

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA  
(ON APPEAL FOR THE COURT OF APPEAL OF ONTARIO)

BETWEEN:

TRINITY WESTERN UNIVERSITY and BRAYDEN VOLKENANT

Appellants

- and -

LAW SOCIETY OF UPPER CANADA

Respondent

- and -

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO, ASSOCIATION FOR REFORMED POLITICAL ACTION (ARPA) CANADA, CANADIAN CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION, THE ADVOCATES' SOCIETY, INTERNATIONAL COALITION OF PROFESSORS OF LAW, NATIONAL COALITION OF CATHOLIC SCHOOL TRUSTEES', LAWYERS' RIGHTS WATCH CANADA, CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION, CRIMINAL LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION (ONTARIO), CHRISTIAN LEGAL FELLOWSHIP, CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS, START PROUD, OUTlaws, CANADIAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHARITIES, UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA, LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY OF ONTARIO, CANADIAN CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH IN CANADA, EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP OF CANADA, CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION CANADA, LESBIANS GAY BISEXUALS AND TRANS PEOPLE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, BRITISH COLUMBIA HUMANIST ASSOCIATION, CANADIAN SECULAR ALLIANCE, EGALE CANADA HUMAN RIGHTS TRUST, FAITH, FEALTY & CREED SOCIETY, ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHDIOCESE OF VANCOUVER, CATHOLIC CIVIL RIGHTS LEAGUE, FAITH AND FREEDOM ALLIANCE and WORLD SIKH ORGANIZATION OF CANADA

Interveners

[Style of Cause continued on inside cover]

---

**FACTUM OF THE INTERVENER, BRITISH COLUMBIA HUMANIST ASSOCIATION**  
(Pursuant to Rule 37 of the *Rules of the Supreme Court of Canada*)

---

**Wesley J. McMillan**

Hakemi & Ridgedale LLP  
1500-888 Dunsmuir Street  
Vancouver, BC V6C 3K4  
Tel: 604-259-2269  
Fax : 604-648-9170  
Email : [wcmillan@hakemiridgedale.com](mailto:wcmillan@hakemiridgedale.com)

**Guy Régimbald**

Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP  
160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1C3  
Tel: 613-786-0197  
Fax: 613-788-3559  
Email: [guy.regimbald@gowlingwlg.com](mailto:guy.regimbald@gowlingwlg.com)

**Counsel for the Intervener, British Columbia Humanist Association**

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel of the Intervener, British Columbia Humanist Association**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CANADA  
(ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL OF BRITISH COLUMBIA)

BETWEEN:

LAW SOCIETY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Appellant

- and -

TRINITY WESTERN UNIVERSITY and BRAYDEN VOLKENANT

Respondents

- and -

LAWYERS' RIGHTS WATCH CANADA, NATIONAL COALITION OF CATHOLIC SCHOOL TRUSTEES', INTERNATIONAL COALITION OF PROFESSORS OF LAW, CHRISTIAN LEGAL FELLOWSHIP, CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION, THE ADVOCATES' SOCIETY, ASSOCIATION OF REFORMED POLITICAL ACTION (ARPA) CANADA, CANADIAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHARITIES, CANADIAN CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS, CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS, LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY OF ONTARIO, SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CHURCH IN CANADA, BC LGBTQ COALITION, EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP OF CANADA, CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION CANADA, BRITISH COLUMBIA HUMANIST ASSOCIATION, EGALE CANADA HUMAN RIGHTS TRUST, FAITH, FEALTY & CREED SOCIETY, ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHDIOCESE OF VANCOUVER, CATHOLIC CIVIL RIGHTS LEAGUE, FAITH AND FREEDOM ALLIANCE, CANADIAN SECULAR ALLIANCE, WEST COAST WOMEN'S LEGAL EDUCATION AND ACTION FUND and WORLD SIKH ORGANIZATION OF CANADA

Intervenors

**ORIGINAL TO:            REGISTRAR**

**COPIES TO:**

**Peter A. Gall, Q.C.**  
**Donald R. Munroe, Q.C.**  
**Benjamin J. Oliphant**  
Gall, Legge, Grant & Munroe LLP  
1000-1199 West Hastings Street  
Vancouver, BC V6E 3T5  
Tel: 604-891-1152  
Fax: 604-669-5101  
Email: [pgall@glqmlaw.com](mailto:pgall@glqmlaw.com)

**Counsel for the Appellant, Law Society of  
British Columbia**

**Kevin L. Boonstra**  
**Jonathan Maryniuk**  
Kuhn & Company  
320-900 Howe Street  
Vancouver, BC V6Z 2M4  
Tel: 604-684-8668  
Fax: 604-684-2887  
Email: [kboonstra@kuhnco.net](mailto:kboonstra@kuhnco.net)

**Robert W. Staley**  
**Ranjan K. Agarwal**  
Bennett Jones LLP  
One First Canadian Place  
Suite 3400, P.O. Box 130  
Toronto, ON M5X 1A4  
Tel: 416-777-4857  
Fax: 416-863-1716  
Email: [staleyr@bennettjones.com](mailto:staleyr@bennettjones.com)

**Counsels of the Appellants/Respondents,  
Trinity Western University and Brayden  
Volkenant**

**Guy Pratte**  
Borden Ladner Gervais LLP  
Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower  
22 Adelaide Street West  
Toronto, ON M5H 4E3  
Tel: 416-350-2638  
Fax: 416-367-6749  
Email: [gpratte@blg.com](mailto:gpratte@blg.com)

**Counsel for the Respondent, Law Society  
of Upper Canada**

**Mark C. Power**  
Power Law  
130 Albert Street, Suite 1103  
Ottawa, ON K1P 5G4  
Tel: 613-702-5561  
Fax: 613-702-5561  
Email: [mpower@juristespower.ca](mailto:mpower@juristespower.ca)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the  
Appellant, Law Society of British Columbia**

**Mark Jewett**  
Bennett Jones LLP  
World Exchange Plaza  
1900-45 O'Connor Street  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1A4  
Tel: 613-683-2328  
Fax: 613-683-2323  
Email: [jewettm@bennettjones.com](mailto:jewettm@bennettjones.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsels for the  
Appellants/Respondents, Trinity Western  
University and Brayden Volkenant**

**Nadia Effendi**  
Borden Ladner Gervais LLP  
World Exchange Plaza  
100 Queen Street, Suite 1300  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J9  
Tel: 613-237-5160  
Fax: 613-230-8842  
Email: [neffendi@blg.com](mailto:neffendi@blg.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the  
Respondent, Law Society of Upper Canada**

**Andre Schutten**

Association for Reformed Political Action  
(ARPA) Canada  
130 Albert Street, Suite 1705  
Ottawa, ON K1P 5G4  
Tel: 613-297-5172  
Fax: 613-249-3238  
Email: [andre@ARPACanada.ca](mailto:andre@ARPACanada.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Association for  
Reformed Political Action (ARPA) Canada**

**Chris G. Paliare****Joanna Radbord****Monique Pongracic-Speier**

Paliare, Roland, Rosenberg, Rothstein LLP  
155 Wellington Street West, 35<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, ON M5V 3H1  
Tel: 416-646-4318  
Fax: 416-646-4301  
Email: [chris.paliare@paliareroland.com](mailto:chris.paliare@paliareroland.com)

**Counsel for the Intervener, The  
Advocates' Society**

**Barry W. Bussey****Philip A.S. Milley**

1-43 Howard Ave  
Elmira, ON N3B 2C9  
Tel: 519-669-5137  
Fax: 519-669-3291  
Email: [barry.bussey@cccc.org](mailto:barry.bussey@cccc.org)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Canadian  
Council of Christian Charities**

**W.J. Sammon**

Barnes, Sammon LLP  
200 Elgin Street, Suite 400  
Ottawa, ON K2P 1L5  
Tel: 613-594-8000  
Fax: 613-235-7578

**Counsel for the Intervener, Canadian  
Conference of Catholic Bishops**

**Marie-France Major**

Supreme Advocacy LLP  
100-340 Gilmour Street  
Ottawa, ON K2P 0R3  
Tel: 613-695-8855  
Fax: 613-695-8580  
Email: [mfmajor@supremeadvocacy.ca](mailto:mfmajor@supremeadvocacy.ca)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the  
Intervener, Association for Reformed  
Political Action (ARPA) Canada**

**Jeffrey W. Beedell**

Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP  
160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1C3  
Tel: 613-786-0171  
Fax: 613-788-3587  
Email: [jeff.beedell@gowlingwlg.com](mailto:jeff.beedell@gowlingwlg.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the  
Intervener, The Advocates' Society**

**Eugene Meehan, Q.C.**

Supreme Advocacy LLP  
100-340 Gilmour Street  
Ottawa, ON K2P 0R3  
Tel: 613-695-8855  
Fax: 613-695-8580  
Email: [emeehan@supremeadvocacy.ca](mailto:emeehan@supremeadvocacy.ca)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the  
Intervener, Canadian Council of Christian  
Charities**

**Peter Barnacle**  
**Immanuel Lanzaderas**  
Canadian Association of University Teachers  
2705 Queensview Drive  
Ottawa, ON K2B 8K2  
Tel: 613-820-2270  
Fax: 613-820-7244  
Email: [barnacle@caut.ca](mailto:barnacle@caut.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Canadian Association of University Teachers**

**Susan Ursel**  
**David Grossman**  
**Angela Westmacott, Q.C.**  
Ursel Phillips Fellows Hopkinson LLP  
1200-555 Richmond Street West  
Toronto, ON M5V 3B1  
Tel: 416-969-3515  
Fax: 416-968-0325  
Email: [sursel@upfhlaw.ca](mailto:sursel@upfhlaw.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Canadian Bar Association**

**Derek B.M. Ross**  
**Deina Warren**  
Christian Legal Fellowship  
470 Weber Street, Suite 202  
Waterloo, ON N2L 6J2  
Tel: 519-208-9200  
Fax: 519-208-3600  
Email: [execdir@christianlegalfellowship.org](mailto:execdir@christianlegalfellowship.org)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Christian Legal Fellowship**

**Rahool P. Agarwal**  
**Kristine Spence**  
Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP  
200 Bay Street  
Royal Bank Plaza, South Tower, Suite 3800  
Toronto, ON M5J 2Z4  
Tel: 416-216-3943  
Fax: 416-216-3930  
Email: [rahool.agarwal@nortonrose.com](mailto:rahool.agarwal@nortonrose.com)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Law Students' Society of Ontario**

**Colleen Bauman**  
Goldblatt Partners LLP  
500-30 Metcalfe Street  
Ottawa, ON K1P 5L4  
Tel: 613-482-2463  
Fax: 613-235-3041  
Email: [cbauman@goldblattpartners.com](mailto:cbauman@goldblattpartners.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Intervener, Canadian Association of University Teachers**

**Jeffrey W. Beedell**  
Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP  
160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1C3  
Tel: 613-786-0171  
Fax: 613-788-3587  
Email: [jeff.beedell@gowlingwlg.com](mailto:jeff.beedell@gowlingwlg.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Intervener, Canadian Bar Association**

**Eugene Meehan, Q.C.**  
Supreme Advocacy LLP  
100-340 Gilmour Street  
Ottawa, ON K2P 0R3  
Tel: 613-695-8855  
Fax: 613-695-8580  
Email: [emeehan@supremeadvocacy.ca](mailto:emeehan@supremeadvocacy.ca)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Intervener, Christian Legal Fellowship**

**Matthew J. Halpin**  
Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP  
45 O'Connor Street, Suite 1500  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1A4  
Tel: 613-780-8654  
Fax: 613-230-5459  
Email: [matthew.halpin@nortonrosefulbright.com](mailto:matthew.halpin@nortonrosefulbright.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Intervener, Law Students' Society of Ontario**

**Gerald D. Chipeur, Q.C.**  
**Jonathan Martin**  
**Grace MacKintosh**  
Miller Thomson LLP  
3000, 700-9<sup>th</sup> Avenue SW  
Calgary, AB T2P 3V4  
Tel: 403-298-2425  
Fax: 403-262-0007  
Email: [gchipeur@millertthomson.com](mailto:gchipeur@millertthomson.com)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Seventh-day  
Adventist Church in Canada**

**Karey Brooks**  
**Robert Freedman**  
**Elin Sigurdson**  
JFK Law Corporation  
640 – 1122 Mainland Street  
Vancouver, BC V6B 5L1  
Tel: 604-687-0549  
Fax: 604-687-2696  
Email: [kbrooks@jfkllaw.ca](mailto:kbrooks@jfkllaw.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, BC LGBTQ  
Coalition**

**Albertos Polizogopoulos**  
**D. Geoffrey Cowper, Q.C.**  
**Kristin Debs**  
**Geoffrey Trotter**  
Vincent Dagenais Gibson LLP  
260 Dalhousie Street, Suite 400  
Ottawa, ON K1N 7E4  
Tel: 613-241-2701  
Fax: 613-241-2599  
Email: [albertos@vdg.ca](mailto:albertos@vdg.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Evangelical  
Fellowship of Canada**

**Eugene Meehan, Q.C.**  
Supreme Advocacy LLP  
100-340 Gilmour Street  
Ottawa, ON K2P 0R3  
Tel: 613-695-8855  
Fax: 613-695-8580  
Email: [emeehan@supremeadvocacy.ca](mailto:emeehan@supremeadvocacy.ca)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the  
Intervener, Seventh-day Adventist Church  
in Canada**

**Guy Régimbald**  
Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP  
160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1C3  
Tel: 613-786-0197  
Fax: 613-788-3559  
Email: [guy.regimbald@gowlingwlg.com](mailto:guy.regimbald@gowlingwlg.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel of the  
Intervener, BC LGBTQ Coalition**

**Albertos Polizogopoulos**  
**D. Geoffrey Cowper, Q.C.**  
**Kristin Debs**  
**Geoffrey Trotter**

Vincent Dagenais Gibson LLP  
260 Dalhousie Street, Suite 400  
Ottawa, ON K1N 7E4  
Tel: 613-241-2701  
Fax: 613-241-2599  
Email: [albertos@vdg.ca](mailto:albertos@vdg.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Christian  
Higher Education Canada**

**Eugene Meehan, Q.C.**

Supreme Advocacy LLP  
100-340 Gilmour Street  
Ottawa, ON K2P 0R3  
Tel: 613-695-8855  
Fax: 613-695-8580  
Email: [emeehan@supremeadvocacy.ca](mailto:emeehan@supremeadvocacy.ca)

**Marie-France Major**

Supreme Advocacy LLP  
100-340 Gilmour Street  
Ottawa, ON K2P 0R3  
Tel: 613-695-8855  
Fax: 613-695-8580  
Email: [mfmajor@supremeadvocacy.ca](mailto:mfmajor@supremeadvocacy.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, International  
Coalition of Professors of Law**

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel of the  
Intervener, International Coalition of  
Professors of Law**

**Tim Dickson**

JFK Law Corporation  
340 – 1122 Mainland Street  
Vancouver, BC V6B 5L1  
Tel: 604-687-0549  
Fax : 604-687-2696  
Email : [tdickson@jfklaw.ca](mailto:tdickson@jfklaw.ca)

**Guy Régimbald**

Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP  
160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1C3  
Tel: 613-786-0197  
Fax: 613-788-3559  
Email: [guy.regimbald@gowlingwlg.com](mailto:guy.regimbald@gowlingwlg.com)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Canadian  
Secular Alliance**

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the  
Intervener, Canadian Secular Alliance**

**Steven Barrett**

**Adriel Weaver**  
Goldblatt Partners LLP  
20 Dundas Street West, Suite 1100  
Toronto, ON M5G 2G8  
Tel: 416-979-6422  
Fax: 416-591-7333

**Colleen Bauman**

Goldblatt Partners LLP  
500-30 Metcalfe Street  
Ottawa, ON K1P 5L4  
Tel: 613-482-2463  
Fax: 613-235-3041  
Email: [cbauman@goldblattpartners.com](mailto:cbauman@goldblattpartners.com)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Egale Canada  
Human Rights Trust**

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the  
Intervener, Egale Canada Human Rights  
Trust**

**Blake Bromley**

Benefic Law Corporation  
1250 – 1500 West Georgia Street  
P.O. Box 62  
Vancouver, BC V6G 1Z6  
Tel : 604-683-7006  
Fax : 604-683-5676  
Email : [blake@beneficgroup.com](mailto:blake@beneficgroup.com)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Faith, Fealty & Creed Society**

**Gwendoline Allison**

Foy Allison Law Group  
207 – 2438 Marine Drive  
West Vancouver, BC V7V 1L2  
Tel: 604-922-9282  
Fax: 604-922-9283  
Email: [Gwendoline.allison@foyallison.com](mailto:Gwendoline.allison@foyallison.com)

**Counsel for the Interveners, Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Vancouver, Catholic Civil Rights League and Faith and Freedom Alliance**

**Julius H. Grey**

Grey, Casgrain  
1155 René-Lévesque West, Suite 1715  
Montréal, QC H3B 2K8  
Tel: 514-288-6180  
Fax : 514-288-8908  
Email : [jhgrey@greycasgrain.net](mailto:jhgrey@greycasgrain.net)

**Counsel of the Intervener, Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada**

**Janet Winteringham, Q.C.****Jessica Lithwick****Robyn Trask**

Winteringham MacKay  
620 – 375 Water Street  
Vancouver, BC V6B 5C6  
Tel: 604-659-6060  
Fax : 604-687-2945  
Email : [jwinterinham@wmlaw.ca](mailto:jwinterinham@wmlaw.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, West Coast Women's Legal Education and Action Fund**

**Michael J. Sobkin**

331 Somerset Street West  
Ottawa, ON K2P 0J8  
Tel: 613-282-1712  
Fax: 613-288-2896  
Email: [msobkin@sympatico.ca](mailto:msobkin@sympatico.ca)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Intervener, Faith, Fealty & Creed Society**

**Albertos Polizogopoulos**

Vincent Dagenais Gibson LLP  
260 Dalhousie Street, Suite 400  
Ottawa, ON K1N 7E4  
Tel: 613-241-2701  
Fax: 613-241-2599  
Email: [albertos@vdg.ca](mailto:albertos@vdg.ca)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Interveners, Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Vancouver, Catholic Civil Rights League and Faith and Freedom Alliance**

**Guy Régimbald**

Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP  
160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1C3  
Tel: 613-786-0197  
Fax: 613-788-3559  
Email: [guy.regimbald@gowlingwlg.com](mailto:guy.regimbald@gowlingwlg.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel of the Intervener, Lawyers' Rights Watch Canada**

**Michael J. Sobkin**

331 Somerset Street West  
Ottawa, ON K2P 0J8  
Tel: 613-282-1712  
Fax: 613-288-2896  
Email: [msobkin@sympatico.ca](mailto:msobkin@sympatico.ca)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Intervener, West Coast Women's Legal Education and Action Fund**



**Avnish Nanda**  
**Balpreet Singh Boparai**

Nanda & Company  
3400 Manulife Place  
10180 – 101 Street NW  
Edmonton, AB T5J 4K1  
Tel: 780-801-5324  
Fax: 587-318-1391  
Email: [avnish@nandalaw.ca](mailto:avnish@nandalaw.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, World Sikh Organization of Canada**

**Eugene Meehan, Q.C.**

**Daniel D. Santoro**  
Supreme Advocacy LLP  
100-340 Gilmour Street  
Ottawa, ON K2P 0R3  
Tel: 613-695-8855  
Fax: 613-695-8580  
Email: [emeehan@supremeadvocacy.ca](mailto:emeehan@supremeadvocacy.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, National Coalition of Catholic School Trustees'**

**S. Zachary Green**

**Josh Hunter**  
Attorney General of Ontario  
720 Bay Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, ON M7A 2S9  
Tel: 416-326-8517  
Fax: 416-326-4015  
Email: [Zachary.green@ontario.ca](mailto:Zachary.green@ontario.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Attorney General of Ontario**

**Marlys A. Edwardh**

**Vanessa Payne**  
Goldblatt Partners LLP  
Box 180  
1039-20 Dundas Street West  
Toronto, ON M5G 2G8  
Tel: 416-979-4380  
Fax: 416-979-4430  
Email: [medwardh@goldblattpartners.com](mailto:medwardh@goldblattpartners.com)

**Counsel for the Interveners, Start Proud and OUTlaws**

**Marie-France Major**

Supreme Advocacy LLP  
100-340 Gilmour Street  
Ottawa, ON K2P 0R3  
Tel: 613-695-8855  
Fax: 613-695-8580  
Email: [mfmajor@supremeadvocacy.ca](mailto:mfmajor@supremeadvocacy.ca)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel of the Intervener, World Sikh Organization of Canada**

**Thomas Slade**

Supreme Advocacy LLP  
100-340 Gilmour Street  
Ottawa, ON K2P 0R3  
Tel: 613-695-8855  
Fax: 613-695-8580  
Email: [tslade@supremeadvocacy.ca](mailto:tslade@supremeadvocacy.ca)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Intervener, National Coalition of Catholic School Trustees'**

**Robert E. Houston, Q.C.**

Burke-Robertson  
441 MacLaren Street, Suite 200  
Ottawa, ON K2P 2H3  
Tel: 613-236-9665  
Fax: 613-235-4430  
Email: [rhouston@burkerobertson.com](mailto:rhouston@burkerobertson.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Intervener, Attorney General of Ontario**

**Colleen Bauman**

Goldblatt Partners LLP  
500-30 Metcalfe Street  
Ottawa, ON K1P 5L4  
Tel: 613-482-2463  
Fax: 613-235-3041  
Email: [cbauman@goldblattpartners.com](mailto:cbauman@goldblattpartners.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Interveners, Start Proud and OUTlaws**

**Alan L.W. D'Silva**  
**Alexandra Urbanski**  
Stikeman Elliott LLP  
5300 Commerce Court West  
199 Bay Street  
Toronto, ON M5L 1B9  
Tel: 416-869-5204  
Fax: 416-947-0866  
Email: [adsilva@stikeman.com](mailto:adsilva@stikeman.com)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Canadian Civil Liberties Association**

**Sean Dewart**  
**Tim Gleason**  
Dewart Gleason LLP  
102 – 366 Adelaide Street West  
Toronto, ON M5V 1R9  
Tel: 416-971-8000  
Fax: 416-971-8001  
Email: [sdewart@dglp.ca](mailto:sdewart@dglp.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, United Church of Canada**

**John Norris**  
**David Brees**  
100 – 116 Simcoe Street  
Toronto, ON M5H 4E2  
Tel: 416-596-2960  
Fax: 416-596-2598  
Email: [john.norris@simcoechambers.com](mailto:john.norris@simcoechambers.com)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Criminal Lawyers' Association (Ontario)**

**Angela Chaisson**  
**Marcus McCann**  
197 Spadina Ave, Suite 402  
Toronto, ON M5T 2C8  
Tel : 647-567-3536  
Fax : 647-977-9074  
Email : [law@chaisson.ca](mailto:law@chaisson.ca)

**Counsel for the Intervener, Lesbians Gays Bisexuals and Trans People of the University of Toronto**

**Nicholas Peter McHaffie**  
Stikeman Elliott LLP  
1600 – 500 O'Connor Street  
Ottawa, ON K1P 6L2  
Tel: 613-566-0546  
Fax: 613-230-8877  
Email: [nmchaffie@stikeman.com](mailto:nmchaffie@stikeman.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Intervener, Canadian Civil Liberties Association**

**Matthew Estabrooks**  
Gowling WLG (Canada) LLP  
160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1C3  
Tel: 613-786-0211  
Fax: 613-788-3573  
Email: [matthew.estabrooks@gowlingwlg.com](mailto:matthew.estabrooks@gowlingwlg.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Intervener, Criminal Lawyers' Association (Ontario)**

**Yael Wexler**  
Fasken Martineau DuMoulin LLP  
55 Metcalfe Street, Suite 1300  
Ottawa, ON K1P 6L5  
Tel: 613-696-6860  
Fax: 613-230-6423  
Email: [ywexler@fasken.com](mailto:ywexler@fasken.com)

**Ottawa Agent for the Counsel for the Intervener, Lesbians Gays Bisexuals and Trans People of the University of Toronto**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | PAGE      |
|--|-----------|
| <b>PARTS I AND II – OVERVIEW AND POSITION</b>  | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>PART III – ARGUMENT</b>   | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>A. An Organization Cannot Have a Religion or a s. 2(a) Right</b>                      | <b>2</b>  |
| <b>B. The Minority’s Test in <i>Loyola</i> is Overbroad and in Need of Clarification</b> | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>C. The BCHA’s Proposed Test</b>   | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>PART IV &amp; V – COSTS AND ORDER SOUGHT</b>  | <b>10</b> |
| <b>PART VI – TABLE OF AUTHORITIES</b>  | <b>11</b> |

## PARTS I AND II – OVERVIEW AND POSITION

1. While these cases stand to be decided on a *Doré* analysis, “questions about the identity of the person(s) whose section 2(a) rights have been interfered with lurk just below the surface of that inquiry.”<sup>1</sup>
2. The wording of the *Charter* does not require s. 2(a) rights be extended to organizations. It provides that right to “everyone”, not every legal person. Furthermore, it is trite that an organization cannot itself have a religion. As such, any decision to extend to s. 2(a) rights to organizations is necessarily a policy decision.
3. The rationale for extending s. 2(a) rights to organizations is the fact that, for many, religion has an important communal aspect. That, however, cannot justify the extension of religious freedoms to organizations. To do so does not enhance religious protection for all but rather, endorses religious oligarchy for individuals controlling organizations that obtain the benefit of s. 2(a). Further, refusing to extend the protection does not make state action toward organizations a *Charter*-free zone. Individuals may always assert their s. 2(a) and s. 2(d) rights.
4. The British Columbia Humanist Association (“BCHA”) is concerned that the extension of s. 2(a) rights to organizations will have significant and deleterious effects on Canadians and Canadian society. Such will result in state-tolerated religious preferences for access to such necessities as education, medical care and employment.
5. Should s. 2(a) protection be extended to organizations, the BCHA, using human rights legislation as its guide, proposes a narrower test than that articulated by the minority of this Court in *Loyola*. The proposed test balances the concerns of protecting the communal aspect of religion with those of too liberally granting organizations s. 2(a) rights and the impact that will have on individual members of organizations, the public and Canadian society at large.

---

<sup>1</sup> Chan, Kathryn, “Identifying the Institutional Religious Freedom Claimant” (June 29, 2017) (2017) 95 Cdn Bar Review (Forthcoming) at p. 7 [Chan, “Identifying”].

### PART III – ARGUMENT

#### A. An Organization Cannot Have a Religion or a s. 2(a) Right

6. The religious freedoms afforded by s. 2(a) of the *Charter* are inherently individual in nature and focused on a person’s subjective beliefs and perceived personal relationship with the divine.
7. The purpose of freedom of religion, as articulated by this Court, is “to ensure that society does not interfere with profoundly personal beliefs”<sup>2</sup> and that “every individual [is] free to hold and to manifest whatever beliefs and opinions his or her conscience dictates”<sup>3</sup>.
8. Consequently, the concept of freedom of religion is clearly both personal and subjective in nature, as well as “integrally linked with an individual’s self-definition and fulfilment and is a function of personal autonomy and choice, elements which undergird the right”<sup>4</sup>.
9. This Court has also noted that “freedom of religion... has both individual and collective aspects”<sup>5</sup> and this Court has recognized “that individuals may sometimes require a legal entity in order to give effect to the constitutionally protected communal aspects of their religious beliefs and practice”<sup>6</sup>.
10. Nevertheless, the communal aspect of religion cannot result in the ascription of religion to an organization that is incapable of having a religion or religious beliefs.
11. As noted by this Court, a corporation cannot possess a belief.<sup>7</sup> It cannot feel. It cannot engage in abstract thought. It cannot choose. It merely does, or does not. An organization is a legal construct. Societies and corporations exist because legislation authorizes their creation.

---

<sup>2</sup> *R. v. Edwards Books and Art Ltd.*, [1986] 2 S.C.R. 713 at ¶97 per Dickson J. [*Edwards Books*]

<sup>3</sup> *R. v. Big M Drug Mart Ltd.*, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 295 at ¶123 per Dickson J.

<sup>4</sup> *Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem*, [2004] 2 S.C.R. 551 at ¶42 per Iacobucci J.

<sup>5</sup> *Edwards Books*, *supra* at ¶140 per Dickson J.

<sup>6</sup> *Loyola High School v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, 2015 SCC 12 at ¶33 per Abella J. [*Loyola*]

<sup>7</sup> *Edwards Books*, *supra* at ¶153 per Dickson J.

12. The use of the word “everyone” in s. 2 of the *Charter* is not an invitation to anthropomorphize organizations so as to provide them with rights which logically, they simply cannot possess. As this Court stated, the collective aspect of freedom of religion “does not, however, transform the essential claim -- that of the individual claimants... -- into an assertion of a group right”.<sup>8</sup> Thus, although it is possible for individuals to arrange themselves into an organization for the purpose of promoting their religious beliefs, this does not impress the organization itself with a religious belief.
13. It has been held that the use of the word “everyone” at s. 2(a) means “all human beings and all entities that are capable of enjoying the benefit” conferred by a certain *Charter* right.<sup>9</sup>
14. Consistent with that, this Court in *Irwin Toy* held that a corporation could not avail itself of s. 7 of *Charter* as the use of the word “everyone” in s. 7 “excludes corporations and other artificial entities incapable of enjoying life, liberty or security of the person, and includes only human beings.”<sup>10</sup>
15. Nevertheless, the minority in *Loyola* proposed to expand the scope of s.2(a) rights to encompass organizations on the basis of the “collective aspect of religious freedom”<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Alberta v. Hutterian Brethren of Wilson Colony*, [2009] 2 S.C.R. 567 at ¶ 31, *per McLachlin C.J.*

<sup>9</sup> *Southam Inc. v. Investigation and Research of the Combines Investigation Branch*, 1982 CanLII 1136 (AB QB) at ¶29 [Emphasis added]. While that decision was overturned by the Court of Appeal, which decision was upheld by this Court, this Court noted in *R. v. CIP Inc.*, [1992] 1 S.C.R. 843 at p. 855, that neither the Alberta Court of Appeal nor this Court took issue with the trial judge’s conclusion. Indeed, subsequent jurisprudence appears to have, at least implicitly, addressed the issue of corporate assertion of *Charter* rights by asking if the corporate claimant is capable of enjoying the benefit of the asserted right.

<sup>10</sup> *Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, [1989] 1 S.C.R. 927 at 1004 *per Dickson C.J. and Lamer and Wilson JJ.*

<sup>11</sup> *Loyola, supra* at ¶33 *per Abella J.*

16. Given that an organization cannot have a religion, the minority's decision to expand the right to organizations is necessarily a policy decision. The wording of the *Charter* does not demand it.
17. Respectfully, the minority's approach fails to take into account the issues already raised and the deleterious societal impact of expanding the s. 2(a) right to organizations.
18. Section 2(a) rights contain both positive and negative aspects that are equally deserving of protection.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, the religious freedoms of individuals are limited by the rights and freedoms held by others.<sup>13</sup>
19. The conflict of rights that may emerge with respect to the assertion of religious freedoms by individual claimants are limited. The same is not so where there may be an organizational claimant.
20. An organization's realization of the positive aspect of the right may conflict with the rights and legitimate interests of more persons and in more impactful ways than an individual's exercise of his or her freedom of religion ever could.
21. With this in mind, there is a strong policy basis for resisting the temptation to expand s. 2(a) rights to organizations.
22. Large organizations like TWU, and others that engage as a matter of practice with the broader public, undoubtedly have a much broader and significant impact on the rights of others, including students, staff and any individuals who interact with them. Consequently, the expansion of s. 2(a) rights to organizations will allow these groups to significantly impose on the "negative aspect" of the religious freedoms of others; that is, not to be compelled to belong to a particular religion or to act contrary to their own religious beliefs.
23. The simple response to this concern is that individuals are not compelled to deal with TWU and other religious organizations. That, however, ignores the role and impact organizations

---

<sup>12</sup> *Congrégation des témoins de Jéhovah de St-Jérôme-Lafontaine v. Lafontaine (Village)*, [2004] 2 S.C.R. 650 at ¶65 per *McLachlin C.J.*

<sup>13</sup> *Ross v. New Brunswick School District No. 15*, [1996] 1 S.C.R. 825 at ¶72 per *La Forest J.*

have within Canadian society in, for example, employment and delivery of key services. Moreover, it disregards the message sent that the government and *Charter* values have no role to play in ameliorating religious-based segregation and ostracizing in the public sphere. This leads to a society in which there are hospitals, schools and shops for Christians, others available only to Muslims, still others for atheists, and so on, and so forth. Such is anathema to the pluralistic and accepting Canadian society of which many in this country rightly take great pride.

24. Indeed, living and participating in a pluralistic and secular society benefits those of all faiths. However, it also means that persons of all faiths, and those of no faith, must necessarily accept that the practice and promotion of any religion or non-theism has its limits.
25. An organizational religious right may result in the compulsion of some members of an organization, or the public, to act in a manner contrary to their own beliefs due the overriding organizational right. Because the organizational claimant is not itself a state actor, those persons would have no recourse. Further, it may impose the beliefs of only a select few members of the organization's board on the whole of the organization or organization's community. As the Community Covenant in the cases at bar demonstrates, the coerced conduct created by an organizational right may apply 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to activities with no connection at all to the organization or its purpose.
26. It must be borne in mind that the policy rationale for expanding the s. 2(a) right to organizations is a recognition of the communal aspect of religion and an apparent concern that, absent an organizational right, there will be some gap in *Charter* protection for individuals. However, refusing to recognize an organizational right does not make the communal aspect of religion a *Charter*-free zone. Where state action impacts the communal aspects of religion, individuals may still assert breaches of their own individual s. 2(a) and s. 2(d) freedom of association rights.
27. Moreover, under the approach to administrative decision-making outlined in *Doré*, administrative bodies are empowered and, in fact, required, to consider fundamental *Charter*



values. As a result, an administrative decision need not directly engage an individual's or organization's *Charter* rights in order for *Charter* values to come into play.<sup>14</sup>

**B. The Minority's Test in *Loyola* is Overbroad and In Need of Clarification**

28. If this Court holds that an organization can have freedom of religion in its own right, the BCHA submits that the approaches taken by the courts below, and test proposed by the minority in *Loyola*, should be rejected as being overbroad and, in any event, requiring clarification.
29. In *Loyola*, the minority stated that an organization “meets the requirements for s. 2(a) protection if (1) it is constituted primarily for religious purposes, and (2) its operation accords with these religious purposes.”<sup>15</sup>
30. If that threshold test is met, the organizational claimant must show “that the claimed belief or practice is consistent with both the purpose and operation of the organization.”<sup>16</sup> Finally, if that is demonstrated, the court must ask whether the impugned state action “interfere[s] with [the organization's] ability to act in accordance with this belief, in a manner that is more than trivial or insubstantial”.<sup>17</sup>
31. In contrast, the courts below have taken the approach of simply accepting at face value an organizational claimant's description of itself and its purpose.
32. The minority's test in *Loyola* lacks clarity in determining when a religious purpose is the primary purpose of the organization. Indeed, many organizations are constituted to engage in a non-religious activity or provide a non-religious service within a religious context. Is the activity the primary purpose, or is it the context in which that activity takes place? The answer will often depend on who is asked. The end user (e.g. student, patient or customer)

---

<sup>14</sup> *Doré v. Barreau du Québec*, [2012] 1 S.C.R. 395 at ¶35 per Abella J. [*Doré*]

<sup>15</sup> *Loyola*, *supra* at ¶100 per McLachlin C.J. and Moldaver J.

<sup>16</sup> *Loyola*, *supra* at ¶138 per McLachlin C.J. and Moldaver J.

<sup>17</sup> *Loyola*, *supra* at ¶140 per McLachlin C.J. and Moldaver J.

will likely focus on the activity. The organization itself may put more focus on the religious context. The state actor is a third person that may have yet a different perspective.

33. Professor Chan provides an excellent analysis of the difficulties in determining an organization's purpose in the context of the cases now before this Court. She notes that determining organizational purpose requires looking at the appropriate constituting documents (not merely what the organizational claimant asserts is its purpose), recognizing the legal constraints imposed by those documents on an organization's ability to define its purpose, and the difficulty that may nevertheless persist in finding a primary purpose.<sup>18</sup>
34. Professor Chan's analysis highlights the problems of an unclear test. She notes that TWU's constituting documents state its object is to provide a university education "for people of any ... creed". This seems to shut the door on any suggestion that compelled observance of the mores of any one religion or religious viewpoint is really in furtherance of TWU's purpose. Nevertheless, despite being aware of the minority's test in *Loyola*, it appears that the lower courts in this case were not prepared to look behind TWU's stated purpose.
35. The next two stages of the minority's analysis in *Loyola* (determining whether the operation of the organization accords with its religious purpose, and determining whether the claimed belief or practice is consistent with both the purpose and operation of the organization) focus more narrowly on the operation of the organization and, more specifically, the belief or practice in issue. However, the proposed test sets an unjustifiably low bar that the operation "accord" with the religious purpose, and that belief or practice be merely "consistent" with the organizational purpose and operation.
36. It is difficult to imagine an organizational claimant whose operation does not accord with its religious purpose, or whose professed belief or practice is not, at a minimum, consistent with the organization's operation and purpose. The minority's proposed test weeds out only those claimants who are acting *contrary* to their religious purpose.
37. Furthermore, it is entirely possible that two contrary and incompatible practices would both meet the test. This, of course, is more likely when the organizational purpose includes terms

---

<sup>18</sup> Chan, "Identifying", *supra* at pp. 9 – 13

that defy a commonly understood definition (i.e. “Christian”). Professor Chan posits the example of TWU’s board being controlled by progressive United Church ministers who amend the Community Covenant to expressly permit same-sex relationships. She notes that, based on TWU’s objects as set out in its constituting documents, neither version of the covenant can be said to not be in accord or consistent with TWU’s religious purpose.<sup>19</sup>

38. We then see that what is *Charter*-protected is nothing more than the views of those individuals that happen to control an organization’s board at any given time. The desire to protect the communal aspect of religion will have thus resulted in *Charter* protection for a select few to impose their view of their religion on an entire community of believers, and the public with whom they engage. The central focus – protection of the communal aspect of religion for a community of persons – has thus morphed into *Charter*-protected religious oligarchy.
39. Finally, the last part of the test misplaces the focus of the inquiry on the organization itself, rather than the individuals practicing their religion through the organization. This flows naturally from the fact that it is only individuals who can have and practice religion.

### **C. The BCHA’s Proposed Test**

40. If this Court is prepared to extend s. 2 (a) rights to organizations, bearing in mind the concerns raised above, the BCHA submits that there must be a meaningful test applied to any organizational claim to a s. 2(a) right. That is, as described by Professor Chan, a “first-order” question: which organizations may seek to assert a s. 2(a) right?<sup>20</sup>
41. In answering this question, one must bear in mind that the rationale for recognizing an organizational right to freedom of religion is to ensure protection of individuals’ freedom of religion. An organization is merely a vehicle for its members’ practice of religion.
42. The notion of recognizing an organizational right to religious freedom is not new in Canada. Human rights legislation in numerous provinces and territories include exceptions from their

---

<sup>19</sup> Chan, “Identifying”, *supra* at pp. 12 – 13

<sup>20</sup> Chan, “Identifying”, *supra* at p. 3

ambit, or part thereof, for certain organizations and activities based on religion. The thresholds for these exceptions are variously framed as requiring that the organization:

- a. “has a primary purpose of the promotion of the interests and welfare of an identifiable group or class of persons characterized by a common religion”<sup>21</sup>;
- b. “is primarily engaged in serving the interests of persons identified by a prohibited ground of discrimination”<sup>22</sup>;
- c. “is primarily engaged in serving the interests of persons identified by their religion”<sup>23</sup>;
- d. “is composed exclusively or primarily of persons having the same religious beliefs, and, is not operated for profit”<sup>24</sup>;
- e. “is primarily engaged in serving the interests of a group of persons identified by that prohibited ground of discrimination”<sup>25</sup>;
- f. is “exclusively religious ... and that is operated primarily to foster the welfare of a religious group with respect to persons of the same religion”<sup>26</sup>; and
- g. is “operated primarily to foster the welfare of a religious group”<sup>27</sup>.

43. This legislation reflects a communal wisdom about organizational religion and, importantly, its interaction and impact on the rights and interests of members of the broader public.

44. What one can see on reviewing that legislation is that the exception for organizations based on religion is narrowly focused. First, the organization must be not-for-profit.

---

<sup>21</sup> *Human Rights Code*, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 210, s. 41

<sup>22</sup> *Human Rights Code*, R.S.O. 1990, c. H.19, s. 18

<sup>23</sup> *The Saskatchewan Human Rights Code*, S.S. 1979, c. S-24.1, s. 16(10)

<sup>24</sup> *Alberta Human Rights Act*, R.S.A. 2000, C. A-25.5, s. 3(3)

<sup>25</sup> *Human Rights Act, 2010*, S.N.L. 2010, c. H-13.1, s. 11(3)

<sup>26</sup> *Human Rights Act*, R.S.N.S. 1989, c. 214, s. 6(c) and *Human Rights Act*, R.S.P.E.I. 1988, c. H-12, s. 10(2)


<sup>27</sup> *Human Rights Act*, S.N.W.T. 2002, c. 18, s. 7(5) and *Human Rights Act*, S. Nu 2003, c. 12, s. 9(6)

45. Second, the organization's *raison d'être* must be to promote the welfare of members of a particular religious community.
46. If there is to be room for an organizational s. 2(a) claimant, the BCHA submits that such a claimant must meet the threshold test of satisfying the court that it is not operated for profit and is primarily engaged in promoting the welfare of an identifiable group or class of persons characterized by a common religion.
47. If that is satisfied, one must then consider the specific belief or practice in issue. Applying the test for an individual, appropriately modified, the questions become: (1) Is the belief or practice consistent with, and in furtherance of, the promotion of the welfare of those religious persons? (2) Does the impugned action interfere, in a manner that is non-trivial or insubstantial, with the promotion of the welfare of those religious persons?
48. This part of the test must focus on the specific belief or practice in issue. That focus must be done in context. Specific practices, for example, compulsory codes of conduct, may engage s. 2(a) rights in some contexts and not in others. Those different contexts may arise within the same organization. A context-specific focus recognizes that an organization may engage in a variety of activities, not all of which are sufficiently related to the organization's purpose to attract *Charter* protection. For example, a "religious organization" may engage in activities directed to or for the benefit of its members (e.g. advocacy or religion-based counselling) and other activities that have no religious content (e.g. the operation of thrift stores). The former may engage the organization's s. 2(a) rights whereas the latter will not.

#### PART IV & V – COSTS AND ORDER SOUGHT

49. The BCHA does not seek costs and asks that none be awarded against it.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

  
Wesley McMillan and Kaitlyn Meyer  
Counsel for the British Columbia Humanist Association

## PART VI – TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| <b>CASES</b>   | <b>PARAGRAPH NO.</b>                    |
|--|---|
| <a href="#"><u>Alberta v. Hutterian Brethren of Wilson Colony, [2009] 2 SCR 567.</u></a>   | 12                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>Congrégation des témoins de Jéhovah de St-Jérôme-Lafontaine v. Lafontaine (Village), [2004] 2 SCR 650</u></a>     | 18                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>Doré v. Barreau du Québec, [2012] 1 SCR 395</u></a>   | 1, 27                                   |
| <a href="#"><u>Irwin Toy Ltd. v. Quebec (Attorney General), [1989] 1 SCR 927</u></a>   | 14                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>Loyola High School v. Quebec (Attorney General), 2015 SCC 12</u></a>  | 5, 9, 15, 28, 29, 30,<br>32, 34, 35, 40 |
| <a href="#"><u>R. v. Big M Drug Mart Ltd., [1985] 1 SCR 295</u></a>  | 7                                       |
| <a href="#"><u>R. v. CIP Inc., [1992] 1 SCR 843</u></a>  | 13                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>R. v. Edwards Books and Art Ltd., [1986] 2 SCR 713</u></a>  | 7, 9, 11                                |
| <a href="#"><u>Ross v. New Brunswick School District No. 15, [1996] 1 SCR 825</u></a>  | 18                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>Southam Inc. v. Investigation and Research of the Combines Investigation Branch, 1982 CanLII 1136 (AB QB)</u></a> | 13                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>Syndicat Northcrest v. Amselem, [2004] 2 SCR 551</u></a>  | 8                                       |
| <br><b>LEGISLATION</b>   |   |
| <a href="#"><u>Alberta Human Rights Act, R.S.A. 2000, C. A-25.5, s. 3(3)</u></a>   | 42                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>Human Rights Act, R.S.N.S. 1989, c. 214, s. 6(c)</u></a>  | 42                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>Human Rights Act, R.S.P.E.I. 1988, c. H-12, s. 10(2)</u></a>  | 42                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>Human Rights Act, S.N.W.T. 2002, c. 18, s. 7(5)</u></a>   | 42                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>Human Rights Act, S. Nu 2003, c. 12, s. 9(6)</u></a>  | 42                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>Human Rights Act, 2010, S.N.L. 2010, c. H-13.1, s. 11(3)</u></a>  | 42                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>Human Rights Code, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 210, s. 41</u></a>   | 42                                      |
| <a href="#"><u>Human Rights Code, R.S.O. 1990, c. H.19, s. 18</u></a>  | 42                                      |

[\*The Saskatchewan Human Rights Code, S.S. 1979, c. S-24.1, s. 16\(10\)\*](#) 42

**OTHER**

[Chan, Kathryn, “Identifying the Institutional Religious Freedom Claimant” \(June 29, 2017\) \(2017\) 95 Cdn Bar Review \(Forthcoming\)](#) 1, 33, 34, 37, 40