



News from the

# B.C. Human Rights Coalition

www.bchrcoalition.org

Volume 2.3 November 2005

## Exploring the Need for Reform

For years the Coalition has voiced concerns about the under-inclusive nature of our provincial human rights legislation. This past year, our law reform committee worked with a number of volunteer researchers on some of these issues and we now highlight the findings of a study that looked at concerns in relation to pre-employment protections.

B.C. has a gap in its human rights legislation in the area of pre-employment questioning. Lack of explicit language in the legislation sends a signal that it's okay for employers to ask questions around marital status, sex, age, race, and other grounds of protection. When looking for work, discrimination is often subtle. You tend to find employers applying a line of questioning around issues such as childcare, age, place of origin and race where the questioning often has nothing to do with the job being applied for. This questioning must influence the hiring decision or it wouldn't be happening. But in B.C., the onus is on the applicant to show that the question had a negative effect as opposed to prohibiting the question in the first place.

This is the wrong signal for legislators to be sending. Yet in B.C., this gap has existed since 1984 and as this study shows, inappropriate questioning is still prevalent and presents as a barrier for many who are attempting to find work. Given that B.C. is the only place in Canada that doesn't explicitly prohibit inappropriate questioning, we suggest it's time for our legislators to reexamine their public policy obligations and to fulfil their duty by entrenching equality commitments into law. If you ask, as Kari Roberts did, whether our current pre-employment provisions are really upholding and fulfilling the purpose of fostering a society free from discrimination, you may come to the same conclusion we have. Simply put, our legislators can and should do better in terms of fostering a society free from discrimination.

### The Research and Researcher

*"The Human Rights Code should prevent substantive or de facto discrimination. Even if a piece of legislation is anti-discriminatory on its face, in reality it may be failing to prevent discrimination. The most important factor is whether or not the legislation actually addresses the problem of discrimination and successfully functions to prevent it. The Human Rights Code is currently failing in this regard."*

Kari Roberts came to the Coalition in early 2005 looking to expand her knowledge and experience in Canadian human rights law and policy. She is a native of Birmingham, U.K. and had obtained a joint L.L.B. Honours in Law and Spanish through the Edinburgh and Granada Universities. After completing this project she married and has since moved back to London to complete an L.L.M. in Human Rights Law at University College in London.

*continued on page 5 ...*

## Recent Decisions

### Learning Environments Must be Free from Discrimination *School District No. 44 (North Vancouver) v. Jubran, 2005 SCCA No. 260*

On October 20, 2005, the Supreme Court of Canada finally put to rest the question as to whether School Boards are expected to provide a strict discriminatory-free learning environment by denying leave to the School Board to appeal a lower court's decision.

In July, we profiled the homophobic bullying that formed the basis of the Jubran complaint and we discussed the implications stemming from the B.C. Court of Appeal's decision. That decision upheld the original Tribunal decision that made clear the expectation that School Boards must provide a strict discriminatory-free learning environment for their students. If they fail to do so, they risk liability under the *BC Human Rights Code*. The Court of Appeal's decision also reinforced the Tribunal's reasoning in stating that it's the effect or the outcome of actions – not the intent or belief of the actors – that determine whether discrimination has occurred.

We are pleased the Supreme Court of Canada has put the issue of liability to rest and provided finality for all those involved. By denying leave, it makes clear the expectation that learning and school environments are to be

*continued on page 2 ...*

---

## Recent Decisions ... continued from page 1

free from discrimination and that School Boards have a duty to provide such an environment. As articulated in the original decision, "...that environment is mandated by the special position educational institutions occupy in fostering the values of our society and by the *Code*, which requires those who provide services to the public to do so in a non-discriminatory way, so as to foster the full participation of individuals in the life of British Columbia, in a climate of understanding, mutual respect and equality of dignity and rights."

### **Interfor Denies Disabled Workers' Right to Severance *MacRae v. Interfor (No.2), BCHRT 462, October 12, 2005***

A recent B.C. Human Rights Tribunal decision found that Interfor discriminated against Mr. MacRae on the basis of his disability when it chose to fire him as opposed to paying him severance when one of its mills closed.

Mr. MacRae had 28-years' service at Interfor's mill in Squamish. In 2001 he was diagnosed with a serious illness which rendered him unable to work. He was on leave from his position at the mill and collecting long term disability (LTD) when in April 2003, the mill curtailed operations and laid-off all employees. Although both management and the union considered a host of options and alternatives to keep the mill operational, it became evident that the long-term viability of the operation was in jeopardy by late December of 2003. Sensing a permanent closure, the union negotiated and entered into a voluntary severance agreement with Interfor to reward employees for past service in March 2004. Mr. MacRae however, was terminated by letter on March 5, 2004 for innocent absenteeism; a mere 11 days prior to the entitlement date of the severance package. No one from Interfor had contacted Mr. MacRae about his health prior to his discharge.

When Interfor terminated the employment of Mr. MacRae, they deprived him of his seniority rights under the collective agreement. In this case, all employees on the seniority list as at March 17, 2004, were entitled to claim severance. But for the termination, Mr. MacRae was entitled to roughly \$64,000.00 in severance.

There was really no dispute in this case that Mr. MacRae was terminated from his employment because of his disability. Interfor relied on the doctrine of non-culpable discharge, which when applied properly and in good faith, may stand as a defense to otherwise discriminatory employment practices, such as terminating someone because of a disability. The doctrine, premised on the notion that employers provide work in return for employee productivity, allows employers to sever relationships for reasons over which an employee has no control, such as excessive and long-term absenteeism due to a disability.

To rely on the doctrine there must be a record of undue absenteeism in the past and no likelihood of regular attendance in the future. Beyond these factors, employers must exercise the option in a way that doesn't

penalize or deny the affected employee of an insured or other kind of benefit and it should be applied in a manner that meets the three-part bona fide requirement assessment including the undue hardship threshold imposed by the duty to accommodate.

In Mr. MacRae's case, the employer appeared to have established the required factors to rely on the doctrine, but because the plant had ceased operation, Mr. MacRae's absence was not causing any of the regular inconveniences typically relied upon for justifying this type of discharge. No work was being provided, no compensation was changing hands and no replacements were being sought to fill MacRae's void. In fact, at the time of termination, there was no foreseeable likelihood that any of the Squamish crew would be called back to work. What Interfor chose to do here was to draw a formal distinction between those away from work due to a disability and those away from work due to lay-off. For those away from work due to disability, it chose to terminate, for those away from work due to lay-off, it chose to voluntarily recognize and reward past service and cooperation. In the Tribunal's opinion, Interfor relied upon the doctrine of non-culpable discharge as a means to accomplish an end and all too often, it's the disabled who bear the brunt of tough economic decisions, "... as a business matter, Interfor's desire to save money on severance is understandable. That does not mean that, as a human rights matter, its purpose was legitimate." Member Lyster adds, "...the primary if not sole reason for

---

## Recent Decisions ... continued from page 2

Interfor's decision to terminate Mr. MacRae at the time it did was to avoid the potential for severance pay." The Tribunal concluded that Interfor discriminated against Mr. MacRae on the basis of disability when it terminated his employment and that its actions in doing so could not be justified on the basis of a defense to discrimination.

In the whole scheme of things, MacRae's portion of severance to Interfor was a drop in the bucket, but to Mr. MacRae, the effects of the termination were devastating and disturbing. As stated in the decision, "there is no good justification for treating a thirty-year employee with a grave illness in this impersonal manner. It is entirely understandable that Mr. MacRae felt that he was treated "like a number" the truth is, that is precisely how he was treated." Lyster further characterizes the effects of the termination as, "Mr. MacRae was already vulnerable at the time of the termination as a result of his disability. As a result of the termination, he felt worthless, angry and ashamed. It increased his social isolation at a time when he was already isolated. He lost a substantial part of his identity with the termination of this employment. He was singled out for termination from among his peers, and thereby excluded for the opportunity to participate in the voluntary severance agreement." In essence the termination completed devalued 28 years of past service and cooperation.

Mr. MacRae was awarded the severance he was entitled to, other sundry expenses, and \$12,500.00 as injury to dignity, feelings and self-respect. Judith Doulis of the Human Rights Legal Clinic Program of the Community Legal Assistance Society,

represented Mr. MacRae.

### **Systemic Discrimination at Tinseltown**

***Radek v. Henderson Development, BCHRT 302, July 13, 2005***

The B.C. Human Rights Tribunal found the owners of International Village (better known as Tinseltown) and the security company that patrols the mall had systematically discriminated against Aboriginals and people with disabilities when they attempted to enter and access the mall.

International Village, located in the downtown eastside of Vancouver, is on a pedestrian route to a Skytrain station and is situated on an old rail line. It's because of this that the mall contains a statutory right of way, meaning the public has a right to pass through whether they intend to shop or not. Owned and operated by Henderson Development, International Village contains anchor businesses including a twelve-screen cinema, Starbucks, McDonald's and 7-11.

Gladys Radek, an Aboriginal disabled woman, was denied entry to the mall because she is a visible Aboriginal who walks with a noticeable limp due to her prosthetic. In the spring of 2001, she and a friend were attempting to pass through the mall to Starbucks when they were immediately approached by a security guard and rudely asked where they were going and for what purpose. Having had similar encounters with security personnel in the past, and with this guard in particular, Ms. Radek and her friend ignored the guard's questioning and kept walking. The guard followed them and continued to demand an explanation. After several minutes, Ms. Radek and her friend confronted the guard, asked what her problem was, and why she continually harassed them. The guard's supervisor arrived on scene and promptly dismissed Ms. Radek's concerns about being treated unfairly. The supervisor told the two they were trespassing and asked them to leave. Ms. Radek asked to be shown the company's policy on trespassing, and when refused, she continued on towards Starbucks. The guards followed and at one point, they physically hindered Ms. Radek's movement. A site security supervisor arrived on scene and again, Ms. Radek and her friend were told they were trespassing. Again, Ms. Radek asked to see the company's policy, and becoming increasingly frustrated, she suggested the guard's practices were racist. Eventually, Ms. Radek and her friend were led outside the mall and waited on a bench for the supervisor to return with copy of company policy. As they waited, Ms. Radek called the police to report she had been assaulted by a security officer at the mall.

The Tribunal found the incident which Ms. Radek suffered was not an isolated incident. It was part of a larger pattern of systemic discrimination – by which Aboriginals and disabled people were targeted and treated in a manner that violated their human dignity.

---

## Recent Decisions ... continued from page 3

To establish the pattern of systemic discrimination, Radek testified to previous encounters where mall security had harassed her and that when accompanied by someone white, she was never bothered. Others from the downtown eastside community, 17 witnesses in all, took the stand and shared their stories. Witnesses who were Aboriginal, or those who were Aboriginal with disabilities, described their experiences with mall security as similar to that of Ms. Radek's. Those who were white indicated they had no problem with security. This testimony raised concerns very similar to those raised in other racial profiling situations. Was the behavior of the security personnel a form of profiling grounded in negative stereotyping and prejudice or was it based on an objective assessment of each situation that warranted security intervention?

The Tribunal also looked at security 'post orders' that instructed guards to impose a zero tolerance policy for 'suspicious people' and 'vagrants'. It found the criteria used to assess 'suspicion' included factors that were more about appearance rather than conduct. In other words, the criteria were based in bias and prejudice as opposed to an objective assessment of actual wrong doing. Some of the factors listed on the orders included an indication of acting intoxicated or stoned, an indication of talking to oneself, an indication of ripped and torn clothing, and an unwillingness to answer questions. An expert took the stand raising issues related to the demographics of the neighbourhood and details as to the health and poverty levels of Aboriginals living in the surrounding area. The expert also spoke to the types of stereotypes and prejudices that are often applied to Aboriginals.

When applied, the policies and practices of the security staff denied Ms. Radek her right to access and use a public shopping centre without fear of undue apprehension. The guard wrongly assumed her limp and her race were signs of 'suspicious' behaviour. In fact, Ms. Radek's limp is due to a prosthetic she wears, she is Aboriginal, and she was simply going for a cup of coffee. The larger result was that the policies and practices targeted anyone who was poor or disabled of which a disproportionate number happened to be Aboriginals. "People who were both Aboriginal and disabled ... were particularly liable to be viewed as suspicious and undesirable, and thus subject to adverse treatment. For example,

stereotypes about "drunken Indians" made it likely for Aboriginal people with mobility-related disabilities to be perceived as intoxicated or stoned."

"To be singled out for treatment of the kind described in this decision, because of one's race or disability, or a combination of those factors, constitutes a clear violation of the human dignity of all those so affected. The opportunity to walk into a shopping mall and buy a cup of coffee, go for an inexpensive meal, use a bank machine, or simply pass through on the way to public transportation, is one which the majority of Canadians take for granted. The practices of the respondents had the effect of systematically denying the Aboriginal and disabled people of the downtown eastside that opportunity. It made them strangers in their own community. In so doing, the respondents impeded Aboriginal and disabled people's "full and free participation in the economic, social, political and cultural life of British Columbia" and failed to "promote a climate of understanding and mutual respect where all are equal in dignity and rights".

Ms. Radek was awarded \$15,000 for injury to dignity and self-respect. The respondent was ordered to modify site 'post orders' to ensure they are not discriminatory and undertake anti-discrimination training for all security personnel, management, and supervisors. In addition, they were ordered to develop an appropriate complaint's procedure and provide copies of the Tribunal's decision and future site 'post orders' to any person who requests them.

The case is a significant victory and demonstrates the capacity of our human right's legislation and the new direct access model to deal with systemic racism. Tim Timberg of the Human Rights Legal Clinic Program of the Community Legal Assistance Society, represented Ms. Radek.

---

## Exploring the Need for Reform ... continued from page 1

The project attempts to shed light on the under-inclusive nature of B.C.'s pre-employment protections and to identify the impact this gap continues to have on British Columbians, especially those who are most vulnerable to discrimination.

A comparative analysis of our legislation against other Canadian legislation and against similar legislative provisions found in the U.S. and the U.K. was undertaken. Kari also assessed whether our provisions would stand up to international scrutiny if weighed against corresponding obligations. She found that across Canada:

- o 8 other jurisdictions explicitly prohibit pre-employment requests for information which relates to prohibited grounds.
- o 4 jurisdictions prohibit enquiries which express or imply limitations or discriminatory conditions.
- o 1 jurisdiction expressly mentions that there can be no discrimination at the pre-employment stage.

All provisions send a strong and clear legislative expression that discrimination will not be tolerated. B.C.'s legislation offers no parallel expression and as a result, it offers sub-standard protection.

On the International front she found:

- o U.K. legislation compares with the legislation in Canada's 8 best jurisdictions.
- o The U.S., as a whole, fits into the same category as the U.K.
- o B.C.'s international obligations dictate that our legislators should monitor the effectiveness of protections against discrimination. Legislators should also put in place the best protection possible.

13 other Canadian jurisdictions offer better protection than B.C. Any one of their specific legislative provisions could easily be adopted.

The study provides a historical record of B.C.'s legislation in this area. It indicates:

- o Job seekers in B.C. had parallel protection to that currently found in four other Canadian jurisdictions (Newfoundland, Ontario, Prince Edward Island and in the federal jurisdiction) in force and available from 1960 through 1984. These

provisions set out a clear legislative expression that inappropriate enquiries were prohibited (see *Fair Practices Act 1960 and Section 24 of the Human Rights Act 1969, 1973, 1979*).

If still in force today, 49% more survey participants would have had recourse under human rights legislation than what is available to them today. Strong legislative expressions have a preventative effect which could help to lower the current 47% chance that a job seeker will be asked a discriminatory question.

Kari asked why we lost what we had and turned to transcripts from the legislature. She also sought information through an FOI request, but it has yet to produce results. Debates from other Canadian jurisdictions were reviewed to determine societal attitudes at the time. Some findings include:

- o the then Minister responsible for human rights was advised that the employment section of the *Code* would capture discriminatory practises such as asking a person's race or religion. The government felt being denied the job was of more significance than explicitly prohibiting discriminatory questioning. This line of thinking misses the broader public policy purpose of the legislation.
- o under current provisions, first you must be denied the job to file a claim. Second, you must show the question asked had a negative effect on the hiring decision. In other jurisdictions, the mere fact that you were asked discriminatory question is enough to show discrimination.
- o no Canadian jurisdiction has considered amending their legislation to reduce protections in this area. On the contrary, these provisions have been commended.
- o debate from Manitoba in 1976, reflects the general antipathy towards the 'old ways' of employers being allowed to ask questions relating to prohibited grounds. A similar extract was obtained from the Quebec Assemblée in 1982.

"By reading these transcripts, one senses that society is considered to have taken a step forward in prohibiting such inquiries and yet in 1983, B.C. stood alone, in taking a step backwards and removing a section thought to be acceptable and even commendable, in other provinces."

---

## Exploring the Need for Reform ... continued from page 5

Kari also attempted to assess the impact of our current provisions. A review and analysis of case law in B.C. and across Canada found that:

- o B.C. has handled more cases relating to pre-employment inquiries than any other province.
- o a greater burden exists for British Columbians wishing to lodge complaints than for all other Canadians.
- o Lack of clear language causes confusion for both employers and job seekers.
- o Lack of explicit prohibitory language causes undue harm to those who have chose to assert their right by lodging complaints.

For more insight, a provincial survey was conducted where 133 participants gave input on recent job finding experiences. Results include and indicate:

- o There is a 47 % chance that a job seeker will be asked a discriminatory question in B.C.
- o 80% of the people who were asked a discriminatory question were asked the question in the last 2 years.
- o There is a greater likelihood of being asked questions pertaining to age, race and family status than sexual orientation, religion or political views.
- o Individuals who identified as 'visible minorities' were 20% more likely to be asked a discriminatory question than those who didn't identify as visible minorities. Visible minorities are 25% more likely to be asked a question relating to race than those not identifying as visible minorities.
- o Those not of Canadian origin were 25% more likely to be asked a discriminatory question relating to race.
- o Persons whose first language is not English are nearly 30% more likely to be asked a discriminatory question relating to race. Visible minorities whose first language is not English are over 40% more likely than visible minorities whose first language is English, to be asked a discriminatory question.
- o Those people who think that their accent is a barrier to seeking employment are 50% more likely to be asked a discriminatory question relating to race.
- o 7% of those surveyed were asked a question relating to disability. However, of those people who live with a disability, 75% were asked a discriminatory question. People with a disability are the group most likely to be asked a

discriminatory question.

- o 77% of people asked a discriminatory question did not get the job. Only 10% felt they weren't qualified. Many felt demeaned, humiliated and 'thrown-off' by the question.
- o 66% of people asked a discriminatory question thought that the question affected the outcome of the hiring decision.
- o Because a different onus exists in B.C. only 32% of those asked a discriminatory question would be able to establish a case whereas 100% would meet the required criteria in 8 other Canadian jurisdictions. 81% would meet the criteria required to establish a case in the remaining 5 jurisdictions.
- o Of those asked a discriminatory question, 37% felt it affected their future job search.
- o Of those asked a discriminatory question only 3% filed formal complaints of discrimination.

The findings of the survey suggest our current legislation is having a significant negative impact on certain groups of job seekers and creating barriers to employment. The findings also indicate that discriminatory pre-employment enquiries are still prevalent and that most people choose not to pursue resolution through a formal complaint's process. Could the legislation however do more to promote a climate of inclusiveness and mutual respect? There is a strong public policy incentive to both correct inefficiencies and to provide better protections. A clear articulation in the *Code* that discriminatory enquiries are not tolerated would go far in terms of setting an acceptable standard by which employers can measure their practices and be held publicly accountable. It would also go far in terms of providing more than a mechanical commitment to promoting the principles of equality and diversity. There is really no justification for requiring an applicant to supply information that can't be used for any legitimate purpose. When the information is needed to determine qualifications it should be allowed. All other information can be supplied after a hiring decision has been made.

Kari's project is comprehensive and we hope we've presented the highlights needed to engage others in the need for reform. We would like to start accumulating reader's responses to this and other issues we've presented on reform areas. If you have comments, we'd appreciate if you could email them to [info@bchrcoalition.org](mailto:info@bchrcoalition.org) with the words 'law reform' in the subject line.

---

## News and Other Announcements

**A Matter of Rights** – *Report of the Canadian Human Rights Commission on the Repeal of Section 67 of the Canadian Human Rights Act*. Released October 2005, available online @ [www.chrc-ccdp.ca](http://www.chrc-ccdp.ca)

In an attempt to resolve a long-standing omission within our federal human rights legislation, the Canadian Human Rights Commission recently released a special report, "A Matter of Rights". The Report calls on parliament to immediately repeal *Section 67* of the *Canadian Human Rights Act*. *Section 67*, first enacted in 1977, restricts the ability of many First Nations from filing complaints of discrimination where the discrimination is related to, or falls under the jurisdiction of the *Indian Act*. The *Indian Act* has a very broad reach and includes for example, the administration of status rights, the use of reserve lands, education, housing and many other resources and aspects that affect the daily lives of First Nations people. While the exclusion was introduced as a temporary measure pending a full consultation on modifying the *Indian Act* back in the 70's, the Canadian Commission, twenty-eight years later, finds itself in a position to once again exert pressure on parliament to resolve the rights gap that still exists.

The Commission's Report outlines the impact and history of the exclusion and contemplates the consequence of lifting the offending provision. The Report recommends an immediate repeal of the provision with no transition period for applying the *Act* to the Government of Canada. They do recommend a transition period of 18 to 30 months prior to applying the *Act* to First Nations and their institutions, which would allow adequate time to consult affected communities on an interpretative provision and to agree upon mechanisms and measures to ensure timely resolution of complaints.

**Annual Report, BC Human Rights Tribunal**, Released October 2005, available online @ [www.bchrt.bc.ca](http://www.bchrt.bc.ca)

The Tribunal's second annual report was released in October 2005. 1,099 new complaints were filed this year as opposed to the 1,145 filed last year. 822 (75%) complaints were accepted after initial screening for jurisdiction. This year the Tribunal has included areas and grounds cited in all accepted complaints, and those statistics indicate the area of employment was cited most frequently (45%), followed by services (24%), tenancy (9%), unions and associations (8%) and publications (5%). The most common ground cited was physical disability (16%) followed by sex (14%), race (11%), mental disability (11%), and family status (7%). (Ancestry, colour and place of origin each were 7%). Retaliation was cited in 6% of complaints.

The report indicates 871 files were closed during the year. Beyond the 277 files that were not accepted at the filing stage, closed complaints also include those that successfully settled (353 indicated in report), those abandoned by complainants (no number provided), those dismissed by way of preliminary application (150 indicated in report) and those that were closed by way of final decision (39 indicated in report).

508 decisions were rendered during the year. 469 were preliminary in nature and 39 were final. Of the 469 preliminary decisions, 219 or 47% were in relation to respondents asking the Tribunal to dismiss complaints. Only 75 such dismissals were granted whereas 144 failed to meet required criteria. In terms of final decisions, complaints were determined in the area of employment (23 heard, 12 justified), services (14 heard, 9 justified) and tenancy (7 heard, 2 justified).

The full report highlights the Tribunal's findings and contains information on many other components of the Tribunal's business. It is available online or by contacting the Tribunal's offices at (604) 775-2000 or 1-888-440-8844 toll free (in B.C.).

---

## International Human Rights Day Celebration

Mark your Calendars for December 8, 2005.

December 10th marks International Human Rights Day. Each year our Coalition celebrates the day by hosting an open house with the United Nations Association (UNA). The major event of the evening is the presentation of the Renate Shearer Memorial Award to someone who has made an outstanding contribution in the field of human rights. This award is a memorial to the life and work of Renate Shearer who was a champion of equality and dignity for all.

Our two organizations alternate selecting award recipients, and this year the Coalition is pleased to present the award to Kenneth W. Smith for his exceptional commitment as an equality rights lawyer working toward strengthened human rights in Canada.

The event takes place on December 8<sup>th</sup>, 2005 at J.J.'s Dining Room, Vancouver Community College from 6 pm to 8:30 pm.

For more information, call or check our website.

## Membership

The Coalition is a membership based organization. We currently have approximately 100 individual and group members, and we always welcome new members to our ranks. In addition to supporting the advancement of human rights, other benefits of membership include: opportunities for networking, collaboration, and training; opportunities to remain informed on current issues and concerns relating to Canada's domestic human rights law and policy; opportunities to host or sponsor educational workshops and training sessions in your community; opportunities to promote your own events; and the opportunity to be part of a great organization!

Annual membership fees are \$20.00 for both organizations and individuals. In the case of need, we will consider waiving this fee. Tax receipts are available for all donations. If you wish to join, complete the application below and return it, with a cheque to the Coalition. If you would like further information on becoming a member, or to check the status of your membership, please call or email Valentina @ [valentina@bchrcoalition.org](mailto:valentina@bchrcoalition.org).

## Membership Information

 (please fill out and remit, with cheque, to the BC Human Rights Coalition)

Individual or Contact Name \_\_\_\_\_

Company/Business \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ Postal \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

Email \_\_\_\_\_

Membership: \_\_\_\_\_

## The B.C. Human Rights Coalition

#1202 - 510 W. Hastings Street  
Vancouver, B.C. V6B 1L8

Phone: 604.689.8474

Toll-Free: 1.877.689.8474

Fax: 604.689.7511

Email: [info@bchrcoalition.org](mailto:info@bchrcoalition.org)

Web: [www.bchrcoalition.org](http://www.bchrcoalition.org)

Office Hours: Monday to Friday  
9 am to 5 pm