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Implementation of Women’s Human Rights

1. FAFIA submits that Canada has not implemented recommendations made by United Nations treaty bodies over the last fifteen years regarding the equality of women. Canada has also not implemented the recommendations which it accepted during the 2009 UPR, a number of which have particular relevance for women, including recommendations 44 and 45, and recommendations 33 through 38.

2. FAFIA urges the Human Rights Council to ensure that the 2013 UPR holds Canada to account for its general and nation-wide failure to implement fully and effectively its human rights obligations to women. The Human Rights Council made a commitment to ensure that the issues of women’s equality would be thoroughly canvassed and attended to during the Universal Periodic Review process.

3. Canada has the resources, institutions and infrastructure to ensure that women enjoy their human rights equally with men, and that women advance to political, legal, economic, social and cultural equality. In this time of global recession, Canada’s economy is relatively healthy. However, while Canada ranks 6th on the United Nations Development Program’s Human Development Index, it ranks 20th on the Gender Inequality Index. Governments in Canada have not put in place the measures necessary to address and overcome the deeply embedded and long-standing structural and systemic inequalities that women face. In fact, over the last decade, Canada has been moving backwards on implementation of the rights of women in important ways.

Women’s Inequality

4. Women’s inequality in Canada is characterized by:
   - higher poverty rates and lower incomes for women;
   - deep social and economic disadvantage experienced by particular groups of women, including single mothers, Aboriginal women, women of colour, women with disabilities, and older women;
   - unequal representation in political office – Canada’s Parliament has only 25% representation of women and one province, Manitoba, has the highest representation in Canada at 31% women;
   - lower employment earnings, underemployment, gendered division of labour, and inadequate measures to overcome sex, race, and disability discrimination in the labour force, including sex and race discrimination in pay and inadequate protections for migrant workers;
   - inadequate access to quality, affordable child care;
   - housing insecurity and inadequate access to safe, affordable housing;
   - inadequate social assistance rates, and punitive rules and policies for recipients, particularly lone mothers, and women who are victims of violence;
• high rates of child apprehension, particularly from low income and Aboriginal mothers;
• lack of access to justice and effective remedies for violations of rights, due to inadequate civil legal aid\(^{15}\) and the cancellation of the Court Challenges Programme;
• constraints on women’s ability to participate in policy development and democratic interaction with governments, because of denial of funding for women’s non-governmental organizations for research and advocacy;
• male violence, accompanied by failures of the justice system (police, prosecutors, and judges) to respond in ways that effectively assist women and keep them safe,\(^{16}\) and inadequate shelters, housing, and income supports for women who experience male violence;
• overincarceration of Aboriginal women and girls,\(^{17}\) overclassification, discriminatory and harmful treatment of women prisoners.\(^{18}\)

**Women’s Poverty and Income Inequality**

5. Historically poverty rates for women have always been higher for women than men. In 2010, one in ten women in Canada was living in poverty (10.3%).\(^{19}\) High as this rate is in such a wealthy country, the overall poverty rate masks much higher rates of poverty for particular groups of women.\(^{20}\) In 2010, 34.7% of unattached women under 65 and 15.6% of unattached women over 65 were living in poverty, as were 21.8% of women-headed lone parent families.\(^{21}\) Rates of poverty in women-headed lone-parent families are three times higher than for male-headed lone-parent families.\(^{22}\)

6. Statistics Canada reports that 37% of First Nations women living off-reserve, and 23% of Métis and Inuit women are living below Low-Income Cut-Offs.\(^{23}\) Aboriginal women are more likely than non-Aboriginal women to be lone parents, which exacerbates their economic disadvantage. In 2006, 18% of Aboriginal women aged 15 and over were heading families on their own, compared with 8% of non-Aboriginal women.\(^{24}\)

7. 22% of women “in a visible minority” are living below Low-Income Cut-Offs,\(^{25}\) as are 15% of immigrant women.\(^{26}\) The low income rate for immigrant women rises to 32% for those who arrived in Canada recently.\(^{27}\) In 2000, 26% of women with disabilities were living below the Low-Income Cut-Offs.\(^{28}\)

8. Women, and particular groups of women, face high rates of poverty, but also, above the poverty level, they experience significant and long-standing income inequality. The average total income of women from all sources, including employment earnings, government transfer payments, investment income, and other money income, was 64% of men’s total income in 2008.\(^{29}\) This gap has changed little in thirty years.
9. Social assistance (welfare) is a basic social program of profound importance to women because women need it when they have no other means, and rely on it when they leave violent partners. In its 2008 review of Canada, the CEDAW Committee recommended that Canada “establish minimum standards for the provision of funding to social assistance programmes, applicable at the federal, provincial and territorial levels, and a monitoring mechanism to ensure …that funding decisions meet the needs of the most vulnerable groups of women…”

10. Today welfare incomes remain profoundly inadequate and the Government of Canada has set no standards. Although the Government of Canada until 1995 attached conditions to its transfers of funds for social assistance and social services to the provinces and required them to meet some standards, it does so no longer. Funds are transferred under the Canada Social Transfer to the provinces and territories without any conditions attached. This permits the provinces and territories to spend the money on anything they choose, including not on social assistance or social services at all. Because there are no national standards, provinces can choose to set social assistance rates so low that they do not fulfill Canada’s human rights obligations.

11. In 2006, women and girls were relying on welfare rates so low that the National Council of Welfare called them “cruel.” In 2011, there are some improvements. Welfare rates for lone parents with one child, who are overwhelmingly women, were approaching adequacy in four jurisdictions. However, welfare rates for lone parents, and for most household types in most jurisdictions, remained far below adequacy.30

12. Women’s poverty and income inequality has far reaching, gender-specific consequences, which affect women’s life chances and their safety. Women living in poverty are less able to protect themselves from sexual exploitation, and more likely to turn to prostitution as a means of survival. The level of violence and psychological damage which women experience in prostitution is extreme.

13. Because of Canada’s nation-wide housing crisis, many women face housing insecurity, homelessness, and lack of access to safe, affordable housing.31 Many women in Canada have problems finding affordable housing, particularly lone mothers and unattached women.32 Poor women can, too easily, become homeless, or they live in unsafe housing, such as squats and shelters, where they are more vulnerable to rape and sexual harassment.33 The federal government estimates the homeless population at 150,000.34 But homeless women and children are not necessarily included in this figure, as their homelessness is not accurately captured by “street counts.” The Homeless Hub, which is a centre for information on homelessness in Canada, recently changed its definition of homelessness35 to include the over 100,000 women and children who live temporarily each year in Canada’s 593 Violence Against Women shelters.36

14. In the North, where weather conditions are harsh, housing shortages and overcrowding present severe problems for women.37 For Inuit and First Nations women, crowded and inadequate housing is a significant barrier to their overall well-
being. In 2006, 31% of Inuit women and girls and 14% of First Nations women and girls lived in crowded dwellings.\textsuperscript{38}

15. Adequate housing is also a significant issue for women with disabilities – 15% (compared to 6% of women without disabilities) live in homes that need major repairs, such as repairs to defective plumbing or electrical wiring, or structural repairs to walls, floors or ceilings.\textsuperscript{39}

16. As the Special Rapporteur on Adequate Housing noted in his 2009 report on Canada: “The lack of adequate and secure housing particularly impacts women who are disproportionally affected by poverty, homelessness, housing affordability problems, violence and discrimination in the private rental market.”\textsuperscript{40}

17. Poor women, especially poor Aboriginal women, are more likely to have their children taken away by the state, often on the grounds of “neglect.” In British Columbia, for example, physical harm or abuse accounts for only about 10% of child apprehensions. The rest are due to failure to provide for a child’s basic needs: food, clothing, adequate shelter, supervision and medical care, which is, almost by definition, poverty. 41% of child apprehensions are from families in receipt of social assistance.\textsuperscript{41}

18. The high rate of child apprehensions from Aboriginal women and families perpetuates the colonial policy of cultural erasure. The First Nations Family and Caring Society reported in 2005 that “[o]ne in ten Status Indian children in three sample provinces were in child welfare care as of May 2005 compared to one in two hundred non-Aboriginal children.”\textsuperscript{42} National data suggests there are three times more Aboriginal children in care now than there were at the height of residential school operations.\textsuperscript{43} Child welfare policies for Aboriginal children and families are in crisis, and the federal government’s under-funding of child welfare services on reserves is being challenged by the First Nations Family and Caring Society in a human rights complaint that is currently before the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal.\textsuperscript{44}

19. For vulnerable mothers and families, child welfare policies in Canada do not provide the supports needed so that they can care for their own children.\textsuperscript{45}

20. In addition, the last decade has seen drastic cuts to legal aid, which have created a crisis in access to justice. Restrictions in eligibility for legal aid and a narrowing of legal aid coverage have a direct impact on women who disproportionately have low incomes.\textsuperscript{46}

21. While men are the principal users of criminal law legal aid, women are the principal users of civil legal aid.\textsuperscript{47} In many jurisdictions, civil legal aid for family law and poverty law matters is either unavailable or has been significantly eroded. Studies show that, when denied counsel and faced with representing themselves, women often give up pursuing their share of family assets, or resign from contesting variations in custody or support orders.\textsuperscript{48} Also the lack of access to legal services for poverty law matters, such as the denial of social assistance, or disability benefits, or when they face housing issues, affects women’s security and enjoyment of their social and economic rights.
22. The Canadian Bar Association states that “legal aid should be recognized as an essential public service, like health care; public funding should … ensure access to justice for low-income people; … national standards for criminal and civil legal aid coverage and eligibility criteria are required; and the federal government should revitalize its commitment to legal aid.”

23. An additional blow to women’s access to justice was the 2006 cancellation by the Government of Canada of the Court Challenges Programme. The Court Challenges Program (CCP) was established in 1985 to provide modest federal funding for test cases initiated by individuals and groups to challenge federal laws and policies that violate the constitutional right to equality. Individual women, women’s organizations and other equality-seeking groups were able, with this funding assistance, to access the Canadian court system to assert constitutional equality rights. In the absence of CCP funding, women cannot exercise their equality rights in Canada unless they are wealthy.

24. Women also face inadequate child care. There are only regulated early care and learning spaces, other than kindergarten, for about 20% of children under six in Canada. Further, the spaces that are available are expensive for families: generally, the second highest cost of living, next to housing, and frequently exceeding the cost of post-secondary education. In December 2008, a UNICEF report card on early childhood education and child care ranked Canada last among 25 developed nations.

25. Poverty and income inequality, lack of affordable housing and child care, and lack of access to legal aid have a connected and systemic impact on the equality of women. Canada has moved backwards on implementing the rights of women because of federal withdrawal from social policy and provincial cuts to social programs. There is a ‘vicious circle’ of events which happen to women, often because of the combined effects of sex and race discrimination. Once a woman experiences one event, the likelihood of other harmful events occurring is greatly increased.

26. The connected events include: male violence, lack of adequate housing, welfare that is insufficient to meet basic needs, lack of access to legal aid, child apprehension, and depression/addiction.

27. For Aboriginal women the vicious circle is described this way: intergenerational impacts of colonialism, including forced removal of children to abusive residential schools, adoption outside of the community, suppression of language, religion and culture; sexual abuse and violence in childhood; addictions; male violence; inadequate welfare; loss of housing; loss of children.

28. The circle can also be described this way: A woman seeks to leave a violent relationship, but there are few adequate supports. Often a woman needs social assistance so that she can support herself and her children independently from the violent partner. Once she is receiving social assistance, inadequate rates mean finding and maintaining adequate housing for herself and her children is difficult, if not impossible. Children may be apprehended because they have witnessed male
violence, or because living conditions are considered poor enough to constitute “neglect”. Once children are apprehended, it is often hard for women to get them back. Foster parents are paid more and therefore are able to offer better food and shelter and better recreational opportunities than parents or grandparents on welfare.  

29. Lack of civil legal aid to deal with separation matters, representation before children are taken away, welfare entitlements, and poor housing, makes it difficult to break out of the circle.

30. What creates the ‘vicious circle’ is the absence of adequate, basic social programs – affordable housing, affordable child care, civil legal aid, and income security. The CEDAW Committee, the Parliamentary Committee on the Status of Women, and the 2009 UPR recommendations all recommend dealing with the patterns of women’s disadvantage in a holistic way.  

FAFIA submits that a strategic approach to eliminating women’s poverty and inequality is essential. Canada’s piecemeal approach, which supports some services, especially short-term training and counseling for women and girls, without supporting adequacy and access in basic social programs, is not effective and does not fulfill its human rights obligations.

**Recommendation:** Canada design and implement comprehensive and multi-faceted strategies for addressing women’s poverty and disadvantage, with specific attention to the particular conditions of poverty and disadvantage experienced by Aboriginal women, racialized women, women with disabilities, and lone mothers.

**Women’s Inequality in the Labour Force**

31. In 2010, full-time, full-year women workers earned 73.6% of their male counterparts. As the Conference Board of Canada reports, the gender income gap in Canada persists, and Canada ranks 12th out of 17 peer countries.

32. Canada accepted the 2009 UPR recommendation that Canada implement the recommendations of CEDAW and take the necessary measures to end discrimination against women in workplaces and implement ILO and CESCR recommendations to ensure equal remuneration for work of equal value in public and private sectors.

33. However, no steps forward have been taken. Canada still does not have laws requiring that women be paid equal pay for work equal in value to work performed by men for both public and private sectors in all jurisdictions.

34. In addition, far from moving ahead, in 2009 Canada took a step backwards on pay equity when the Government of Canada introduced the *Public Sector Equitable Compensation Act*. This new law takes away the right of women employed in the federal public sector to submit pay equity complaints under the *Canadian Human Rights Act*, and restricts the scope of pay equity in the federal public service. The *Public Sector Equitable Compensation Act* adds “market forces” as a legitimate criteria for
assessing “equitable compensation” thus re-injecting sex discrimination into pay practices for women federal public servants. The legislation makes pay equity into an issue that must be discussed at the bargaining table, without guarantees that what is bargained will actually provide pay equity. The Public Sector Equitable Compensation Act is not compatible with Canada’s obligations under international human rights law.

35. Also, there is still a deeply-entrenched gendered division of labour. Women are still mainly employed in teaching, nursing, clerical, and sales and service occupations. They remain a minority in senior management positions, in professional positions in the natural sciences, engineering and mathematics, and in the trades.

36. Racialized women, including Aboriginal women, have higher rates of unemployment and lower earnings than other women and than men. Women of colour, who, as a group, have higher education levels than other women, have lower employment incomes. Aboriginal women living off-reserve earn just two thirds what their male counterparts earn and half as much as men in Canada earn overall.

37. Women with disabilities report about 25% lower personal incomes than women without disabilities; their income is 42% lower than that of men with disabilities and half that of men in Canada overall. They are more dependent on non-employment income.

38. Canada has no concerted strategies for changing sex, race, and disability-based structural inequalities in the labour force. Employment equity programs, where they exist, are weak. Individual women can challenge sex, race, and disability discrimination in employment using statutory anti-discrimination laws, but this is increasingly difficult, as not all human rights commissions provide complainants with legal representation, and procedures are often complex. The lack of safe, affordable child care also constrains women’s earning capacity.

Recommendation: Canada implement the recommendations of the Pay Equity Task Force and establish effective pro-active pay equity laws for all women workers in federal jurisdiction, and in all jurisdictions in Canada. Canada design a coherent labour force strategy that will address long-standing structural inequalities experienced by women, and support their full and equal participation in work.

The Absence of the Federal Government

39. For women to enjoy equality and security in every part of Canada, nation-wide social programs, and funding agreements between federal and provincial/territorial governments to support them, are necessary. Through the use of its spending power, the Government of Canada has the capacity to implement nation-wide standards and programs. It also has the capacity to be a leader among governments in Canada and to ensure that there are co-ordinated programs in all jurisdictions to solve long-standing problems of poverty, lack of adequate housing, child care and early childhood education, and adequate civil legal aid. Currently, however, Canada has no national
anti-poverty strategy, no national standards of adequacy for welfare, no national child
care program, no national housing strategy, and no nation-wide standards for
eligibility and adequacy for civil legal aid, and it has abandoned attaching national
standard to transfer payments as a means of achieving effective national social policy
and the fulfillment of human rights.

40. The National Council of Welfare conducted research and produced a report in 2007
called Solving Poverty. The Council concluded that “if there is no long-term vision, no
plan, no one accountable for carrying out the plan, no resources assigned and no
accepted measure of result, we will continue to be mired in poverty for generations.”66
The Council urged the federal government to adopt and lead a national strategy “as
one of the most important initiatives” it could undertake.67 FAFIA submits that federal
leadership and national strategies are needed to ensure that Canada has the social
programs and systems in place that are the foundation for women’s equality in every
part of the country.

Recommendation: Canada design and implement a national anti-poverty
strategy as recommended by the National Council of Welfare, and pass Bill C-233,
An Act to Eliminate Poverty in Canada; Canada design and implement co-
ordinated national strategies for housing, child care, and civil legal aid to ensure
that women in Canada, wherever they live, can have access to adequate social
programs that fully realize their rights to security and equality.

Aboriginal Women68

Murders and Disappearances of Aboriginal Women and Girls

41. Canada accepted UPR recommendations 33 – 38 regarding violence against
women, and against indigenous women in particular.69 Canada has not implemented
these recommendations.

42. Canada has been urged repeatedly by United Nations treaty bodies to take
effective action to address the failed justice system and governmental responses to
the hundreds of murders and disappearances of Aboriginal women and girls.

43. Two facets of this problem have been identified by Aboriginal women, families,
and non-governmental organizations, These two facets are:

- the failure of police to protect Aboriginal women and girls from violence
  and to investigate promptly and thoroughly when they are missing or
  murdered; and

- the disadvantaged social and economic conditions in which Aboriginal
  women and girls live, which make them vulnerable to violence and unable
  to escape from it.

44. Both of these issues have been highlighted by United Nations treaty bodies after
reviews of Canada, including the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
In 2006, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in 2007 and in 2012 and most recently the Committee Against Torture.

45. In 2008, after its periodic review, the CEDAW Committee urged Canada to “examine the reasons for the failure to investigate the cases of missing or murdered Aboriginal women and to take the necessary steps to remedy the deficiencies in the system…to urgently carry out thorough investigations of the cases of Aboriginal women who have gone missing or been murdered in recent decades [and]…to carry out an analysis …to determine whether there is a racialized pattern…and take measures to address the problem if that is the case.”

46. At the same time, the CEDAW Committee recommended that Canada “develop a specific and integrated plan for addressing the particular conditions affecting aboriginal women, both on and off reserves, …including poverty, poor health, inadequate housing, low school-completion rates, low employment rates, low income and high rates of violence…”

47. The United Nations Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women has also taken note of the hundreds of murders and disappearances of Aboriginal women and girls in Canada and the “multi-level oppression that culminates in violence.” Rapporteur Manjoo names among the causes “the disadvantaged social and economic conditions in which aboriginal women and girls live, which make them vulnerable to such violence.”

48. The CEDAW Committee asked Canada to report back on this issue in one year, and it concluded in August 2010 that its recommendation had not been implemented. At the request of the Canadian Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA) and the Native Women’s Association of Canada (NWAC) the CEDAW Committee initiated an Inquiry under Article 8 of the Optional Protocol into the murders and disappearances of Aboriginal women and girls in Canada in October 2011. The CEDAW Committee’s inquiry is welcomed and awaited by many Aboriginal, women’s and human rights organizations.

**Recommendation:** Canada immediately implement the recommendations of treaty bodies, invite the CEDAW Committee to visit Canada, and fully assist the Committee by facilitating access to officials and information.

49. In addition to the CEDAW inquiry, a national inquiry in Canada is needed in order to address the many issues affecting the families of murdered and disappeared Aboriginal women and girls; to review police policies and procedures on searches and investigation; to examine communications between officials, police and the families of missing and murdered women; to review police oversight and disciplinary procedures and address the culture of racial and sexual harassment inside police forces; and, to examine the social and economic disadvantages that contribute to the vulnerability of Aboriginal women and girls to violence. National Aboriginal organizations, women’s and human rights organizations are calling for a national inquiry.
Recommendation: Canada establish a national inquiry, with terms of reference agreed to by the Native Women’s Association of Canada and other organizations representing and supporting the interests of Aboriginal women so that the causes and consequences of the violence, and the steps necessary to end the murders and disappearances, can be fully examined.

NWAC Database and Advocacy

50. Through its ground-breaking project Sisters In Spirit, NWAC documented disappearances and murders of almost 600 Aboriginal women and girls in Canada, the majority over the last twenty years. It developed a national database of information, the only one of its kind. However, in October 2010, the Government of Canada gave 4 million dollars to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to develop a national database of missing women. At the same time, NWAC was denied further funding to maintain its Sisters in Spirit research and database. NWAC was denied funding because under Status of Women Canada’s new funding guidelines for women’s NGOs, no research, policy development or advocacy can be funded. The RCMP database is not functional yet, and it is not likely to ever be a substitute for NWAC’s work.

Recommendation: Canada restore funding to the Sisters in Spirit project so that NWAC can maintain its database of information regarding murders and disappearances of Aboriginal women and girls.

Access to Justice and Legal Aid for Aboriginal Women

i) Missing Women Commission of Inquiry – British Columbia

51. On September 27, 2010, the Government of British Columbia (British Columbia) established the Missing Women Commission of Inquiry, with the former Attorney General of British Columbia, Wally Oppal, Q.C., as the Commissioner. This was an Inquiry into the facts, police investigations and official decisions involved in the disappearances and murders of over 33 women from Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside between the years 1997 and 2002. A disproportionate number of the women who disappeared from the Downtown Eastside were Aboriginal.

52. The Inquiry is the first and only official Inquiry appointed in Canada that is mandated to examine some of the disappearances and murders of Aboriginal women and girls, as well as police responses to these incidents.

53. NWAC applied for standing at the Inquiry, and was granted full standing. Standing permits participation as a party with the right to cross-examine witnesses, present evidence and make submissions. Commissioner Oppal granted standing to a number of groups because of their expertise and direct interests. He also determined that some of these groups would not be able to participate unless public funding was provided for legal counsel, and he recommended to the Attorney General of British Columbia that funding be provided as appropriate.
54. On July 22, 2011, the Attorney General refused to provide funding for legal counsel, except for one lawyer representing some of the families of the women who were murdered by serial killer William Robert Pickton. The Attorney General, in effect, overturned the independent Commissioner’s ruling on standing, since without funding for legal counsel, NWAC and other groups, could not exercise the standing they were granted.

55. NWAC was forced to withdraw from the Inquiry because of the denial of funding, as were all other groups granted standing. The decision not to fund counsel for parties granted standing at an inquiry is unprecedented in Canada.80

56. The Vancouver Police Department, the Criminal Justice Branch of the Attorney General’s Ministry, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police - whose conduct was under scrutiny - were represented by twenty-five publicly-funded legal counsel.

57. The Inquiry is due to report to the Government of British Columbia on October 31, 2012. Recommendations from this inquiry will have no legitimacy for Aboriginal women, since they were excluded from an inquiry process so significant to their rights to life, equal protection of the law and security of the person.

58. NWAC made a complaint about its exclusion to three United Nations Special Rapporteurs.81 NWAC submitted that Canada discriminated against Aboriginal women on the basis of sex and Aboriginality by refusing to fund counsel for NWAC after NWAC was granted standing.

**Recommendation: Canada ensure that Aboriginal women have access to legal representation of their choice and full participation in all legal fora where their rights are at stake.**

59. On April 26, 2012, the CEDAW Committee issued its decision on a petition filed by Cecilia Kell, an Aboriginal woman and a victim of domestic violence.82 When Ms. Kell escaped her violent partner to access a battered women’s shelter, her partner persuaded the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation to remove her name from homeownership documents without her knowledge or consent, which rendered her and her three children homeless. Several lawyers and ten years later, Ms. Kell lost her case against the estate of her ex-partner and the Northwest Territories Housing Corporation. The Committee found that the Canadian legal system did not provide Ms. Kell with an appropriate remedy, and in particular, legal aid in the Northwest Territories was not adequate. The CEDAW Committee determined that Canada did not take the appropriate steps to protect Ms. Kell from discrimination on the basis of sex and Aboriginality, and recommended that, as well as providing direct compensation to Ms. Kell, Canada recruit and train Aboriginal women to provide legal aid to women from their communities; and review legal aid systems to ensure that Aboriginal women who are victims of domestic violence have effective access to justice. Canada is required to report back to the Committee on implementation of these recommendations on October 26, 2012. No action has been taken yet.
60. Ms. Kell’s case reflects the experience of many Aboriginal women in Canada who face male violence, lose their housing as a result, and then cannot obtain adequate legal aid to secure appropriate remedies. Effective enjoyment of women’s equal right to property depends on Aboriginal women being able to obtain adequate legal aid when it is needed.

**Recommendation:** Canada ensure that adequate civil legal aid is available to women in all parts of Canada, and in particular to Aboriginal women who are victims of domestic violence.

**Indian Status**

61. The *Indian Act* still discriminates against Aboriginal women and their descendants with respect to Indian status.

62. In 2011, the *Gender Equity in the Indian Act* came into force. This legislation was the outcome of a constitutional challenge to the *Indian Act* brought by Sharon McIvor, which was commenced in 1989.

63. The 2011 legislation corrected some of the sex discrimination and will newly permit an estimated 45,000 Aboriginal women and their descendants to be registered. But the *Indian Act* still excludes Aboriginal women and their descendants who would be entitled to register if sex discrimination were completely eradicated from the registration scheme. Examples of those still excluded because of sex discrimination include: the grandchildren of status women and non-status men who were unmarried; the female child of a status man and a non-status woman who were unmarried; and the grandchildren born prior to September 4, 1951 who are the descendants of women who married out. Male lineage counterparts are entitled to Indian status. It is estimated that more than 100,000 Aboriginal women and their descendants are still excluded from registration because of continuing sex discrimination.

64. In addition, the *Gender Equity Act* does not grant equal registration status to the Aboriginal women and their descendants whom it newly includes, because the legislated inability of one Indian parent to transmit status, known as the second generation cut-off, applies to the newly included female lineage descendants one generation earlier.

65. Because of this continuing sex discrimination, Sharon McIvor has filed a petition with the United Nations Human Rights Committee, continuing the more than 40-year-long struggle by Aboriginal women in Canada to eliminate sex discrimination from the status registration provisions of the *Indian Act*.

**Recommendation:** Canada immediately eliminate all residual sex discrimination from the status registration provisions of the *Indian Act*. 
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Incarceration of Aboriginal Women

66. Aboriginal peoples are 4% of the Canadian population. However, a new report reveals that “[a]s of April 2010, Aboriginal women accounted for 32.6% of the total female offender population; this means that one out of every three women federally incarcerated is of Aboriginal descent.”\(^\text{85}\) The report also notes that “[o]ver the past 10 years, the representation of Aboriginal women in Federal Corrections has increased by nearly 90% as such they represent the fastest growing offender population.”\(^\text{86}\)

67. Experts say that the “the federal government’s current plan [to increase mandatory sentencing and build more prisons] will only serve to further increase the numbers and worsen the already staggering injustice experienced by Aboriginal peoples as a whole.”\(^\text{87}\)

68. The high incarceration rates are connected to the high rates of violence and poverty faced by Aboriginal women.\(^\text{88}\) Further, the evidence is that in federal prisons in Canada, Aboriginal women’s serious mental health needs are not being addressed and that programming is inadequate to meet their needs for education, training, counseling, family, and community connection. Even worse, their needs for supports and programming are equated to risk and result in Aboriginal women being disproportionately classified as higher security and therefore less likely to be released from prison when they are legally entitled to be.

**Recommendation:** Canada implement the accountability measures recommended by the Arbour Commission and others; and provide access to adequate and effective community-based mental health care and culturally and gender-appropriate programming for Aboriginal women in federal prisons. \(^\text{89}\)
Endnotes

1 United Nations treaty bodies have commented repeatedly on key features of women’s inequality in Canada, including:

- Women’s higher rates of poverty and the worsening situation of Canadian women following post-1995 federal budgets and federal and provincial social service cutbacks that have had disproportionate negative effects on women. (CEDAW 2003, paras. 351, 352; CEDAW 1997, paras. 334, 342; CCPR 2006, para. 24, CPR 1999, para. 20; CESCR 1998, paras. 16, 23, 54). CEDAW especially noted the high and disproportionate poverty of Aboriginal women, elderly women living alone, single mothers, older women, women of colour, immigrant women and women with disabilities (CEDAW 2003, para. 357; CEDAW 2008, paras. 43, 44). CEDAW recommended national standards and a monitoring mechanism for social assistance because of inadequate social assistance incomes (CEDAW 2008, paras. 39-40).

- Women’s inequality in the paid labour market, including reduced access to employment insurance benefits (CESCR 2006, para. 22), uneven and inadequate implementation of pay equity, and the inadequacy of protection provided by statutory human rights systems (CEDAW 2003, paras. 373, 374, 375, 376, 381, 382; CESCR 1998, para. 16), and exploitation of migrant domestic workers (CESCR 2006, para. 49; CEDAW 2003, paras. 365, 366; CEDAW 2008, paras. 37, 38).
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