❍ ORIGINS

Elizabeth Fry (Gurney) was born into a family of Quakers in 1780 in England. Her mother's father, the Scottish theologian Robert Barclay, played an important role in defining early Quaker beliefs. It was fortunate for all concerned that Quakers believed in the equality of women (250 years before they won the vote), otherwise Elizabeth Fry's unusual talents in the area of prison reform might never have been realized.

Her insight, persistence, organizational ability and her willingness to see a "divine light" in every person resulted in striking reforms taking place in the manner in which women and children were treated in London's Newgate Prison. She was a strong proponent of humane treatment for prisoners and regarded by many as a leading expert in prison reform. Most of her life was spent in England, although she did visit Ireland and continental Europe. She also offered advice to the Americas, Russia and Australia. She died in 1845 at the age of 66 years.

The first Elizabeth Fry Society was established in Vancouver in 1939. The Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies (CAEFS) was originally conceived of in 1969 and was incorporated as a voluntary non-profit organization in 1978. Today there are 23 member societies across Canada.

❍ MISSION STATEMENT

CAEFS is a federation of 24 autonomous societies which work with, and on behalf of, women involved with the justice system, particularly women in conflict with the law. Elizabeth Fry Societies are community based agencies dedicated to offering services and programs to marginalized women, advocating for legislative and administrative reform and offering fora within which the public may be informed about, and participate in, aspects of the justice system which affect women.

Voluntarism is an essential part of Elizabeth Fry work. Both volunteer and paid staff are involved in governance as well as program and service delivery throughout the association. The CAEFS Board of Directors is composed of one representative from each local society, as well as a President and a past President. The priority agenda, as well as policies and positions, are established by the Association's membership at each Annual General Meeting.

❍ PRINCIPLES

The strength of our federation is the freedom to meet the needs of our communities in unique and effective ways. As an Association, CAEFS develops policies and positions and acts on common interests affecting women. Member societies support the following principles:

- Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to equal benefit of the law without discrimination.

- Every individual has a right to legal counsel, due process and natural justice protection. Women have the right of access to equal opportunities and programs in the justice system; women have the right to justice without fear of prejudice or gender discrimination.

- Commitment to equality rights does not preclude any practice, program or activity of our association that has as its object the amelioration of the conditions of disadvantaged individuals or groups.

- Action is required in order to ensure quality programs, services and facilities for women in conflict with the law, based on individual needs.

- Responses of the justice system to individual behaviour should interfere with individual rights and freedoms only to the minimum extent necessary. The correction of the offender should take place in the community, unless there

are compelling reasons to the contrary. Further, the offender should retain all the rights and privileges of an ordinary citizen, except those expressly removed by law.

- Because the community and all its members have the ultimate responsibility for the response of the system and the handling of offenders, it is essential that the community be involved in all aspects of the criminal justice system.

- The active participation of volunteers in all aspects of our organization is fundamental to attainment of the Association's goals.

- In pursuit of excellence and efficiency, CAEFS and its members shall always seek to improve their standards and programs, to identify and address the gaps and unmet needs and to seek changes through reforms of the law and penal and correctional regulations, practices and conditions.

❍ GOALS

To provide an Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies and to encourage suitable reform at all levels of the criminal justice system.

To assist member societies in developing and maintaining high standards of programs and services for the purposes of aiding adult and young women who have come into, or who are at risk of coming into conflict with the law, whether such programs be in courts, institutions, or in the community, and whether they be for the purpose of assistance, guidance, rehabilitation or prevention, and whether provided by paid or volunteer personnel.

To promote public awareness and understanding of the needs of women in conflict with the law and the need for change in the criminal justice system as it affects women. Promote awareness of the ways in which individuals and communities can address these needs.

To facilitate communication and cooperation among Elizabeth Fry Societies and similar societies.

To obtain funds for the financial support of the organization, and for such other purposes as may from time to time seem desirable for furthering the aims of the Association.

To communicate and cooperate with agencies and services in the correctional field and with governments in furthering the aims of the Association.

To encourage the formation of Elizabeth Fry Societies and societies with similar purposes.

❍ CAEFS BOARD OF DIRECTORS (1999/2000)

President	Dawn McBride
Healing Lodge Representative	Deb Batstone

Regional Representatives
Atlantic - Laurie Ehler, Cathie Penny, Lois Weatherby
Quebec - Sylvie Bordelais, Nathalie Duhamel, Margaret Shaw
Ontario - Elaine Bright, Bonnie Rush, Connie Swinton
Prairies - Charlene Gutscher, Sara McEwan, Ailsa Watkinson
B.C. - Shawn Bayes, Bernice Blackburn, Mollie Both

❍ CAEFS STAFF (1999/2000)

Executive Director	Kim Pate
Executive Assistant	Gayle Bray

❍ PRESIDENT'S REPORT

As I end my first year as President, I reflect back on the year and our accomplishments. It always amazes me how strong and connected our organization is. CAEFS' network stretches across this country and is deeply rooted in our communities. We, as an organization, have faced numerous challenges in our advocacy with and on behalf of women facing conflict with the

law. Despite these numerous challenges we continue to grow and strengthen as an organization. I applaud all of my colleagues across Canada who work as Elizabeth Fry staff members, board members and front line workers. Their support, energy and knowledge is CAEFS' strength and credibility.

Kim Pate, our Executive Director, continues to challenge and energize all of us. I have enjoyed working with Kim throughout this past year and I wish to recognize and thank her for her efforts and commitment to our organization. Kim has brought a national and international face and voice to CAEFS. She has been at the forefront of our accomplishments and has summarized these in her report below.

Kim was at the forefront of CAEFS' move forward to join with other women's groups domestically and internationally in our commitment to equality and justice for women. CAEFS was able to bring together members of national women's groups to discuss, debate and develop a joint position and we have now formally prepared our response to the Department of Justice's proposal for legislative changes to the law of self-defence, provocation and mandatory minimum sentences. The benefits of consulting with these groups of women reach far beyond the formulation of united policies and positions. Our coalitions with other equality seeking groups helps push the women's movement forward to achieve greater equality and justice for women in many areas and across a multitude of issues.

This year, we will finally see the end of the Prison for Women after approximately 60 years of calls for its closure. In this coming year, CAEFS will focus on CSC's "Intervention Strategy" for the movement of women classified as maximum security back into the regional prisons. We want to ensure that the these women do not continue to be held in punitive and isolated circumstances. We will also challenge CSC to eliminate the harsh conditions that will continue to face women in the segregated maximum security units in men's prisons until they are moved to the regional prisons.

As we see the movement of the women classified as maximum security back to the regional prisons, CAEFS will continue to focus on the very important need for community release options. Our CAEFS' membership has worked extensively in the last year to secure real community release options for women being released from the prisons. More work needs to be done as there continues to be a severe lack of resources in communities, especially rural and northern communities.

The regional prisons for federally sentenced women continue to house all three levels of security in a high security setting. CAEFS has advocated and will continue to advocate that women prisoners classified as minimum security have the right to live in a minimum security environment. This will be pursued further in the upcoming year and could involve court challenges if necessary.

As we head into the next year, our organization will continue to face challenges. The media has focused a great deal of negative and alarmist attention on justice issues. We also face numerous private members bills, most of which promote regressive reforms on justice issues. At the same time as the climate is becoming more difficult, we also see positive recognition of the need for deincarceration and alternatives to incarceration from both our government and the Supreme Court of Canada. We need to remain encouraged and united in our advocacy!

❍ TREASURER'S REPORT

We have once again finished the year within the budget approved by the Board of Directors, and although expenses have gone up we have accomplished a great deal with the money available. Please refer to the copy of CAEFS' audited financial statements for more specific information on the CAEFS' revenues and expenditures.

We are most appreciative of the financial support provided by the Ministry of the Solicitor General, which, in spite of these economically challenging times, has remained constant.

The portion of the grant that goes to member agencies is evenly distributed among the five regions. It is specifically designated for the work that they do with and for CAEFS, and the agencies are accountable to CAEFS for that grant.

The Corporate and individual donations remains an important part of our budget and the Executive Director continues to work hard to seek other funding. On behalf of CAEFS, I am also pleased to be working with the "Women's Future Fund", a group of National Women's organizations seeking secure funding through payroll deductions.

While our resources are continuously stretched to cover ever-expanding expectations, we look forward to new challenges as we fulfill our mandate to work with and on behalf of women who come into conflict with the law.

❍ EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

& Priority Issues and Law Reform Initiatives

As we open this century, we continue to work with and on behalf of criminalized women in our efforts to realize our vision. We look forward to the closure of the Prison for Women in Kingston as well as the segregated maximum security units in men's prisons, the development of community resources for women and the outflux of women from the regional prisons home to their children and communities of support.

While we closed the year, decade, century and millennium with the ever-present and persistent challenge of ensuring that women behind prison walls have access to justice, we nevertheless face the coming year with new hope, energy, ideas and enthusiasm. As the economic, social and political climate continues to produce ever more daunting challenges to the women with and on behalf of whom we work, we too find ourselves struggling at times to remain clear, united, strong and focussed on our mission and objectives.

We are increasingly being urged to abandon the most difficult issues in favour of self-preservation. Resisting such efforts has and will continue to strengthen our collective voice as well as commitment to equality and justice for women and girls. Highlights of the issues and challenges faced by CAEFS as we strive to fulfil our mandate are highlighted in the following activity and issue summaries.

& Federally Sentenced Women: Arbour and Beyond

CAEFS continues to play a key role in the forewarning, monitoring and exposure of procedural and policy problems related to the manner in which the Correctional Service of Canada chooses to address problems which emanate from or have been visited upon P4W and the regional women's prisons. Issues which persist in the regional prisons for women in Canada point to the need for national leadership in the area of women's corrections.

This year saw the virtual vacation by the Correctional Service of Canada of the position of the Deputy Commissioner for Women. When the DCW was appointed to the position of Senior Deputy Commissioner, those responsibilities were added to her pre-existing ones, which thereby provided further practical limitations to the authority of the position.

On September 3, 1999, Solicitor General MacAulay announced that P4W and the segregated maximum security units in men's prisons would close and the women therein would be accommodated in the regional women's prisons by September of 2001. As such, although we continue to have significant concerns regarding the future for federally sentenced women in Canada, CAEFS still has hope that CSC will continue to be challenged to develop new options for women.

CAEFS has repeatedly called for the closure of the Prison for Women in Kingston as well as the segregated maximum security units for women in men's prisons and the integration into the regional prisons and the Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge of the women currently housed in those units. However, CAEFS is extremely concerned that the decision to close P4W

and the segregated maximum security units in the men's prisons will result in the construction of additional prison beds in the regional prisons. We do not support the building of additional cells inside the walls of the regional prisons. But for the manner in which the issues pertaining to federally sentenced women are being managed, we do not believe there is truly a need for additional beds. Rather, we consider the development of appropriate community integration resources as vital and consequently a more appropriate focus.

CAEFS is also extremely concerned that the needs of women classified as minimum security prisoners are not being addressed at all. One of the recurring historical criticisms of the Prison for Women in Kingston was that all women were subject to the same high security measures, regardless of their security classification. This situation has now been replicated in the new regional prisons.

Although CAEFS does not support the construction of additional prison beds, if CSC persists in the desire to construct new cell space anyway, we advocate that they develop minimum security space outside the fences of the regional prisons. The current situation, whereby there are no minimum security beds for women aside from the 13 beds at the Isabel MacNeil House in Kingston, is a situation that continues to violate the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* and the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act (CCRA)* and unfairly discriminate against women classified as minimum security prisoners.

We are also concerned that Aboriginal women who are classified as having serious mental health concerns and those classified as maximum security prisoners may still not have access to the Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge. The Aboriginal women who authored the recommendations of the Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women which pertain to the Healing Lodge clearly intended that all federally sentenced Aboriginal women should have access to the Lodge, regardless of the security classification they are given by the Correctional Service of Canada. Indeed, it is CAEFS' view that the Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge was built for the very women who have been

refused access, many of whom are now kept in the segregated maximum security units in the Saskatchewan Penitentiary in Prince Albert and the Regional Psychiatric Centre in Saskatoon.

In 1996, CSC moved women who were classified as higher security prisoners out of the regional women's prisons for what we were told would be an 18-24 month period, in order to allow time for the installation of security fences, razor wire, additional high security cameras and other security measures at the regional prisons. Now, approximately four years later, instead of seeing the incorporation of all women into the regional prisons, the Correctional Service of Canada is working on the further fortification of the prisons.

This will be the third "enhancement" of static security measures at the new regional prisons -- all for the same women who have yet to be incorporated into the prison populations. The first was the doubling of the "Enhanced Security Units" in 1994, and the second occurred in 1996 and 1997, when the security fences, razor wire, eye-in-the-sky 360 degree swivel zoom and infrared cameras, as well as additional internal and external security measures were installed at all of the regional women's prisons.

Rather than replicate the problems of constructing segregated units for women, albeit within the grounds now of the women's prisons, as opposed to in the men's prisons, CAEFS has suggested to CSC that they implement their pre-existing unimplemented plan to focus on the use of more dynamic (human and humane) staff support and interventions to "manage" the women classified as maximum security prisoners as well as those classified as having significant 'mental health concerns'.

If the conversion and/or development of minimum security houses and community resources were instead the focus of any new resources, however, the vacated prison beds behind the walls should result in sufficient cell space to accommodate the women imprisoned in the segregated maximum security units for women in men's prisons. CAEFS was not involved in the development of current plans but will seek and welcome

opportunities to develop appropriate implementation strategies to accommodate all women prisoners in the regional prisons and their surrounding communities. To this end, CAEFS has urged the Solicitor General to establish the sort of advisory body envisioned by the Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women, the Arbour Commission and advocated by CAEFS, most recently in our submissions to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights regarding the Five Year Review of the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act*.

It is sixty-six years since the first national report urged and four years since Madam Justice Arbour's report heralded the closure of the Prison for Women. The first report referred to P4W as "unfit for bears". Since then, although they have been also labelled "too few to count", far too many women have called the Prison for Women home. It is CAEFS' hope that with the closing of the doors of the Prison for Women, we will also see the end of one era and the beginning of a brighter future for women prisoners and women's corrections in Canada.

Unfortunately, CAEFS remains apprehensive about the willingness and ability of the Correctional Service of Canada to institute the necessary reforms to address the needs and challenges of federally sentenced women released into the community. Four years after the release of Madam Justice Arbour's recommendations and nearly ten years after the completion of the work of the Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women issued its report, *Creating Choices*, we still await CSC's articulation and action plan for a national strategy for the provision of community release or supervision options for federally sentenced women. With the exception of a halfway house in the Greater Vancouver area, a few private home placements in Edmonton, and the purchase of two beds in E. Fry Saskatchewan's provincially funded house there are still virtually no women-only day parole options for federally sentenced women west of central Ontario. Regrettably, there is also one less halfway house in Ontario, as the EFS of Ottawa was forced to close their house due to the insufficiency of funding to finance the beds for FSW. As such, there are now only three Elizabeth Fry and one Salvation Army halfway

houses for women in Ontario. There is one in Quebec, but not one in Eastern Canada. CAEFS continues to urge CSC to develop a clear national community integration strategy and standards for federally sentenced women (FSW).

CAEFS would like to see CSC developing clear action plans designed to ensure that the needs of federally sentenced women are met in the institutional and community release contexts for those women still imprisoned at the Prison for Women, as well as of those in the regional prisons, the Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge and the segregated maximum security units in men's prisons. Much more emphasis is needed on the development of community supports for women prisoners.

& Increased Criminalization of Women

Women prisoners, especially racialized women prisoners, are the fastest growing prison population world wide. The so-called "War on Drugs", evisceration of health and other social support services, as well as "gender-neutral" zero tolerance policies have contributed significantly to this phenomenon. It is often the women who have been hired to transport drugs who are detected, prosecuted and imprisoned, as opposed to those who hire them.

Too many of the federally sentenced women who are currently classified as maximum security prisoners are women who have cognitive and/or mental disabilities. Many of them were previously institutionalized in psychiatric hospitals and/or involved in other mental health services. Many are criminalized as a result of their disability-induced behaviour in institutions and/or the community. As a result of funding cutbacks to services over the past decades, we have literally seen these women dumped into the streets and, ultimately, into the wider, deeper and stickier social control net of our criminal justice system. Although the criminal justice system is the likely the least effective and most expensive system that could be used to respond to cognitive and mental disabilities, it is a system that cannot refuse to "service" anyone who is criminalized, regardless of their disability.

Once in prison, the practical reality is that mental health needs have been equated with risk. Physical and mental disability are included in s. 17 of the Regulations of the *CCRA*, as factors which must be considered in determining security classification. This does not mean, however, that the presence of a disability should result in an increased security classification. Mental health concerns that are disabling undoubtedly create very real needs for federally sentenced women and therefore for CSC. But, equating mental health disabilities with risks only serves to perpetuate a social construction of persons with mental disabilities as dangerous.

This is precisely the kind of stereotyping which is prohibited by the equality provisions of the *Charter*. Many of the women identified as having mental health needs do not pose the kind of risks to which s. 17 of the Regulations is directed. Using the need for mental health treatment as a reason to classify women as maximum security imposes harsher treatment on such women. Since this is based on their disability, it is clearly discriminatory and contrary to s. 15(1) of the *Charter*. Consequently, CAEFS continues to pursue opportunities to challenge the increased criminalization of women with cognitive and mental disabilities.

Finally, CAEFS and other equality-seeking women's groups are working to counter the increased criminalization of women who experience violence. Part of the backlash to increased attempts to hold violent men accountable has been the application of so-called "gender neutral" zero tolerance policies to cross or counter charge women. Women are increasingly charged in circumstances where they have called the police in relation to assault and/or threats directed at them by abusive men, especially if they have managed to defend or otherwise react to the violence perpetrated against them. This is especially true for Aboriginal and other racialized women.

& The Jettisoning of Juvenile Justice?

As we close this year, we await the report to Parliament by the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, regarding Bill C-3, the proposed new juvenile justice legislation, the *Youth*

Criminal Justice Act. CAEFS presented to the Committee in February 2000. While there are some significant positive improvements in the new legislation, CAEFS is extremely concerned about the lack of resources for the implementation of same. Unless community based services are encouraged with the enhancement of resources, the progressive elements of the legislation run the risk of being scuttled in the same manner as were those of the *Young Offenders Act*.

In addition, the increasing numbers of younger women in the provincial and federal prison systems are of particular concern to CAEFS. Unfortunately, unless the Minister resists the calls for more punitive and regressive scapegoating of Canadian youth, and, instead, embarks upon a public education campaign to inform Canadians about the excessive penalizing and incarcerating of youth in Canada, we are not likely to see much change in the current slide away from justice for young people.

In an effort to encourage the Parliamentary Standing Committee to seriously examine the disastrous impact and untold human costs of jettisoning more young people into the adult system, CAEFS facilitated a presentation by a young woman who had first hand experience in and with the system. A summary of her story follows:

® A Young Woman's Nightmare: K's Story

K. is a young Aboriginal woman from Manitoba -- the province that has the highest rate of transferring young people from the juvenile into the adult system. K was arrested when she was 16 years old. She was driving in a car from which a young man shot another youth. She was taken into custody and immediately sent to the Portage Jail, a provincial jail for women. As a result of her age, as well as the high profile nature of her case in the province, K was segregated in one of the worst segregation units in the country for almost the entire time that she was remanded in custody awaiting her transfer hearing.

K was initially charged with first degree murder. It is common that the police usually charge with the most serious offence supported by their version of the facts, those young people

who they wish to see transferred up to the ordinary or adult court. Evidence that is presented at a transfer hearing is not subject to the same rigorous examination as when it is raised at trial. K was transferred up essentially on the basis of that charge. She was one of seven youth who were involved, and, ultimately, the only young woman charged. Two young men were also charged and the remaining four youth gave evidence against their "friends" in exchange for their freedom.

Once K was transferred to the adult court, the Crown Prosecutor immediately offered her a deal: a recommendation for 3-4 years in prison if she entered a guilty plea to a reduced charge of manslaughter. As is too often the case, although K's lawyer felt that she had a chance of acquittal, she was not willing to risk going to trial on the first degree murder charge because of the potential that she might end up convicted and therefore subject to a mandatory minimum sentence of life in prison with no parole eligibility for 25 years.

K consequently pleaded guilty and was convicted of manslaughter. Although the Crown argued that K should be sentenced to 3-4 years in prison, the judge decided to give her a sentence of one year. When K realized that this would mean that she would have to return to the same prison in where she had spent the previous two years of remand, her lawyer was instructed to try to get her sent somewhere else. The result was a request for a prison sentence of two years so that she might be incarcerated in the new regional women's prison in Edmonton or the Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge for Aboriginal women prisoners.

Unfortunately, the Correctional Service of Canada classified K as a maximum security prisoner and shipped her off to the segregated maximum security unit in the Saskatchewan Penitentiary. I met K there, just after she had tried , for the second time, to kill herself. She was 18 years old. She was later transferred to the Regional Psychiatric Centre. CSC staff also recommended that she be detained in prison until the expiration of her warrant of committal thereto.

When K's grandfather died, her request for a compassionate temporary absence pass to allow her to attend his funeral was refused. When a Winnipeg police officer exaggerated and misstated the reality of the risk posed by K, CSC and the Solicitor General refused to allow her to pay her respects to the man who had raised her and whom she had known more as a father than as a grandfather.

At the age of 19 years, K was released on statutory release. Although her grandmother requested that K be permitted to live with her, CSC chose instead to force her to go to a men's halfway house. K was the only woman in the house and she became to focal point of more than one resident's advances. Consequently, it was not surprising that she tried to use any means available to avoid being at the house. As a result, she was deemed to have breached the conditions of her parole and was twice put back into the Portage jail.

When K's two-year jail sentence expired, she was still not free to move on with her life. She is now subject to a sentence which we consider excessive. When her prison sentence expired, K commenced three years of probation, the conditions of which are more stringent than her parole conditions. In addition to a 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. curfew, she has to complete 400 hours of community service work. These conditions preclude her being able to continue the work she was doing in the evenings while on parole, which means she cannot afford to support herself nor is she able to continue in her educational endeavours. After spending time at her mother's beyond her curfew, as well as because of difficulties she is experiencing in trying to complete her community service work hours, K has also now been charged with breaches of her probation order.

As K has so articulately challenged us and the members of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, where does she go for help and support now? K was in the care of the child welfare authorities at the time of her arrest. The State were therefore her "parents". Five years later, however, at the age of 21 years, K is "released to freedom" without resources, familial support and now further beaten

down by the system. K learned to slash and self-medicate as a means of coping with life in prison. It is all she sometimes feels she has left when she is overcome by the bleak reality of her life -- no family, no money, and no job, but quick action to charge and jail her when she finds she cannot cope and fails to adhere to all of her conditions of probation.

& Dangerous Offender Designation Denounced

On June 29, 1999, the Alberta Court of Appeal released its decision to overturn the November 17, 1994 designation of Lisa Neve as a dangerous offender. Lisa was 21 years of age when she was labelled the most dangerous woman in Canada and sentenced to an indeterminate prison sentence. Previously, two other women have been labelled dangerous offenders. The first woman, Marlene Moore, killed herself in the Prison for Women. A third woman's case was also overturned on appeal.

When Lisa was 12 years old, she was dragged into secure "treatment", followed fairly quickly by secure custody. The system was not impressed by her assertive and confident manner. Unlike so many other young women her age, she was clearly a respected and undisputed leader. These qualities are not ones that are generally accepted, much less encouraged or nurtured, in our social control systems -- be they child welfare or criminal justice in orientation. They are seen as particularly unacceptable when embodied by a young woman. Sexism, racism, hetero sexism and class biases intersect to provide an incredibly discriminatory lens through which women like Lisa are viewed and judged.

As a result, it did not take long for the adults in authority to label Lisa as a "problem" in need of "correction". Once the labels were applied, they not only stuck, but they also attracted other labels which built upon and expanded those prior. Consequently, Lisa started as "mischievous", "a brat", then she was called an instigator, negative, and eventually, aggressive, sociopathic and then a dangerous offender. Largely based upon accounts of her institutional behaviour in young offender centres, as well as her "unfeminine" renegade behaviour while working the street, Lisa was characterized as the most

dangerous woman in Canada by Justice Murray in 1994 and then as a maximum security prisoner by the Correctional Service of Canada for more than four years.

Including her pre-trial detention, Lisa spent approximately six years in jail for an offence which the Court of Appeal eventually determined warranted a three year sentence, as opposed to the indeterminate one imposed by Justice Murray. To make matters worse, she also spent most of her time living in some of the most severe and limiting prison conditions in Canada. Nobody should ever have to face the sort of tortuous ordeal that Lisa was forced to endure.

Hopefully the decision of the Alberta Court of Appeal in Lisa's case will result in broader systemic changes to the administration of justice for women in Alberta and across Canada. To start with, the Court reaffirmed the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in the *Lyons* case, by indicating that the dangerous offender provision, "applies to "...a small group of highly dangerous criminals ...and that "the court must be satisfied that the pattern of conduct is substantially or pathologically intractable". They also challenged the acceptance in the lower courts of a psychological assessment of Lisa that "effectively implies ... that a woman's thoughts about murder can somehow be equated with a man's commission of a murder..."

The Court also pointed out that "dangerous offender legislation is targeting that small group of recalcitrant offenders whose past behaviour is sufficiently entrenched that future risks to public safety warrant preventative detention" and noted that "every offence which Neve committed was entangled in some way with her life as a prostitute." They also pointed out that while it was not to be condoned, Lisa's violent offences were generally characterized as attempts to avenge wrongs done to others. Furthermore, they characterized Lisa as "a young woman with a relatively short criminal record for violence, [who was] disposed to telling shocking stories of violence."

Finally, in determining if and when the dangerous offender provisions should apply, the Court of Appeal determined that,

"the question is whether, relatively speaking compared to all other offenders in Canada - male and female, young and old, advantaged and disadvantaged - Neve falls into that small group of offenders clustered at or near the extreme end of offenders in this country." They also found that Lisa Neve did not fit into that group at all, overturned her dangerous offender designation and substituted a penitentiary term of three years as a "fit and proper sentence for the robbery".

Within two days, Lisa went from facing the rest of her life in prison to being released from prison. While CAEFS and other women's and Aboriginal groups have applauded the decision of the Alberta Court of Appeal because of the very real and tangible benefit it provided to and for Lisa, there is considerable regret that the Court did not allow CAEFS, the Native Women's Association of Canada, the DisAbled Women's Network and the Women's Legal Education and Action Fund to intervene in support of Lisa's case. We argued that it was important for the Court to examine the overriding *Charter* equality implications of Justice Murray's decision.

The Court of Appeal did not permit our coalition to intervene as they determined that Lisa's lawyer could canvas any equality arguments. Then, they declined to address the equality arguments because they found it unnecessary once they had decided that the dangerous offender label was wrongly applied to Lisa. Fortunately, however, the very thorough analyses of the facts and the law by the Honourable Chief Justice Fraser, Madam Justice Conrad and Madam Justice Picard, provide a viable basis for us to extract the implications for future equality arguments. Most significantly, it will assist others, especially men, who have been labelled as dangerous offenders.

In the meantime, with a great deal of support from her family, Lisa is working on adjusting to being out of prison. She was on parole until her warrant expiry date at the end of November 1999. Lisa continues to work hard at her plans for her future. The biggest danger for Lisa now is that the reaction of others to her infamy will hinder her ability to make her own way.

& Another Bad Trip: CSC Malingering in LSD Compensation Case

The millennium dawned with justice still eluding Dorothy Proctor and the other prisoners who were subjected to LSD experimentation in segregation at the Prison for Women (P4W) in Kingston approximately 40 years ago. It is more than five years since Ms. Proctor, the only woman who has been willing to be identified, approached the Solicitor General and CSC requesting that they acknowledge and take responsibility for the experiments that she was subjected to at when she was a teenager imprisoned at P4W.

CSC commissioned a Board of Investigation to look in to Ms. Proctor's case. In their report, *Board of Investigation into Allegations of Mistreatment by a Former Inmate at the Prison for Women Between March 22, 1960 and August 1, 1963*, the CSC- appointed investigators recommended compensation for Ms. Proctor and the other 22 women who had been administered LSD at the Prison for Women 35-40 years ago. CSC then commissioned the McGill University Centre for Medicine, Ethics and Law "to obtain independent advice concerning the long term effects of LSD, and to develop guidelines, or protocols, for addressing each individual case". They also suggested that women identify themselves to CSC health services.

The obvious deficits in the analysis of the McGill Report raises questions regarding the nature and completeness of the information that the authors were provided by CSC. Indeed, as Ms. Proctor's lawyers have revealed recently, CSC has yet again repeated prior patterns by failing to disclose critical relevant documentation pertaining to the LSD experiments and CSC operations at P4W and throughout their investigation of same over the past five years.

CAEFS has urged the Commissioner of Corrections to immediately offer compensatory settlements to Ms. Proctor and the other former prisoners who were subjected to the experiments. We also urged him to continue efforts to locate the additional 20+ women who were part of the experiments.

Given the obvious sensitivity of these issues and the likelihood that women may not wish to have their families and circumstances jeopardized by unwanted publicity, we further urged him to encourage women to come forth by providing assurances of anonymity.

Similar to the chain of events revealed during the Arbour Commission, developments in Ms. Proctor's case to date reveal a disturbingly similar pattern of behaviour on the part of CSC. In the face of rather obvious wrongdoing and correctional culpability, the response of CSC has been to deny, obfuscate and avoid any assumption of responsibility. It appears to be merely a matter of time before they will be once again called to account.

& Messes Made by Mandatory Minimum Sentences

CAEFS has a long history of urging the Department of Justice to reform the defence of self-defence to reflect the realities experienced by battered women who defend themselves and others with lethal force. After the Supreme Court of Canada handed down the *Lavallee* decision in 1990, CAEFS and other equality-seeking women's groups requested a review of the cases of women who had been jailed for killing their abusers.

These efforts resulted in the establishment of the Self-Defence Review. The purpose of the Review was essentially to examine the cases of women jailed as a result of their involvement in the deaths of their abusers and recommend how they might achieve some measure of justice for women who had been convicted in Canada of homicide in circumstances where self-defence should have been considered.

CAEFS has also been involved in national consultations with women's groups on violence against women, and has articulated the link between women's experience of male violence and their subsequent convictions and imprisonment. In this regard, CAEFS participated in 1995, along with other women's groups, in responding to the White Paper proposals in 1993 and in discussions regarding proposals for reform of the law of self-defence in 1995.

In 1998, the federal government released its latest consultation document on the reform of self-defence, *Reforming Criminal Code Defences: Provocation, Self-Defence and Defence of Property*, which included proposed reforms to the defence of provocation and defence of property as well. In the summer of 1999, CAEFS convened a national consultation with equality-seeking women's groups to discuss the relationship between self-defence, the defence of provocation, and the mandatory minimum sentence of life imprisonment for murder.

CAEFS' primary and most critical response to the Department of Justice paper, *Reforming Criminal Code Defences: Provocation, Self-Defence and Defence of Property* is to urge the abolition of the mandatory minimum sentence of life imprisonment. CAEFS has, since 1979, formally opposed all mandatory minimum sentences, as have many other government commissions such as the Sentencing Commission of Canada. Given the extremely serious repercussions of the mandatory minimum sentence of life imprisonment for individual women convicted of murder and for the conditions in women's prisons, CAEFS calls for abolition of this and all other mandatory prison sentences.

First and foremost, the abolition of mandatory minimum sentences is necessary if we are to address systemic discrimination in the criminalization and imprisonment of women, members of racialized communities, people with disabilities, the poor, and lesbians and gays. While some people seem to believe that mandatory minimum sentencing amounts to "equal treatment", this assumption is falsely simplistic.

Mandatory sentencing could only be said to be "equal treatment" if everyone had an equal chance at receiving a mandatory sentence. Everyone does not have an equal chance at receiving a mandatory prison sentence for a number of reasons. Disparity is partly created by the choice of offences that are targeted for mandatory minimums -- usually the offences disparately committed by the socio-economic underclass of society.

Further, as has been demonstrated over and over again by activists, researchers, and advocates, Aboriginal people, other racialized people, and poor people face a criminal justice system in which discretion is exercised to their disadvantage at every turn, from the investigatory and charge stage by police, to the prosecutorial decisions made by Crown attorneys, to the trial and sentence decisions by judges, to the penal practices, including discipline of prison authorities, through to the parole determinations made by the parole board.

There are also significant numbers of people with cognitive and psychiatric disabilities who are caught up in the criminal justice system, and for whom stereotypes and discriminatory practices play a role in their conviction and exposure to mandatory sentences of incarceration. Moreover, the available evidence indicates a Crown preference for first degree murder charges against women who kill their mates, when either no charges or a manslaughter charge would be warranted on all the evidence.

Given the reality that most women who use lethal force to prevent an attack by an abusive partner are also the first to notify police of the death and their involvement, their own actions are frequently used by Crown prosecutors as the basis for laying first degree murder charges. It is neither logical nor just to allow the gendered context that gives rise to the decision to lay first degree murder charges against such women to dictate a minimum sentence of life imprisonment.

In addition, consistent with the 1995 findings of the *Commission on Systemic Racism in the Ontario Criminal Justice System*, statistics on charging decisions by police and other prosecutorial decisions substantiate that systemic biases against groups such as African-Canadians shape the exercise of discretion with respect to many criminal offences. In addition, consistent with the 1996 report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples, *Bridging the Cultural Divide*, statistics illustrate racism in Canadian sentencing patterns, as exemplified by the over-use of more punitive measures against Aboriginal as well as African-Canadian accused, and the over-representation of Aboriginal women in federal prisons.

Even among federal prisoners who are serving mandatory life sentences for murder, Aboriginal and other racialized offenders are disadvantaged by systemic racism with respect to the conditions under which they serve their sentences, such as security classification and prison discipline, which in turn affect their chances of release on parole and thus the ultimate length of their life sentences. Given what we know about systemic racism in prison discipline in provincial institutions and in light of Madam Justice Arbour's comments about the federal prison culture and disregard for the law in her Inquiry into Events at the Prison for Women, we know that racism is carried over from the decisions of police, prosecutors, and judges to those who administer sentences of imprisonment and the terms of parole in federal institutions as well.

Cognitive and psychiatric disabilities also generally weigh against an accused in the prison classification process and correctional programming, not to mention the availability of parole. Not surprisingly, in jurisdictions that have attempted to gauge the impact of mandatory sentencing laws, the results indicate consistently that minority groups are the ones targeted by these laws.

Women who allege that they killed violent mates face widespread disbelief and misogynist denial, an enormous lack of legal, social, and economic support for their defence, and the prospect of loss of their children for decades. Added to this is the loss of self-worth, confidence, and clarity engendered by male control and violence. Thus, women are systemically disadvantaged when charged with first degree murder in their ability to fight the charge based on self-defence, as a direct consequence of the mandatory life sentence that is tied to a murder conviction. The overwhelming trend in such cases is for the woman to agree to plead guilty to manslaughter in order to open up the possibility of judicial as opposed to mandatory sentencing.

Mandatory sentencing also produces unequal results, even if it could be called equal treatment, because it forces a judge to impose a set sentence regardless of mitigating circumstances. For women and other disempowered groups, this results in

ignoring systemic oppressions that assist in creating "criminals", and it even overrides individual responsibility. For example, some women who killed violent mates and plead guilty to manslaughter had, after *Lavallee* (1990) received suspended sentences and/or community sentences on the basis that they had been battered and that the battering was relevant to their moral culpability.

However, new gun legislation passed in 1995, requires a judge to impose a minimum sentence of incarceration in a federal institution for at least four years for offenders convicted of specific offences of violence against the person if a firearm was used. This mandatory sentence of at least four years of imprisonment will be imposed even where there are compelling mitigating circumstances such as long-term abuse of the woman who kills her mate. The legal recognition of the significance of such factors, which was achieved only after lengthy feminist struggle, has been obliterated by this new mandatory minimum sentence since the new firearms law will impose the mandatory sentence regardless of the degree of moral fault of the offender. As a result, a woman who fires a gun at her mate, in an action that is deemed not to amount to self-defence, may receive a longer sentence than the man who beats his wife to death over a period of hours.

Long prison terms may have more devastating effects upon prisoners who are racialized or who experience cognitive or psychiatric disabilities, whose prospects of employment will be further crushed by a record of imprisonment. In the case of women, they are more likely to be the primary, often sole parent of children and therefore more likely to experience the loss of their children and the anxiety related to concerns about their well-being. Further, the conditions of women's imprisonment have often been condemned for their failure to provide appropriate services for women.

CAEFS believes that mandatory minimum sentences also contribute to systemic discrimination by putting pressure on lawyers to resort to extraordinary measures to avoid conviction and the mandatory sentence for their clients. Many of the problems that have been associated with the defences of self-

defence and provocation are in fact distortions caused by the existence of a mandatory minimum sentence of life imprisonment for murder. Accused persons, lawyers, and judges are pressured to resort to constructs such as "Battered Woman Syndrome", "Homosexual Advance", "Homosexual Panic", "Cultural Defences", and "Rage" in order to avoid this sentence, even when such uses carry negative social policy consequences and in fact violate the *Charter* rights of the deceased victims and social groups such as women, lesbians and gays, and racialized people. The more appropriate response is to rid the law of the mandatory minimum sentence of life for murder.

CAEFS also opposes the use of the mandatory life sentence for murder based on its contribution to the growing population of prisoners in Canada, and particularly women prisoners. We know that women have not suddenly become more violent, yet the numbers of women serving life sentences have risen from 12-14 % in the late 1980s, to approximately 22 % a decade later. CAEFS attributes this startling increase in the women's federal population to the impact of mandatory life sentences for murder. A similar trend has been documented in the United States, where the increased use of mandatory minimum sentences has produced its most dramatic expansion of prisoners in the women's population.

Further, CAEFS notes that the effect of the mandatory minimum sentence for murder in Canada is to produce extraordinarily long sentences of incarceration, by international standards. For example, only just behind the U.S., Canada has the second longest average sentence, 28.4 years, served for first degree murder among many nations, where the average sentence served among these nations is 14.3 years.

Fore the foregoing reasons and more, CAEFS' recommendations to the Department of Justice are as follows:

* Abolish the mandatory minimum sentence of life imprisonment for first and second degree murder, and all other mandatory minimum sentences.

* Abandon the parole ineligibility rules for murder.

* Permit the extension of the period of parole ineligibility for murder only upon a clear burden of proof, where a jury so recommends to a judge, and where reasons are provided in writing for the decision.

* Make appellate review of parole ineligibility decisions and judicial review of parole decisions available automatically in the case of alleged *Charter* violations.

* Initiate or fund quantitative and qualitative research into the current operation of self-defence and provocation in the context of intimate homicide and femicide, as well as other hate-inspired killings.

* Initiate or fund research into the use of the defence of property at the level of charging and prosecutorial and trial decisions, including an equality-based analysis of its relevance and significance in Aboriginal land disputes where possession is asserted.

* Convene and fund a national consultation on provocation and self-defence with women's groups who work on violence issues, and ensure an ongoing process of consultation with women's groups that work on violence against women.

* Convene and fund a national consultation on the defence of property with women's and Aboriginal groups who have expertise in criminal defence work on behalf of Aboriginal protesters.

* Demonstrate federal leadership and co-ordination regarding provincial and territorial prosecutorial consultation and guidelines for the prosecution of intimate homicide and femicide and other hate-inspired killings.

* Identify the promotion of equality and justice and the reduction of inequality as experienced on the basis of sex, race, disability, and/or sexual orientation as the impetus for reforming all criminal law, including the defences of self-defence and

provocation. In particular, the criminal law must ensure that everyone has the same duty of self-control, and must strive to accord to all, on an equal basis, the rights to self-worth and to self-preservation.

* Create and develop data to identify the different paradigms in which self-defensive violence is invoked and employ policy analysts to undertake a feminist, anti-racist, gay and lesbian-positive analysis of the systemic factors that should be considered in developing self-defence doctrine.

* Enact a duty to retreat, where it is safe to do so, for those who initiate or threaten violence or abuse.

* Exclude from the ordinary law of self-defence those who were exercising lawful authority and create a specific defence of self-defence for those in lawful authority that has more stringent criteria for self-defence.

* Draft a defence that does not differentiate between those who intend and those who do not intend to kill or seriously injure when defending themselves or another.

* Draft a defence that is open-ended in terms of protection of other persons, regardless of the legal relationship between the accused and the person protected.

* Require that an accused must actually and reasonably, consistent with a s. 15 equality analysis, believe in the need to use defensive violence and in the need to use the degree of violence invoked.

* Enact a self-defence law that requires the accused to believe that the use of force is necessary, but requires only that the degree of violence used by the accused be reasonable, not objectively necessary or proportionate.

* Enact a statutory list of considerations going to "reasonableness" in cases where the accused or the person protected was subjected to a pattern of coercive control, violence, threats and or abuse. This list must include both

systemic issues, as highlighted in *Malott*, and consideration of the particular features of the accused's experience, as set out above.

* Require that the reasonableness of the accused's belief regarding the need to use force and the degree of violence that is needed be assessed from the standpoint of the ordinary, sober person.

* Draft a self-defence law that disqualifies an accused's belief in the need to invoke defensive violence or the degree of force used as unreasonable only where it constitutes a marked departure from the beliefs or force used by the reasonable person, consistent with s. 15 of the *Charter*.

* Abolish the "excessive force" limitation and instead rely on a thorough determination of "reasonableness", as discussed in Recommendation #18.

* Draft a defence that can be used to defend against violence or threats of violence and that is available with respect to the commission of all offences involving violence.

* Qualify the defence by reference to assaults that are "unavoidable in the sense that the accused could not otherwise guarantee her or another's safety, rendering defensive violence necessary".

* Undertake a study of the use of model self-defence instructions by trial judges in Canada.

* Amend the *Criminal Code* so as to require trial judges to relate the law of self-defence to the evidence presented, to relate the theories of both sides, and to remind jurors that the factual findings are their domain.

* Engage in an equality analysis of the defence of property, focussing particularly on women, Aboriginal, and otherwise racialized people.

* Amend the defence of property to make it available only where the threat to property also poses a threat to human physical security or safety.

* Review and revise other *Criminal Code* provisions, including sentencing provisions, to ensure that they reflect the value of protection of human safety and life over property.

* Create a specific rule for the use of force by Aboriginal peoples in defence of land.

* Develop specific rules according to the values to be protected through the defence of property.

* Create a defence of property rule that is broad enough to include the range of economic interests of equality-seeking groups and that is tied to human security and safety.

* Define the defence so as to include defence against a range of infringements of "property" interests.

* Hinge the defence of property on "colour of right" in combination with a risk to human life or security.

* Adopt the mixed subjective-objective test for the defence of property with respect to the accused's belief that force is needed and that the degree of force used was necessary.

* Require that the defence of property through violence be "reasonable", but not also "necessary" and "proportionate".

* Require that the defence of property be dependant on defence of the person or Aboriginal lands, such that the use of deadly force could only be justified in such circumstances.

* Engage in an equality-based analysis of the defence of provocation that examines the broader implications of the defence beyond the results in reported cases.

* Abolish provocation at the same time that the mandatory minimum sentence of life imprisonment for murder is abolished.

* Remove “victim provocation” as a factor in mitigation of sentence.

* Delete the phrase "in the heat of passion" and substitute language that identifies a temporal link between the alleged provocation and the accused’s response.

* Replace the phrase “wrongful act or insult” with “unlawful act”, employing an equality-based understanding of insults that encompasses the implicit threat posed by racist insults and other taunting.

* Retain the "ordinary person" test for provocation.

* Retain the “suddenness” requirement for the accused’s reaction to the alleged provocation.

* Do not create a formal bar on the provocation defence for "spouses", but enact one instead for male violence against women and children and for killings inspired by alleged gay advances or “homosexual panic”.

* Qualify the ordinary person test such that the person is one who adheres to *Charter*, specifically equality values.

* Do not restrict provocation to those who fail self-defence only by reason of their use of excessive force.

* Create a legal mechanism that would repudiate discriminatory sentencing patterns and practices, and that would create the potential for public accountability and legal challenge of such sentences.

& Proliferation of Private Members’ Bills

The November 30, 1998 changes to the rules for introducing private members’ bills into the House of Commons have resulted in a proliferation of undisguised regressive criminal justice-related bills. Given the limited amount of human and fiscal resources of most national voluntary sector groups, the development of formal responses and appearances before the

Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights significantly impacting the nature of the CAEFS' workload.

CAEFS continues to encourage Canadians to demand that these bills be vetted and required to meet at least the same minimum standards as government-sponsored legislation in order to make it to the floor of the House of Commons. While many Members of Parliament have expressed private and personal support for such a requirement, none have yet to introduce same.

& Women's World March 2000

CAEFS and other national and international equality-seeking women's groups launched the Women's World March on March 8, 2000, International Women's Day. The internationally shared objectives are to end violence against women and woman's poverty world wide. Canadian women's groups have developed a list of demands for social, economic and political equality for women in Canada. For copies of these, please refer to the Pan-Canadian March Committee's home page -- march@web.net

& Elizabeth Fry Week - Challenging Stereotypes and Encouraging Proactive Action

The Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies celebrates National Elizabeth Fry Week annually. Elizabeth Fry Societies across the country organize public events in their communities throughout the week.

Our goal is to enhance public awareness and education regarding the circumstances of women involved in the criminal justice system. We hope to challenge and gradually break down the negative stereotypes that exist about women who come into conflict with the law.

National Elizabeth Fry Week is always the week preceding Mother's Day. The majority of women who come into conflict with the law are mothers. Most of them were the sole

supporters of their families at the time they were incarcerated. When mothers are sentenced to prison, their children are sentenced to separation. We try to draw attention to this reality by ending Elizabeth Fry Week on Mother's Day each year.

By focusing on initiatives to keep women in the community and facilitate their integration after prison, our 24 member societies hope to encourage the Canadian public to examine some productive and responsible means of encouraging community responses to addressing criminal justice matters from coast to coast. Particularly in this time of fiscal restraint, our aim is to retain a proactive focus in order to encourage the development of, and support for, community-based alternatives to human and fiscal expenses of our increasing reliance on incarceration. We focus on increasing public awareness of the myriad issues facing women in prison and gradually break down the stereotypes of women in conflict with the law. In addition, CAEFS initiates and responds to media awareness and coverage of the myriad relevant issues on an ongoing basis.

CAEFS continues to challenge Canadians to reach behind the walls and welcome women into our, and their, communities, so that they may take responsibility and account for their actions in ways that enhance our national, provincial and local commitment and adherence to fundamental principles of equality and justice.

❍ AFFILIATIONS - Strengthening the Ties

CAEFS continues to maintain and strengthen its ties with other national justice, women's and voluntary organizations. Some of the key umbrella and member groups with whom we work include: the National Associations Active in Criminal Justice (NAACJ); Equality for Gays and Lesbians Everywhere (EGALE) the National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NAC); the Women’s Legal Education and Action Fund (LEAF); the Native Women's Association of Canada (NWAC); Pauktuutit, the Inuit Women's Association; the Métis National Council of Women; the Canadian Association of Sexual Assault Centres (CASAC); the DisAbled Women's

Network (DAWN); the Congress of Black Women; the National Anti-Poverty Organization (NAPO); the National Council of Women of Canada (NCWC); National Voluntary Organizations (NVO); the National Association of Women and the Law (NAWL); the National Organization of Immigrant and Visible Minority Women of Canada (NOIVMWC); and the United Way National Agencies Committee.

For copies of CAEFS' position papers or additional information, please contact Kim Pate directly at kpate@web.ca, visit the CAEFS' Home Page at http://www.elizabethfry.ca, telephone us at 1-800-637-4606 or (613) 238-2422 or fax us at (613) 232-7130.

❍ CAEFS' SPONSORS

Solicitor General Canada

CIBC Charitable Foundation
DuPont Canada
Harlequin Enterprises Limited
North Shore Unitarian Church
PPG Canada Inc.
Royal Bank Financial Group Foundation
The Co-operators
The Seagram Company Ltd.

*BN/Registration Number 10807 4980 RR0001

THANK YOU!

❍ MEMBER SOCIETIES

Elizabeth Fry Society of Calgary

650, 1010 - 1St. S.W.
Calgary, Alberta
T2R 1K4 (403) 294-0737

Elizabeth Fry Society of Cape Breton

150 Bentinck Street
Sydney, Nova Scotia
B1P 1G6 (902) 539-6165

Central Okanagan Elizabeth Fry Society

104 - 347 Leon Avenue
Kelowna, British Columbia
V1Y 8C7 (250) 763-4613

Elizabeth Fry Society of Edmonton

10523-100th Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 0A8 (780) 421-1175

Elizabeth Fry Society of Greater Vancouver

4th Floor- 402 E. Columbia Street
New Westminister, British Columbia
V3L 3X1 (604) 520-1166

Elizabeth Fry Society, Hamilton Branch

627 Main Street East, 2nd Floor
Hamilton, Ontario
L8M 1J5 (905) 527-3097

Kamloops and District Elizabeth Fry Society

261 B Victoria Street
Kamloops, British Columbia
V2C 2A1 (250) 374-2119

Elizabeth Fry Society of Kingston

127 Charles Street
Kingston, Ontario
K7K 1V8 (613) 544-1744

Elizabeth Fry Society of Mainland Nova Scotia

217 - 2786 Agricola Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3K 4E1 (902) 454-5041

Elizabeth Fry Society of Manitoba

773 Selkirk Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R2W 2N5 (204) 589-7335

Elizabeth Fry Society of New Brunswick Inc.

39 McDougall Avenue
Moncton, New Brunswick
E1C 6B1 (506) 855-7781

Elizabeth Fry Society of Newfoundland & Labrador

83 Military Avenue
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 2C8 (709) 753-0220

Elizabeth Fry Society of Ottawa

#311, 211 Bronson Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K1R 6H5 (613) 237-7427

Elizabeth Fry Society of Peel-Halton

#401 - 134 Queen Street East
Brampton, Ontario
L6V 1B2 (905) 459-1315

Elizabeth Fry Society of Peterborough

483 George Street South, Upper Level
Peterborough, Ontario
K9J 3E6 (705) 749-6809

Prince George & District Elizabeth Fry Society

#101 - 2666 S. Queensway
Prince George, British Columbia
V2L 1N2 (250) 563-1113

Société Elizabeth Fry du Québec

5105 Chemin de la Cote St.Antoine
Montréal, Québec
H4A 1N8 (514) 489-2116

Elizabeth Fry Society of Saint John

P.O. Box 23012
St. John, New Brunswick
E2J 4M1 (506) 635-8851

Elizabeth Fry Society of Saskatchewan

230 Avenue R South, 4th Floor
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
S7M 2Z1 (306) 934-4606

Elizabeth Fry Society of Simcoe County

102 Maple Avenue
Barrie, Ontario
L4N 1S4 (705) 725-0613

South Cariboo Elizabeth Fry Society

P.O. Box 603 (601 Bancroft Street)
Ashcroft, British Columbia
V0K 1A0 (250) 453-9656

Elizabeth Fry Society of Sudbury

204 Elm Street West
Sudbury, Ontario
P3C 1V3 (705) 673-1364

Elizabeth Fry Society of Toronto

215 Wellesley Street East
Toronto, Ontario
M4X 1G1 (416) 924-3708

❍ FINANCIAL SUMMARY 1999/2000

INCOME & EXPENDITURES
for year ending March 31, 2000

❍ INCOME

Solicitor General Canada Grant:	
CAEFS	$276,801
Societies	175,006
Donations	5,850
Interest & Miscellaneous	22,507
Dues and Registration	6,854
Consulting	0
	$496,008

❍ EXPENDITURES

Grants to Societies	$175,006
Salaries & Benefits	90,793
Travel & Meetings	88,802
Professional Fees	3,397
Reproduction	11,633
Telephone	17,214
Rent	12,840
Office and Postage	5,010
Office Maintenance	8,210
Depreciation	1,920
Insurance	2,867
Subscriptions & Membership	2,294
Translation	1,280
Healing Lodge Allocation	15,728
NGO and Government Liaison	406
Consulting Fees	30,508
Reimbursable Expenses	8,253
	$476,161

Excess of Expenditures over Revenue for the year (expenditures over revenue)	$ 19,847

❍ BALANCE SHEET AS AT MARCH 31, 2000

	ASSETS	LIABILITIES & EQUITY
Operating Fund	$150,387	$132,434
Designated Funds	6,963	6,963
Accounts Payable		17,953
	$157,350	**$157,350**

❍ AUDITOR'S NOTE

This is to confirm that we have examined the information contained in the foregoing 1999/2000 financial summary. We are satisfied that the information presented is prepared directly from the audited financial statements on which we reported, and it fairly represents the position and the results of operations for the year.

McKechnie Moore
June 2000