

Representation of Canadian Women at the Cabinet Table

Linda Trimble, University of Alberta, researches women's political representation in Canada. She edits and writes on such topics as feminism, the politics of gender, media representations of women politicians, federalism and the constitution, and women's political representation in Canada.

Manon Tremblay, University of Ottawa, edits and writes extensively on Canadian women and politics. She has guest edited special issues for *Politique et Sociétés* (1998) and *International Political Science Review* (2000) and is the current French co-editor of the *Revue canadienne de science politique*.

Abstract

This examination of the appointment of elected women to Canadian federal, provincial and territorial cabinets from 1917 to 2002 analyzes both the numbers of women appointed to cabinets and the nature of their cabinet posts, revealing that while female legislators have had a competitive advantage over their male counterparts when it comes to cabinet representation, the allocation of cabinet duties continues to reflect a gendered division of labour.

Résumé

Cet examen de la nomination des femmes élues aux cabinets fédéraux canadiens, provinciaux et municipaux de 1917 à 2002, analyse tant le nombre de femmes nommées à des cabinets révélant que tandis que les femmes législatrices ont eu l'avantage compétitif sur leurs confrères quand il en est de la représentation du cabinet, la répartition des fonctions des cabinets continue de refléter une division du travail différenciée selon les sexes.

Introduction

This paper examines the representation of women in Canadian government cabinets at both the federal and provincial/territorial levels, across jurisdictions and over time, both with respect to the numbers of elected women who have been appointed to cabinet positions as well as the types of portfolios women have occupied. The analysis draws from a data set of information about all female legislators, and a stratified random sample of male Members of Parliament (MPs) at the federal government level, about whom information was gathered about their personal and political backgrounds and political careers. The data show that, once elected, female MPs and, particularly, Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) are at least as likely as their male counterparts to be selected for cabinet positions. Female MPs have been marginally more likely to achieve cabinet positions than have male MPs. It is important to qualify these positive trends with the observation that women are not winning cabinet positions via "affirmative action" measures; they do have equal, equivalent, or even exceptional qualifications for the job. Moreover, women's chances of serving in cabinet are declining at both levels of government. A final cautionary note is provided by the data on the type of ministry typically held by women. Our analysis shows a continued gendered division of labour at the cabinet table, with women tending to head ministries dealing with social citizenship or social welfare activities, and men holding more portfolios related to the defining and physical resource mobilization activities of government. However, we qualify, and to some extent challenge the assumption prevalent in the literature that so-called "women's portfolios" are less powerful and

important than those traditionally occupied by men.

Women and Cabinet Posts: Trends and Observations

Although cabinet positions are at the apex of power in parliamentary democracies, particularly those featuring rigid party discipline, relatively little has been written about the nature and level of women's representation in the political executive. This is not surprising because, until fairly recently, there were very few women ministers to study. As with legislators, female cabinet ministers are a product of a surge in women's legislative representation beginning in the 1980s in Canada and other western democracies. Before this time, if women held cabinet positions at all, it was in token numbers (Moncrief and Studlar 1996, 10).

The literature on women in cabinet in parliamentary democracies has focused on three general concerns. The first is the number of women who have reached the upper ranks of parliamentary power. Early research on this question tended to support the "higher the fewer" principle, as women had little more than token representation at the cabinet level in the 1970s and into the 1980s. Davis (1997, 3) did not begin her evaluation of women's cabinet appointments in Western European parliamentary democracies until 1968; "before then, women were nominated to national executives in very small numbers." Bashevkin (1993, 87-88) showed this to be true of national cabinets in Canada before 1985, and the work of Moncrief and Studlar (1996; 1997) established that women were no better represented in provincial cabinets. Most Canadian jurisdictions saw the first woman in cabinet in the 1960s and 1970s, and some provinces and territories did not feature a woman cabinet minister until the latter part of the twentieth century (Arscott and Trimble 1997, information boxes). Arguably, these initial appointments were largely symbolic as the first women to sit in cabinet in Canada were appointed as ministers without portfolio (Erickson 1997, 112; Palamarek 1989,

46). At the federal level, a woman was not appointed to cabinet until 1957 and one female cabinet minister was considered adequate to represent women's interests throughout the 1960s.

European studies confirmed that women's relative invisibility at the executive level in the early 1980s was not confined to Canada (Davis 1997, 14-15; Lovenduski 1986, 241; McRae 1990, 343; Randall 1987, 109). Globally women's under-representation in cabinet remains marked. Reynolds (1999) tabulated women in national cabinets in 180 nation-states at the beginning of 1997 and found an average of about 9% cabinet ministers overall. In the last two decades of the twentieth century, the proportions began to increase in many Westminster-based parliamentary systems. Davis's (1997, 14-15) study of women's cabinet appointments in 15 Western European parliamentary systems between 1968 and 1992 found uneven progress, with dramatic increases, to the point of near parity, in Nordic countries, but representation at or below 5% in some southern European nations. Moon and Fountain (1997, 457) examined the presence of women in Australian State and Commonwealth cabinets from 1970 to 1996 and discovered considerable growth at both levels of government in the 1980s and 1990s, with, for instance, women holding about 18% of State level cabinet positions between 1990 and 1996. Similarly, in the Canadian provinces, the average percentage of women cabinet ministers improved from 1985, when women held 7% of the available cabinet positions, to 1994, when 21% of the posts were held by women (Moncrief and Studlar 1996, 10).

The second concern addressed by recent literature, women's proportional representation as cabinet ministers, challenges the "higher the fewer" principle. In Canada and Australia, at both the national and sub-national level, women are now marginally over-represented as cabinet ministers relative to their presence in legislatures (Moon and Fountain 1997, 458;

Moncrief and Studlar 1996, 10; Studlar and Moncrief 1997, 71). In Canada's federal, provincial and territorial legislatures, as of July 2003, women occupied 20% of legislative seats, but held 22% of cabinet positions (www.stillcounting.athabascau.ca).

The third focus of the literature on women at the cabinet table is the nature of the ministries to which women have been appointed. Most authors assert a gendered division of labour, or, as Davis (1997, 16) puts it, "a strong degree of sectorization." Women have been appointed to "stereotypically feminine policy areas...of a social welfare or cultural nature" (Bashevkin 1993, 87-88), and thus have been clustered in so-called "soft ministries" (Lovenduski 1986, 241), "social portfolios" (Reynolds 1999, 565), "stereotypically housekeeping portfolios" (Vickers and Brodie 1981, 74) and "traditional women's ministries" (Moncrief and Studlar 1996, 12). Women's portfolios are "considered to be the logical extension of feminine concerns - health, welfare, education, culture, the family, consumer affairs" (Randall 1987, 112). These cabinet posts reflect the types of educational and occupational categories in which women have traditionally been over-represented (Davis 1997, 16). As such, "women as nurturer" portfolios are argued to include health, social services, education, women's affairs, culture, family and children, consumer affairs, identity-based ministries (multiculturalism, citizenship) and sometimes leisure activities (sport and tourism). It is argued that women are rarely, and only very recently, appointed to the male-dominated and allegedly most powerful positions, such as defence, foreign affairs, finance/treasury, home affairs, intergovernmental relations, and justice (*ibid*). Moncrief and Studlar (1996, 12) found that the majority of women in Canadian provincial cabinets have held "traditional women's positions."

It is by now well-established that women are, and have been, poorly represented at the cabinet level in Canada and elsewhere, nowhere comprising much

more than 20% of the cabinet, thus our analysis focuses on the second and third concerns; women's proportional representation in cabinets and the portfolios to which they have been appointed. Based on recent literature, we propose two general hypotheses. First, we expect to find that elected women have been slightly better represented in cabinets than their presence in legislatures would suggest. With respect to the comparison between male and female MPs, we anticipate that proportionally more of the women than the men will have held cabinet positions. The second general hypothesis focuses on the nature of women's cabinet duties. We expect the data to show that while women are increasingly appointed to portfolios considered traditional male posts, on the whole they have served as ministers of social-welfare portfolios, such as education, health, welfare, family and children. However, we challenge the circular reasoning suggesting that the portfolios in which women are concentrated are, by association, "nurturing" portfolios, positions of lesser importance and power than traditionally male posts. Apart from status of women duties, which are clearly linked to women's interests, we argue that there is no such thing as a "woman's portfolio."

Methodology

The findings presented are based on an analysis of the biographies of all women elected to provincial and territorial legislatures and the Canadian House of Commons, as well as a random sample of male MPs. All of the women elected to Canada's provincial and territorial legislatures between 1917 and 2000 (a total of 402) and to the House between 1921 and May 13, 2002 (a total of 155) were selected for this study, whether they won in a general election or by-election. A stratified sample¹ of male MPs was selected, with the strata reflecting the increase in women's representation in the House of Commons over three discrete time periods. Information about these

legislators was gathered from several sources: biographies published in *The Canadian Parliamentary Guide* and *The Canadian Parliamentary Handbook*; the House of Commons Web site, which offers information on all parliamentarians since 1867; provincial and territorial websites; and various legislative library websites.

Given the large time frame encompassed by the data, and the resultant changes in women's life circumstances and political opportunities since the early part of the twentieth century, the samples are divided into three periods, each of which corresponds to a discrete phase in women's electoral representation at both levels of government. The first phase is marked by women's gross under-representation in political office, 1917 to 1984. Phase One begins when the first women were elected, in 1917 at the provincial level and 1921 at the federal, and ends in 1984, when the 32nd Parliament was dissolved in July. The phase one cohort consists of 38 female (and 38 male) Members of Parliament and 121 women MLAs. During the second period, which includes 43 elected MPs of each sex and 147 female MLAs, women's representation in more than token numbers became established as women's electoral representation began to rise above the 10% mark federally and provincially. This phase extends from the start of the 33rd Parliament in September 1984 to the dissolution of the 34th Parliament in September 1993. The third phase extends from the October 1993 election to May of 2002 for the House of Commons and includes 74 female and 74 male MPs. The provincial and territorial data do not include women elected after 2000, and this sample comprises 134 MLAs. This third phase is marked by women's representation at the "critical mass" level of 15% or more which, according to Kanter (1977) is the minimum threshold for a minority group to start differentiating itself somewhat from the majority.

For each of the samples, we analyze the

number of women holding cabinet positions during each time period. In other words, our data indicate the proportion of elected women who served in cabinet rather than the percentage of cabinet seats held by women. As well, we tabulated the types of ministries held by all women cabinet ministers and by the sample of male MPs, counting each portfolio held, even if the minister held multiple portfolios. The data indicate the types of ministerial duties that have been held by women over time, and allow a comparison between the portfolios assigned to women and men in the federal cabinet. As such, we determine whether or not women's increased presence in legislatures has changed the proportion of women holding cabinet positions and shaped the nature of their cabinet appointments.

The Numbers -Women in Cabinet

Figure 1 compares the percentages of female MLAs, female MPs and male MPs who held cabinet posts during each of the three discrete periods of women's representation in political office. It illustrates that elected women's chances of securing a cabinet appointment have been fair to good at the federal level and very good at the sub-national level. Vickers and Brodie's (1981, 74) observation that once elected, women tend to "move rather rapidly through the ranks of the parliamentary party" remains valid. About a fifth (21%) of the female MPs elected between 1921 and 1983 were represented in cabinet. Women's presence in the executive increased to 28% during the Mulroney years, but declined to 10% of female MPs in the most recent time period, that of the Chrétien Liberal governments.

Women at both levels of government were best represented in cabinet during the second time period, though the increase was more dramatic at the sub-national level. This second phase of women's representation reflects the fairly consistent election of women to about 10% of the seats in jurisdictions across

the country. More women were available for cabinet assignments in this phase, which was also marked by bigger cabinets and enhanced sensitivity among governments to women's representational demands. Federal cabinets were at their largest in the 1980s, featuring between 30 and 40 ministers, and shrank considerably with the election of the Chrétien government in 1993 (Dyck 2000, 491). Women's movement activism was reflected in party efforts to increase women's representation in public office as well as party and government attempts to include women's issues and perspectives in policy discourses (Burt 1993). Figure 1 also indicates that in the most recent time period, more women have been elected to legislative office but proportionally fewer of them have been selected to serve as ministers. Arguably, women's over-representation in cabinets in the first two periods has given way to a level of appointment that better reflects women's presence in Canada's parliament and legislatures. A similar pattern is evident for female MLAs, though proportionally the numbers of women in provincial and territorial cabinets have been much higher in all three time periods.

As Figure 1 clearly illustrates, female provincial and territorial legislators have been better represented in cabinet than their federal counterparts. While 37% of the women elected to serve in provincial and territorial legislatures between 1917 and 2000 were appointed to cabinet, only 17% of MPs elected between 1921 and 2002 served as members of the political executive. There are three possible, by no means mutually exclusive, explanations for this finding. First, more provincial and territorial women have been elected to serve with the governing party than have female MPs, thus increasing their access to cabinet appointments (Trimble and Tremblay 2003). Sixty eight percent of the women elected to provincial and territorial legislatures between 1917 and 2000 were members of the governing party when first elected. In

contrast, 57% of female MPs entered the House of Commons as members of the government. Secondly, provincial and territorial cabinets are proportionally larger, when compared to the number of legislators in the assembly, than are federal cabinets. For instance, the federal cabinet as of January 2003 featured 39 ministers, and 301 MPs (thus 13% of the MPs were in cabinet), while the Alberta cabinet had 24 ministers and 83 MLAs (29% of the total number of MLAs were ministers), and in Ontario there were 25 ministers and 103 MPPs² (24% of MPPs were ministers). Again, this increases opportunities for female MLAs seeking cabinet posts.

Thirdly, for a period of time in the 1980s, governments were larger than they are now. The provincial level in particular featured larger legislatures, bureaucratic structures and agencies, and cabinets. Moncrief and Studlar (1996, 10) noted that the number of provincial cabinet positions increased from 186 in 1976 to 225 in 1985, then declined in 1994, to a total of 182. Trimble and Arcsott (2003, 50) reported that the total number of cabinet positions in the 10 provinces went up again recently, totalling 193 in 2003. In sum, because provincial and territorial woman legislators have had greater access to cabinet, it is not surprising that a larger percentage of them have been appointed to the political executive.

Are women's opportunities at the cabinet table better than those of their male colleagues? Figure 1 shows that this is indeed the case for Members of Parliament, and given the higher numbers of female MLAs in cabinet, we can suggest that the trend would be stronger at the provincial level. Overall, women parliamentarians have been twice as effective as their male counterparts at securing ministries; 17% of female MPs have been cabinet ministers, compared to 9% of the male MPs sampled for this study. Women's relative advantage was greatest in the second time period, suggesting that appointment to the political executive is

more than a matter of sheer numbers of women elected to Parliament. This trend reflected the socio-political context of larger governments, the logic of the welfare state, and greater political receptivity to both the representational and policy demands of the women's movement.

The Portfolios — Women and Their Cabinet Duties

The number of women at the cabinet table does not fully reveal women's access to the top jobs, namely those ministries that actively shape the policy agenda. It has been suggested that women's portfolios are "feminised" positions, carrying less power, status and policy influence than those occupied by men. Davis (1997, 16) notes that about half of the 138 cabinet positions in Western Europe that were offered to women between 1968 and 1992 were related to their traditional roles: health, social welfare, education, family, culture and consumer affairs. Those authors who point out the distinction between soft (or nurturing)/feminine portfolios and hard/masculine ministries argue that the ghettoization of women in "soft" ministries represents a form of gender-based gatekeeping (Moon and Fountain 1997, 462). For instance, Lovenduski (1986, 241) suggests that appointment to ministries such as family, welfare, and culture impedes women's promotion to more senior posts because such ministries do not foster the development of high-level management skills. Perhaps the best example of a ministerial position that is feminized in the sense of revealing considerable tokenism is the peculiar appointment of minister without portfolio (Vickers and Brodie 1981, 74). Certainly the status of women portfolio is inherently gendered.

Apart from these two acute examples of the sexual division of labour in the political executive, we agree with Moon and Fountain's (1997, 463) argument that while women tend to be grouped in certain types of portfolios, this is not sufficient evidence of gendered gate-keeping. These authors raise two objections to the

argument about a "pink collar ghetto for women in cabinet." First, they contest the "assertion that because women get these portfolios therefore they must be inferior" as inherently teleological reasoning (ibid). Secondly, they argue that several key portfolios with the greatest concentration of women ministers, namely health, education and welfare, are typically associated with the "biggest expenditure items in most OECD national budgets," are large public (and sometimes private) sector employers, and make decisions about allocation, choice and quality of resources that are central "to the life chances of all of the population" (ibid). For example, the 2003/04 expenditures of the Alberta Department of Finance were \$874 million, while the Department of Health and Welfare spent over \$7 billion during this time-period (www.finance.gov.ab.ca/publications/measuring/minbus). As Desserud (1997, 266) maintains, ministries such as education, child and social services are of crucial importance at the provincial level of government in Canada, especially in less advantaged provinces. Finally, given women's relationship to the welfare state, which features greater reliance on state services and higher levels of employment in public sector institutions, these ministries have a profound impact on women's citizenship status (Vickers 1994). Rather than characterizing these ministries as "soft" portfolios of implicitly lower status and power, it may be more appropriate to argue that they are crucial posts with respect to status of women concerns. Indeed, women who are in charge of social welfare ministries have as many if not more opportunities as do those in charge of traditionally masculine portfolios to affect woman-sensitive policy decisions. For instance, anti-poverty activist Claudette Bradshaw saw her federal Labour portfolio as key to improving the lives of people living in poverty (Carbert and Black 2003, 74). Such opportunities are arguably as important in an era of neo-liberal state retrenchment and restructuring as they

were during the development of the welfare state (Brodie 1995).

Our analysis refines the classification scheme for portfolios suggested by Moon and Fountain (1997) in an effort to better reflect the Canadian case and more effectively distinguish between types of ministries. Moon and Fountain distinguish between ministries carrying out a defining activity (defence, maintenance of internal order, mobilization of financial resources), those involved in physical resource mobilization (energy, infrastructure and transportation and communication services), and those conducting social activities (attending to the well-being of citizens). Our revision of this scheme reflects the fact that, because of the division of powers between governments in the Canadian federal system, ministerial duties differ according to jurisdiction. While there is considerable overlap, with federal, provincial and territorial cabinets featuring ministers of health, finance, justice, and so on, certain portfolios are unique to each jurisdiction. Provinces do not have ministers of defence or foreign affairs, though ministers responsible for intergovernmental affairs often represent the province in international forums. The federal cabinet does not include a minister responsible for children's services, municipal affairs or education. As well, ministries have different levels of importance depending on jurisdiction. For example, travel and gaming/lotteries are increasingly large sources of revenue for provincial governments. Another difference is the tendency of provincial cabinets to include ministers without portfolio until the early 1990s. No ministers without portfolio were found among the women MPs and the representative sample of male MPs.

Table I categorizes Canadian government portfolios according to the three types of government activity: defining activity, physical resource mobilization, and social activity. As well, it indicates the division of powers between federal and sub-national governments by specifying which portfolios are exclusive to each level

of government. In general, the classification scheme works reasonably well in the Canadian case because of jurisdictional overlap as evidenced by both levels of government performing significant duties in each area of government activity.

Is there a gender-based division of labour in cabinet, with a determined allocation of social portfolios to women? As Figure 2 shows, male MPs have been more likely to occupy defining and physical resource mobilization portfolios than their female counterparts, with 67% of the ministries held by the sample of male MPs in these categories as compared with 52% of female MPs. Female legislators have been appointed more often to social portfolios than their male counterparts, with 48% of the portfolios held by female MPs and 58% held by female MLAs in this category. In contrast, 33% of the portfolios occupied by male MPs have been social activity portfolios. Looking at trends across time³ shows some interesting results, with the percentage of social activity appointments increasing for female MPs while decreasing for male MPs. In short, there is a clear difference between the types of portfolios assigned to men and women, and this difference has persisted and become more distinct.

Examining the distribution of ministries to women over time reveals differences between levels of government in the first and second time-periods.⁴ While female ministers at both levels of government were, and continue to be, more likely to hold social activity portfolios, until 1993 female cabinet ministers at the sub-national level were more strongly concentrated in the social activity category than were their federal counterparts. Federal ministers held more defining activity portfolios. Another difference is that, at the federal level, there has been little change in the distribution of women ministers in these three categories over time, while at the provincial level, the number of women holding social activity portfolios dropped in the most recent time period and those in defining and

physical resource activity ministries increased.

As Table 1 indicated, the social activity category is considerably more expansive at the provincial and territorial level. As constitutional responsibility for most aspects of the welfare state rests with sub-national governments, at the provincial level the "social activity" category is quite large. The sheer number of portfolios encompassing social activities at the provincial and territorial levels could therefore suggest that proportionally more women hold these portfolios when in fact it is simply a matter of more portfolios being available in this category. For this reason, social activity ministries are further analyzed at the sub-national level, divided into two categories: citizenship activities, and welfare state activities. The former are predominantly concerned with identity-based claims on the state, community and identity concerns, and human rights, while the latter focus on delivering welfare state services such as health care, education and social services to the public. The distinctions are outlined in Table 2. Arguably there is considerable overlap between these categories, as citizenship and social welfare are necessarily intertwined. However, there are important policy and budgetary differences between social programs intended for delivery to the entire community and programs designed for specific groups. For instance, while seniors receive social assistance, they also make particular claims on the state specific to their economic status and identity-based social location. Thus while the dividing line may not be unassailable, it does indicate the different types of social activities engaged in by sub-national governments.

By dividing the social activity category into citizenship activities and social welfare activities, and examining the portfolios held by provincial and territorial women cabinet ministers, we see that women have increasingly been appointed to social citizenship portfolios while the number holding social welfare posts has declined. Still, overall a greater percentage of the

appointments has been in the social welfare category than in the social citizenship group. One of the reasons for the increasing number of women occupying social citizenship positions could be the creation and proliferation of ministerial posts addressing multiculturalism, human rights, seniors, persons with disabilities and aboriginal rights in the 1980s and 1990s in response to group-based representational human rights claims.

Do these findings suggest gendered gatekeeping at the executive level in the provinces and territories? The number of women appointed to cabinet without portfolio is strongly indicative of tokenization, but Figure 3 illustrates that this rather paternalistic appointment was concentrated in the first time period and has all but disappeared. Looking at the number of women who have held the status of women or women's issues post, it would appear that women are ghettoised in the women's ministry, as women have held this position more often than they have occupied any other portfolio (47 times, representing almost 12% of women's cabinet positions at the sub-national level; data not shown). While this is a cabinet appointment for which gender is a clear qualification, the proliferation of female ministers responsible for the status of women is entirely unsurprising. Surely feminist analysts and activists would protest if more men than women were allocated this position. As Lovenduski (quoted in Davis 1997, 15) points out, "if a preponderance of women in cultural, social, or women's departments or ministries is not ideal, it is a major advance on a preponderance of men in such posts."

Conclusions

This exploration of women at the cabinet table in Canada's federal, provincial and territorial governments has confirmed some assertions about women in cabinets and has contested others. The "higher the fewer" principle has been challenged to

some degree. While women now hold a larger number of cabinet seats, in fact occupying a slightly higher percentage of cabinet positions than legislative positions in most jurisdictions, proportionally fewer elected women now have an opportunity to serve in executive posts. During the time periods when women's representation in Parliament and legislatures was at or below 10% of the seats, election to office meant a good chance of receiving a cabinet appointment, especially at the provincial and territorial level. Now fewer women MPs and MLAs can expect these policy-making positions. It seems the advantage women may have enjoyed due to their novelty value in legislatures, coupled with attention to issues of gender-based representation in cabinet, is now waning. Gender parity in executive positions will require the election of more women and, perhaps more importantly, the political will to appoint them in greater number.

Their sex may on occasion have benefited women legislators when seeking cabinet appointments, but it has also affected the types of ministries women receive. This study shows that women continue to be appointed in greater number to social activity portfolios than do men, who tend to receive more appointments in the defining activity and physical resource mobilization categories. This is particularly the case at the sub-national level, reflecting at least in part provincial and territorial jurisdiction over many aspects of the welfare state. Does this mean women are type-cast, given "nurturing" portfolios which are intrinsically less prestigious, important and career-enhancing? Arguably this is the case with the status of woman position and other identity-based ministerial duties, as group-based claims have less currency in an era of neo-liberal restructuring (Brodie 1995, 56-63). Yet the same argument cannot be made with as much vigour for many of the social activity portfolios, notably education, health care and social assistance. These ministries have enormous budgets, oversee large numbers of staff, shape

fiscal decisions and wield considerable influence.

Despite program and spending cuts in social welfare ministries, these portfolios remain crucial to the evolving status of women, as women are more likely to seek access to welfare state services, secure employment in these sectors, and be gravely affected by cuts to program spending and service delivery. If women ministers are concerned with responding to women's diverse policy claims then their appointment to key social activity portfolios should be as welcome as their entry into traditionally male-dominated ministries such as foreign affairs and finance.

Acknowledgement

The authors acknowledge the financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada; funding for this project was provided by Grant Number 816-99-0005. As well, we would like to thank the Australian National University, as this paper was written while the authors were serving as Visiting Fellows in the Political Science Program, Research School of Social Sciences, February 2003.

Endnotes

1. From a statistical point of view, it would have been preferable to compare all female MPs with all male MPs (or even a somewhat larger pool of male MPs) but limited resources made this impossible given that more than 6,000 men were elected to the House of Commons between 1921 and 2002. Therefore, the three time periods were used as strata for selecting a sample of male MPs. The number of men in each stratum was determined by the number of women elected to the House of Commons in each period. The men were selected based on a simple random method.


2. MLAs in Ontario are referred to as Members of Provincial Parliament (MPP).

3. These data are not reported, but are available from the author upon request (ltrimble@ualberta.ca).

4. Data available from Linda Trimble (ltrimble@ualberta.ca)

TABLES AND FIGURES

Figure 1
Percentage of Legislators Appointed to Cabinet by Sex, Jurisdiction,
Time Period



* The data reflect the entire universe of female MPs, and a stratified random sample of male MPs.

Table I
Classification of Ministerial Portfolios

Type of Governing Activity	Defining Activity	Physical Resource Mobilisation	Social Activity: Citizenship and Welfare State
Federal Portfolios	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Defence, Veteran's Affairs - Foreign Affairs, International Cooperation & Trade - National Revenue 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Canadian Heritage - Citizenship and Immigration
Common Portfolios	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finance/Treasury - Economic development/diversification - Industry, Trade - Justice/Attorney General - Intergovernmental Affairs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environment - Transport - Public Works and Government Services - Agriculture - Natural Resources - Fisheries and Oceans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multiculturalism - Status of Women - Labour, Human resources - Health - Indian Affairs and Northern Development - Aboriginal Affairs
Provincial /Territorial Portfolios	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consumer Affairs - Gaming/lotteries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Municipal Affairs - Science/ technology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Education - Community Affairs/citizenship - Social Services - Child and Family Services - Housing - Persons with Disabilities - Seniors - Human Rights

Table 2

Social Activity Portfolios – Sub-National Level of Government

Citizenship and Identity Portfolios	Welfare State Program Delivery Portfolios
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multiculturalism - Status of Women - Community Affairs/citizenship - Persons with Disabilities - Aboriginal Affairs - Seniors - Human Rights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Labour, Human resources - Health - Education - Social Services - Child and Family Services - Housing

Figure 2

Type of Portfolio Held by Cabinet Ministers (in percentages)
by Sex, Jurisdiction





Figure 3

Types of Portfolios Held by Female MLAs (in percentages)
by Time Period



References

Arcott, Jane and Linda Trimble, eds. *In the Presence of Women: Representation in Canadian Governments*. Toronto: Harcourt, 1997.

Bashevkin, Sylvia. *Toeing the Lines: Women and Party Politics in English Canada*, 2nd edition. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Brodie, Janine. *Politics on the Margins: Restructuring and the Canadian Women's Movement*. Halifax: Fernwood, 1995.

Burt, Sandra. "The Changing Patterns of Public Policy,"

Changing Patterns: Women in Canada, Sandra Burt, Lorraine Code and Lindsay Dorney, eds. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1993, pp. 212-42.

Carbert, Louise and Naomi Black. "Building Women's Leadership in Atlantic Canada," *Atlantis* 27.2 (2003): 72-78.

Davis, Rebecca Howard. *Women and Power in Parliamentary Democracies: Cabinet Appointments in Western Europe, 1968-1992*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

Desserud, Don. "Women in New Brunswick Politics: Waiting for the Third Wave," *In the Presence of*

- Women: Representation in Canadian Governments, Jane Arscott and Linda Trimble, eds. Toronto: Harcourt, 1997, pp. 254-77.
- Dyck, Rand. *Canadian Politics: Critical Approaches*, 3rd edition. Scarborough: Nelson, 2000.
- Erickson, Lynda. "Parties, Ideology and Feminist Action: Women and Political Representation in British Columbia Politics," In *the Presence of Women: Representation in Canadian Governments*, Jane Arscott and Linda Trimble, eds. Toronto: Harcourt, 1997, pp. 106-27.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women," *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (1977): 965-90.
- Lovenduski, Joni. *Women and European Politics: Contemporary Feminism and Public Policy*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1986.
- McRae, Susan. "Women at the Top: The Case of British National Politics," *Parliamentary Affairs* 43:3 (1990): 341-347.
- Moncrief, Gary F. and Donley T. Studlar. "Women Cabinet Ministers in Canadian Provinces 1976-1994," *Canadian Parliamentary Review* 19.3 (1996): 10-13.
- Moon, Jeremy and Imogen Fountain. "Keeping the Gates? Women as Ministers in Australia, 1970-96," *Australian Journal of Political Science* 32.3 (1997): 455-66.
- Palamarek, Michael. *Alberta Women in Politics: A History of Women and Politics in Alberta, 1900-1988*. Edmonton: Report prepared for Senator Martha P. Bielish, 1989.
- Randall, Vicki. *Women and Politics: An International Perspective*. London: Macmillan, 1987.
- Reynolds, Andrew. "Women in the Legislatures and Executives of the World: Knocking at the Highest Glass Ceiling," *World Politics* 41.4 (1999): 547-72.
- Studlar, Donley T. and Gary F. Moncrief. "Research Note: The Recruitment of Women Cabinet Ministers in the Canadian Provinces," *Governance* 10.1 (1997): 67-81.
- Trimble, Linda and Jane Arscott. *Still Counting: Women in Politics across Canada*. Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2003.
- Trimble, Linda and Manon Tremblay. "Women Politicians in Canada's Parliament and Legislatures, 1917-2000: A Socio-Demographic Profile," In *Women and Electoral Politics in Canada*, Manon Tremblay and Linda Trimble, eds. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2003, pp. 37-58.
- Vickers, Jill McCalla. "Why Should Women Care About Federalism?" *Canada: The State of the Federation*, ed. Douglas Brown and Janet Hiebert. Kingston: Queen's Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, 1994, pp. 261-84.
- Vickers, Jill and Janine Brodie. "Canada," *The Politics of the Second Electorate*, ed. Joni Lovenduski and Jill Hills. London: Routledge, 1981, pp. 52-82.