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## Amnesty International submission to the UN Universal Periodic Review

## 16th session of the UPR Working Group, May-june 2013

## Follow up to the previous review

There has been no public reporting by the Canadian government with respect to implementing the outcome of its 2009 Universal Periodic Review. There is no publicly available information indicating the status of the recommendations that were accepted and the commitments made by Canada. There have been no consultations with Indigenous Peoples and no meaningful dialogue with civil society groups to discuss the 2009 UPR or prepare for the 2013 UPR.

The system in place in Canada for coordinating and ensuring the implementation of international human rights obligations, including UPR outcomes, Concluding Observations and Views of treaty bodies and recommendations made by the Special Procedures, is inadequate.[[1]](#endnote-1) Numerous UN treaty bodies have called for an approach that is publicly accessible, broadly consultative, politically accountable and well-coordinated among various levels of government. Amnesty International (AI) has endorsed a widely supported submission calling for legislation to address this longstanding shortcoming.[[2]](#endnote-2)

## The national human rights framework

**I) International human rights instruments**

Canada has repeatedly committed to consider ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture, but has not done so.[[3]](#endnote-3) Canada has not ratified the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families; the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; and the Convention on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances.

AI is concerned that Canada has not developed, in collaboration with Indigenous Peoples’ organizations, a plan of action for implementing the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

**II) Extra-territorial human rights protection and corporate accountability**

Canada has declined to adopt binding standards to govern corporate accountability for human rights outside Canada. UN treaty bodies have urged Canada to regulate the human rights impact of Canadian extractive companies abroad, particularly with respect to the rights of Indigenous Peoples.[[4]](#endnote-4) Canada has also refused to institute a policy of carrying out independent human rights impact assessments of trade agreements.[[5]](#endnote-5)

Canadian courts have generally accepted the position advanced by the government of Canada that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms does not apply extra-territorially.[[6]](#endnote-6) AI is concerned that this restricts the extra-territorial implementation of Canada’s international human rights obligations because treaties ratified by Canada can only be legally enforced in Canada through domestic legal instruments such as the Charter of Rights.

## The human rights situation on the ground

**I) Indigenous Peoples**

**a) Policing**

An Ontario public inquiry into the 1995 police killing of Indigenous rights protestor Dudley George at Ipperwash Provincial Park reinforced the principle that force should be used only as a last resort and only in proportion to any threat to public safety. However, key inquiry recommendations remain unimplemented including, critically, the call for an independent assessment of the current provincial police policy for responding to Indigenous protests.[[7]](#endnote-7)

**b) Indigenous child welfare**

In its 2009 UPR Canada accepted to “establish policies to improve healthcare and general welfare of Indigenous children.” Government action has run counter to that commitment.[[8]](#endnote-8) In a Canadian Human Rights Tribunal hearing, the federal government argued that child welfare services delivered to First Nations children under federal jurisdiction should not be compared to services delivered to the general population under provincial jurisdiction for the purposes of a discrimination complaint, which has been supported by AI.[[9]](#endnote-9) This position was rejected by the Federal Court; the government has appealed the decision.[[10]](#endnote-10)

**c) Lands, territories and resources**

The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights has found that processes for legally recognizing Indigenous Peoples’ customary land and resource rights in Canada do not meet international standards because redress is slow and interim protections ineffective.[[11]](#endnote-11) Canada objects to the right of free, prior and informed consent.[[12]](#endnote-12) The government narrowly interprets the duty to consult as excluding the need to seek consent, and often fails to ensure Indigenous Peoples’ concerns are accommodated. The UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination has called on Canada to “implement in good faith the right to consultation and to free, prior and informed consent of Aboriginal peoples”.[[13]](#endnote-13)

**d) Water**

There continues to be a grave crisis regarding the right to water within First Nations communities.[[14]](#endnote-14) A government-appointed expert panel concluded this is primarily because the government has failed to provide adequate resources “to ensure that the quality of First Nations water and wastewater is at least as good as that in similar communities and that systems are properly run and maintained”.[[15]](#endnote-15) Planned government spending for First Nations water systems does not cover all highest risk systems, including many communities with little or no water and sewage.[[16]](#endnote-16) AI is concerned that proposed legislation establishes regulations for First Nations water quality without providing new resources.[[17]](#endnote-17)

**II) Women’s human rights**

**a) Violence against Indigenous women**

Canada has been criticized by numerous UN treaty bodies for failing to respond adequately to the disproportionately high levels of violence faced by Indigenous women. Because police do not consistently record whether the victims of violent crime are Indigenous, there are no reliable, disaggregated statistics.[[18]](#endnote-18) AI considers that there is an overdue need for a comprehensive and coordinated national action plan, consistent with the severity and pervasiveness of the threats facing Indigenous women.

**b) Safety, security and equality**

Rates of physical and sexual assault against women remain unchanged over the past decades, while rates of reporting are decreasing. 87% of the victims of sexual assault and 71% of victims of spousal homicide are female.[[19]](#endnote-19) AI notes with concern that Canada no longer publishes comprehensive data on violence against women. There has been virtually no progress in addressing serious economic,[[20]](#endnote-20) employment[[21]](#endnote-21) and other inequalities faced by women in Canada, which often increase vulnerability to intimate partner violence.

**c) Women prisoners**

The UN Human Rights Committee, the Canadian Human Rights Commission and a 1996 public inquiry have raised concerns about the human rights of women prisoners held in federal prisons, particularly Indigenous women and those with mental health issues. AI is concerned that Canada has not established an independent oversight body for federally-sentenced women prisoners, including a process for independent adjudication of involuntary segregation decisions.

**d) Retrogression**

In 2006 the word “equality” was removed from the mandate of the governmental department, Status of Women Canada; the criteria for funding was changed to pre­clude support for research and advocacy; 43% of its budget was cut; 12 out of 16 regional offices were closed; and approximately 50% of staff were laid off. AI is deeply concerned that this sets back important programming with respect to women’s human rights.

**III) Refugees and migrants**

**a) Arbitrary detention and loss of appeal rights**

AI is concerned that new legislation[[22]](#endnote-22) authorizes the Minister of Public Safety to designate certain categories of refugee claimants as “irregular arrivals” and subject them to a range of sanctions including mandatory and unreviewable detention for a minimum period of 14 days, with subsequent reviews only once every six months.[[23]](#endnote-23) The new Act removes the right of appeal for “irregular arrivals” and for claimants who come from countries of origin designated as “safe”.[[24]](#endnote-24) This constitutes discrimination with respect to access to justice and places refugees at heightened risk of removal to persecution.[[25]](#endnote-25)

**b) Denial of healthcare**

Changes to the Federal Interim Health Program limit health-care services for accepted refugees and most refugee claimants to “urgent and essential” care,[[26]](#endnote-26) and for refugee claimants who come from designated “safe” countries of origin, to those conditions that pose a risk to public health and safety.[[27]](#endnote-27) AI is concerned that refugee claimants will face discrimination in accessing basic health care services and will often be unable to obtain necessary medical services.

**c) *Non-refoulement***

The Human Rights Committee and the Committee against Torture have repeatedly called on Canada to revoke legal provisions allowing the removal of a person to a risk of torture in circumstances where the person is found to pose a security risk. AI is concerned that the provisions contravene the absolute nature of the protection against *refoulement* in cases involving torture.

**IV)** **Counter-terrorism**

**a) Torture of Canadian nationals abroad**

The Human Rights Committee, Committee against Torture and public inquiries in 2006[[28]](#endnote-28) and 2008[[29]](#endnote-29) have all raised concerns about the role of Canadian officials in the torture of Canadian nationals abroad. AI is concerned that Canada has not implemented a recommendation to establish a comprehensive review and oversight mechanism for Canadian agencies involved in national security. Canada provided an official apology and $10.5 million in compensation to Maher Arar[[30]](#endnote-30) in 2007, but has refused to provide an apology and compensation to three other men, who have been forced into protracted litigation.[[31]](#endnote-31)

**b) Torture and intelligence activities**

The Minister of Public Safety has instructed the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Canadian Border Services Agency to make use of information from foreign sources that may have been obtained by torture and to share information even when doing so would give rise to a risk of torture, “in exceptional circumstances where there exists a threat to human life or public safety.”[[32]](#endnote-32) AI is concerned that the policy contravenes international obligations, including the UN Convention against Torture.

**c) Immigration security certificates**

AI is concerned that reforms to the secretive immigration security certificate process do not ensure a fair trial. Non-citizens who are arrested pursuant to certificates and slated for deportation are prohibited from communicating with their “Special Advocate” once the Advocate is given access to secret evidence relied upon by the government, in violation of international fair trial standards.

**d) Omar Khadr**

Canadian citizen Omar Khadr was apprehended by US forces in Afghanistan in July 2002 when he was 15 years old. He was held in detention at Guantánamo Bay for close to ten years and was not accorded status as a child soldier. On 29 September 2012 he was transferred to a Canadian prison, almost one year after he had become eligible for transfer further to an October 2010 plea agreement. AI is concerned that he has not been provided redress for the human rights violations he experienced at the hands of US and Canadian officials.

**V) Policing and administration of justice**

**a) Conducted Energy Devices (CEDs)**

Guidelines developed by the federal government in October 2010 governing the use of CEDs such as TASERS do not adopt a threshold of harm which would justify the use of a CED.[[33]](#endnote-33) Amnesty International has called on Canada to amend the Guidelines to require that CEDs will only be used in situations involving an imminent threat of death or serious (potentially life threatening) injury which cannot be contained by less extreme options.

**b) Policing of G8/ G20 protests**

Canada has consistently denied that there were any concerns related to the policing of the protests at the time of the G8/G20 Summits, despite the unprecedented number of arrests[[34]](#endnote-34) and numerous credible allegations of abuse and ill-treatment at the hands of police and of inhuman prison conditions in the temporary detention centre. AI notes with concern that the federal and provincial governments have rejected calls for a comprehensive public inquiry to examine all aspects of the security operation, including the role of officials other than the police.

**c) Student protests and Quebec emergency legislation**

AI is concerned that an emergency law enacted by the Quebec provincial government in response to mass student protests imposes harsh fines[[35]](#endnote-35) and contains an unprecedented notice requirement which jeopardizes the right to peaceful demonstration and rights to freedom of assembly and association. There are credible allegations of the use of excessive force by the police in response to the protests, including rubber bullets, tear gas and beatings, and potential arbitrary arrests in the context of mass arrests. Although the law was suspended in September 2012 following the election of a new provincial government, Amnesty International has called for an independent public inquiry and for full repeal of the law.

**d) International justice**

Canadian law allows for the criminal prosecution of individuals accused of committing crimes against humanity, war crimes and torture abroad. However, only two such prosecutions have been launched.[[36]](#endnote-36) AI is concerned that the government continues overwhelmingly to prefer deportation over prosecution. AI is also concerned that Canadian law bars torture survivors from obtaining redress against foreign governments responsible for their torture, through provisions of the State Immunity Act.

**VI) Economic, social and cultural rights**

**a) Legal enforcement**

AI is concerned about the lack of effective enforcement mechanisms for economic, social and cultural rights and the position advanced consistently in court by the Canadian government, urging an interpretation of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms denying protection of these rights.[[37]](#endnote-37)

**b) Action plans**

UN treaty bodies have raised concerns about high levels of poverty and homelessness among vulnerable groups in Canada, including Indigenous Peoples, women, children, the elderly, persons with disabilities, immigrants and refugees, and racial minorities.[[38]](#endnote-38) AI regrets that the federal government has not developed effective strategies or action plans to address poverty and homelessness.

## Recommendations for action by the State under review

Amnesty International calls on the government of Canada to:

*UPR follow-up*

* Develop and adopt an International Human Rights Implementation Act.

*Normative and institutional framework*

* Ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and initiate ratification processes for the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their Families; the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities; and the Convention on the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearances.
* Develop a plan of action for implementing the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples;
* Establish and implement an effective regulatory framework for holding companies registered in Canada accountable for the human rights impact of all their operations;
* Adopt a policy of carrying out independent human rights impact assessments of all trade agreements;
* Recognize jurisdiction of courts to enforce extra-territorial application of human rights obligations.

*Indigenous Peoples*

* Enact and implement laws and policies to ensure that approval of resource extraction activities is contingent on formal, rigorous and meaningful consultation with Indigenous peoples and that development proceeds only with the free, prior and informed consent of those Indigenous peoples whose rights are affected, consistent with international human rights standards. Indigenous peoples whose rights to lands and resources are the subject of as yet unresolved disputes should receive the same protections;
* Work with governments across Canada to implement Ipperwash Inquiry recommendations;
* Ensure that funding for First Nations child and family services agencies is equitable and adequate to meet the needs of First Nations children;
* Provide adequate resources to ensure that water and sanitation in First Nations communities meets the standards enjoyed by other people in Canada and adopt urgent measures to address the needs of communities that have no potable water or sewage systems.

*Women*

* Develop a comprehensive national plan of action for addressing violence against Indigenous women.
* Increase funding for the protection and promotion of women’s human rights, including for the prevention and remedy of violence against women;
* Ensure social assistance rates are adequate to ensure women can realize their rights to food and housing;
* Collect comprehensive, disaggregated data on violence against women, women’s economic status, and unpaid work;
* Establish an independent oversight body for federally-sentenced women prisoners, including a process for adjudication of involuntary segregation decisions;
* Reinstate funding for advocacy and research on women’s rights.

*Refugees and migrants*

* Repeal the provisions on mandatory detention of designated foreign nationals;
* Entitle all refused refugee claimants to a meaningful appeal on the merits by the Refugee Appeal Division, without discrimination as to national origin or method of arrival;
* Ensure that refugees and refugee claimants have access to adequate health care, regardless of their nationality;
* Provide absolute protection against *refoulement* to torture.

*Counter-terrorism*

* Implement the recommendation for review and oversight of national security activities from the Maher Arar Inquiry;
* Provide Abdullah Almalki, Ahmad Abou-Elmaati and Muayyed Nureddin with redress;
* Reform the immigration security certificate system to meet international fair trial standards;
* Replace the Ministerial Direction with a policy on intelligence and information sharing consistent with international standards;
* Ensure Omar Khadr receives redress for the human rights violations he has experienced.

*Policing and administration of justice*

* Amend the Guidelines for the Use of Conducted Energy Weapons to require that CEDs will only be used in situations involving an imminent threat of death or serious injury;
* Thoroughly examine the role of players other than the police at the G8/G20 Summits;
* Withdraw the Quebec emergency laws and conduct a public inquiry into the policing of Quebec student protests;
* Ensure that extradition or criminal prosecution will be pursued over deportation with respect to individuals accused of committing international crimes subject to universal jurisdiction;
* Amend the State Immunity Act to allow civil suits involving crimes that are subject to universal jurisdiction.

*Economic, social and cultural rights*

* Support legal enforcement of economic, social and cultural rights in domestic courts;
* Develop comprehensive national plans of action or strategies to address homelessness and poverty.
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