



CEDAW 2010

REPORT CARD

HOW BC IS MEASURING UP IN WOMEN'S RIGHTS

SUBJECT	GRADE	TEACHER'S COMMENTS
WOMEN & SOCIAL ASSISTANCE	F	<i>Cuts to services for social assistance recipients continue to target marginalized women.</i>
MISSING AND MURDERED ABORIGINAL WOMEN AND GIRLS	C	<i>An inquiry into the "missing women investigations" was finally announced – whether it will address systemic issues remains to be seen.</i>
VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS	C+	<i>While women experiencing violence continue to fall into gaps in service, a new provincial plan is being implemented.</i>
WOMEN AND GIRLS IN PRISON	B-	<i>Progress has been made in protecting incarcerated girls, but marginalized women are still over-represented in prison.</i>
ACCESS TO CHILDCARE	C-	<i>Additional funding does not go far enough to address the needs of children and parents.</i>
WOMEN & HOUSING	D+	<i>Despite new developments and Olympic promises, the housing crisis in BC continues.</i>
WOMEN & ACCESS TO JUSTICE	F	<i>Continued cuts to services undercut equal access to justice for most British Columbians.</i>
WOMEN & HEALTH CARE	C+	<i>Health-related budget cuts in 2009 and 2010 affected marginalized groups most.</i>



CEDAW REPORT CARD 2010

The purpose of this report card is to grade the Government of British Columbia on its compliance with the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

Affiliated with the Women's Legal Education and Action Fund
Supported by the Law Foundation of British Columbia

REPORT CARD GRADING SCHEME

A	Fulfillment of CEDAW obligations and satisfaction of the concerns of the CEDAW Committee.
B	Considerable action towards fulfilling CEDAW standards and Committee standards.
C	Some action taken. Needs continued improvement.
D	Very limited action. Needs significant improvement.
F	Total inaction or detrimental action.

BACKGROUND

CEDAW enshrines important protections for women in international human rights law. The UN CEDAW Committee is an international body of independent experts who are charged with monitoring state parties' compliance and implementation of the Convention. Every four years, each country that has signed on to the Convention must report to the CEDAW Committee about how well it is measuring up to the CEDAW standards of women's equality. Non-governmental organizations may also submit what are called "shadow reports", expressing their views on that country's CEDAW compliance.

Canada ratified CEDAW on December 10, 1981. In October and November of 2008, the CEDAW Committee considered the sixth and seventh reports from Canada, along with reports from local NGOs, and issued its observations on Canada's compliance and implementation of the Convention. The BC CEDAW Group, a coalition of women's organizations in BC including West Coast LEAF, produced a shadow report about the situation for women in BC.

The Committee was very concerned about a number of issues concerning women's rights in Canada, and singled out some issues of significance in BC especially. The Committee took the unusual step of requiring Canada to report back to the Committee in a year on its progress on two issues of particular concern:

- (1) establishing and monitoring minimum standards for the provision of funding to social assistance programs, and carrying out an impact assessment of social programs related to women's rights; and
- (2) examining the failure to investigate the cases of missing and murdered Aboriginal women, and to address those failures.

The Government of Canada submitted its response to these questions in February 2010, and the BC CEDAW Group submitted a shadow report entitled "Nothing to Report." The UN Committee has not yet responded to these reports.

This Report Card measures how well BC is measuring up to some of the CEDAW obligations that fall within provincial jurisdiction, including these two areas of urgent concern to the Committee. For more information on our methodology and grading scheme used, please turn to the back cover of the Report Card.

So...How is BC measuring up to international legal standards of women's equality?

In 2008, the CEDAW Committee expressed concern “at reports of cuts in social assistance schemes in many provinces and at the resulting negative impact on the rights of vulnerable groups of women such as single mothers, aboriginal women, Afro-Canadian women, immigrant and migrant women, elderly women and disabled women, who rely on social assistance for an adequate standard of living.”¹ While the provincial government is responsible for implementing social assistance programs and standards, the CEDAW Committee is concerned at the lack of federal accountability and recommends that such programs be assessed and monitored to ensure that the needs of the most vulnerable women are served.² The UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has also expressed concern about women’s poverty in BC, and noted that inadequate social assistance presents an additional obstacle for women fleeing abusive relationships.³

Social assistance rates have not changed in BC since Canada and the BC CEDAW Group reported to the CEDAW Committee in 2008, despite the economic downturn and the entrenchment of poverty in BC.⁴ BC still has the highest overall rate of poverty in the country at 11.4%, as well as the highest rate of child poverty in Canada at 10.4%.⁵ A recent study by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities comparing 24 different Canadian cities placed Vancouver at the top of the list for cities with the largest gap between rich and poor, the highest percentage of working poor families, and the highest percentage of low income residents.⁶ The *2009 Cost of Eating in BC* report produced by the Dietitians of Canada clearly demonstrates that more than 100% of the amount that social assistance recipients receive is required for adequate housing and food alone.⁷

Due to the high number of applications following the economic downturn, the provincial Government recently announced \$26 million of cuts to social assistance in 2010-11, including: elimination of funding for contraceptive devices for women on disability assistance; decreased eligibility for the monthly medical nutritional supplement; the elimination of the \$75 shelter allowance for homeless recipients and restrictions on how often the Ministry will provide and repair medically required equipment and devices.⁸ In addition, in 2010 the law was changed so that no income assistance, hardship assistance or supplement will be paid to an individual or family unit on account of an applicant or recipient for whom a warrant for arrest has been issued under immigration law or criminal law (for indictable offences only).⁹

Women are not only disproportionately poor, but the impact of poverty is also gendered: women and girls with inadequate and insecure housing live with a greater threat of sexual violence; many women are forced to stay in abusive relationships in order for them and their children to survive financially; and women are more likely to have their children apprehended because they cannot provide adequate shelter, food and other necessities.¹⁰ For Aboriginal women, women with disabilities, immigrant and refugee women, and other marginalized women, these disadvantages are compounded;¹¹ marginalized women with intersecting layers of disadvantage are more likely to live in poverty, more likely to lose their children to child protection services and more likely to suffer from the socio-economic harms of poverty.

In 2008, the Committee remained “concerned that hundreds of cases involving aboriginal women who have gone missing or been murdered in the past two decades have neither been fully investigated nor attracted priority attention, with the perpetrators remaining unpunished.”¹² The Committee recommended that the government: urgently investigate cases of Aboriginal women who have gone missing or been murdered in recent decades; determine whether there is a racialized pattern and address that pattern; and examine the reasons for the system’s failure to adequately protect or investigate these cases to date.¹³

Since the 1970s, at least 500 Aboriginal girls and women have been identified as missing or murdered in Canada, and a disproportionate number of these cases are from British Columbia (137 or 26%),¹⁴ although the real numbers are likely higher than documented.¹⁵ Aboriginal women report 3.5 times the rates of domestic and sexual violence than non-Aboriginal women in Canada and young Aboriginal women are five times more likely than their non-Aboriginal peers to die violent deaths.¹⁶ The dangers for Aboriginal women in BC are particularly focused on two high-risk locations – Canada’s poorest neighbourhood, Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside, and Northern BC’s Highway 16, dubbed the Highway of Tears.¹⁷ In 2010, the BC Government failed to renew funding for the Highway of Tears Project, a project aimed at preventing further deaths and disappearances along this notorious stretch of BC highway.¹⁸

After a multi-year investigation and many more years of judicial proceedings, Robert Pickton has been convicted of murdering six women from the Downtown Eastside, and has been charged with an additional 20 murders. The internal Vancouver Police Department review of the investigation into these women’s disappearances and murders shows multiple and prolonged deficiencies that failed to prevent the ongoing disappearances and murders of women.¹⁹

While individual investigations into some of the cases of missing and murdered women have been proceeding, the calls for a broad based inquiry into the systemic causes of this violence and into the failure of the justice system to adequately respond were largely ignored by the Government until September 2010. Numerous organizations ranging from the Vancouver Police Department to the United Native Nations to women’s community-based organizations have called for an inquiry into the multisystem failure to protect women and investigate this violence.²⁰ In September, the BC Government finally announced a public inquiry into the conduct of the “missing women investigations”, which has been limited to investigations conducted between January 1997 and February 2002 respecting women reported missing from the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver.²¹ While the announcement of this Inquiry is an important and laudable step towards achieving justice for the missing and murdered women and their families, and towards preventing further violence and investigative missteps, the community has largely responded critically to the appointment of a former Attorney General as Commissioner and the temporally and geographically narrow terms of reference. In order to satisfy the CEDAW requirements, the scope of the Inquiry must be broad enough to address the race, gender and class dimensions of the failed systemic response to the violence against women in these cases. Whether the Inquiry will engage with such important systemic issues remains to be seen.

The CEDAW Committee has noted that “[g]ender-based violence is a form of discrimination that seriously inhibits women’s ability to enjoy rights and freedoms on a basis of equality with men.”²² In its 2008 report, the Committee “remains concerned that domestic violence continues to be a significant problem.”²³ The Committee was particularly concerned about a number of elements of the social services’ and justice system’s response to violence against women, including: the use of diversion and mediation in situations involving domestic violence; the practice of “dual charging”; an insufficient number of shelters for victims of violence; and the failure of courts to take domestic violence into account in custody and access determinations.²⁴

In January 2010, the Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General announced the launch of the BC’s Domestic Violence Action Plan.²⁵ The Action Plan was motivated, at least in part, by the murder of Sunny Park, her child and her parents by her estranged husband, following a history of violence and Park’s reporting to police that she feared for her and her family’s lives. The consequent Lee/Park Inquiry and the report from the Representative for Children and Youth on this case made extensive recommendations about necessary reforms to the justice and related systems. The Domestic Violence Action Plan included BC’s first domestic violence death review panel, which released a report in June 2010 calling for greater consistency, informationsharing and timeliness among and across domestic violence responders.²⁶ The Action Plan also included the development of a new Domestic Violence Unit in Victoria, BC, which was launched in August 2010.²⁷

In July 2010, the Ministry of the Attorney General presented a draft overhaul of the family law statute in BC, and invited community feedback.²⁸ This draft legislation revises the legal considerations in custody and access determinations to ensure that violence against any family member be considered in relation to determining the best interests of the child. This specifically responds to the CEDAW Committee’s concern about the past failures of the courts to take domestic violence into account in custody cases. While the draft law shifts the focus in family law from litigation to non-court dispute resolution mechanisms, the intention is to exempt families experiencing domestic violence from these alternative processes. The proposed legislation integrates consideration of family violence into many aspects of family law where it was not previously a formalized consideration, relying on an expanded definition of family violence that includes psychological abuse and omits self defence. While these proposed changes are progressive, their effective implementation depends heavily on adequate training of family justice professionals, access to translation services and increased legal aid resources.

Despite this progress, violence against women remains a massive and intractable social problem. Domestic violence composed the single largest category of criminal convictions involving violent offences in non-specialized adult courts in Canada over the five-year period 1997/98 to 2001/02, and over 90% of those offenders were men.²⁹ In 2007, almost 40,200 incidents of spousal violence were reported to police in Canada, and 83% of the victims of spousal violence were women.³⁰ While the RCMP and many local police forces in BC have policies to determine who is the primary aggressor in spousal violence incidents, there are continued reports by women and their advocates of the police failing to implement this policy and therefore arresting both spouses, even where a woman is clearly the victim of her partner’s abuse.³¹ Vancouver General Hospital announced in summer 2010 that it would close its outpatient Domestic Violence Program, leaving approximately 25 people a week without services and relying on overstretched community resources (groups who are now calling on government to intervene).³² In short, women experiencing violence continue to fall into the gaps in services, and violence against women both within and outside relationships remains a pressing concern.

In 2008, the CEDAW Committee was concerned about the disproportionate number of Aboriginal, Afro-Canadian and other women and girls of colour incarcerated in Canadian prisons.³³ The Committee was particularly concerned about “the continuing presence of male guards in female prisons, which increases the risk of sexual harassment or assault and violates the right to privacy of female detainees” as well as “the treatment of adolescent girls in juvenile detention, who are often detained in mixed-sex prisons, where they are exposed to violence from adolescent male detainees or from male prison guards.”³⁴ The *UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners* requires that male guards should not enter any part of a prison facility in which women are imprisoned unless accompanied by a woman officer;³⁵ although Canada is not a signatory, these rules serve as an important guideline for internationally acceptable treatment of incarcerated individuals.

While boys and girls are held in the same general facilities in BC, they are housed in separate living units and programming is separated for the sexes, with additional programming implemented specifically for the distinct needs of girls.³⁶ In short, there is no longer an opportunity for interaction between boys and girls in custody in BC, which thereby provides greater protection for girls’ privacy and safety.³⁷ Furthermore, girls’ units are staffed exclusively by female youth supervisors.³⁸ The majority of women sentenced in the BC Corrections system are incarcerated in the female-only Alouette Correctional Centre for Women; while most guards are female, the facility maintains some male prison guards who continue to have direct contact with female inmates.³⁹ Thus, two of the issues of specific concern to the Committee have been mostly addressed, although some issues remain outstanding.

Unfortunately, in 2008, the Alouette facility cancelled a program designed to allow incarcerated mothers to keep their infants in their care if there were no other child protection concerns; the cancellation of this program has a detrimental impact on the security of the person and equality concerns of incarcerated women, particularly women living in poverty and Aboriginal women, who are disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system.⁴⁰ Moreover, the over-representation of Aboriginal women in prisons remains a concern, which has a strong connection to the socioeconomic disadvantages this group faces, as highlighted elsewhere in the Report Card; in fact, the number of aboriginal women incarcerated in Canada has jumped 90% since 2001, with Aboriginal women now representing 33% of the women federally incarcerated, although they only make up only 3% of the population.⁴¹

Further, in May 2010, the B.C. Government proposed legislation that would limit access to cabinet documents by the Representative for Children and Youth⁴², whose mandate is to improve services and outcomes for children in BC through advocacy, accountability and review.⁴³ The proposed legislation will limit the Representative’s ability to critique and investigate the condition and provision of young people in custody in BC.⁴⁴

The Convention requires that state parties promote the establishment and development of a network of childcare facilities in order to ensure women's effective right to work.⁴⁵ In its 2008 comments on Canada, the CEDAW Committee remained "gravely concerned at the fact that poverty is widespread among women, in particular aboriginal women, minority women and single mothers."⁴⁶ The Committee discussed the impact of the lack of affordable quality childcare on women's economic empowerment.⁴⁷

In another 2008 report, UNICEF reported that Canada tied for last place in an assessment of early childhood services, including childcare, in the 25 most developed Organization of Economic Co-operation of Development (OECD) countries.⁴⁸ The UNICEF report built on the 2006 OECD Starting Strong report showing that Canada has the lowest public investment in, and access to, child care among the 20 developed countries included in the review. A 2009 UNICEF report further confirms Canada's standing and notes that while measures such as the Universal Child Care Benefit are positive, few new childcare facilities have been built which has "provided little help for the families that are still desperately seeking developmentally appropriate spaces for early learning and childcare."⁴⁹

In its latest budget, the BC Government announced an additional \$26 million in funding over three years to support child care programs that assist low and moderate income families with the cost of child care through direct assistance to families for child care and funding to child care operators.⁵⁰ The Government also announced that full school-day kindergarten would be available for up to 50% of kindergarten students in 2010 and for every five-year old starting school in 2011.⁵¹ However, the Government has only pledged \$129 million in annual funding by the time the program becomes fully operational,⁵² in spite of the finding of their own Early Childhood Learning Agency, which estimates that annual operational costs will be in the range of \$615 million.⁵³

Notwithstanding the advancements in kindergarten provision, there are currently only enough regulated child care spaces for 15% of children under 12 years old in B.C., and waiting times for licensing child care are years long.⁵⁴ Spaces have been lost in communities across the province due in large part to the high costs of operating, lack of qualified early childhood educators, and organizations unwilling to assume the risk of financially fragile services.

In August 2009, the Government cut the small minor capital grants that child care centres use for basic safety and quality repairs from a maximum of \$5000 to \$2000 per facility address.⁵⁵ The Child Care Operating Fund has not increased this year despite increasing operating costs.⁵⁶ With expenses rising and government funding not increasing the result has been substantial fee increases for parents. Child care fees account for 20% of BC families' monthly expenditures, which is their second highest cost after housing.⁵⁷ On average, a Metro Vancouver family with two children (a four year old in full-time care and a seven year old in after-school care, and six weeks of summer care) will spend \$1096 per month on child care expenses, which is up \$113 per month from 2008.⁵⁸

In 2008, the CEDAW Committee expressed regret over “the absence of a national housing strategy and expressed concern at the current severe housing shortage, in particular in Aboriginal communities, and at the high costs of rent and the impact thereof on women.”⁵⁹ The right to housing, and the failure to fulfill this right, is connected to a number of other rights protected in the Convention and other instruments of international law, including the right to an adequate standard of living, keeping children with their parents where possible and appropriate, employment, and access to basic services like sanitation and clean water.

On May 25, 2010, the BC Government, the City of Vancouver and private parties announced the development of 1,006 new units of supportive housing for homeless people in Vancouver.⁶⁰ This is in addition to a previously announced 569 new supportive housing apartments, on which construction has already begun.⁶¹ While the announcement indicates a move in the direction of reducing homelessness and housing insecurity, the money involved in this announcement includes moneys previously promised, and the new housing does not meet the significant need for social housing in the lower mainland. Part of the funds for the new projects comes from the sale of the Little Mountain property, BC’s first social housing project which is now slated to host market-priced condominiums.⁶² Further, a recent study by the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives shows that “Taken together, the government’s own data indicate an overall net increase of only 280 actual social housing units over the past five years, a sobering and concerning finding.”⁶³ This very slow accumulation of social housing does not match the fast growing need: in May 2008, BC Housing, the provider of social housing in BC, had over 13,400 applicants on its waitlist and in Metro Vancouver (at last count in March 2008) there were more than 2,600 homeless people (which is an increase of 137% since 2002).⁶⁴

Unfortunately, the Province fell far short of its housing promises in relation to the 2010 Olympic Games in Vancouver; although the Province spent \$925 million to stage and host the Games,⁶⁵ the City of Vancouver was forced to half its commitment to create new units of social housing from the Olympic Village site, producing only 125 new units of social housing.⁶⁶ Housing for people on social assistance remains essentially inaccessible – for example, a 2010 study by the Carnegie Community Action Project found that only 12% of the privately owned rooms for rent in the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver (DTES) are now affordable for DTES residents on income assistance, disability and basic pension, which is down from 29% last year.⁶⁷ Women on social assistance whose children are removed from their care temporarily by the Ministry often lose their funding for child-friendly housing, which acts as an additional obstacle for the return of their children.⁶⁸ Despite the new developments and movements towards prioritizing development of low income and social housing, the housing crisis in BC continues.

In 2008, the CEDAW Committee expressed concern “at reports that financial support for civil legal aid has diminished and that access to it has become increasingly restricted, in particular in British Columbia, consequently denying low-income women access to legal representation and legal services.”⁶⁹ The Committee recommended that the Government should ensure that all women, particularly vulnerable women, have access to justice.⁷⁰ The inadequate civil legal aid system has also been criticized by other international bodies, notably the UN Committee charged with monitoring the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR).⁷¹ A 2010 Resolution of the UN General Assembly describes access to justice as an “essential determinant of effective eradication of poverty”⁷² and the UN Secretary General describes one of the links between women’s empowerment and poverty eradication as encompassing access to justice concerns.⁷³

Both 2009 and 2010 brought more changes to the legal aid system in British Columbia. Over the course of this time, the Legal Services Society (LSS) implemented a see saw of service cuts and reinstatements.⁷⁴ Among those programs reinstated are extended family law services, which provide additional legal aid hours for clients who are eligible for legal aid but cannot resolve their issues within the time allocated. Services that have been eliminated include the LawLINE legal information telephone service and five of the seven regional centres for legal aid services. While the LSS has increased the number of agents providing intake services for legal aid applicants across the province, the efficacy of such agents have been questioned by advocates and any improvements in intake accessibility do not necessarily correspond to an increase in state-funded legal services.

Access to counsel remains out of reach of most BCers. While the Canadian Lawyer Magazine reports that a two-day civil trial in Western Canada costs an average of \$81,063,⁷⁵ the average after-tax income of a two-parent family in BC was \$85,400 in 2008, while the average income of a single-mother led family was \$41,900.⁷⁶ Median after-tax incomes in BC for 2008 are lower: \$78,600 for two-parent families and \$35,800 for female lone-parent families.⁷⁷ While incomes have dropped with the economic downturn, the need for legal services has only increased with increased stress on families, workers and other individuals; in fact, the increases in demand were offered as justification for recent cuts to legal aid services.⁷⁸

In 2008, the CEDAW Committee applauded Canada's attempts to integrate gender and diversity considerations into the delivery of health care services, but expressed concern about the health of marginalized populations and the services available to them.⁷⁹ The Committee noted its concern that Aboriginal women are disproportionately impacted by HIV/AIDS and that senior women are not receiving adequate care for their age-specific health problems.⁸⁰ The Committee regrets "that aboriginal women in Canada continue to live in impoverished conditions, which include high rates of poverty, poor health, inadequate housing, lack of access to clean water, low school-completion rates and high rates of violence."⁸¹ The World Health Organization's Commission on Social Determinants of Health found that: "In countries at all levels of income, health and illness follow a social gradient: the lower the socioeconomic position, the worse the health."⁸²

In 2006, BC, Canada and First Nations representatives signed an agreement designed to improve the health and well-being of First Nations and close the gaps in health between First Nations people and other British Columbians. Yet, using the calculations of the 2001 United Nations Human Development Index (HDI), which considers life expectancy, education, and economic well-being, the Canadian Aboriginal population ranks 33rd among nations while Canada as a whole ranks 8th.⁸³ The prevalence of HIV/AIDS among Aboriginal women remains a critical concern – cases of infection are three times higher in Aboriginal women than non-Aboriginal women.⁸⁴

The socioeconomic marginalization of Aboriginal women is a strong contributor to these inequities in health,⁸⁵ despite BC's Minister of Housing and Social Development Rich Coleman's statement that the linkage between poverty and health "is not well established."⁸⁶ As discussed above, recent provincial cuts to medical services for people on disability assistance further compound the existing socioeconomic inequalities in health – for example, the eligibility of persons on disability for a nutritional supplement have been tightened so that they must have two or more of the listed symptoms rather than only one as previously, including malnutrition, significant deterioration of a vital organ and moderate to severe immune suppression.⁸⁷ Further, the local health authorities are still reeling from the millions of dollars cut from their budgets in 2009;⁸⁸ resulting service cuts included mental health service reductions, closure of geriatric beds, decreased access to treatment for children with autism, significant reductions in MRIs and widespread layoffs.⁸⁹

While the Canada Health Act provides a strong foundation for universal health care, this foundational standard is subject to erosion under current provincial policies and the failure to recognize the connections between comprehensive and effective social policies and the indicators of good health – and these risks are particularly potent for the most marginalized residents of BC. Despite higher rankings in the latest HDI, the inequalities in health and medical services available to different populations of BCers undermine the universality, fairness and effectiveness of BC's health care system.

CITATIONS

- ¹ *Concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Canada*, UN CEDAWOR, 42d Sess., UN Doc. CEDAW/C/CAN/CO/7 (7 November 2008) at 3, para. 13, online: <<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N08/602/42/PDF/N0860242.pdf?OpenElement>>.
- ² *Ibid.* at 3, paras. 13-14.
- ³ Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, *Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties Under Articles 16 and 17 of the Covenant, Concluding observations of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Canada*, UN ESCOR, 36th Sess., UN Doc. E/C.12/CAN/CO/4, E/C.12/CAN/CO/5 (22 May 2006) at 5, para. 26, online: <<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G06/427/83/PDF/G0642783.pdf?OpenElement>>.
- ⁴ BC CEDAW Group, *Nothing to Report: A Report on Progress in Implementing Priority Recommendations made by the Committee on its 2008 Concluding Observations on Canada*, Submission to the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, January 2010, at 11, online: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cedaw/docs/ngos/NothingToReport_CanadaFU.pdf>.
- ⁵ Statistics Canada. "Income in Canada, 2008: Table 2020802". Online: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-202-x/75-202-x2008000-eng.htm>.
- ⁶ Jean Swanson, "Vancouver leads in poverty" *The Vancouver Sun*, 29 March 2010, online: <<http://communities.canada.com/VANCOUVERSUN/blogs/communityofinterest/archive/2010/03/29/vancouver-leads-in-poverty.aspx>>.
- ⁷ Dietitians of Canada, "The Cost of Eating in BC 2009: Low-income British Columbians can't afford healthy food," 2009 at 2, online: <<http://www.dietitians.ca/pdf/CostofEating2009.pdf>>.
- ⁸ Jonathan Fowlie, "Province to cut \$25m from income assistance" *The Vancouver Sun*, 30 March 2010, online: <<http://www.vancouversun.com/technology/Province+from+income+assistance/2741597/story.html>>.
- ⁹ *Employment and Assistance Act*, [SBC 2002], c.40 at s.15.2
- ¹⁰ Seth Klein, et al., *The Time is Now: A Poverty Reduction Plan for BC*, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, BC Office, 2008, at 21-23, online: <<http://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/reports/poverty-reduction-plan-bc>>.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*
- ¹² *Concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Canada*, *supra* note 1 at 7, para. 31.
- ¹³ *Ibid.* at 7, para. 32.
- ¹⁴ Native Women's Association of Canada, *Voices of Our Sisters in Spirit: A Report to Families and Communities*, 2nd ed. March 2009, online: <http://www.nwachq.org/en/documents/NWAC_VoicesofOurSistersInSpiritII_March2009FINAL.pdf>.
- ¹⁵ Walk4Justice, as cited in BC CEDAW Group, *supra* note 4 at p.4.
- ¹⁶ See Brzozowski, Jodi-Anne, Andrea Taylor-Butts & Sara Johnson, "Victimization and offending among the Aboriginal population in Canada," (2006) 26:3 *Juristat Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*, at 5, online: <<http://dsp-psd.tpsgc.gc.ca/Collection-R/Statcan/85-002-XIE/85-002-XIE2006003.pdf>>.
- ¹⁷ BC CEDAW Group, *supra* note 4 at p.5.
- ¹⁸ As confirmed by Honourable Michelle Mungall, MLA.
- ¹⁹ LePard, Doug, Deputy Chief Constable. "Missing Women: Investigation Review". August 2010. Online: <<http://www.cbc.ca/bc/news/bc-100820-vancouver-police-pickton-investigation-review.pdf>>
- ²⁰ See: B.C. CEDAW Group letter to Attorney General Wally Oppal, March 11, 2009, online: <<http://www.justiceforgirls.org/publications/InquiryletterCEDAW2009.pdf>>; see also: <www.bccla.org/othercontent/09missing_women.pdf>; <<http://www.globallethbridge.com/Highway+Tears+inquiry+possible+attorney+general/2220244/story.html>>; <<http://www.missingjustice.ca/2009/06/activists-call-for-inquiry-into-the-highway-of-tears>>; B.C. CEDAW Group, *supra* note 4 at 9; Lindsay Kines, "Vancouver police back calls for full public inquiry into missing-women case," *The Vancouver Sun*, 29 November 2009, online: <<http://www.vancouversun.com/news/Vancouver+police+back+calls+full+public+inquiry+into+missing+women+case/2282721/story.html>>; Pete McMartin, "Column: Murder and racism along the Highway of Tears," *The Vancouver Sun*, 28 August 2009, online: <<http://www.vancouversun.com/news/Column+Murder+racism+along+Highway+Tears/1941209/story.html>>.
- ²¹ Ministry of Attorney General of British Columbia. "Terms of Reference: Missing Women Commission of Inquiry" (Sept. 28, 2010). 2010AG0024-001152. Online: <http://www2.news.gov.bc.ca/news_releases_2009-2013/2010AG0024-001152.htm>

- ²² Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, General Rec. No. 19, *Violence against women*, 11th Sess. (1992) at para. 1, online: <<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/recommendations/recomm.htm>>.
- ²³ *Concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Canada*, *supra* note 1 at 6, para. 29.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*
- ²⁵ Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General. “News Release: Domestic Violence Action Plan Launched” (January 18, 2010). 2010PssG0002-000035. Online: <http://www2.news.gov.bc.ca/news_releases_2009-2013/2010PSSG0002-000035.htm>.
- ²⁶ Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General. “News Release: Enhancing Victims’ Safety, Making Offenders Accountable” (June 1, 2010). 2010PSSG0034-000644. Online: <http://www2.news.gov.bc.ca/news_releases_2009-2013/2010PSSG0034-000644.htm>.
- ²⁷ Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General. “News Release: Local Domestic Violence Unit Up and Running (Aug.5, 2010). 2010PSSG0046-0009-15. Online: <http://www2.news.gov.bc.ca/news_releases_2009-2013/2010PSSG0046-000915.htm>.
- ²⁸ Ministry of Attorney General, Justice Services Branch, Civil Policy and Legislation Office. “White Paper on *Family Relations Act* Reform: Proposals for a new Family Law Act”. (July 2010) Online: <<http://www.ag.gov.bc.ca/legislation/pdf/Family-Law-White-Paper.pdf>>.
- ²⁹ Statistics Canada. “Measuring Violence Against Women, Statistical Trends 2006” as cited by Canadian Women’s Foundation. “Factsheet on violence against women”. Online: http://www.cdnwomen.org/EN/section05/3_5_1_1-violence_facts.html
- ³⁰ Statistics Canada. “Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile: Highlights” Online: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-224-x/2009000/aftertoc-aprestdm2-eng.htm>.
- ³¹ Community Coordination for Women’s Safety. “Backgrounder: Women Being Arrested” (September 2007, revised June 2010). Online: Ending Violence Association of BC <http://www.endingviolence.org/files/uploads/eing_Arrested_Backgrounder_Revised_June_2010.pdf>
- ³² Tieleman, Bill. “‘I Was Afraid He Was Going to Kill Me’: Survivor says life was saved by domestic violence counselling now being eliminated at Vancouver General”. TheTyee.ca, August 10, 2010. Online: <<http://thetyee.ca/Opinion/2010/08/10/DomesticAbuseCuts/>>
- ³³ *Concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Canada*, *supra* note 1 at 7, para. 34.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*
- ³⁵ United Nations, *Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners*, 1955 at 8, para. 53(2), online: <<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/pdf/treatmentprisoners.pdf>>.
- ³⁶ Letter from Senior Executive Director of Provincial Services at the MCFD after publication of 2009 report card.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*
- ³⁹ Information gathered in phone call from Kasari Govender to Alouette Correctional Facility, July 28, 2010.
- ⁴⁰ MapleRidge-Pitt Meadows Times, “Women’s prison sued after baby program is cut: Mothers who give birth while incarcerated at a provincial jail have the constitutional right to keep their babies with them, says a legal action filed in a B.C. Supreme Court”, November 21, 2008, online: <<http://www.canada.com/mapleridgetimes/news/story.html?id=ebd181bb-419f-42bd-984d-4a556044fbed>>.
- ⁴¹ Stone, Laura, “Number of Women Going to Prison Up 50 Per Cent,” *The Vancouver Sun*, 10 May 2010, <<http://www.vancouversun.com/health/Number+women+prison+cent/3008161/story.html> >
- ⁴² Shaw, Rob. “Children’s Watchdog Angry at Her Power Being Eroded” *The Vancouver Sun*, 1 May 2010, online: <<http://www.vancouversun.com/news/Children+watchdog+angry+power+being+eroded/2973811/story.html>>.
- ⁴³ British Columbia Representative for Children and Youth, “Introduction”, <<http://www.rcybc.ca/Content/AboutRCY/Introduction.asp>>.
- ⁴⁴ Shaw, *supra* note 42.
- ⁴⁵ *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*, GA Res. 34/180, UN GAOR, 34th Sess., UN Doc. A/RES/34/180 (1979) at

Article 11, 2(c), online: <<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/text/econvention.htm>>.

⁴⁶ Concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Canada, *supra* note 1 at 8, para. 39.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre and UNICEF Canada, “Not There Yet: Canada’s Implementation of the General Measures of the Convention of the Rights of the Child,” Aug. 2009, online: <http://www.unicefirc.org/publications/pdf/canada_nty.pdf>.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ Government of British Columbia, “Budget 2010 – Building a Prosperous British Columbia” (2 March 2010), online: <http://www.bcbudget.gov.bc.ca/2010/newsrelease/2010_News_Release.pdf>.

⁵¹ The Canadian Press “All-day kindergarten to start next year: BC Liberals” CTV News, 7 September 2009, online: <http://www.ctvbc.ctv.ca/servlet/an/local/CTVNews/20090907/bc_kindergarten_090907/20090907?hub=BritishColumbiaHome>.

⁵² Government of British Columbia Budget 2010, *supra* note 50.

⁵³ Ivanova, Igluka. “Policy Note: BC government should heed its own report on childcare”. May 7th, 2009. Online: <<http://www.policynote.ca/bc-government-should-heed-its-own-report-on-childcare/>>.

⁵⁴ Coalition of Child Care Advocates of British Columbia, “2010 BC Budget Ignores Economic Benefits of Child Care,” March 2010, <http://www.cccabc.bc.ca/cccabdocs/pdf/CCCABC_Budget_March2010.pdf>.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ Lee, Marc. “Policy Note: BC Budget 2010 (notes from Igluka and Marc)”. March 2, 2010. Online: <<http://www.policynote.ca/bc-budget-2010-notes-from-iglika-and-marc/>>

⁵⁷ Coalition of Child Care Advocates of BC “Government Makes Cuts to Child Care; Parent Fees Will Increase – Again”, 14 August 2009, online: <http://www.cccabc.bc.ca/cccabdocs/pdf/CCCABC_Capital_Cuts_Aug09.pdf>.

⁵⁸ Richards, Tim, Marcy Cohen, & Seth Klein, “Working for a Living Wage 2010: Making Paid Work Meet Basic Family Needs in Metro Vancouver,” May 2010, The Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, online: <http://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/reports/docs/ccpa_bc_livingwage_2010.pdf>.

⁵⁹ *Concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Canada, supra* note 1 at 39, para. 8.

⁶⁰ CBC News, “1,006 new units for Vancouver’s homeless” CBC News, 25 May 2010, online: <<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/british-columbia/story/2010/05/25/bc-vancouver-homeless-housing.html>>.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ Klein, Seth and Lorraine Copas. “Unpacking the Housing Numbers: How much new social housing is BC building?” Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, BC Office, September 2010. Online: <http://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/BC%20Office/2010/09/CCPA-BCSPARC-Unpacking-Housing-Numbers.pdf>

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* at 2

⁶⁵ CBC News, “Olympics cost B.C. \$925M”. July 9, 2010, online: <<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/britishcolumbia/story/2010/07/09/bc-olympic-games-cost.html>>

⁶⁶ CBC News, “Vancouver cuts Olympic Village social housing”. 23 April 2010, online: <<http://www.cbc.ca/canada/british-columbia/story/2010/04/23/bc-olympic-village-social-housing.html>>

⁶⁷ Pedersen, Wendy and Jean Swanson. “Pushed Out: Escalating rents in the Downtown Eastside,” Carnegie Community Action Project, September 2010, online: <<http://ccapvancouver.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/ccaphotelreportweb.pdf>>.

CITATIONS (cont.)

⁶⁸ B.C. CEDAW Group, *supra* note 4 at 13.

⁶⁹ *Concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Canada*, *supra* note 1 at 5, para. 21.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, *Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties Under Articles 16 and 17 of the Covenant: Concluding observations of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: Canada*, UN ESCOR, 36th Sess., UN Doc. E/C.12/CAN/CO/4 and E/C.12/CAN/CO/5 (22 May 2006) at 3, para. 11(b), online: <[http://www.unhchr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/898586b1dc7b4043c1256a450044f331/87793634eae60c00c12571ca00371262/\\$FILE/G0642783.pdf](http://www.unhchr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/898586b1dc7b4043c1256a450044f331/87793634eae60c00c12571ca00371262/$FILE/G0642783.pdf)>.

⁷² *Legal empowerment of the poor and eradication of poverty*, GA Res., UN GAOR, 64th Sess., UN Doc. A/RES/64/215 (23 March 2010) at 2, online: <<http://daccess-ddsny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N09/474/73/PDF/N0947473.pdf?OpenElement>>.

⁷³ *Report of the Secretary General, Legal empowerment of the poor and eradication of poverty*, UN GAOR, 64th Sess., UN Doc. A/64/133 (13 July 2009) at 6, online: <http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A%2F64%2F133&Submit=Search&Lang=E>.

⁷⁴ See *Legal Services Society*. Online: <<http://www.lss.bc.ca/>>.

⁷⁵ Harris, Kelly. “The Going Rate” *Canadian Lawyers Magazine*, June 2009, at 38, online: <<http://www.canadianlawyermag.com/images/stories/pdfs/Surveys/2009/CL-going-rate2.pdf>>.

⁷⁶ Statistics Canada. “Income in Canada, 2008: Table 2020702”. Online: <<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/cgi-bin/af-fdr.cgi?l=eng&loc=t/702.ivt>>

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ *Legal Services Society*. “News Release: Statement regarding service and staff changes”, January 13, 2009. Online: <<http://www.lss.bc.ca/assets/media/newsReleases/serviceAndStaffChanges.pdf>>.

⁷⁹ *Supra*, *Concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Canada*, at 41.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ *Ibid.* at 9, para. 43.

⁸² Commission on Social Determinants of Health, World Health Organization, *Closing the gap in a generation: Health equity through action on the social determinants of health: Final Report of the Commission on Social Determinants of Health*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2008 at Executive Summary.

⁸³ Mikkonen, Juha and Dennis Raphael, *Social Determinants of Health: The Canadian Facts* (Toronto: York University School of Health Policy and Management, 2010) at 42, online: <http://www.thecanadianfacts.org/The_Canadian_Facts.pdf>; Health Canada, Canada Health Act Annual Report 2008 – 2009, online: <<http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hcs-sss/pubs/cha-lcs/2009-cha-lcs-arral/index-eng.php#bc-cb>>.

⁸⁴ Armstrong, Pat, *et al.*, “Reading Romonow: The Implications of the Final Report of The Commission on the Future of Health Care in Canada for Women” The National Coordinating Group on Health Care Reform and Women, April 2003 at 81, online: <<http://www.womenandhealthcarereform.ca/publications/reading-romanow.pdf>>; Pat Armstrong & Jennifer Deadman, *Women's Health: Intersections of Policy, Research and Practice*. Toronto: Women's Press of Canada, 2008 at 37.

⁸⁵ Phipps, Shelley. “*The Impact of Poverty on Health: A scan of research literature*” Canadian Population Health Initiative, June 2003. Online: <<http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/H118-11-2003-1E.pdf>>

⁸⁶ Letter from Minister Rich Coleman to MLA Kathy Corrigan, dated March 1, 2010. Cited online: <http://www.bcndp.ca/newsroom/bc-liberals-can%E2%80%99t-get-story-straight-poverty-and-health>.

⁸⁷ British Columbia, “Information Bulletin: Province Protects Services for Low-Income Clients” 2010HSD0026- 000219, 4 March 2010.

⁸⁸ CBC News. “BC health authorities cut costs to meet budgets”. July 15, 2009. Online: <http://www.cbc.ca/canada/british-columbia/story/2009/07/15/bc-health-authority-operational-cuts.html>

⁸⁹ Health Sciences Association of British Columbia. “We’re Speaking Out”. Online: <http://www.hsabc.org/content.php?id=335>

ABOUT WEST COAST LEAF



West Coast LEAF's mandate is to achieve equality by changing historic patterns of systemic discrimination against women through BC-based equality rights litigation, law reform and public legal education.

METHODOLOGY

The goal of West Coast LEAF's CEDAW Report Card project is to raise public awareness about the shortcomings and successes of BC in meeting its international obligations on women's rights, and to advocate for adequate responses to the CEDAW Committee's concerns.

West Coast LEAF identified eight key areas from the most recent CEDAW Concluding Observations on Canada as priorities based on their relevance to our mandate and expertise. The Report Card Subcommittee considered the following specific criteria: whether the issue was legal in nature; whether the issue was one the organization had worked on in the past, or about which it had any expertise to offer (although this was not determinative); and whether the issue was one for which the provincial Government had some responsibility.

West Coast LEAF sought the participation of a number of community representatives and organizations through distribution of the draft report card. We requested written submissions, as well as feedback through an in-person roundtable discussion. All the feedback we received was very helpful in formulating the final draft of this report card.

West Coast LEAF would like to thank the members of our Report Card Subcommittee: Amanda Winters, Aditi Master, Menka Sull and Robin Folvik, as well as our research assistants Rachel Mathisen and Hasan Alam. The report was drafted by Legal Director, Kasari Govender. We would also like to thank the community members and organizations who took the time to consult with us and provide feedback on the draft Report Card. Last but not least, we want to thank our tireless designer Asad Kiyani.

CONTACT INFORMATION

For more information about West Coast LEAF, please visit our website at www.westcoastleaf.org or contact us directly:

West Coast LEAF
555-409 Granville Street
Vancouver, BC, V6C 1T2
604.684.8772
Toll free 1-(866)-737-7716
FAX 604.684.1543
info@westcoastleaf.org