

## *Criminalization of coercive control: Are we just putting another tool in the hands of abusers to use against their partners?*

**Prepared by:**

Luke's Place Support & Resource Centre for Women & Children  
February 2024

**Endorsed by:**

Action ontarienne contre la violence faite aux femmes  
Barbra Schlifer Commemorative Clinic  
Centre Victoria pour femmes  
CHADWIC Home  
CORNERSTONE Family Violence Prevention Centre  
Elliot Lake Women Group Inc.  
Herizon House  
Lanark County Interval House & Community Centre  
LEAF (Women's Legal Education & Action Fund)  
Network of Women with Disabilities NOW  
Northwestern Ontario Women's Centre  
North York Women's Centre  
Nova Vita Domestic Violence Prevention Services  
Ontario Association of Interval & Transition Houses  
Violence Prevention Coordinating Council of Durham  
WomanACT  
YWCA Cambridge  
YWCA Durham  
YWCA Peterborough Haliburton  
YWCA Sudbury  
YWCA Toronto

### ***Who we are***

[Luke's Place](#), an award-winning, community driven, non-profit organization, works with women who have been subjected to intimate partner abuse to support them and their children through the family law process. Located in Durham Region, we provide direct services to women across Ontario and are a provincial and national leader in systemic work such as law reform, advocacy, research, education and training on family violence and family law.

Our work has led us to a deep understanding of the many ways different legal systems intersect with and affect women's family law experiences. For this reason, we have conducted some research on the possible criminalization of coercive control<sup>1</sup> – in particular, its potential impact on women's family law cases – and been part of various discussions about this issue with other gender-based violence organizations over the past several years. We have also coauthored a brief on this issue with LEAF for the Canadian Women's Foundation.

Our position has been developed based on our frontline work and internal research as well as a review of the following:

- existing legislation in other jurisdictions
- Private Member's Bill C-332
- Mass Casualty Commission Final Report
- CKW Inquest recommendations
- House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights study on controlling or coercive behaviour in intimate relationships
- Standing Committee on the Status of Women's study on intimate partner and domestic violence in Canada

In July 2023, we brought together our staff team for a group discussion about whether or not coercive control should be criminalized. We heard the perspectives of those with lived experiences of coercive control as well as those whose daily work with survivors has shaped their thinking on this topic and those whose systemic work with the law has provided them with insights into past law reform successes and failures.

Luke's Place has serious concerns about both the criminalization of coercive control generally and Private Member's Bill C-332 specifically, which we set out following a brief overview of what coercive control is.

### ***What is coercive control?***

Coercive control is a term that describes a pattern of behaviours, including psychological abuse -- which itself can encompass such things as intimidation, demeaning and insulting treatment, verbal abuse, threats, gaslighting, surveilling and stalking -- as well as social isolation and financial abuse. Physical violence may or may not be present, but the threat of it is often part of the coercive control.

Over time, coercive control can result in the victim losing her autonomy and sense of self-worth, thinking she is crazy and becoming, essentially, a hostage of the abuser. Many of those subjected to coercive control live in a state of constant fear, always anticipating when the next

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://lukesplace.ca/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Stopping-Coercive-Control-by-Criminalization-Lukes-Place.pdf>

abusive act is going to happen. It can have a profound impact on children who are exposed to it.

Coercive control is now included in the definition of family violence in the *Divorce Act*, but it does not yet appear in the *Criminal Code*. Some jurisdictions have developed a criminal offence of coercive control, and other jurisdictions are considering doing so.

The verdict from the CKW inquest held in Renfrew County in June 2022 and the final report of the Nova Scotia Mass Casualty Commission both include recommendations related to the criminalization of coercive control.

## **CONCERNS WITH CRIMINALIZATION OF COERCIVE CONTROL GENERALLY**

### ***Key issues***

There are a number of reasons to think that criminalizing coercive control could have positive outcomes, among them:

1. Creating a criminal offence of coercive control would empower some survivors by validating their experiences. With no criminal offence, survivors can feel as though what has happened to them is not taken seriously by the criminal law and, by extension, by society at large.

*A lot of the women we see ask "why won't they charge him?" or "why won't they help me?"<sup>2</sup>*

*It was very hard for me to hear that what was happening to me wasn't real as far as the police were concerned.*

2. This could lead to survivors having greater confidence in the criminal system.

*What are we saying to survivors if we don't criminalize it?*

3. Some evidence shows that coercive control is a strong red flag for future lethality. Criminalizing it could lead to earlier interventions, thus saving lives.

*It could have been a game changer for my mum if it had been criminalized.*

4. If supported by appropriate public education, criminalizing coercive control could increase public awareness and understanding of this often hidden form of intimate partner violence (IPV).

*Criminalizing coercive control would help family law lawyers understand how serious it is.*

---

<sup>2</sup> All italicized comments come from the Luke's Place staff discussion about this issue.

5. If well implemented and enforced, it could offer police a new tool to use and provide a deterrent to abusers who engage in this behaviour and hold them accountable.

There are also a number of possible negative impacts of criminalizing coercive control:

1. The criminal law has largely failed survivors of gender-based violence, as we discuss in greater detail below.
2. Given that police reporting rates of IPV are generally low (approximately 30%), a new offence may affect only a small number of victims.

*What tools and policies will be created for police to minimize re-traumatization and make the process better and safer for the survivor?*

3. Abusers have been very successful in using other legal and policy responses to IPV against their victims (eg mandatory charging). Criminalizing coercive control presents the same possibility; in particular, that abusers will manipulate the intent of the law to have their partner charged.

*Criminalizing coercive control just puts another tool in the abuser's toolbox to manipulate the law.*

4. By its nature, coercive control is hard to define, making it difficult for police to accurately assess, especially if the abuser is making counter-claims.

*How will police officers even be able to identify coercive control? There are so many nuances and cultural aspects to it.*

5. It may prove difficult to determine the elements of the offence. What is "repeatedly or continuously?" What is "controlling or coercive conduct?"

*Crowns need a standard procedure for prosecuting these cases.*

6. Establishing what evidence will be necessary to lead to a finding of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt may prove challenging.

*Women will be retraumatized when they have to testify and be cross-examined.*

7. There is likely to be a differential impact of criminalization on women from marginalized communities (for example, women with criminal histories, Indigenous and racialized women, women with disabilities).

*There is already fragmentation in the criminal system.*

8. Criminalization will have an impact on survivors' family law and child protection cases, as we explore in greater detail below.

*We already see the family law not protecting women and children when other charges have been laid.*

*Will it be used against her in family court if she doesn't report coercive control to the police? Or if she does but the police don't lay a charge?*

9. A carceral approach is expensive and does not offer either healing to survivors or a meaningful opportunity for abusers to take responsibility, heal and learn new behaviours for moving forward.

*How will sentencing reflect the long-term impact on the survivor as well as the best interests of children in terms of parenting arrangements?*

### ***A failed system to date***

Over the past 40 years, we have seen the many ways in which the criminal law has failed survivors of IPV as well as those who cause the harm – particularly for those from marginalized communities. Despite criminal law interventions and initiatives – new laws, changes to laws, new court processes, education for those who implement and interpret the law, different approaches to bail and to punishments for those found guilty – IPV, including lethal violence, remains a serious social problem in this country.

### **Validating women's experiences**

The insidiousness and seriousness of coercively controlling behaviour needs to be recognized and understood by the legal systems to which women turn for help. Survivors need to be validated that what has been done to them is wrong.

Unfortunately, many women report that they feel dismissed when they tell their family law lawyer, the police and others about their partner's coercive control of them. Our society still thinks of intimate partner violence as physical, and this means we are ignoring the non-physical forms of abuse that, for some women, are far more serious.

As more than one of our clients has said: "I wish he just would have hit me. Then, people would have believed me."

While coercive control needs to be validated, criminal law is not the best way to do this.

In the present landscape, there is no certainty that creating a criminal offence of coercive control will mean charges are laid when women report it, that charges laid will be properly prosecuted or that prosecutions will lead to findings of guilt, because those with the responsibility for doing so lack the education and training they need to properly respond to what is a highly nuanced kind of abuse. There is also a considerable risk that survivors may be inappropriately charged.

This will not provide validation for survivors or give survivors greater confidence in the criminal system, both outcomes that are touted by those who support criminalization.

### ***Impact on a survivor's family law case***

Although our mandate is to provide support and services to women through the family law process, many of the women we support are also involved in the criminal system. Our

anecdotal experience with women can be confirmed through past research showing the number of people who have concurrent family law and criminal law cases.<sup>3</sup>

In cases involving family violence, the intersection between family and criminal law is so deep that it is not possible to make changes to one system without impacting the other.

#### Intersections between courts

The intersections between criminal and family law is often challenging for women to navigate. Trying to reconcile the different legal standards, processes, procedures and rights afforded in each system can be extremely confusing. Women are often frustrated by the lack of coordination and communication between the two courts. Although a woman is a party in the family case, as a complainant in the criminal case, she is not. Getting updated information about the status of criminal charges can be complicated and time-consuming. Women must retell their story over and over and are at risk of having the abuser try to coerce them into not testifying in the criminal case in exchange for a particular family court outcome. Abusers may also use the concurrent proceedings as a way to delay and derail the family court case.

Adding another criminal offence does not address these problems: rather, it has the potential to increase the number of women forced to navigate concurrent proceedings.

#### Impact on credibility

A criminal charge or conviction and, importantly, the lack of criminal charge and conviction can have an enormous impact on the outcome of a family law case.

In cases of IPV, the lack of criminal charges and convictions often becomes a focal point of the evidence in family court, relied on by abusers to support their claim that the violence did not occur. If a woman has not reported abuse to the police or the police have not laid charges or the abuser was not found guilty, her claim of abuse in family court is subject to increased scrutiny, and she is at risk of not being believed.

The same is true for women who return to or stay with an abusive partner. There are many reasons why a woman may not leave or report abuse to police, including financial dependency on the abuser, distrust of police, fear of losing the children or of increased violence, shame and isolation. This is particularly true for women from marginalized communities and gender-diverse survivors who may fear involvement with the criminal process because of systemic oppression and racism. Unfortunately, not all legal system stakeholders in family court understand this. Instead, a woman's claim of abuse is viewed with distrust and increased skepticism.

We anticipate challenges for police when it comes to properly identifying and charging cases of coercive control. Will family law judges and lawyers understand these challenges? Or will they instead view a lack of criminal charge or conviction as evidence that the violence alleged in the family court case did not occur?

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, one study found that approximately 10.7% of active family law cases in the Ontario Court of Justice between 2003 to 2010 involved an active criminal proceeding related to issues of IPV. Approximately 38% of family law lawyers surveyed in 2010 reported that in situations of family violence, their clients are often involved with the criminal court at the same time as family court.

Adding another criminal offence will not address these concerns but may result in judges and others making negative credibility assessments about women who raise coercive control in their family law cases if they did not immediately leave the relationship or report the violence to police.

### Impact on child protection involvement

When police are called in situations involving IPV, they report their involvement with the family to the children's aid society (CAS). Adding a new criminal offence adds another potential avenue for the CAS to get involved in the family's life. This can be problematic for women, particularly those from marginalized communities who face increased scrutiny and oppression when engaged with this system.<sup>4</sup>

Involvement with CAS can have a detrimental impact on a woman's family law case. Family courts often rely on the outcome of CAS investigations when making decisions about parenting arrangements.<sup>5</sup> Like the concerns about police not being able to properly identify and charge, there are concerns about CAS workers' ability to properly identify coercive control and its impacts on a child. If they cannot identify the violence, they are unlikely to be able to verify protection concerns. This will then get used by the abuser in family court to discredit a woman's claim of abuse.

### Risk of women being charged

This new offence could increase the number of women who face criminal charges themselves.

One tangible example of how the offence could become a tool for further abuse and manipulation against women is in the context of parental alienation claims. These claims are primarily made by men against women and, in cases that also involve allegations of IPV, are often raised by the alleged abuser. Parental alienation has been viewed as a form of coercively controlling violence in family court. There is a risk that abusers who use allegations of parental alienation in family court may use the offence of coercive control as another strategy to discredit and silence women by having them criminally charged.

We have seen the impact of mandatory charging policies, with a number of women being criminalized when mislabelled as the primary aggressor in an IPV situation. Abusers know how to manipulate the system and present themselves as the victim rather than the aggressor when police are called. Adding a new criminal offence without first re-evaluating these policies can have a disastrous effect on women in family court.

Women who are criminally charged are at a disadvantage in family court with respect to their credibility and the strength of their case. Abusers will use the existence of a charge or the involvement of police to gain a tactical advantage – alleging, for example, that they are the victim and claiming that the woman's parenting time with her children should be limited. It gives the abuser another way to exert power and control and makes a woman less likely to

---

<sup>4</sup> See for example the Ontario Human Rights Commission Report, "Interrupted childhoods: Over-representation of Indigenous and Black children in Ontario child welfare" which highlights the disproportionate rates of Indigenous and Black children in care, online: <<https://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/interrupted-childhoods#4.Research%20on%20racial%20disproportionality%20in%20child%20welfare>>.

<sup>5</sup> Wanda Wiegers, "The Intersection of Child Protection and Family Law Systems in Cases of Domestic Violence", 35 Can J Fam L 183.

reach out to police in the future, even if she is at serious risk of harm. Children are left in an unsafe situation, where they risk further trauma, fear and confusion. They may be denied contact with their mother, who has been their primary caregiver. Women in these situations are at risk of pleading guilty to get the criminal charges dealt with or as a result of pressure from the abuser.

We are concerned that adding another criminal offence, particularly one that may pose challenges for police in terms of proper identification, is rife for manipulation by abusers.

### **CONCERNS WITH BILL C-332 SPECIFICALLY**

While our position is that we do not support the criminalization of coercive control, we also have specific concerns about Bill C-332.

1. Section 264.4 (1) No clear definition of what constitutes "repeatedly or continuously engages in controlling or coercive conduct"

Coercively controlling behaviours are insidious, subtle and often invisible to anyone outside the relationship. What constitutes coercive control is different from one relationship to another. It builds, with one incident leading to another and then another, and only when all of them are examined in totality can the pattern of abuse be recognized – by the survivor herself, as well as by outsiders.

Likewise, there is no single definition or understanding of what repeated or continuous engagement is. This, too, will look different from one relationship to another.

Perhaps even more important, those who enforce and interpret the law – police, Crown Attorneys and judges – will also have different understandings of what, exactly, the law is prohibiting.

Without clearer language and mandatory education for those enforcing and interpreting the law, criminalizing coercive control is potentially dangerous for survivors of IPV.

2. Section 264.01 (2) No clear definition of "significant impact."

The trauma of IPV impacts how survivors react to the abuse to which they are being subjected. It is not uncommon for a survivor to under-identify what is happening to her as a trauma reaction and coping mechanism. Because, by its nature, coercive control is a pattern of behaviours, as time passes, the survivor may acclimate to it and not even be aware of the extent of the abuse. This makes it very difficult to assess objectively whether or not there has been a significant impact. It also places a high burden on the shoulders of survivors to prove to the satisfaction of a judge beyond a reasonable doubt that they have been harmed. The focus should be on the abuser's behaviour, not the resultant harm on the survivor.

While the list of factors to be considered in making this assessment is helpful, more context needs to be provided.

3. Section 264.01 (3) No clear definition of "two persons are connected if."

We find this definition confusing. We also disagree with (c), which appears to set a two-year limit on how long people can be separated and still be considered "persons who are connected."



The definition would be clearer if (a) listed both current and former spouses, common-law partners and dating partners, and then (b) listed only those relationships described in (ii) and (iii).

The impact of a former partner's abusive behaviour, even years after the relationship has ended, can be significant. Some survivors may need to be out of the relationship for more than two years to be able to report coercive control to the police. They may want to wait until the children are grown, to protect them from any reactive abuse by their father. There may be a gap in the abuser's coercive and controlling conduct and then it starts again; perhaps when the victim/survivor becomes involved in a new relationship.

For these and other reasons, there should be no time limitation in the definition of eligible relationships.

4. Sections 264.01(5) and (6) Best interests of the person/proof of facts.

These provisions are confusing as presently written. Their intended purpose is not clear, and they have the potential to place women with disabilities, who are dependent on their partner/abuser for daily care, in a compromised position if the partner's abuse includes coercively controlling conduct. They should be removed.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Our position on how we believe government should move ahead on this issue can best be summed up in the words of one member of our team:

*It seems to me that the pros are best case scenarios that we hope for, but the cons are what is most likely to happen.*

### **We recommend that government build the infrastructure needed to support survivors of IPV to engage meaningfully with the criminal system BEFORE committing to the creation of a new criminal law.**

We need to look at system changes that focus on prevention rather than continuing to tinker with those that respond after the abuse has happened, as recommended in the Final Report of the Nova Scotia Mass Casualty Commission, which calls for, among other things:

- A society-wide response (V14)
- Frameworks for structured decision-making by police with a focus on violence prevention (V10)
- A national, collaborative process bringing together all stakeholders "to develop a national framework for a women-centred approach to responding to intimate partner violence" (rec. V10)

Rather than creating new criminal laws, we should review those that exist as well as policies such as mandatory charging to determine their effectiveness, as recommended by both the CKW inquest and the Mass Casualty Commission.

Figuring out the best ways to respond to and, ultimately, prevent coercive control will take an all of society approach, which needs to include all levels of government, survivors, community-based experts and other stakeholders.

Here's how we propose that could happen:

1. Do not move ahead with Bill C-332 at this time.
2. Follow the Mass Casualty Commission's recommendation V-12 to establish an expert advisory group drawing on the gender-based-violence advocacy and support sector to examine whether and how criminal law could better address the context of persistent patterns of controlling behaviour at the core of gender-based, intimate-partner and family violence.
3. Examine existing laws that could be used to respond to some forms of coercively controlling behaviours.
4. Provide NEW and MANDATORY training for all police to ensure they understand:
  - the prevalence of IPV, including coercive control
  - already available charges that could be used in response to coercive control
5. Create real accountability measures so police officers are evaluated regularly on whether they are applying the training in a meaningful way. These could include:
  - Establishing a standard of practice for responding to IPV calls across all police forces
  - Making assessment of officers' responses to IPV part of their regular performance reviews
  - Conducting spot reviews of IPV files, in collaboration with community partners
  - Applying consequences for officers who do not meet the standard of practice
6. Develop NEW and MANDATORY education for Crowns and judges, with accountability measures as above.
7. Fund access to free independent legal advice for survivors of gender-based violence who are considering accessing the criminal system (modeled on Ontario's ILA for sexual assault survivors program).
8. Create a Criminal Court Support Worker Program similar to Ontario's Family Court Support Worker Program to work in collaboration with existing criminal court victim/witness assistance programs.
9. Fund national stakeholder consultations and discussions about the appropriate use of restorative and transformative justice models as a response to GBV in addition to the existing criminal system.

Then, and only then, consider how the criminal law might need adaptation to respond effectively to coercive control, using a collaborative consultation process with all stakeholders.