XIV

(49)

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
P.O. BOX 6000
FREDERICTON, N.B.
E3B 5H1

NEW BRUNSWICK
NOUVEAU-BRUNSWICK

COMMISSION DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
CASE POSTALE 6000
FREDERICTON, N.B.
E3B 5H1

June 20, 1980

Jakob Th. Moller
Chief, Communications Unit
Division of Human Rights
United Nations Office at Geneva
Palais des Nations
Ch-1211 Geneve 10

REGISTERED

Dear Mr. Moller:

Ref. No.: G/SO 215/51 CANA (8) R.6/24

I am pleased to herewith transmit to the Human Rights Committee the handwritten observations of Sandra Lovelace, together with a digest of our views prepared by Professor Donald Fleming, Professor of International Law at the University of New Brunswick.

I wish to take this opportunity to recommend to the Human Rights Committee that it consider extending the time allowed for responses from individuals. The slow delivery of mail to North America, and especially to Eastern Canada is such, that little time remains for the preparation of a response by the time your letters finally reach us.

With every good wish,

Yours sincerely,

DR. NOEL A. KINSELLA
CHAIRMAN

NAK/amn

(50)

UNIVERSITY OF
NEW BRUNSWICK Post Office Box 4400 / Fredericton, N.B. / Canada E3B 5A3

Faculty of Law
(506) 453-4669/4670/4671

Telex: 014-46-202

20 June 1980

Jakob Th. Moller
Chief, Communications Unit
Division of Human Rights
United Nations Office at Geneva
Palais des Nations
Ch-1211 Geneve 10

Dear Mr. Moller:

Ref. No.: G/SO 215/51 CANA (8) R.6/24

Mrs. Sandra Lovelace has the honour to address the Human Rights Committee concerning her communication of 29 December 1977 to the Committee under the Optional Protocol to the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. In accordance with your note of 1 May 1980 (Ref. No. G/SO 215/51 CANA (8) R. 6/24), Mrs. Lovelace wishes to accept the offer to add additional information and observations for the benefit of the Human Rights Committee's consideration of the issues raised by her communication of 29 December 1977.

The information and observations accompany this note. They are in two parts. The first part was drafted by Mrs. Lovelace and the second part is a more formal document which has been drafted by request on behalf of Mrs. Lovelace. For the convenience of the Human Rights Committee, a verbatim word-by-word typewriten transcript of the hand-written material of the first part of the additional information and observations has been incorporated into the text.

Severe constraints of time have necessitated that both parts of the additional information and observations be prepared within a matter of days. As a result, many of the aspects and complexities of the issues raised by the communication of Mrs. Lovelace could not be researched, examined and commented upon in great detail. Therefore, should The Human Rights Committee require any further information in order to assist it in its deliberations of

the issues raised by the communication of Mrs. Lovelace, every effort will be made to meet such requests.

Yours sincerely,

Donald J. Fleming
Assistant Professor of Law

DJF/eh
Encs.

(52)

Additional Information and Observations

Concerning the 29 December 1977 Communication of Mrs. Lovelace Submitted to the Human Rights Committee Under the Optional Protocol to the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

20 June 1980

INTRO

It is clear by the poor preparation and the contant that very little effort and little understanding has gone into the responce from Canada to the U.N. complaint by myself Sandra Nicholas Lovelace. If this is an indiction of Canadas attitude about the importance of this issue than judging from the sloppy inept way in which it has been prepared I can only surmize that Canada does not take this complaint seriously. Furthermore, it indicates the dominant point of view which is that of the Eoro-Canadian.

Contents

Part A

Additional Information and Observations Drafted by Mrs. Sandra Lovelace

It is clear by the poor preparation and the blatant that very little effort and little understanding has gone into the response from Canada to the U.S. complaint by myself Sandra Nicholas Lawless. If this is an indication of Canada's attitude about the importance of this issue than judging from the sloppy inept way in which it has been prepared I can only surmise that Canada does not take this complaint seriously. Furthermore, it indicates the dominant point of view which is that of the Euro-Canadian

points

Should have ans by March of 1979 but this matter so unimportant Canada did not bother to ans until recenlty.

exact date

page 2 para 2

If Canada were serious about preventing discrimination Canada would not have allowed the I.A. to superceed the Human Rights Act. Also if Canada were serious about change it would not have taken ten years of discussions with no change. If Native women had not rebelled there would be no intent to change the Indian Act at present. There was no serious discussion previous to this complaint

page 2 para. 2

This implies that the I.A. exist to protect the culture, relegion and language of the Indian people then there would be no need for native women such as S.N.L. to go to such extrems as to bring to the attention of the international comunity the obvious injustice.

This excuse has been used for ages but the intent of the Indian Act was to assimulate the native people in CANADIAN SOCIETY. This is a Red herring.

Should have ans by March of 1979 but this matter as unimportant Canada did not bother to ans. until recently.

Page 2 para 2

If Canada were serious about preventing discrimination Canada would not have allowed the I. A. to supercede the Human Rights Act. Also if Canada were serious about change it would not have taken ten years of discussion with no change. If Native women had not rebelled. There would be no intent to change the Indian Act at present. There was no serious discussion previous to this complaint

Page 2 para. 2

This implies that the I. A. exist to protect the culture, religion and language of the Indian people then there would be no need for native women such as S. M. L. to go to such extreme as to bring to the attention of the international community the obvious injustice.

This excuse has been used for ages but the intent of the Indian Act was to assimilate the native people in Canadian Society. This is red herring.

page 2

Canada society, this is Red Herring

para 4 pade 2

If this was the intent than why would non-Indians be allowed to gain status upon marriage. Again I contend that gradual assimulation was the intent (see report from Ron Whileside).

No proof that patritinal family relationship was the norm among the Indians at that time. The reasoning behind the statement that says that white men were more of a threat is irrational because all non-Indians were a threat male and female. The white man would take the land and the white women would gradually melt down the Native Culture.

para 5 page 2-3

This para. contains the admission that white values norms legal systems were imposed on Native people. land base did not decrease because of increase in Native people but shrank because of increase in white population and resulting theft of reserve lands. Emotional issue because of the greediness of white settlers for Indian land. Land symbitized two different values for two different cultures.

Page 2

Canada society, this is Red Herring

4 para. 2

If this was ~~victor~~ the intent then why would non-Indians be allowed to gain status upon marriage again I contend that ~~the~~ ~~or~~ gradual assimilation was the intent (see report from Ron Welsand)

To accept that patriland family relation- up was the norm among the Indians at that time, the reasoning behind the statement that says that white men were more of a threat is irrational because all non-Indians were a threat male and female. The white man would take the land and the white women would gradually melt down the Native culture.

para 5 page 2-3

This para. contains the admission that white values, norms legal systems were imposed on Native people.

Land base did not decrease because of increase in Native people. But shrank because of increase in white population and resulting theft of reserve lands.

Emotional issue because of the greediness of white settlers for Indian land. Land symbolized two dynamic values per two different cultures.

(continued, PARA 1 page three)

The statement About gov't protection of Indian Land indicates the European point of view And imposition of European standards. If the gov't had Really protected Indian Land then the present Reserves would have much Larger Land bases. If there is a Fear today that the Land base on Indian Reserves will continue to shrink then the gov't itself is Responsible For this Fear. In the past, the gov't has sided with white squatters whenever disputes over Land Arose. This is the basis of this Fear About Further erosion of Indian Land. Aside From the question of the Loss of Land, the Fact that the grass Roots people were not consulted As to the present discussions on the Revisions to the Indian Act and the Fact that only the All-male National Indian Brotherhood was consulted indicates clearly that the gov't of CANDA does not take this issue As a priority.

(continued, PARA 1 page three)

This statement about gov't protection of Indian land indicates the European points of view and imposition of European standards. IF the gov't had really protected Indian land then the present Reserves would have much larger Land bases. IF there is A FEAR today that the Land base on Indian Reserves will continue to shrink then the gov't itself is Responsible For this Fear. In the past, the white gov't has sided with Squatters whenever disputes over Land arose. This is the basis of this Fear about Further Erosion of Indian Land.

Aside From the question of the loss of land, the Fact that the grass roots people were not consulted As to the present discussions on the revisions to the Indian Act and the Fact that only the All-male National Indian Brotherhood was consulted indicates Clearly that the gov't OF CANADA does not take this issue AS A priority.

Gov't implys that Native groups CANNOT Agree on changes to the Act is therefore being democratic in Not wanting to Arbitarily impose its will on the Native population. There has Never been A Reluctance on CANADA'S part to impose its will whenever it is economically 'Necessary'. This is true For past AS well AS the present. CANADA is pushing devalopment in the North At this moment And in the process imposing its will on the Native population however on this complaint it says piously that it CANNOT do so in this CASE. The real Reason is that Canads believes if Non-Status Native women were to Regain their Rights then it would Necessarily involve A Larger output of revenues And An increase in the Land base on Reserves. A study done by the United Native Nations OF VAN. B. C. indicates that if Indain Rights were Not Conferred on Non-Indin women upon marriage then the Amount would be

Court implys that native groups cannot agree on changes to the act is therefore being democratic in not wanting to arbitrarily impose its will on the native population. There has never been a reluctance on Canadas part to impose its will whenever it is economically 'necessary'. This is true for past as well as the present. Canada is pushing development in the North at this moment and in the process imposing its will on the native population however on this complaint it says piously that it cannot do so in this case. The real reason is that Canada believes if non-status native women were to regain their rights then it would necessarily involve a larger output of revenues and an increase in the land base on reserves. A study done by the United Native Nations of Can. B.C. indicates that if Indian Rights were not conferred on Non-Indian women upon marriage then the amount would be

would be negligible in the increase of resources involved. The other point is that this is not our problem. The Govt created this problem the Indian Comm. NOT be required to solve it. The view which states there should be an objective criteria for determining Indian status is nessary because of the fact that band Councils discrimate again Certain individual and if they were in a position to determine who should or should not be an Indian, then it is possible that Sandra Nicholas Lovelace, and others who have rebelled publically will not stand a Chance when it Comes to being returned to the band list.

one
four

Bullshit! The Govt. had no intention of changeing the Indian Act until political pressures forced them to Consider it. R.I.W. *funded starting 1979, as a result of political pressures created during and after Native Women's Walk. There has been no Continoues funding.

Indnin Rights For Indian Women

~~women upon marriage to Indian men~~ ~~then there~~ would be negligible ~~amount~~ in the increase ~~o~~ of resources ~~to~~ involved. The other point is that this is not our problem. The Govt. created this problem the Indian Comm. not be required to solve it. The view which states there should be an objective criteria for ~~detecting~~ [etermining] Indian status is ~~nec~~ nessary because of the fact that band Councils discrimate again certain individuals and if they were in a position to determine who should or should not be an Indian, then it is possible that Sandra Nicholas Lovelace, and others who have rebelled publically will not stand a chance, when it comes to being returned to the band list.

[RT ONE / of four] Bullshit! The Govt. had no intention of changing the Indian act until political pressures forced them to consider it. I.R.I.W.* funded starting 1979 as a result of political pressures created during and after Native Women's Walk. There has been no continuous funding.

* Indian Rights For Indian Women

Gov't looking to its own interest. Problems caused to Indian familes, were brought about by the first Indian Act. Therefore the Gov't should have to resolve it wheather or not it involves increased resources.

six

a. 2
e 5

The Indian Act has discriminated since its inception, so where is this supposed Commitment for change? There is not now, and has never been Any such thing as a Government-Indian partnership of views.

Govt looking to its own interest. Problems caused ~~the~~ Indian families, were brought about by the first Indian act. Therefore the Govt should have to resolve it no matter or not it involves increased resources.

The Indian Act has discriminated since its inception, so where is the proposed Commitment for Change? There is not now, and has never been any such thing as a Government-Indian partnership of views.

Part B

Additional Information and Observations

Drafted on Behalf of Mrs. Sandra Lovelace

I

By way of a communication of 29 December 1977, under the terms of the Optional Protocol to the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Mrs. Sandra Lovelace petitioned the Human Rights Committee to consider her complaint against the Government of Canada. She alleged that, by virtue of the Indian Act R.S.C. 1970, C. I-6, section 12(1)(b), a number of her human rights as enumerated in the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights had been violated by the Government of Canada. After due consideration, the Human Rights Committee recognized that the communication was worthy of consideration. In accordance with accepted procedures, the Human Rights Committee requested the Government of Canada to supply information and observations relevant to the question of admissibility of the communication and, later on, to the issues raised by the communication.

The requests for information and observations eventually prompted the Government of Canada, through the Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations, to forward to the Secretary-General of the United Nations two replies. Neither reply by the Government of Canada challenged the admissibility of the communication. Both replies (dated 29 September 1979 and 4 April 1980, respectively) however addressed the issues raised by the communication.

II

Preliminary statements in both of the responses by the Government of Canada admit that "difficulties exist with the present Indian Act including section 12(1)(b)"[1] and that "many of the provisions of the present Indian Act, including section 12(1)(b) require serious consideration and reform."[2] The Government of Canada previously made a similar admission to the Human Rights Committee when, pursuant to section 40(1)(a) of the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, it submitted its Report on the Implementation of the Provisions of the Covenant.[3] It is a commendable act for the Government of Canada to tacitly admit, on three different occasions, that section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act does, indeed, violate certain rights which Canada, by ratifying the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, has accepted an international obligation to protect. Even more praiseworthy are the statements of the Government of Canada that it intends to amend at

---

[1] Canadian reply of 26 September 1979 (hereinafter referred to as the "September 1979 reply") at p. 2.

[2] Canadian reply of 4 April 1980 (hereinafter referred to as the "April 1980 reply") at p. 2.

[3] Report of Canada on the Implementation of the Provisions of the Covenant, Final Draft, January 1979 at pp. 104-106, hereinafter referred to as the Report of Canada. The relevant sections of these pages are reproduced in Appendix A. The reproduced portion of the Report of Canada concerns the examination of Canadian federal law as it relates to article 26 of the Covenant. Virtually the entire section of that portion of the Report of Canada refers to the problem of discrimination under the Indian Act.

least that portion of the Indian Act[4] which has deprived Mrs. Lovelace of various rights as enumerated in the Covenant.

Unfortunately, not all the statements of the Government of Canada concerning the required amendment to the Indian Act are laudable. If one examines the two replies to Mrs. Lovelace's communication which were forwarded to the SECRETARY-[redacted] General of the United Nations, it becomes apparent that the Government of Canada has altered its position concerning the important obligation of amending the section of the Indian Act which offends Canada's international committment to human rights. In its September 1979 reply, the Government of Canada states that it intends

> at the next session of Parliament to introduce legislation to amend this section of the Act so as to resolve the difficulties that have resulted from its application[5]

However, in its April 1980 reply, the Government of Canada states that it merely

> intends to introduce into the Canadian Parliament proposed legislation that would amend section 12(1)(b) of the Act in a way that resolves as many as possible of the difficulties caused by this provision.[6]

---

[4] Report of Canada at p. 106 (see Appendix A), September 1979 reply at p. 2 and April 1980 reply at p. 2.

[5] September 1979 reply at p. 2 (emphasis added).

[6] April 1980 reply at p. 2 (emphasis added).

The portion of the second reply by the Government of Canada which is quoted above provides a strong indication that the Government, within the space of less than seven months, has chosen:

(1) to delay amending section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act from a specific and acceptably immediate date to a non-specified future time; and

(2) that it has retracted its promise to resolve "the difficulties" caused by the section and, instead, intends to remedy only as many of those difficulties as it considers "possible" of solution.

The change of attitude by the Government of Canada as outlined above reflects an unacceptable indecisiveness. In the Report of Canada, the Government of Canada only undertook to "revise" the Indian Act. No time frame was mentioned and no commitment was made to produce a revision which accorded with the state's human rights obligations. In its September 1979 reply, the Government of Canada made a definite commitment in terms of both when it would act and what it would do. Its April 1980 reply suggests that it has reneagued on these undertakings and has reverted to a far more nebulous and less acceptable position.

In addition to barring the way to meeting its treaty commitments, the vacillation of the Government of Canada does not provide any respite for Mrs. Lovelace. If the most recent

position of the Government of Canada continues, individuals who are suffering as a result of section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act will continue to do so for, at best, an unspecified length of time. Notwithstanding the time element, the April 1980 reply by the Government of Canada admits that not all "the difficulties" created by the offending section will be remedied. - At least some individuals who have suffered as a result of it will continue to do so.

When the Human Rights Committee debates the merits of the issues raised by her communication, Mrs. Lovelace requests that it consider them on the basis:

(1) of a recognition that the validity of her complaint has gone unchallenged by the Government of Canada and that the Government of Canada recognizes the soundness of her claim;

(2) of the obligations which Canada has undertaken by ratifying the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and

(3) the vacillation on the part of the Government of Canada concerning

(a) when section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act will be amended, and

(b) to what extent the amendments to the Act will remedy the harms caused by section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act.

The consideration of Mrs. Lovelace's communication by the Human Rights Committee will afford its members the opportunity to examine a situation wherein a state has acceded to the validity of a complaint against it but, by virtue of its indecisiveness or lack of genuine desire to determine when and to what degree it must remedy the difficulties caused by the problem, it has refused to affect a remedy. Given that the state has ratified a treaty which places upon it an obligation to arrive at a satisfactory solution to the problem (presumably within reasonable time limits), and given that the treaty also provides for the establishment of a body which must examine and comment on the extent to which the state is meeting its treaty commitments, it seems obvious to conclude that the state in question is waiting for an external impetus which will give it direction to act in a positive and remedial manner.

III

Following its recognition of the difficulties presented by section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act and its various expressions of desire to amend that Act, the replies of the Government of Canada to the communication of Mrs. Lovelace contain statements which attempt to justify the position taken by the Government of Canada with respect to its activities (or lack thereof) concerning the offending section of the Indian Act. Mrs. Lovelace submits that the outline by the Government of its attempt to justify its behaviour concerning this matter is, at

most, a very weak rationalization and one which underlines the plea by Mrs. Lovelace that the Human Rights Committee should make findings and recommendations which will encourage the Government of Canada to take immediate and positive steps to alleviate the difficulties which have been created by section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act. Although the reasons submitted by the Government of Canada for its delay and refusal to amend the Indian Act constitute a rationale to which little, if any, reply need be made, a number of statements of the Government may possibly serve to create misleading impressions that could be detrimental to the complaint of Mrs. Lovelace. Some comment, therefore, will be directed to certain portions of the information supplied by the Government of Canada.

1. In the Report of Canada, the Government of Canada asserted that it:

> has undertaken to revise the Indian Act, including the various sections dealing with Indian status, and has taken measures to ensure that this revision is done only after consultation with the Indians.[7]

The same intention is reflected in the first reply of the Government of Canada to Mrs. Lovelace's communication,[8] but such does

---

[7] Report of Canada at p. 106 (emphasis added).

[8] September 1979 reply at p. 2.

ot appear to be the case in the second reply of the Government of Canada. In the April 1980 reply, the Government of Canada suggests that it does not wish merely to consult with the Indian people on this matter. Rather, it appears instead that the Government of Canada will not amend section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act until there is virtually unanimous concurrence among all Indians that the required changes take place:

> The National Indian Brotherhood, an organization of Indian associations across Canada, has stated that Indian men and women should be treated equally, that the Government should compensate all those who have lost their status through sections such as 12(1)(b), and that the Indians alone should determine who is an Indian and who is not. However, that view is not shared by all Indian associations. Some maintain that because amendments to the status provisions of the Act may well increase the number of Indians and thereby place demands on Indian lands and reserve lands, there should be no such amendment without a corresponding increase in the resource base of Indians. Others oppose any changes because it is felt that the present legal situation protects the Indian cultures and land base from erosion by non-Indians. There is in addition the view to the effect that objective criteria for determining status should be included in the Act rather than Indian control of membership. These sometimes opposing viewpoints have been widely and consistently expressed, underlining the magnitude of the differences of opinion within the Indian community itself.[9]

One can interpret the section of the April 1980 reply quoted above as suggesting that section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act might never be amended. Such lack of action could result merely because various groups among the Indian people themselves

---

pril 1980 reply at pp. 3-4.

ave a vested interest in maintaining the status quo and denying to other Indians their proper rights and privileges. The division among native people on the question of status is a long-standing one and is evident merely by examining the list of intervenants who appeared before the Supreme Court of Canada when the Lavell-Bedard cases were argued in the early 1970's. In addition to the actual parties to the action, at least twelve Indian associations and four women's rights groups prepared arguments for the case.[10] The division of interests concerning the validity of section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act was, even then, quite obvious. Although Indian women command more support today than in 1973, it should come as no surprise to learn that the Indian people are still unable to reach unanimous agreement on the issue.

2. The same portion of the April 1980 reply quoted above suggests that the Government of Canada has already consulted with the Indian people and has determined the feelings, beliefs and desires of Indians regarding the amendment of section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act. The Human Rights Committee and particularly the Government of Canada, are reminded that the Indian people are not responsible for ensuring the adherence in Canada of the rights enumerated in the United Nations Covenant

---

[10] See Appendix B, which is a reproduction of p. 483 of the Lavell-Bedard decisions as published in (1973), 38 D.L.R. (3d) 481 (S.C.C.). The page lists both the parties to the action and the intervenants who appeared before the Supreme Court of Canada.

on Civil and Political Rights but that it is Canada, through its government, which bears the duty to ensure that its laws accord with its obligations under the Covenant. (This was recognized by the Government of Canada in its first reply when it stated that section 12 (1) (b) of the Indian Act would be amended, even if the Government of Canada could not, in the near future, reach an agreement with Indian groups[11]. -The second reply seems to have altered that view quite considerably.)

3. Mrs. Lovelace wishes to point out to the Human Rights Committee that the replies of the Government of Canada to her 29 December 1977 communication are incomplete and do not convey the Committee the degree of research and effort which the Government of Canada and others have invested in their many examinations of the difficulties raised by section 12 (1) (b) of the Indian Act and their possible solutions. The second reply of the Government of Canada raises a number of objections to changing that section of the Act (e.g., historical reasons[12], divisions of opinion among the Indian people[13], economic repercussions[14], protection of Indian culture and land[15], divisions of opinion as to the alteration of the section[16]).

---

[11] September 1979 reply at p.2.
[12] April 1980 reply at p.2.
[13] Ibid. at p.4.
[14] Ibid. at pp.3-4.
[15] Ibid. at p.4.
[16] Id.

Nowhere in the information volunteered to the Human Rights Committee has the Government of Canada indicated the numerous studies which have been made and the many solutions which have been proferred as a result of intensive research into the very issues presented before the Human Rights Committee by the communication of Mrs. Lovelace. The Government of Canada implies that Indian families were traditionally patrilineal in nature[17] when such is -or, at least, was- not necessarily the case (many Indian communities were matrilineal in nature, and the Indian Act has successfully destroyed that aspect of their culture). Furthermore, the allegations of the Government of Canada concerning the divisiveness which will occur and the economic and cultural degeneration which may result from amending section 12 (1) (b) of the Indian Act is wholly unsubstantiated. The Federal Government of Canada has the constitutional authority and corresponding duty to deal with the nation's Indians. The Indian Act, which is a legislative enactment of that Government, is the cause of the divisiveness presently existing among the Indian people, and it has forced them to live under a law which has resulted in hardships affecting the economic and cultural security of many of them. If the Government of Canada believes that greater economic and cultural degeneration will result in correcting that Act, then a duty also rests

---

[17] April 1980 reply at p.2.

upon the Government of Canada to commit the necessary resources to alleviate the problems which it has created.

If the Government of Canada sincerely believes the arguments it has put forward to justify its refusal to amend the Indian Act, then the onus is on the Government to validate its arguments.

4. In its April 1980 reply the Government of Canada claims that, only during the last decade, has it encountered pressure to amend section 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act. The Government of Canada implies[18] that the lack of pressure until that time indicates concurrence by the Indian people with that section of the Act. The reply of the Government, however, fails to mention that:

(1) The discriminatory provisions of the Indian Act permit males to dominate the Indian leadership and spokesman positions, whereas in certain Indian communities this would not necessarily have been the case but for the provisions and the administration of the Indian Act. This led to a suppression of the claims of Indian women.

(2) The Canadian Bill of Rights was assented to only in the early 1960's. Before then, no legal recourse existed for any Indian to challenge the Indian Act.

---

[18] April 1980 reply at p. 3.

5. In its second reply, the Government of Canada implies that time is needed to heal any wounds which might be associated with an amendment of section 12 (1) (b) of the Indian Act and, paradoxically, it wishes to wait until that time has passed and the wounds have healed before it amends the Act. The Government of Canada neglects to mention that the issue of Indian status under the Act has been of concern to the Government, the Indian people, and the remainder of the Canadian public at least since 1973, when the Lavell-Bedard cases were thrust before the courts. As this matter has been of concern to Canadians for at least seven years, and as the government of Canada, on page two of its September 1979 reply, vowed to amend the Indian Act during "the next session of Parliament", there appears to be no reason for further delay in altering the Act, nor is any further time needed to carry out more consultations and research relating to those changes.

6. Another issue raised by the replies of the Government of Canada suggests that a sudden amendment of section 12 (1) (b) of the Indian Act might very well create changes which will detrimentally affect Indian society[19] and that the Government of Canada is conforming to article 2(2) of the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and is

---

[19] September 1979 reply at p. 3 and April 1980 reply at p. 5.

rotecting the rights provided for in article 23 (1) of the Covenant[20]. Furthermore, the Government of Canada alleges that the:

> Indian Act is in accordance with the aims sought to be achieved by article 27 of the International Covenant.[21]

Again, the Government of Canada has made allegations which, on the facts of the case before the Human Rights Committee, cannot be supported. Mrs. Lovelace has been deprived of basic rights which, were she a male instead of a female, she would not be denied. Furthermore, the family from which Mrs. Lovelace comes and to which she now belongs is not, at present, protected by society and the state. In addition, Mrs. Lovelace is, by law, denied rights which Canada has guaranteed her under both articles 26 and 27 of the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

7. Mrs. Lovelace wishes to remind the Human Rights Committee that the "interim measures" taken by the Government of Canada[22] are of no benefit to her or to anyone whose rights have been violated as a result of section 12 (1) (b) of the Indian Act. Such measures are mere token gestures which do little but recognize the violation of the rights which result from that section of the Indian Act.

---

[20] April 1980 reply at pp. 4-5.
[21] Ibid. at p. 2.
[22] September 1979 reply at p. 2 and April 1980 reply at p. 5.

IV

Mrs. Lovelace respectfully requests that the Human Rights Committee consider the issues presented by her communication in light of the information before its members. She submits that the case speaks for itself and that the Government of Canada has presented no supportable arguments for its failure to amend section 12 (1) (b) of the Indian Act and to grant her such relief as is reasonable and necessary. Mrs. Lovelace requests that the Human Rights Committee find:

(1) that section 12 (1) (b) of the Indian Act is in violation of the rights set forth in the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as outlined in her communication of 29 December 1977 submitted to the Human Rights Committee under the provisions of the Optional Protocol to the Convention; and

(2) that the Government of Canada can provide no reasonably acceptable ground for refusing to amend the legislation which has created the violation of the rights of the Covenant as set out in her communication of 29 December 1977.

So that Canada might respect and live up to its international obligations to protect and promote the human rights as set out in the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and

Political Rights, and to grant relief to those whose rights have been violated by section 12 (1) (b) of the Indian Act, Mrs. Lovelace petitions the Human Rights Committee to append to its findings the following recommendations:

(1) that the Government of Canada amend section 12 (1) (b) of the Indian Act at the next session of its Federal Parliament following the issuance of the Committee's findings and recommendations;

(2) that the amendment by the Government of Canada of section 12 (1) (b) of the Indian Act resolve all past difficulties which have been created by the application of that section; and

(3) that the amendment by the Government of Canada of section 12 (1) (b) of the Indian Act ensure that the formula to determine the status of Indians accord with the obligations undertaken by Canada pursuant to the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

V

Mrs. Lovelace wishes to convey her appreciation to the Human Rights Committee for its care and efforts in the consideration of her application. The findings and the recommendations which she requests the Human Rights Committee

to make are not only just and favourable to her nation and herself; they are also in accord with the committment of Canada under the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and with both the views of Canada and the views of the United Nations concerning the rights of women[23].

---

[23] E.g., refer to the work of the United Nations Economic and Social Council and its Commission on the Status of Women and the United Nation's General Assembly Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (G.A. Resol. 1763) which, on 7 January 1967, was adopted unanimously by 111 votes.

APPENDIX A

- the relevant sections from pp. 104-106 of the Report of Canada on the Implementation of the Provisions of the Covenant, Final Draft, January 1979.

Article 26

Section 1(b) of the Canadian Bill of Rights recognizes the right of every individual, without discrimination by

reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, to equality before the law and the protection of the law.

In Attorney General of Canada v Lavell, [1974] S.C.R. 1349, at pages 1365 to 1367, the Supreme Court of Canada concluded that the concept of equality before the law as recognized in s. 1(b) of the Canadian Bill of Rights was different from that recognized by the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution, as interpreted by the courts of that country. In the opinion of the Supreme Court, the phrase "equality before the law" must be interpreted in light of the "rule of law" as conceived by Professor A.V.Dicey. In his book Introduction to the Study of the Constitution, Prof. Dicey indicated that the "rule of law" implies, inter alia, equality before the law or the equal subjection of all classes to the ordinary law of the land administered by the ordinary courts of the land. In Dicey's view, this concept excludes the idea of any exemption of officials or others from the duty of obedience to the law which governs other citizens, or from the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts. In the opinion of the Supreme Court, equality before the law as recognized in the Canadian Bill of Rights means "equality in the administration or application of the law by the law enforcement authorities and the ordinary courts of the land."

In the Lavell case, the Supreme Court of Canada came to the conclusion that s. 12(1)(b) of the Indian Act, R.S.C. 1970, ch. I-6, which stipulates that any woman who is a registered Indian loses the right to be so registered when she marries a non-Indian, does not contravene, on the ground of sex discrimination, the principle of equality before the law as recognized in the Canadian Bill of Rights and as interpreted by the Court, notwithstanding the fact that a man would not

lose his Indian status if he married a non-Indian woman. Whatever may be said about this decision, the Government of Canada has undertaken to revise the Indian Act, including the various sections dealing with Indian status, and has taken measures to ensure that this revision is done only after consultation with the Indians.

APPENDIX B

- p. 483 of the Lavell-Bedard decisions as published in (1973), 38 D.L.R. (3d) 481 (S.C.C.).

C.R.N.S. 302; *Vine v. National Dock Labour Board*, [1957] A.C. 488, refd to]

APPEALS (1) from the judgment of the Federal Court of Appeal, 22 D.L.R. (3d) 188, [1972] 1 O.R. 396*n sub nom. Re Lavell and A.-G. Can.*, [1971] F.C. 347 *sub nom. Lavell v. A.-G. Can.*, setting aside the decision of Grossberg, Co.Ct.J., 22 D.L.R. (3d) 182, [1972] 1 O.R. 390, sitting as *persona designata* under the *Indian Act* (Can.) confirming, on a motion for review by respondent Lavell, a decision of the Registrar deleting respondent's name from the Indian register; and (2) from the judgment of Osler, J., 25 D.L.R. (3d) 551, [1972] 2 O.R. 391, declaring that s. 12(1) (*b*) of the *Indian Act* (Can.) was inoperative and that the eviction of respondent Bedard from the reserve was of no effect.

C. R. O. Munro, Q.C., *N. A. Chalmers*, Q.C., *J. E. Smith* and *Mrs. C. J. Pepper*, for appellant, the Attorney-General of Canada.

Clayton C. Ruby, for respondent, Jeannette Vivian Corbiere Lavell.

B. H. Kellock, Q.C., and *V. Libis*, for the Six Nations Band of Indians of the County of Brant.

B. J. MacKinnon, Q.C., for the Native Council of Canada.

Miss M. P. Hyndman, Q.C., and *Mrs. Frances Smookler*, for Rose Wilhelm, Alberta Committee on Indian Rights for Indian Women Inc., Viola Shannacaffo, University Women's Club of Toronto, University Women Graduates Ltd., North Toronto Business and Professional Women's Club Inc., and Monica Agnes Turner.

Arnold F. Moir, Q.C., for the Treaty Voice of Alberta.

Edward L. Greenspan, for Anishnarvbekwek of Ontario Inc.

B. H. Kellock, Q.C., and *V. Libis*, for appellants, Richard Isaac and others.

Malcolm Montgomery, Q.C., for respondent, Yvonne Bedard.

Douglas E. Sanders, *B. A. Crane*, *James O'Reilly*, *Ken Regier*, *Bob Young* and *Bruce H. Fotheringham*, for the Indian Association of Alberta, the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood Inc., the Union of New Brunswick Indians, the Indian Brotherhood of the Northwest Territories, the Union of Nova Scotia Indians, the Union of Ontario Indians, the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, the Indian Association of Quebec, the Yukon Native Brotherhood, and the National Indian Brotherhood.