, Coordinator, Vernon and District Women's Centre Society		
Child Care Coalition of Manitoba		
Susan Prentice, Member, Steering Committee		
Coalition for Women's Equality		
Kathy Marshall, Executive Director, Womenspace		
Coalition of Provincial and Territorial Advisory Councils on the Status of Women		
Joyce Hancock, President, Newfoundland and Labrador Advisory Council on the Status of Women		
Native Women's Association of Canada		
Beverley Jacobs, President		
Philippine Women's Centre of B.C.		
Cecilia Diocson-Sayo, Executive Director		
Wolseley Family Place		
Sharon Taylor, Executive Director		
Women's Economic Equality (WEE) Society		
Doreen Parsons, Managing Coordinator		
Women's Enterprise Centre		
Bev Suek, Chief Executive Officer		
Women's Network Office		
Laurie Ann McCardle, Executive Director, Women's Network of Prince Edward Island		

Associations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
Canadian Council on Social Development	10/05/2005	31
Katherine Scott, Vice-president, Research		
Canadian Labour Congress		
Penni Richmond, National Director, Women's and Human Rights Department		
Fédération des femmes du Québec		
Danielle Hébert, Executive Director		
Relais-Femmes		
Charlotte Thibault, Member, Forum du secteur bénévole et communautaire		
Voluntary Sector Forum		
Darlene Bessey, Vice-chair		

REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the Committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report within one hundred and twenty (120) days.

A copy of the relevant Minutes of Proceedings of the Standing Committee on the Status of Women (*Meetings Nos. 30, 31 and 32*) is tabled.

Respectfully submitted,

Anita Neville, M.P.
Chair

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday, May 17, 2005
(*Meeting No. 32*)

The Standing Committee on the Status of Women met at 3:33 p.m. this day, in Room 209 West Block, the Vice-chair, Nina Grewal, presiding.

Members of the Committee present: France Bonsant, Paule Brunelle, Jean Crowder, Nina Grewal, Helena Guergis, Susan Kadis, Anita Neville, Russ Powers, Joy Smith and Hon. Paddy Torsney.

In attendance: *Library of Parliament*: Julie Cool, Analyst; Lydia Scratch, Analyst.

Witnesses: *As an Individual*: Beth Bilson, Former Chair, Pay Equity Task Force.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted by the Committee on May 10, 2005, the Committee commenced its study of Pay Equity.

The witness made a statement and answered questions.

At 4:52 p.m., the sitting was suspended.

At 4:58 p.m., the sitting resumed *in camera*.

The Committee commenced consideration of a draft report, the Chair, Anita Neville, presiding.

It was agreed, — That the draft report be adopted in principle as the Third Report of the Committee, subject to the Chair's consultations with the Members concerning changes and translation.

It was agreed, — That after consultations and with agreement of the Members the Chair present the Third Report to the House.

It was agreed, — That, pursuant to Standing Order 109, the Committee request that the Government table a comprehensive response to the report.

At 5:23 p.m., the Committee adjourned to the call of the Chair.

Richard Rumas
Clerk of the Committee