

**A Report Prepared For**

**THE ALBERTA  
HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION**

**and**

**THE GAY AND LESBIAN  
COMMUNITY OF ALBERTA**

**A STUDY OF DISCRIMINATION  
BASED ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION**

**(A Projected Case Load Study, Should Sexual  
Orientation Become A Protected Category  
Within The Individual's Rights Protection Act.)**

**Trevor H Edwards  
Senior Consultant**

**David Lee  
Volunteer Consultant**

**Mary Crunkilton  
Editor**

**September 10, 1992**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	3
STUDY BACKGROUND .....	4
THE INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT .....	4
THE STUDY FORMANT .....	4
THE STUDY VOLUNTEERS .....	4
STUDY ORGANIZATION .....	5
PUBLIC RELATIONS .....	5
OFFICE STRUCTURE .....	5
ISSUES BEYOND THE IRPA .....	6
VIOLENCE AND ASSAULT .....	6
SELF DISCRIMINATION .....	7
POSSIBLE IRPA COMPLAINTS .....	9
DISABILITY .....	9
SERVICES .....	10
NOTICES .....	11
HARASSMENT .....	12
EMPLOYMENT .....	13
PRIVATE INDUSTRY .....	13
GOVERNMENT OF ALBERTA .....	15
SPOUSAL BENEFITS .....	16
STATISTICS .....	19
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	20
EPILOGUE .....	21
APPENDIX I .....	A 1

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On January 9, 1992, The Alberta Human Rights Commission (AHRC) called on the Government of Alberta to open the Individual's Rights Protection Act (IRPA) to include sexual orientation as a protected ground. The Commission reached its decision unanimously. The February edition of Dignity announced its plan to have a team of volunteers help it "determine the number of potential complaints involving discrimination based on sexual orientation."

The study was launched on March 9, 1992 and maintained office hours of 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM on Monday, Wednesday and Friday. The Commission provided office support. This included secretarial services, telephone, supplies and photocopying. Following meetings with the Chief Commissioner, the gay and lesbian community agreed to become the study's primary communication link with Albertans. Their support made the study possible.

During the first three months of the study 65 calls were received. This resulted in the opening of 33 files. Of these 24 were determined by the volunteers to be within the scope of the IRPA were sexual orientation to be a protected ground. These included potential violations of grounds totalling 43.

It is interesting to note that this number represented 15% to 20% of the complaints received by the Commission during the study period. It normally reviews 600 files each year, approximately 150 per quarter. Obviously, more information would have been gathered had the study continued for the second three month period as was originally announced.

We would also like to point out that these files document complaints that are substantially the same as those currently being addressed by the Commission. There is though one substantive difference. If an individual experiences discrimination because of "the race, religious beliefs, colour, gender, physical disability, mental disability, age, ancestry or place of origin of that person or class of persons" Albertans have recourse in law. Unfortunately, if the discrimination is based upon ones sexual orientation, there is no recourse under this province's Individual's Rights Protection Act.

A draft report was circulated on June 17, 1992 to the study participants for review and comment. The input of individuals from the gay and lesbian community, service organizations, the Government of Alberta and the Cities of Edmonton and Calgary is greatly appreciated. We regret that the Commission did not choose to participate in this process. Their input was missed.

Others provinces have demonstrated the courage to interpret their human rights legislation in a more compassionate fashion, one that defends the rights of all their citizens. Either the Alberta Human Rights Commission must develop the consensus to do likewise, or, gay and lesbian Albertans will continue to be victimised until such time as the Act is changed.

The purpose of the study was to explore the apparent failure of the Individual's Rights Protection Act to recognise, in the words of that Act, "...the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all persons is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world...".

It is evident from the findings that discrimination based upon sexual orientation is a fact of life in Alberta. This directly impacts the lives of gay, lesbian and heterosexual Albertans with equal ferocity. Unfortunately, in Alberta there is no recourse for any of us.

# **STUDY BACKGROUND**

## **THE INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHTS PROTECTION ACT**

This act provides protection from discrimination based upon race, religious beliefs, colour, sex, physical disability, age, ancestry or place of origin. It does not however recognise discrimination when based upon ones sexual orientation.

## **THE STUDY FORMANT**

(Written and circulated by the AHRC)

At its February meeting, the Commission approved the establishment of a project to determine the extent and nature of claims that the Commission would expect to receive if sexual orientation were a protected ground under the legislation as it now stands. The purpose of the project is twofold. The Commission wants to demonstrate the extent and nature of the discrimination that now exists in this province and to anticipate the number of complaints that would be received.

The project consisted of establishing a phone line. Individuals may call if they think that they, or someone they know, has suffered discrimination as protected by the IRPA. Individuals can call this number and speak to a volunteer, Trevor Edwards, who has been trained in the grounds and intake methods of the Commission. Mr. Edwards also can provide advice and assistance on the legislation and the project to the callers. He may refer callers to other agencies or organizations, although this is secondary to the project. Callers will be asked to limit their calls to experiences within the last 6 months, the limit set by the legislation. However, all information may be taken and any sorting or culling will occur at the end of the project.

At the conclusion of the project, a report will be prepared for the commissioners and will be made public. Further steps that the Commission may take on the issue of sexual orientation will be determined at the end of the project.

The Commission is asking for assistance from the community in spreading the word about this project and in encouraging individuals to call. We have informed the media and our volunteer is actively engaged in finding ways to make this project more visible. We need more help and would appreciate a volunteer from the lesbian community to answer the phone as well, bearing in mind that the project is based in Edmonton. We will convene more meetings with the Community as the project progresses to discuss progress and continue to receive input.

## **THE STUDY VOLUNTEERS**

Volunteers from the private sector, government and the fields of education and journalism staffed the study. The core group was made up of concerned professionals from both the gay and heterosexual communities. This included a senior member of the Alberta civil service, the vice-president of a major private company and an experienced editor.

Informal advisory committees from the gay and lesbian community of Alberta provided major input and support. Several municipal governments, trade unions and community service organizations also contributed by increasing the awareness of their staff and membership. We also give recognition to a number of heterosexual Albertans who contributed to this process.

# STUDY ORGANIZATION

## PUBLIC RELATIONS

At the beginning of the study the Alberta Human Rights Commission (AHRC) made it quite clear, money would not be available for public relations. Aside from a Commission press release, communications were handled informally with the help of supportive individuals and organizations.

The Commission's poster was distributed by the gay and lesbian community of Alberta. Their support made the study possible. It was also sent to forty supportive organizations across Alberta. Interviews also took place with the print and electronic media.

The first public organization to offer its support was the United Nurses of Alberta. Their newsletter brought the study to the attention of their provincial membership. This was quickly followed by similar newsletter articles by the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees and the Rotary Club of Edmonton. Edmonton and Calgary placed the poster on all their employee bulletin boards. Their decision to duplicate and distribute the material at their own cost helped greatly. Computer bulletin boards were also used to spread the message.

It is interesting to speculate on the impact that these initiatives would have had on documenting further complaints had The Human Rights Commission not withdrawn its support for the continuation of the study for an additional three months.

While we appreciate the support of these various organizations, more formal initiatives in the public relations field would have increased participation. There are thousands of Albertans, gay and lesbian and heterosexual, living in the cities, towns, villages and farms of this province. They were largely unaware of the Commission's support and interest in recording their experiences. As a result, we believe the complaints of discrimination based upon sexual orientation, recorded in this study, represent only a portion of those that might have been received.

## OFFICE STRUCTURE

The study was undertaken at the initiative of the Alberta Human Rights Commission (AHRC). Their support and guidance made this study possible. Office space, telephones, duplication and secretarial support were all provided by the Edmonton Regional Office. The Government of Alberta RITE system was used to receive calls from the general public. Individuals were encouraged to contact their local operator and were connected to the offices of the Alberta Human Rights Commission.

This provided Albertans with a no cost method of reporting acts of discrimination. It is possible that the complexity of the system created a barrier for some. Calls were routed through a minimum of two operators before reaching the study's staff. This may have created an impression that breaches of confidentiality were possible.

For reason of confidentiality, complaint files were maintained separately from the Commission's general filing system and were only available to the study's participants. They were stored in a locked cabinet at all times. This approach was developed with the full supported of the Commission and its staff. As of the completion of this final draft, all files have been turned over to the Chief Commissioner. We expect that the Commission will respect the commitment to confidentiality and protect the identity of those who participated in the study.

The office was staffed Monday, Wednesday and Friday from 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM. At other times, the Commission's receptionist was available to take messages, although these were limited in number.

## ISSUES BEYOND THE IRPA (Both Currently and Proposed)

Some issues, such as physical assault, are not covered under the IRPA. They come under the jurisdiction of the Criminal Code. However, violence against gays and lesbians is common. Therefore, we feel it is important to note such occurrences. One of the sad realities, is that people often discriminate against themselves. We discovered a number of cases where individuals chose to limit their opportunities out of fear of potential discrimination.

### VIOLENCE AND ASSAULT

Assault, based on the actual or perceived sexual orientation of an individual, does occur in Alberta. This study notes three such incidents and recognises there is extensive anecdotal evidence that such events occur all too frequently in our Province.

*A young man approaches another in a major public shopping centre. He makes it clear that he is gay and wants to get to know the other better. The response is clearly negative and he withdraws.*

*A short time later he leaves the mall, heading for his car. Unknown to him, he is followed by the other man and is assaulted in the parking lot. Following multiple blows and a demand that he give up his leather jacket, he escapes to the safety of his car. The assailant continues the attack, kicking in the car's door.* file (A2012)

We have to ask serious questions when incidents such as this take place. Is assault an acceptable response to an unsolicited advance? Does a heterosexual Albertan have to fear such an attack, if he or she approaches an individual who is similarly not interested?

The Criminal Code of Canada already covers Physical Assault. In this case the victim complained to the police. They investigated the events in the parking lot and, with the help of the young man, identified the attacker. The police laid charges and, with the support of the Crown Prosecutor, obtained a conviction.

*Two women, partners of many years, are walking to their car after an evening out. They have had a good time, made even more special by the participation of supportive friends who honour and respect their relationship.*

*They are accosted by a male. In addition to being called a number of insulting and degrading names, one is slammed against a wall. Only the arrival of another group of women prevents the two from being further victimized.* file (A1806A)

The attack was simply based on the assumption that the women were lesbians and therefore fair game. Unfortunately, that is all it takes. If your wife and daughter or husband and brother were the victims of a similar attack, how would you respond?

We have already alerted the reader to the reality that all Albertans are at risk. Anyone can be attacked if we permit bigotry to exist in our laws and culture. The following clearly demonstrates that danger.

*Kirk is a heterosexual man with a spouse and two children. He crossed the street to a convenience store. When he emerged, he was confronted by two men who got out of their vehicle.*

*Through the use of derogatory language, they accused him of being gay. One, who had moved to Kirk's side, struck him on the head. At this point, Kirk, who is trained in martial arts, rapidly and successfully ended the confrontation to the duo's disadvantage.*

file (D0530)

The fear of physical assault is a reality of life for gay and lesbian Albertans. Incidents of violence often go unreported. The victims are assaulted and degraded. They are made to feel powerless. Even if they are aware that they too are protected by law, they usually fail to follow through with charges. This is generally because of a fear of disclosure or uncertainty as to the system's response.

We realize these fears are not unique to lesbians and gays. Victims often experience a similar response with respect to spousal abuse or sexual assault. Slowly, the situation is improving, but we require an aggressive program of education for the benefit of everyone. Until that happens, gay and lesbian Albertans will continue to be victims of abusive individuals and their own fears as well.

As protection exists for the three preceding cases they have not been considered in projecting the potential case load should the IRPA be changed. We have included these cases to offer an insight for the reader.

## **SELF DISCRIMINATION/FEAR**

Several Albertans have gained prominence by declaring that lesbian and gay citizens of this Province only experience discrimination when they fail to hide their sexual orientation.

*Elliot gained employment in a provincial group home and earned compliments for his performance and judgement. In recognition of this, he was left in charge of the facility while the senior staff attended a weekend conference in another community. Suddenly he is informed "we've done some checking on you and found out you're a homosexual. You have to go...you're fired."*

file (A1605A)

He wrote his MLA, seeking assistance. The response is very interesting. It contains the following quote, "...if sexual orientation is involved, it generally is because of the individual's sexual behaviour or other factors like AIDS which have come to the knowledge of the employer through the individuals actions." In other words, it was his own fault. How often have we seen society blame the victim?

In the words of the pastor of a Christian denomination, "There are many who live out their lives secretly. I think that's tremendously lonely. It's a denial of self, a type of schizophrenia...". The victim often chooses a path of self-discrimination limiting not only the blame and abuse they have to contend with but, unfortunately, their opportunities as well. This form of self-discrimination can include sacrificing careers or education, as demonstrated in the following story.

*Gord is a student of Adult Continuing Education, with only two months left in his program. He is upgrading to complete his high school diploma and increase his job opportunities.*

*While at school, female students would flirt and ask him out. Because he declined their advances, assumptions were made about his sexuality. He became the target of harassment within the classroom and in various social situations. He was considering quitting his educational upgrading program.*

file (C0127)

This study is simply advocating equal protection under the Individual's Rights Protection Act. The current interpretation refuses to recognise violations of our existing statute if they are based upon ones sexual orientation. A simple addition is required to the list of protected grounds. Our current legislation states;

**"It is recognised in Alberta...that all persons are equal in dignity and rights without regard to race, religious beliefs, colour, gender, physical disability, mental disability, age, ancestry or place of origin."** All that is sought is the addition of two words, sexual orientation.

*Dwayne was a employee with the head office of a major city religious denomination. He was also a part-time pastor with another church that ministers to the gay and lesbian community. When a major news publication asked to do a story and it appeared, the first church asked Dwayne to "do something to address it."*

*He resigned from his position and continues to work with the other church.* file (A2009)

The fear created by these practices, in the absence of any meaningful recourse, is devastating, both to the individual and the family. Some individuals choose to avoid legal action to resolve the break up of their marriages. It separates families and exposes lesbian and gay Albertans to the devastating reality of emotional blackmail. All of these are demonstrated in the following complaint.

*After several years in a heterosexual marriage, Donna came to the realization she was a lesbian. Her husband's reaction was to do anything that would insure that she received nothing from their years together, including access to her young daughter.*

*Her husband gave her an ultimatum to renounce all rights and give up any claim to the child. If she didn't, he would fight her through the courts and would reveal her sexual preference to her employer, the Government of Alberta.*

*She had a successful career in a Department that is involved in legal issues. It was her belief that such a disclosure would result in the loss of any chance for advancement and possibly dismissal.*

*Ultimately, she was able to get agreement for supervised access to the child. This was though without any legal obligation and could be cancelled at any time. She eventually left her job and chosen field of work. She felt there was little understanding in the Department and was constantly in fear of exposure. She sought education and employment in another field that would be less hostile to a lesbian.*

file (A2716)

Once again we see the impact of the absence of protection. Not only do Albertans become the victims of discrimination, but they feel compelled to make decisions that victimize themselves as individuals. We call this self-discrimination. It is an all too frequent fact of life for gay and lesbian citizens of this province.



# POSSIBLE IRPA COMPLAINTS

(Should the Act be Changed)

Citizens who are perceived to be different, as a result of their sexual orientation, are denied protection under The Individual's Rights Protection Act in the areas listed below.

- Discrimination In Notices
- Discrimination re Public Accommodation
- Discrimination re Tenancy
- Building Standards
- Equal Pay
- Discrimination re Employment Practices
- Applications and Advertisements re Employment
- Sexual Harassment
- Membership in Trade Unions, etc
- Services

Following are descriptions of various complaints which are or will be covered were sexual orientation to becomes a protected ground.

## DISABILITY (AIDS)

Under The Individual's Rights Protection Act, individuals who experience discrimination based upon physical or mental disability have an avenue of redress.

The study received two complaints of such discrimination. Both occurred in the work place. What was interesting about these cases, was it did not seem to matter whether the victim was actually, or simply perceived to be, infected by the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV). This virus ultimately leads to the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, (AIDS).

In the first case, the victim was driven out of his place of employment and forced to abandon his chosen career.

*Todd was a long time employee with an unbroken string of complimentary performance appraisals. His employer was a community agency. The agency is under contract to the Government of Alberta to operate a facility and provide programs for mentally handicapped individuals. As an experienced nursing assistant, his responsibilities included providing care and support to the facility's residents.*

*After a long illness, a member of Todd's family died of an infection resulting from AIDS. Shortly thereafter, Todd became a target of harassment and abuse by several staff members. The complainant characterised them as religious fundamentalists who used their beliefs to justify this form of discrimination. When asked why he did not seek the assistance of his employer, it was disclosed that one of the leading harassers was his immediate supervisor.*

*This continued for many months and ultimately, Todd was left with no choice but to resign. He is now pursuing a degree at university in the hope of beginning a new career.*

file (A1303)

Driving an individual out of his place of employment, due to the death of a relative, is contrary to the law. It also sadly displays the view of some peoples' Christian values.

In this case the victim was unaware that protection existed and, even so, said that he would be reluctant to face the repercussions of filing a complaint.

In a different case a worker was also the recent victim of discrimination based upon physical disability.

*Brian, is a construction worker who is living with AIDS. He and his partner, who is facing a similar challenge, are successfully maintaining their careers and continue to be self-supporting Albertans. Brian shared his medical history with his foreman. The response was supportive. Whether or not the information was passed on to more senior officers of the company is unknown.*

*In recent months it has been necessary for Brian to see a Doctor on a number of occasions. (The Commission's consultant believes these visits totalled three but the exact number was not recorded in the file.) On the first two occasions, there was no difficulty obtaining a short term medical leave. The third time, he was docked 3 days pay. He was subsequently advised that future medical appointments would result in a similar response on the part of the company. He was lead to believe that dismissal was a real possibility, should these continue.* file (B2226)

This is unacceptable under the current legislation governing the work place and is grounds for a complaint under the Individual's Rights Protection Act.

This individual was referred to the local office of the Alberta Human Rights Commission and a complaint is currently being filed. We congratulate him. Such a challenge brings with it the probability of negative repercussions in his personal life and place of work. It is unfortunate, that neither Brian nor his partner, were aware that legal redress was available. This is not unique. This type of ignorance continues to contribute to ongoing discrimination.

## **SERVICES**

That Act states, "No person...shall deny to any person...services customarily available to the public." However, this is not true, when discrimination is based upon their sexual orientation, including heterosexuals.

*Connie and Anne are in a public restaurant, reputed to be owned by gays and hospitable to members of the gay and lesbian community. One has just received news of the death of a parent. The other reaches across the table and takes her hand in the hope of providing consolation. The tears are obvious.*

*A waiter approaches and orders them to stop holding hands. They explain the circumstances. He responds that such displays, like taking another by the hand, will not be tolerated. He repeats the demand and they are denied further service. Ultimately, they are forced to leave.*

file (A1806B)

Imagine the anger and frustration. A gesture of sympathy was interpreted as an unacceptable display. Reasonable explanations were to no avail. They are denied services customarily available to the public.

We must point out, these women were denied service based on an assumption that they were lovers. That fact was never established and is still not known to the study. Does this mean that two heterosexual women could be refused service if an establishment presumed they are lesbians?

Would our current laws permit a business owner to discriminate against heterosexual Albertans if the discrimination was based upon their sexual orientation? Remember, no form of sexual orientation is protected in the Act. While we believe that such is totally unacceptable, it would be theoretically possible

to deny someone accommodation or dismiss them from their place of employment simply because they choose to love a member of the opposite sex. It is an interesting concept to consider.

This concept should pose a frightening thought for all Albertans. When we legitimise discrimination against an invisible minority, we place all citizens at risk of being similarly victimized.

*Susan and her long time partner decided to start a family by artificial insemination, an option that is available to qualified members of the public. After seeing a number of professionals, they experienced refusals including the statement "I cannot condone this lifestyle." Finally, a gay positive nurse recommended "In order to get quality health care...lie!" Instead, they contacted a hospital that provided such services. Their treatment at this institution was quite exceptional.*

file (A2715)

Do all Albertans have the right to expect equal access to medical services? If individual practitioners withhold services, what are the responsibilities of their professions to insure accessibility?

The choice to have children is enshrined in our laws and culture. The study is unaware of any circumstance where society or the law is permitted to intrude and deny someone that right. Did we not outlaw the involuntary sterilization of our mentally handicapped citizens several decades ago? Albertans rebelled at the thought of the State interfering with such a basic right. However, certain members of our medical profession are denying this choice to some, through the denial of services.

The Government of Canada also engages in administrative discrimination against residents of this Province. The following is one such example.

*After an unsuccessful search for a suitable candidate in Canada, a community based organization located a professional from the United States who is willing to relocate. There was no difficulty obtaining the necessary documents and approvals to work in Canada.*

*When they got to the border, her same sex partner was refused an accompanying spousal visa. Issuance of this visa is normal practice for the spouse of individuals with a valid work permit. After considerable debate a sympathetic Customs official granted a six month visitors visa. The partner, however, has to return to the USA twice a year simply to remain with her spouse.*

[We recognise immigration law is a matter of Federal jurisdiction and not a topic for this report. This case, however, has a provincial twist.]

*Upon arriving in Alberta, the couple went through the normal process of settling in, including an application for Alberta Health Care. To their surprise, coverage was denied for the accompanying spouse. She has a visitors visa and our Health Care Commission does not permit the issuing of coverage for someone with such a permit even though she is the accompanying spouse of another with all the necessary permits and authorizations. As a result she is living in Alberta without any medical protection.*

file (A2011)

This discrimination, based on sexual orientation, is placing this individual's health at risk.

## NOTICES

Our current legislation states "no person shall publish or display before the public or cause to be published or displayed before the public any notice, sign, symbol, emblem or other representation...indicating discrimination or an intention to discriminate against any person or class of

persons." However, no individual is protected when discriminatory notices are based upon ones sexual orientation. Once again, it is interesting to realize that if heterosexual partners or their relationships are exposed to notices, signs, symbols, emblems or other representations that promote discrimination, based upon their sexual orientation, they are denied protection in this area as well.

Gay and lesbian Albertans experience this daily. They are exposed to written notices that advocate and promote public ridicule. Objecting to such representations can potentially cost one his or her job. One such person is even required to teach impressionable people that their emotions are disgusting and immoral. This is his story.

*Tim is a social worker and is employed in a community based, Government funded facility. It exists to provide care, guidance, and support to mentally handicapped young adults.*

*As part of an assessment process, workers are required to show their charges a series of drawings and pictures and to evaluate the appropriateness of the responses. These have been developed by the facility's management and all staff are trained in their use.*

*Three pictures show couples holding hands. One is a man and a woman, the next is two men, and the third is two women. They are asked to "spot the queers and fairies." References are even made to "back door specialists." In addition to the extremely negative characterization of loving couples, the worker was required to use these in the assessment of one young man who was demonstrating strong gay tendencies. He tried to minimize the impact. However, being forced to train a young man to hate himself is indefensible.*

file(B2224)

## **HARASSMENT**

Harassment is probably the largest single form of discrimination reported to the study. It is often an underlying issue that exists in combination with other forms such as employment, services and notices. We recorded eight such cases. The following are just two examples of what is being experienced by gay and lesbian Albertans.

In this case a couple, who experienced harassment from another couple in their group, received positive support from the balance of the members.

*Leonard is a married gay man, who has been "out" to his wife for a number of years. They have chosen to remain together and function successfully as a family, with the support of their children. Over the past number of years, they have been long standing members of a "couples support group."*

*When they "came out" to the group they received general support. One couple, who were fundamentalist in their religious beliefs, objected. In addition to a number of derogatory statements, the couple demanded that Leonard and his wife leave the group or they would stop coming.*

*As the group was opposed to banning anyone, the couple that was making an issue over Leonard's sexuality withdrew. Leonard and his wife continue to participate in the group.*

file (A2717)

Harassment is not only aimed at individuals. In some cases it is much broader in nature, aimed at an organization or identified group of individuals.

*Kieran, an officer of the gay and lesbian association on campus was subjected to verbal abuse. An officer of the association confronted the abuser, a member of another university club, and sent a letter to all other organization.*

*The Student's Union had, in April 1992, amended its human rights policies to address discrimination based upon sexual orientation. All clubs were advised of possible disciplinary action.*

file (D0229)

Obviously some universities are taking steps to address discrimination in all its forms. As a result, there is an avenue by which this harassment could be challenged. Unfortunately, such is not possible under the Individual's Rights Protection Act of Alberta.

## **EMPLOYMENT**

Discrimination in the work place is a fact of life for gay and lesbian Albertans. All it takes is suspicion. Instantly ones performance, qualifications, contributions, loyalty and years of service to your employer vanish into thin air along with any outstanding commitments they have to you. No legal recourse is available.

However, some progress has been made. In many Canadian provinces, there is recourse through provincial law. Unfortunately, Alberta is not one of the provinces that has taken steps to protect all employees, although its leading municipalities have. Many unions have already won or are negotiating protective clauses. These changes are aimed at protecting those whose ability to love has a different focus from those who are in the majority.

The calls to the Human Rights Commission demonstrated these realities. In total, there were twelve complaints that would lead to investigations of discrimination in the work place, should sexual orientation be included in Alberta's Individual's Rights Protection Act.

## **PRIVATE INDUSTRY**

The following examples demonstrate what happens when basic rights are denied.

*Barry was hired as a manager to help start up a new retail outlet for a major Canadian company. The firm was expanding in the west. Customer response exceeded all projections. Barry was the recipient of many compliments. A bonus was promised if this continued to year end. Sales continued to be strong.*

*Shortly before the bonus was due, he was called into the office and confronted by an extremely agitated Area Manager and a more senior company official. He was questioned about his sexuality. References are made regarding assaults on children and a reputed violation of company policy, permitting a friend to sit in the store's waiting area after closing. The latter is a common practice for the spouses of most managers and employees during winter months, when they were providing the employee with a ride. He was also asked about the sexual orientation of the male who provides such transportation.*

*Finally, it was revealed that the company had received a letter from a former partner. He requested an opportunity to see the letter and respond to its allegations. This was refused. Eventually, he was told that he was fired and ordered to leave the premises immediately. The bonus was withheld.*

file (A1807)

This young man was an exceptional performer. His contribution to the successful start up of a new company outlet was recognised by both local officials and visitors from head office. This was confirmed

by the promise of further compensation. All was blown away by one "poison pen" letter which he was not even permitted to see.

Does this make sense to you? Is it permissible to terminate an employee and renege on a promised bonus solely based upon unsubstantiated charges? Is it acceptable to deny him an opportunity to even respond? This level of homophobia is both discriminatory and frightening, although it is not unique.

This next complaint deals with the discrimination experienced by a young teacher in this Province.

*Ken was a first year teacher with the public school in an Alberta town. A disruptive student asked him in class if he was gay. He indicated that the question was not appropriate for the classroom and that she should get back to work.*

*Later in the day, he approached the school counsellor for advice. They agreed that he should advise the principal of his sexual orientation. Though not knowledgeable on the subject, the principal appeared to be open and supportive. It was mutually agreed to tell nobody. Early the next morning, Ken was confronted by the superintendent. He presented an ultimatum, "either sign a request for medical leave or face public disclosure and firing...". Ken took the medical leave and was given 30 days termination pay.*

*Ken, successfully teaching with another institution, is careful to make sure he does not come into contact with anyone from that school system. He feels his career and opportunities for advancement could be placed in jeopardy.* file (B1323)

The following is the last employment related case in private industry that we will summarise. There are others in the appendix. It demonstrates that prejudice can exist in all of us.

*Larry is a male secretary. He is good at his job and has experienced no major difficulties in the work place.*

*He took a temporary position with the local office of a major international energy company. The work went well and he was complemented by his supervisor. After several months, the job was made permanent and went to competition. Larry applied but was unsuccessful. He was, though, offered another temporary posting.*

*When similar things happened with respect to another two positions, he questioned his supervisor to find out what his shortcomings were. She advised him, there were none. His performance was excellent and he was selected for two out of the three positions. These selections had been overruled by a senior official, who said "no" to a male being in a reception position.* file (B0119)

Technically, he was discriminated against based on gender. However, how can we know what role perceived sexual orientation may have also played in the manager's decision?

The reader has already seen many examples of discrimination which is acceptable practice in our business community. Gay and lesbian Albertans have been refused access to suitable employment simply because of their orientation. They have been passed over in the selection process in spite of their qualifications, commitment and performance. They have been fired by homophobic individuals.

The decisions of such individuals can deny all people the right to pursue their careers and to fully contribute to the growth of this Province. If such decisions were based on skin colour, we would know what to call it.

**GOVERNMENT OF ALBERTA  
(Employment and Services)**

The Government of Alberta, in the interpretation of regulation and in law, discriminates against citizens of this Province, based upon their sexual orientation. Due to its size as an employer and the myriad of programs it delivers, it disenfranchises certain individuals and identifiable minorities as a matter of administrative policy. Twenty-seven percent (27%) of all complaints received by the study dealt with the actions of the Provincial Government, its Crown Agencies and Corporations.

Employees of Alberta's Civil Service are required, as a condition of employment, to participate in several plans that are an integral part of the employers benefit package. Employers contribution often match that of the individual. However, when gay and lesbian employees apply for certain benefits, they are denied the access and levels of support and security that is enjoyed by others. We will cite just one example.

The Government of Alberta, through its Public Service and Management Pension Plans, provides for death benefits for the surviving spouse. These are funded by both the required contributions of the employee and employer. Unfortunately, when the surviving same sex spouse applies for benefits, the benefits disappear. Our government refuses coverage, pockets its corresponding contribution and offers to return only the employees contribution to the estate. These are the same contributions that the employer has had the benefit of, often for decades.

*Kim is a long term employee of good standing with a major Crown Corporation. She approached her employer to explore what spousal benefits existed for her life partner. The benefits clerk refused to take her application and would not even provide her with the proper form. She was denied the opportunity to appeal and was laughed out of the clerk's office.*

file (A0901)

These people were denied benefits because they are not been seen to be a family. However, there are examples of the opposite. Program administrators are willing to recognise a gay family for the purpose of denying access to public programs.

The following story documents such a case. It clearly demonstrates hypocrisy with our Government in the administration of public programs. While this case deals primarily with the issue of Services, we have included it here as it clearly demonstrates the inconsistency in the application of Government's definition of family.

*Elliot was on unemployment insurance following a series of low grade, temporary jobs. He decided to take control of his future by seeking educational upgrading.*

*He applied for assistance under the Alberta Vocational Training Program. This is designed to provide limited financial support for living costs and tuition. Its intent is to assist needy individuals in developing stable, self supporting careers. It is limited to those who can demonstrate a need for financial assistance. Elliot had no assets or job.*

*In light of this, the response from the Government of Alberta is fascinating. The applicant is denied admittance to the program because "...it appears that Elliot is not eligible for the program...[his] family income is too high for program guidelines..."*

*The young man and his same sex partner publicly had previously exchanged vows of life-long love and fidelity in the presence of their family, friends and colleagues. The ceremony took place at the local college where his spouse was a respected member of the faculty.*

file (A1605B)

In the first story, the government refused to recognise same sex couples and denied them access to spousal benefits, even those to which they must contribute as a condition of employment. In the second case, there was adequate income in the applicant's family, as family was defined by the Government in its own correspondence, to support the applicant's educational goals.

If sexual orientation were to be included in the Individual's Rights Protection Act, the second case would have been a perfectly defensible administrative decision and this study would give its full support. However, in the first case, the couple were not recognized as a family and were denied services. In the second case, the couple were recognized as a family and refused services.

What is evident is the inconsistent application of the definition of family. In each case a decision was made that denied individuals access to government programs. It is apparent that the definition of family is open to interpretation if it is for the purpose of denying services to gay and lesbian Albertans.

## **SPOUSAL BENEFITS**

The failure to recognize same gender spousal relationships and the resulting denial of access to benefits is an endemic fact of life in Alberta. This is both amazing and infuriating in light of the "married status" recognition that is granted to all common law relationships. The only difference between the two is the gender of the partners. Generally, administrative policies require the partner be of the opposite sex.

The denial, in Alberta, of both recognition and benefits to loving couples is indefensible, if one believes "there is no place for the State in the bedrooms of the Nation." The loving relationships of all adult citizens promotes stability, continuity and, in many cases, the nurturing of our next generation. It also contributes to stability, independence and mutual support for all age groups.

The study is aware of instances where the Government of Alberta has displayed a far more compassionate view of loving couples. A decade ago, a Provincial Crown Corporation revised its definition of common law to remove any reference to the gender of the spouse. This was done by the Executive of the Corporation, with the approval of its Board and the Minister of the day. Several letters, under the signature of that Minister and his successor, are on file with the Provincial Ombudsman confirming this approach.

This resulted in \$1,000,000,000 worth of provincially funded housing loans being provided to low or modest income families under guidelines that were deliberately blind to the gender of the spouse. The only requirement was financial need.

The authors of this report believe that all loving relationships must receive the same level of support. These same couples must also assume identical levels of responsibility within our state and society. To expect otherwise is hypocrisy.

Unfortunately, this is not the case. We deny individuals access to programs perceived as being universal. Spousal benefits are withheld from program contributors even though their financial contributions are required as a condition of employment.

The following is an example of one such case. Sometimes it is simply the result of an individual's homophobia.

*Steven is an employee of the Alberta office of a major international corporation. The head office in the United States proudly offers equal access to benefits and programs for all employees and is active in gay issues. It provides full spousal benefits for same sex couples.*

*After working with the company for a number of years, Steven established and maintained a permanent relationship with another man. In time, he applied for*



*spousal benefits with no expectation of difficulty. His application was refused. It was explained that the Canadian insurer would not provide coverage to same sex couples.*

*A few months later his company changed carriers. The new insurer advised him that coverage was available under their policy, no matter what the gender of the applicant or spouse. He resubmitted his application.*

*To his amazement, his employer rejected the request. He questioned the decision in light of the information provided by the insurer. He was advised that senior management blocked the application without forwarding it to the carrier. He was advised that further requests would stand in the way of future promotions. He decided to appeal to Head Office in the USA.*

*When the Alberta office learned of this, management advised him that such actions would not be tolerated. If he persisted, it would end his career with the company. He remains there today, without coverage for his spouse.* file (B0620)

In this case the company has a clear policy on the issue. Their insurer was fully prepared to provide coverage. The road block was a homophobic manager who used his authority and the absence of protective legislation to deny an employee access to benefits that were available and fully supported by this company's head office. Surely this demonstrates the clear need for protective legislation in this Province.

We received similar complaints from employees of the Provincial Government and its Crown Corporations. In all cases they were required, as a condition of employment, to participate in the Government's Employee Benefit Plan. In spite of this, some employees are denied access to some benefits. They are still, however, required to make regular contributions.

*Stan works in the financial services area of a provincial Crown Corporation. He applied for spousal benefits for his common law spouse and was denied. The couple have been together for less than the required 2 years. He plans on reapplying shortly.* file (2010)

In total, the study received six complaints dealing with the denial of spousal benefits. They are split between the Government of Alberta and its agencies, and the private sector. In all cases, contributions and participation are mandatory.

The cases are all quite similar. Common law relationships receive coverage, automatically. When identical couples, who are composed of loving same sex partners, apply and are fully prepared to meet the same requirements of demonstrated length of commitment and community disclosure, they are denied coverage.

We do, however, wish to share with you one more story. Not all our findings were negative and prejudicial. There are occasions that give us all hope.

*Karl's company's insurance benefits cover "common law" spouses. He applied to the benefits officer to obtain coverage for his same sex spouse. The officer said "just send her in." When advised that the spouse was a "he", the officer said she "didn't know about that" and would check.*

*The insurance carrier said no. The administrator, supportive of the situation, told the insurer that perhaps they would find a new group benefits carrier. Suddenly, the insurer amended their policy to cover same-sex couples!* file (D0532)

This file shows how an individual can indeed influence spousal benefits coverage and end discrimination based on ones sexual orientation, if the employer is willing to recognize and support the relationships of their employees. In this case, no action would be required by Alberta's Human Rights Commission save possibly issuing an appropriate commendation.

## STATISTICS

The following is a statistical report and analysis of the number, type and nature of the complaints received during the first phase of the study. The Alberta Human Rights Commission received 65 calls pertaining to this study. This led to the opening of files where complaints were applicable. The breakdown of calls follows.

Total Calls to Study:	65
Total Files Opened:	33

### Complaints Received, by Category

Category	Stale Dated	Current	Total <sup>4</sup>	% of Total
Employment	6	6	12	28%
Services	4	3	7	16%
Spousal Benefits	0	6	6	14%
Harassment	3	3	6	14%
Notices	1	1	2	5%
Membership	0	1	1	2%
Physical Assault <sup>1</sup>	2	1	3	7%
Physical Disability <sup>2</sup>	1	1	2	5%
Self-Discrimination <sup>3</sup>	2	2	4	9%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100%</b>

<sup>1</sup> This issue is not part of the IRPA. It is covered by the criminal code of Canada.

<sup>2</sup> This issue is covered by the IRPA. However, in the case of AIDS many individuals are unaware the protection is available.

<sup>3</sup> This issue would not be covered by a change to the IRPA. It is an ongoing reality when there is no protection in law.

<sup>4</sup> Some files contain complaints relative to more than one Ground.

### Files, evaluated by Respondent

Private Industry/Retail	10	30%
Government of Alberta	9	27%
Individuals	7	21%
Non Profit Organizations	5	15%
Municipal Governments	1	3%
School Boards	1	3%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>

Several calls were received which did not pertain directly to sexual orientation. They would have gone unreported had the study not been under way. Of these, one complaint is current and has been referred to the local office of The Alberta Human Rights Commission.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

That, in accordance with the recommendation of the Alberta Human Rights Commission, the Government of this Province take immediate steps to include sexual orientation as a Protected Ground under the Individual's Rights Protection Act of this Province.

That the Alberta Human Rights Commission continue to support its decision of January 9, 1992 with an ongoing process of receiving, recording and documenting cases of discrimination based upon sexual orientation and that this be continued until the Individual's Rights Protection Act is applied uniformly to all citizens of this Province.

That a permanent Community Advisory Committee be established to assist the Alberta Human Rights Commission in responding to generations of disenfranchised Albertans.

That an internal Ministerial Committee be established to investigate bias and the resulting discrimination that currently exists in our Government based upon sexual orientation and within our current regulations and administration of public programs.

That the Alberta Human Rights Commission launch an educational program aimed at eliminating discrimination against citizens of this Province based upon any grounds, including sexual orientation.

## EPILOGUE

We believe it is not possible to remain neutral about the issue of discrimination. Either we accept that all citizens must enjoy the same basic rights and responsibilities or we hold that the State, and specific interest groups, can define citizens as inferior, not worthy of protection on our streets, in their homes, at work or even in the choice of someone to love. The repercussions of the latter holds frightening possibilities for all of us.

Martin Niemueller was a protestant minister in prewar Germany. As the Nazis began to impose their policies of racial purity, he became more and more concerned about the impact. In time, he became one of the few who spoke out against the denial of basic human rights to Catholics, Jews, trade unionists, gays, the mentally handicapped and other targeted minorities.

On March 1, 1938 he was arrested by the Gestapo and interned in Dachau, one of the infamous death camps. Fortunately, he survived. He went on to become a noted exponent of Human Rights and to serve as President of the World Council of Churches.

In later years he was asked, how did this happen? He responded;

*"in Germany they came first for the communists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a communist,*

*then they came for the jews, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a jew,*

*then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a trade unionist,*

*then they came for the Catholics, and I didn't speak up because I was a Protestant,*

*then they came for me, and by that time no one was left to speak up."*

The question today is, "Are we prepared to speak up or do we find it more prudent to say nothing?" We are not the first people to be confronted by that choice.

# APPENDIX I

## THE PEOPLE STORIES

The following are case summaries prepared from the study's files. They demonstrate the fear and discrimination that threatens all Albertans as a direct result of the failure of Individual's Rights Protection Act (IRPA) to provide protection based on ones sexual orientation.

All the names are fictitious in order to insure protection for those who registered their experiences with the study volunteers. We commend their courage. No information that could reveal their identity will ever be released. The volunteers have been honoured by their trust and candour. They made the study possible.

**FILE #;** identifies the month, date and order in which the complaints were received. In keeping with the Commissions commitment, reports regarding discrimination based upon sexual orientation that were stale dated or beyond the proposed mandate of the IRPA are also included in the report.

**INCIDENT DATE;** identifies the date of the events leading to the complaint.

**RESPONDENT;** the subject of the complaint. As they have not had an opportunity to review or comment on the reported events, the actual name of the individual, company or government department have not been used.

**IRPA CATEGORY;** indicates the type of complain, as defined in the Individual Rights Protection Act, should discrimination based upon sexual orientation ever become a protected ground. [Note; these are the judgments of the volunteers and have not been reviewed or sanctioned by the Commission or its staff.]

[ ]; These are observations, comments or explanatory notes prepared by the study's volunteers. They do not necessarily represent the opinions or judgements of the Alberta Human Rights Commission.

<b>FILE #</b>	<b>INCIDENT DATE</b>	<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>IRPA CATEGORY</b>
<b>A0901:</b>	<b>March, 1992</b>	<b>Publicly Owned Phone Company</b>	<b>Employment, Services, spousal</b>
[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 15.]			
<b>A1102:</b>	<b>February, 1992</b>	<b>Educational Institution</b>	<b>Public Notices</b>
[The caller declined to file a formal complain as redress was being perused through other avenues.]			
<b>A1303:</b>	<b>1989</b>	<b>Gov of Alberta</b>	<b>Physical Disability (Covered in IRPA)</b>
[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 9.]			
<b>A1604:</b>	<b>March, 1992</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Harassment</b>
[The caller was a friend of the victim of discrimination. We asked that the victim be encouraged call back with details. None was received.]			
<b>A1605A:</b>	<b>1987</b>	<b>Gov of Alberta</b>	<b>Employment</b>
[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 7.]			
<b>A1605B:</b>	<b>1987</b>	<b>Gov of Alberta</b>	<b>Services</b>
[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 15.]			
<b>A1806A:</b>	<b>Fall, 1991</b>	<b>Private Citizen</b>	<b>Assault (Not in the IRPA)</b>
[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 6.]			
<b>A1806B:</b>	<b>Fall, 1989</b>	<b>Public Restaurant</b>	<b>Services Harassment</b>
[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 10.]			
<b>A1806C:</b>	<b>Fall, 1991</b>	<b>Private Individuals</b>	<b>Harassment</b>
Connie was walking on the street in an area with several gay/lesbian bars. A string of epithets and derogatory statements were shouted from a passing car, full of teenaged boys.			

<b>FILE #</b>	<b>INCIDENT DATE</b>	<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>IRPA CATEGORY</b>
---------------	----------------------	-------------------	----------------------

<b>A1807:</b>	<b>March, 1990</b>	<b>Private Company</b>	<b>Employment Harassment</b>
---------------	--------------------	------------------------	----------------------------------

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 13.]

**A\*\*08:**

[There is no file #8. This was a numbering error by volunteers.]

<b>A2009:</b>	<b>January, 1991</b>	<b>Protestant Church</b>	<b>Self Discrimination</b>
---------------	----------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 8.]

<b>A2010:</b>	<b>Spring, 1992</b>	<b>Crown Corporation Gov of Alberta</b>	<b>Employment, Services, spousal</b>
---------------	---------------------	---	--

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 17.]

<b>A2011:</b>	<b>March, 1992</b>	<b>Gov of Canada Gov of Alberta</b>	<b>Services</b>
---------------	--------------------	---	-----------------

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 11.]

<b>A2012:</b>	<b>July, 1991</b>	<b>Private Citizen</b>	<b>Assault (Not in the IRPA)</b>
---------------	-------------------	------------------------	--------------------------------------

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 6.]

<b>A2313:</b>	<b>March, 1992</b>	<b>Major City</b>	<b>Derogatory Notices Self Discrimination</b>
---------------	--------------------	-------------------	---

Sam works for one of Alberta's larger cities. His desk is close by the office duplicating machine. A joke letter referring to "queers" is copied, discussed and circulated by a number of staff. This included his supervisor.

In spite of the city's positive stand on sexual orientation, Sam is unwilling to make his objections known. He is concerned that the supervisor could restrict his opportunities for advancement.



<b>FILE #</b>	<b>INCIDENT DATE</b>	<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>IRPA CATEGORY</b>
---------------	----------------------	-------------------	----------------------

<b>A2314:</b>	<b>Spring, 1992</b>	<b>Public Company</b>	<b>Employment, Services, spousal</b>
---------------	---------------------	-----------------------	--

Angela works for an international financial services company and applied for spousal benefits. She was rejected. The company claims to be working on the issue, but nothing has come of it yet.

<b>A2715:</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>Medical Practitioners</b>	<b>Services</b>
---------------	-------------	------------------------------	-----------------

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 11.]

<b>A2716:</b>	<b>Historic</b>	<b>Husband</b>	<b>Self Discrimination Intimidation (Not in the IRPA)</b>
---------------	-----------------	----------------	---

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 8.]

<b>A2717:</b>	<b>Spring, 1991</b>	<b>Private Citizens</b>	<b>Harassment</b>
---------------	---------------------	-------------------------	-------------------

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 12.]

<b>A3018:</b>	<b>November, 1991</b>	<b>Public Restaurant</b>	<b>Services</b>
---------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-----------------

Ted arrived at a restaurant reputed to be run by and catering to members of the gay and lesbian community. His purpose was to display a poster announcing a benefit bingo in support of a shelter for AIDS victims. He was greeted at the door by the maitre d'. "I hope you're not here to eat." He was refused admission. Upon returning home, a call was received from the restaurant owner. He explaining that they had problems with a similarly dressed group from another city. We are discouraging "that type of clientele".

[Ted's apparent offence was wearing what he described as clean and neat leather pants, a black t-shirt and arm band. He would appear to have been discriminated against as a result of a blanket banning of a specific clothing style, one that is sometimes associated with a subgroup of the gay/lesbian community.]

<b>B0119:</b>	<b>1987</b>	<b>Public Company</b>	<b>Employment</b>
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	-------------------

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 14.]

<b>B0620:</b>	<b>1990 to present</b>	<b>Public Company</b>	<b>Employment, Services, spousal</b>
---------------	------------------------	-----------------------	--

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 16.]

<b>FILE #</b>	<b>INCIDENT DATE</b>	<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>IRPA CATEGORY</b>
---------------	----------------------	-------------------	----------------------

<b>B0621:</b>	<b>March, 1992</b>	<b>Public Business</b>	<b>Services Harassment</b>
---------------	--------------------	------------------------	--------------------------------

Carl has been a member of a karate dojo for over 2 years. He has advised a number of the members that he is gay. Recently, the instructor/owner advised him that he would have to leave the group. Supposedly others were refusing to come. He couldn't afford this loss in business. The instructor said that being gay was in conflict with his perception of life and he would not give him a promotion to black belt.

<b>B0822:</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>Private Club</b>	<b>Employment</b>
---------------	-------------	---------------------	-------------------

Dennis was hired to tend bar and received a raise within a few days of starting work. His supervisor complimented him on his work and stated there would be lots of work for him in January.

He met the manager at Christmas. Shortly after, his supervisor advised him that she had been wrong. There would not be additional work. A waitress told him that he was being fired "...because you are gay...". He confronted the supervisor who confirmed this was so. However she told him "If you tell anyone, I'll deny everything".

[He was let go based upon a perception that he might be gay. There was no action on his part, or on the part of management to establish this fact. Obviously, he was a victim of homophobia.]

<b>B1323:</b>	<b>1987</b>	<b>School Board</b>	<b>Employment</b>
---------------	-------------	---------------------	-------------------

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 14.]

<b>B2224:</b>	<b>Spring, 1991</b>	<b>Gov of Alberta</b>	<b>Employment Notices</b>
---------------	---------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 12.]

<b>B2225:</b>	<b>February, 1992</b>	<b>Insurance Company</b>	<b>Employment, Services, spousal</b>
---------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	--

Denise has been employed by a financial services company as a sales representative for more than 4 years. She applied this year for spousal benefits for her long-term partner, of 4.5 years, and was rejected. "A common-law relationship shall be defined as...two people of the opposite sex."

<b>FILE #</b>	<b>INCIDENT DATE</b>	<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>IRPA CATEGORY</b>
---------------	----------------------	-------------------	----------------------

<b>B2226:</b>	<b>April, 1992</b>	<b>Construction Co</b>	<b>Employment Physical Disability (Covered in IRPA)</b>
---------------	--------------------	------------------------	---

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 10.]

<b>C0127:</b>	<b>This school year</b>	<b>Private Citizens</b>	<b>Harassment Self Discrimination</b>
---------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 7.]

<b>C2728:</b>	<b>June, 1992</b>	<b>Real Estate Co</b>	<b>Services</b>
---------------	-------------------	-----------------------	-----------------

Wendy and Mary are a lesbian couple of long standing, both respected and successful in their respective careers. They co-purchased a home in an fashionable subdivision in one of our major cities. One inducement to purchase was a membership and the prepayment of two years of fees in an exclusive golf & country club. When informed of their relationship, the real estate company assured them that it would be no problem.

Normally couples, both married and common law, are granted a primary and an associate membership. Following a lengthy discussion, the club agreed to provide a primary membership, but refused to recognize the partner. Finally they were told that one of them could sign in as a "guest" if they agreed to pay normal visitors fees. The other option would be for them to buy a second membership for \$24,000.00, regardless of what they had been told by the real estate company. The couple found this unacceptable. They are investigating a possible breach of contract suit.

<b>D0229:</b>	<b>June, 1992</b>	<b>University Org</b>	<b>Harassment</b>
---------------	-------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Kieran, a student on a major university campus, reported an attack by unknown individuals on a gay student on the campus. The student sought the assistance of the Students' Union but none was available. [As the victim would not come forward, the study did not open a file.]

[This file has a second component. Its summary is located in the body of the report; Page 13.]

<b>D0530:</b>	<b>March, 1992</b>	<b>Private Citizens</b>	<b>Assault, (Not in the IRPA)</b>
---------------	--------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------------------

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 6.]

<b>FILE #</b>	<b>INCIDENT DATE</b>	<b>RESPONDENT</b>	<b>IRPA CATEGORY</b>
---------------	----------------------	-------------------	----------------------

---

<b>D0531:</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>Gov of Canada</b>	<b>Immigration (Not in the IRPA)</b>
---------------	-------------	----------------------	--

Karl had an ongoing relationship with a British citizen, travelling extensively back and forth, between 1987 and 1990. When he applied to sponsor his partner to enter Canada as a citizen, his application was denied. As a result the relationship has not survived the enforced separation.

[The inclusion of sexual orientation in Alberta's IRPA would not address this situation.]

<b>D0532:</b>	<b>June, 1992</b>	<b>Insurance Co</b>	<b>Services, spousal</b>
---------------	-------------------	---------------------	--------------------------

[This file summary is located in the body of the report; Page 17.]