

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

BETWEEN:

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF WATERLOO

Appellant

-and-

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR ONTARIO

Appellant
(Intervener)

-and-

**JOSEPHINA DUGAS, TERRA-LYNN WEBER, AVERY AMENT, AARON PRICE,
JEREMY LINTON, JEREMY NICHOL, JAMES HAMMOND, JAKOB STUBBS, JAMES
DAVIS, JASON PAUL, NOAH HELSBY, JOSEPH BRADLEY, JOSEPH SADLER, JULIE
YOUNG, KYLE YORK, MEGAN LOPES, STEPHANIE MCMILLAN, JEFFREY COUTO,
JORDAN CAMM, TERRANCE COLE, XANDER HARKER, CHARLES KOCHER, ALINE
JEFFERY, MICHAEL JEFFERY, AND PERSONS UNKNOWN**

Respondents

**FACTUM OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENER
ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
ON MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE**

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
180 Dundas Street West, 9th Floor
Toronto, ON M7A 2G5

Reema Khawja (LSO #40895M)
Tel: (416) 567-1304
Email: reema.khawja@ohrc.on.ca

Nika Farahani (LSO #73491H)
Tel: (437) 775-5991
Email: nika.farahani@ohrc.on.ca

**Counsel for the Proposed Intervener,
Ontario Human Rights Commission**

TO THIS HONOURABLE COURT

AND TO: PALIARE ROLAND ROSENBERG ROTHSTEIN LLP
155 Wellington St. West, 35th Floor
Toronto, ON M5V 3H1

Gordon Capern (LSO #32169H)
Tel: (416) 646-4311
Email: gordon.capern@paliareroland.com

Andrew Lokan (LSO #31629Q)
Tel: (416) 646-4324
Email: andrew.lokan@paliareroland.com

Kartiga Thavaraj (LSO #75291D)
Tel: (416) 646-6317
Email: kartiga.thavaraj@paliareroland.com

Greta Hoaken (LSO #87903I)
Tel: (416) 646-6357
Email: greta.hoaken@paliareroland.com

Counsel for the Appellant, The Regional Municipality of Waterloo

AND TO: THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO
Civil Law Division
Constitutional Law Branch
720 Bay Street, 4th Floor
Toronto, ON M7A 2S9

S. Zachary Green (LSO #48066K)
Tel: (416) 922-2327
Email: zachary.green@ontario.ca

Andrea Bolieiro (LSO #60034I)
Tel: (437) 551-6263
Email: andrea.bolieiro@ontario.ca

Sara Badawi (LSO #87480W)
Tel: (647) 825-2156
Email: sara.badawi@ontario.ca

Counsel for the Appellant/Intervener, The Attorney General of Ontario

AND TO: WATERLOO REGION COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICES

450 Frederick Street, Unit 101
Kitchener, ON N2H 2P5

Ashley Schuitema (LSO #68257G)

Tel: (519) 743-0254 x. 17

Email: ashley.schuitema@wrcls.clcj.ca

Joanna Mullen (LSO #64535V)

Tel: 519-743-0254 x. 15

Email: joanna.mullen@wrcls.clcj.ca

Shannon K. Down (LSO #43894D)

Email: shannonkdown@gmail.com

CLINIC RESOURCE OFFICE

Legal Aid Ontario

20 Dundas Street West, Suite 730

Toronto, ON M5G 2H1

Anna Rosenbluth (LSO #56921S)

Tel: (437) 225-4529

Email: rosenba@lao.on.ca

INCOME SECURITY ADVOCACY CENTRE

1500-55 University Avenue,

Toronto, ON M5J 2H7

Robin Nobleman (LSO #71014P)

Tel: 416-597-5820 x. 5142

Email: robin.nobleman@isac.clcj.ca

Adrian Merdzan (LSO #82809I)

Tel: 416-597-5820 x. 5152

Email: adrian.merdzan@isac.clcj.ca

Counsel for the Named Respondents

AND TO: Mercedes Perez (LSO #48381L)
Tel: (416) 320-1914
Email: mperez@pbplawyers.com

Karen A. Steward (LSO #58758O)
Tel: (416) 270-0929
Email: karenannesteward@yahoo.ca

SWADRON ASSOCIATES
15 Wellesley Street West, Suite 321
Toronto, ON M4Y 0G7

Jen Danch (LSO #74520I)
Tel: (416) 362-1234
Email: jdanch@swadron.com

***Amicus Curiae* for Persons Unknown, The Mental Health Legal Committee**

PART I - OVERVIEW

1. This appeal is being heard at a time when municipalities are grappling with how to address the growing reality of encampments and unsheltered homelessness in a constitutionally compliant manner. The outcome will impact the rights of many homeless and highly marginalized Ontarians and define the *Charter*¹ obligations of municipalities across the province.
2. This Honourable Court previously recognized the OHRC's expertise in "addressing equality rights in the areas of homelessness, sex, race and disability" and unique perspective on "the interpretation and application of ss. 7 and 15 of the *Charter* in the context of homelessness" by granting the OHRC leave to intervene in *Heegsma v Hamilton (City)*.² However, the Court ultimately declined to prescribe an analytical framework for cases involving *Charter* challenges to by-laws and municipal actions that affect unhoused people who shelter in municipal parks and on municipal lands.³
3. As this appeal presents an opportunity for this Honourable Court to do so, the Ontario Human Rights Commission (OHRC) once again seeks leave to intervene, including leave to file a factum and to make oral submissions.
4. Leave to intervene should be granted because the OHRC is an expert human rights body with a significant interest in the outcome of this appeal. The OHRC has a statutory mandate to promote the rights of all Ontarians, advance the interpretation of equality under the law and respond to emerging human rights issues in the province. The OHRC will be able to provide unique contributions to the issues in the appeal. Its perspective and arguments will assist this

¹ *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, Part I of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982 (UK)*, 1982, c 11 [*Charter*].

² *Heegsma v Hamilton (City)*, [2025 ONCA 904](#) at paras [22](#) and [25](#) [*Heegsma intervention decision*].

³ *Heegsma v Hamilton (City)*, [2026 ONCA 726](#) [*Heegsma*].

Honourable Court address a complex substantive equality claim which is recognized as a notoriously difficult area of the law.

5. The OHRC's intervention will not unduly delay or prejudice the main parties to the appeal. The OHRC will avoid duplicating the submissions of any parties or interveners.

PART II – FACTS

6. The OHRC is a statutory human rights body established under the Ontario *Human Rights Code* (*Code*) with a broad mandate to promote and advance human rights and prevent discrimination in Ontario.⁴

7. The OHRC discharges its statutory obligations by developing policies, initiating reviews and public inquiries, and engaging in strategic litigation.⁵

8. The Superior Court of Justice, this Honourable Court and the Supreme Court of Canada have repeatedly granted the OHRC leave to intervene in matters involving *Code* and *Charter* rights.⁶ This includes discrimination claims related to poverty and homelessness and the rights of women, Indigenous and racialized persons and persons with disabilities. The OHRC has also been granted leave to intervene to make arguments about the relationship between equality and rights and freedoms under sections 2 and 7 of the *Charter*.⁷

9. This appeal is about the rights of the poorest and most marginalized Ontarians who are members of groups protected under the *Code*. It engages the values of human dignity and equality, matters squarely within the expertise of the OHRC. The appeal raises important legal issues including the proper approach to applying substantive equality principles in a complex *Charter* claim where homelessness intersects with gender, disability and race/Indigeneity.

⁴ *Human Rights Code*, RSO 1990, c H19, s 29 [*Code*].

⁵ *Ibid*, ss 29–31, 37; Motion Record of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, Affidavit of Patricia DeGuire, sworn October 20, 2026 at para 4 [*DeGuire Affidavit*].

⁶ DeGuire Affidavit, *ibid* at paras 7–15.

⁷ *Ibid*.

10. For decades, the OHRC has identified poverty, housing, mental health and addictions and Indigenous reconciliation as pressing human rights issues in Ontario. Health and well-being, including access to housing, is a priority area in the OHRC's current 2023-2025 Strategic Plan (extended to 2028) *Human Rights First: A plan for belonging in Ontario*.⁸

11. In managing municipal parks and enforcing by-laws, municipalities are providing a service to the public. This public includes persons who live in encampments.⁹ The *Code* prohibits discrimination in services. Therefore, the issue of homeless encampments falls squarely within the OHRC's public interest mandate. Due to the overlap between discrimination under the *Code* and *Charter*, the OHRC has an interest in the equality analysis under section 15.

12. The OHRC has developed a Human Rights-Based Approach framework to help municipal governments apply a human rights approach to support municipal by-laws, policy, program and service system planning and implementation in a way that mitigates discrimination and disproportionate adverse impacts on marginalized Ontarians. The OHRC has also approved various policies and guides on human rights and housing which address municipalities' responsibility to ensure that their actions do not create or exacerbate disadvantage based on one or more prohibited grounds.¹⁰

13. The OHRC has engaged in advocacy concerning the clearing of encampments. As Ontario's statutory body responsible for examining laws and making recommendations on any laws that are inconsistent with the intent of the *Code*,¹¹ the OHRC has been monitoring Ontario municipalities' response to the crisis of unsheltered homelessness. The OHRC has publicly called on municipalities to adopt a human rights-based approach to encampments.¹²

⁸ *Ibid* at para 23.

⁹ *The Corporation of the City of Kingston v Doe*, [2023 ONSC 6662](#) at para [139](#) [*Kingston*].

¹⁰ DeGuire Affidavit, *supra* note 5 at paras 17, 24.

¹¹ *Code*, *supra* note 4, s [29\(d\)](#).

¹² DeGuire Affidavit, *supra* note 5 at para 27.

14. The interpretation of equality rights generally and in relation to encampments is a matter of significant concern for the OHRC. This Honourable Court’s decision will have broad implications for the OHRC’s work, including its current efforts to engage with municipalities to promote a human rights-based approach to addressing homelessness and encampments.

PART III – ARGUMENT

15. Rule 13.02 of the *Rules of Civil Procedure* permits an organization to seek leave to intervene as a friend of the court “for the purpose of rendering assistance to the court by way of argument.”¹³

16. In determining such motions, the court will generally consider “the nature of the case, the issues which arise and the likelihood of the applicant being able to make a useful contribution to the resolution of the appeal without causing injustice to the immediate parties.”¹⁴

17. As *Charter* cases may have a wide impact on the rights of non-parties, courts have recognized the importance of hearing from a broader number of groups. The test for granting leave to intervene is more relaxed and flexible¹⁵ and there is greater scope for intervention.¹⁶

18. Courts will grant leave to intervene where the moving party meets *at least one* of the following criteria:

- i. The intervener has a real, substantial and identifiable interest in the subject matter of the proceedings;
- ii. The intervener is a well-recognized group with a special expertise and with a broad identifiable membership base; or

¹³ *Rules of Civil Procedure*, RRO 1990, Reg 194, r [13.02](#).

¹⁴ *Peel (Regional Municipality) v Great Atlantic & Pacific Co. of Canada Ltd* (1990), [1990 CanLII 6886 \(ON CA\)](#), 74 O.R. (2d) 164, at p [167](#) [*Peel*]; *Reference re Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act*, [2019 ONCA 29](#) at para [8](#); and *Caruso v Law Society of Ontario*, [2025 ONCA 270](#) at para [6](#).

¹⁵ *Peel* *ibid*; *Animal Justice v Ontario (AG)*, [2024 ONCA 941](#) at para [12](#); *Christian Heritage Party of Canada v Hamilton (City)*, [2025 ONCA 700](#) at para [8](#).

¹⁶ *R v Robert*, [2016 ONCJ 697](#) at para [55](#).

iii. The intervener has an important perspective distinct from the immediate parties.¹⁷

19. The OHRC's intervention in this proceeding meets *all three* criteria.

i. The OHRC has a real, substantial and identifiable interest in the subject matter of this proceeding

20. As set out above, the OHRC has a history of advocating for the protection of the equality rights of people who experience poverty, homelessness and discrimination based on sex, race/Indigeneity and disability.¹⁸

21. This appeal raises issues of considerable public importance and directly engages the OHRC's public interest human rights mandate. This Honourable Court's decision will have a significant impact on the OHRC's work advancing the rights of marginalized people. It could affect future adjudication of discrimination claims in Ontario and the OHRC's efforts to promote a human rights-based approach to the issue of encampments.¹⁹

ii. The OHRC is a well-recognized body with special expertise

22. The OHRC has been given a statutory mandate under the quasi-constitutional *Code* to protect and promote human rights in the province. One of the ways the OHRC does this is through strategic litigation and intervention in cases that have the potential to shape discrimination law, will have broad systemic impact, relate to emerging discrimination issues or raise matters of significant public importance.

23. The OHRC has been at the forefront of the development of rights jurisprudence in Canada. Tribunals and all levels of court, including this Honourable Court and the Supreme Court of

¹⁷ *Ontario (AG) v Dieleman* (1993), [16 OR \(3d\) 32](#) (Gen Div); followed in *Bedford v Canada (AG)*, [2009 ONCA 669](#). See also *Halpern v Toronto (City of)* (2000), [2000 CanLII 29029 \(ON SCDC\)](#), 51 OR (3d) 742.

¹⁸ DeGuire Affidavit, *supra* note 5 at para 22.

¹⁹ *Ibid* at para 25.

Canada, have recognized the OHRC's special role and expertise by granting it leave to intervene in *Code* and *Charter* cases.²⁰

24. Most recently, this Honourable Court recognized the OHRC's statutory mandate and experience intervening "in cases of public importance addressing equality rights in the areas of homelessness, sex, race and disability".²¹

25. Recognizing that the OHRC is an authoritative voice on human rights, tribunals and courts, including the Supreme Court of Canada, have also cited the OHRC's research, policy work and reports in their decisions.²²

iii. The OHRC has an important perspective, distinct from the immediate parties

26. Courts have acknowledged that a well-recognized body with special expertise and a broadly identifiable membership base may be better able to provide a useful and distinct contribution.²³ A history of involvement in the specific issue also makes it easier to satisfy this criterion.²⁴ Intervention is especially helpful when the interests of some of the most vulnerable Ontarians are at stake.

27. Potential overlap in the positions of the proposed intervener and a party is not a ground to deny leave to intervene. It is still open to a proposed intervener, whose position "generally aligns" with that of a party, to show that it will make a useful contribution.²⁵

²⁰ *Ibid* at paras 6–16, 19–21.

²¹ *Ibid* at paras 11, 26; *Heegsma* intervention decision, *supra* note 2 at para [22](#).

²² DeGuire Affidavit, *supra* note 5 at paras 18–20.

²³ *Elementary Teachers' Federation et al v Her Majesty*, [2018 ONSC 6318](#) at para [11](#).

²⁴ *Reference re Workers' Compensation Act 1983* (Nfld), [\[1989\] 2 S.C.R. 335](#), 1989 CanLII 23 (SCC) at pp [340-341](#).

²⁵ *Choc v Hudbay Minerals Inc*, [2013 ONSC 998](#) at para [11](#); *Oakwell Engineering Ltd v Enernorth Industries Inc*, [2006 CanLII 60327 \(ONCA\)](#) at para [9](#); *Childs et al v Desormeaux et al* (2003), [2003 CanLII 47870 \(ONCA\)](#), 67 OR (3d) 385 at para [16](#); *Peel*, *supra* note 14; *PS v Ontario*, [2014 ONCA 160](#) at paras [11–13](#).

28. Courts have recognized that some overlap is to be expected in constitutional cases where the focus tends to be on legal argument rather than the resolution of factual issues.²⁶

The fact that the CCLA and the parties **will predictably cover some of the same topics or rely on the same authorities relevant to those topics, does not alone determine whether the proposed intervenor can offer a fresh perspective.** As was recently held in *Dorsey, Newton, and Salah v. Attorney General of Canada*, [2021 ONSC 2464](#), at para. [25](#), “Notwithstanding their reliance on the same evidence to support the same result, I accept the submission of the [proposed intervenor] that **the correct resolution of this set of test cases will be assisted by submissions that provide a broader understanding of the historical, legal, policy and practical contexts that surround [the challenged government action].**”²⁷ [Emphasis added.]

29. In addition to being able to provide a broader contextual framework, assisting the court in navigating the law in the specific area of its expertise falls within the proper role of an intervenor. This is even more so in areas where that law is undeveloped, in flux or where novel issues are raised.²⁸

30. Regarding *Charter* section 15 specifically, this Honourable Court has found that an intervenor who can assist it with a proper substantive equality analysis, including taking existing law and building on it and demonstrating how the equality analysis applies to a particular context, can offer something useful and distinct:

This appeal is likely to call upon the court to grapple with how to approach adverse-impact discrimination and substantive equality in the context of lower income individuals living with disabilities. I see the unique expertise of the ISAC, a well-recognized organization with specialized knowledge in this area of the law, being of assistance to this court in considering how the legal principles, as established by the Supreme Court of Canada in cases such as *R. v. Sharma* and *Fraser v. Canada (Attorney General)* should apply against this contextual backdrop.

This appeal will have potentially far-reaching implications, with the potential to impact people living with disabilities and income insecurity. I do not see the ISAC as simply asking this court to reaffirm or overturn existing law. Rather, their focus will be on how to approach adverse-impact discrimination and substantive equality. **This is a notoriously difficult area of law and one that has seen some recent fluctuation.**

²⁶ *Working Families Ontario v Ontario*, [2021 ONSC 3652](#) at para [7](#).

²⁷ *Ibid* at para [8](#).

²⁸ *Jacob v Canada (AG)*, [2024 ONCA 195](#) at para [11](#) [*Jacob*].

Assisting the court in navigating that law in the specific area of their expertise falls within the proper role of an intervener.²⁹ [Emphasis added, citations omitted.]

31. This is precisely what the OHRC’s intervention proposes to do.

32. In the *Heegsma* intervention decision, Justice Favreau found that the OHRC would make a useful contribution, writing “the OHRC can provide a unique perspective on issues on appeal, namely the interpretation and application of ss. 7 and 15 of the *Charter* in the context of homelessness.”³⁰

33. The OHRC proposes to bring that same expertise and unique perspective to the issues raised in this appeal, including the application of substantive equality principles to the characterization and assessment of the *Charter* claims.

iv. The nature of the case and the issues in this appeal favour the OHRC’s intervention

34. This appeal presents an opportunity for this Honourable Court to provide appellate guidance on the constitutional framework applicable to municipal restrictions on shelter in public spaces. In *Heegsma*, this Honourable Court recognized that there may be a need for such guidance but declined to prescribe a specific analytical framework in the absence of sound factual findings and a sufficiently developed analysis by the application judge.³¹

35. As in *Jacob v Canada (AG)*, this is a case with potentially far-reaching implications, in a notoriously difficult area of law that has seen some recent fluctuation, in the context of a challenging and rapidly evolving social issue.³² The OHRC is uniquely placed to assist this Honourable Court navigate the equality issues which fall within its area of expertise.

²⁹ *Ibid* at paras [10](#) and [11](#).

³⁰ *Heegsma* intervention decision, *supra* note 2 at para [25](#).

³¹ *Heegsma v Hamilton (City)*, *supra* note 3 at para [85](#).

³² *Jacob supra* note 28.

v. The OHRC’s arguments if permitted to intervene

36. If permitted to intervene, the OHRC’s proposed submissions will not simply restate, or ask the Court to reaffirm, the law.

37. The OHRC’s arguments will add “a focus” to the equality rights issues. The OHRC will “refine and supplement” arguments raised by the Respondents without merely repeating them. These types of contributions were recognized as meriting the intervention of Fair Vote Canada and The Women’s Legal Education and Action Fund in *Fair Voting BC v Canada (AG)*³³ and the Income Security Advocacy Clinic in *Jacob*.³⁴

38. If permitted to intervene, the OHRC will make submissions on the proper analytical framework for evaluating *Charter* rights of homeless people that ensures their rights are not evasive of *Charter* scrutiny. Specifically, the OHRC will address the risk of allowing pre-existing disadvantage to obscure the unconstitutional effects of government action, by arguing that:

- i. The impugned government conduct must be framed in a holistic and contextual manner;
- ii. Dependence on public space is not a claim for government assistance; and
- iii. The ongoing need for shelter does not amount to a claim for permanent occupation or change the effects-based analysis.

39. The OHRC will take no position on the outcome of the appeal.

40. In accordance with the directions of Justice Huscroft, dated July 23, 2026, the OHRC’s intervention motion includes a 10-page draft factum with its proposed arguments if permitted to intervene (subject to further refinement by counsel and coordination with other interveners to avoid duplicating submissions).

³³ *Fair Voting BC v Canada (AG)*, [2024 ONCA 619](#) at paras [19](#) and [20](#).

³⁴ *Jacob*, *supra* note 28 at para [11](#).

PART IV - ORDER SOUGHT

41. The OHRC seeks an order granting it leave to intervene in this appeal as a friend of the court, for the purpose of assisting the Court by way of written and oral argument. It seeks leave to file a 10-page factum and to make 15 minutes of oral argument at the hearing of this appeal. The OHRC does not seek to add to the record, will not seek costs, and asks that it not be exposed to a costs order.

**ALL WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS
21st DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026.**



Reema Khawja/Nika Farahani
Counsel, Ontario Human Rights Commission

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHENTICITY

I, Reema Khawja, counsel for the proposed intervener, the Ontario Human Rights Commission, certify that I am satisfied as to the authenticity of every authority cited in this factum, pursuant to Rule 4.06.1(2.1) of the *Rules of Civil Procedure*.

October 21, 2026



Reema Khawja
Counsel, Ontario Human Rights Commission

SCHEDULE “A” – CASES

Animal Justice v Ontario (AG), [2024 ONCA 941](#)

Bedford v Canada (AG), [2009 ONCA 669](#)

Caruso v Law Society of Ontario, [2025 ONCA 270](#)

Childs v Desormeaux (2003), 67 OR (3d) 385, [2003 CanLII 47870](#) (ON CA)

Choc v Hudbay Minerals Inc., [2013 ONSC 998](#)

Christian Heritage Party of Canada v Hamilton (City), [2025 ONCA 700](#)

Elementary Teachers’ Federation et al v Her Majesty, [2018 ONSC 6318](#)

Fair Voting BC v Canada (AG), [2024 ONCA 619](#)

Halpern v Toronto (City of) (2000), [2000 CanLII 29029 \(ON SCDC\)](#), 51 OR (3d) 742

Heegsma v Hamilton (City), [2024 ONSC 7154](#)

Heegsma v Hamilton (City), [2025 ONCA 588](#)

Heegsma v Hamilton (City), [2025 ONCA 904](#)

Heegsma v Hamilton (City), [2026 ONCA 726](#)

Jacob v Canada (AG), [2024 ONCA 195](#)

Oakwell Engineering Ltd v Enernorth Industries Inc., [2006 CanLII 60327](#) (ONCA)

Ontario (AG) v Dieleman (1993), [16 OR \(3d\) 32](#) (Gen Div)

Peel (Regional Municipality) v Great Atlantic & Pacific Co of Canada Ltd (1990), [1990 CanLII 6886 \(ON CA\)](#), 74 O.R. (2d) 164

PS v Ontario, [2014 ONCA 160](#)

R v Robert, [2016 ONCJ 697](#)

Reference re Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act, [2019 ONCA 29](#)

Reference re Workers’ Compensation Act 1983 (Nfld), [1989] 2 S.C.R. 335, [1989 CanLII 23 \(SCC\)](#)

The Corporation of the City of Kingston v Doe, [2023 ONSC 6662](#)

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo v Persons Unknown and to be Ascertained, [2023 ONSC 670](#)

The Regional Municipality of Waterloo v Persons Unknown and to be Ascertained, [2025 ONSC 4774](#)

Working Families Ontario v Ontario, [2021 ONSC 3652](#)

SCHEDULE “B” – LEGISLATION

Human Rights Code, RSO 1990, c H.19, s 29

PART III THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Functions of Commission

29 The functions of the Commission are to promote and advance respect for human rights in Ontario, to protect human rights in Ontario and, recognizing that it is in the public interest to do so and that it is the Commission’s duty to protect the public interest, to identify and promote the elimination of discriminatory practices and, more specifically,

- (a) to forward the policy that the dignity and worth of every person be recognized and that equal rights and opportunities be provided without discrimination that is contrary to law;
- (b) to develop and conduct programs of public information and education to,
 - (i) promote awareness and understanding of, respect for and compliance with this Act, and
 - (ii) prevent and eliminate discriminatory practices that infringe rights under Part I;
- (c) to undertake, direct and encourage research into discriminatory practices and to make recommendations designed to prevent and eliminate such discriminatory practices;
- (d) to examine and review any statute or regulation, and any program or policy made by or under a statute, and make recommendations on any provision, program or policy that in its opinion is inconsistent with the intent of this Act;
- (e) to initiate reviews and inquiries into incidents of tension or conflict, or conditions that lead or may lead to incidents of tension or conflict, in a community, institution, industry or sector of the economy, and to make recommendations, and encourage and co-ordinate plans, programs and activities, to reduce or prevent such incidents or sources of tension or conflict;
- (f) to promote, assist and encourage public, municipal or private agencies, organizations, groups or persons to engage in programs to alleviate tensions and conflicts based upon identification by a prohibited ground of discrimination;
- (g) to designate programs as special programs in accordance with section 14;
- (h) to approve policies under section 30;
- (i) to make applications to the Tribunal under section 35;
- (j) to report to the people of Ontario on the state of human rights in Ontario and on its affairs;

- (k) to perform the functions assigned to the Commission under this or any other Act. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Commission policies

30 The Commission may approve policies prepared and published by the Commission to provide guidance in the application of Parts I and II. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Inquiries

31 (1) The Commission may conduct an inquiry under this section for the purpose of carrying out its functions under this Act if the Commission believes it is in the public interest to do so. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Conduct of inquiry

(2) An inquiry may be conducted under this section by any person who is appointed by the Commission to carry out inquiries under this section. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Production of certificate

(3) A person conducting an inquiry under this section shall produce proof of their appointment upon request. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Entry

(4) A person conducting an inquiry under this section may, without warrant, enter any lands or any building, structure or premises where the person has reason to believe there may be documents, things or information relevant to the inquiry. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Time of entry

(5) The power to enter a place under subsection (4) may be exercised only during the place's regular business hours or, if it does not have regular business hours, during daylight hours. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Dwellings

(6) A person conducting an inquiry under this section shall not enter into a place or part of a place that is a dwelling without the consent of the occupant. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Powers on inquiry

(7) A person conducting an inquiry may,

- (a) request the production for inspection and examination of documents or things that are or may be relevant to the inquiry;
- (b) upon giving a receipt for it, remove from a place documents produced in response to a request under clause (a) for the purpose of making copies or extracts;
- (c) question a person on matters that are or may be relevant to the inquiry, subject to the person's right to have counsel or a personal representative present during such questioning and exclude from the questioning any person who may be adverse in interest to the inquiry;
- (d) use any data storage, processing or retrieval device or system used in carrying on business in the place in order to produce a document in readable form;
- (e) take measurements or record by any means the physical dimensions of a place;
- (f) take photographs, video recordings or other visual or audio recordings of the interior or exterior of a place; and
- (g) require that a place or part thereof not be disturbed for a reasonable period of time for the purposes of carrying out an examination, inquiry or test. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Written demand

- (8) A demand that a document or thing be produced must be in writing and must include a statement of the nature of the document or thing required. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Assistance

- (9) A person conducting an inquiry may be accompanied by any person who has special, expert or professional knowledge and who may be of assistance in carrying out the inquiry. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Use of force prohibited

- (10) A person conducting an inquiry shall not use force to enter and search premises under this section. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Obligation to produce and assist

- (11) A person who is requested to produce a document or thing under clause (7) (a) shall produce it and shall, on request by the person conducting the inquiry, provide any assistance that is reasonably necessary, including assistance in using any data storage, processing or retrieval device or system, to produce a document in readable form. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Return of removed things

(12) A person conducting an inquiry who removes any document or thing from a place under clause (7) (b) shall,

(a) make it available to the person from whom it was removed, on request, at a time and place convenient for both that person and the person conducting the inquiry; and

(b) return it to the person from whom it was removed within a reasonable time. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Admissibility of copies

(13) A copy of a document certified by a person conducting an inquiry to be a true copy of the original is admissible in evidence to the same extent as the original and has the same evidentiary value. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Obstruction

(14) No person shall obstruct or interfere with a person conducting an inquiry under this section. 2006, c. 30, s. 4.

Intervention by Commission

37 (1) The Commission may intervene in an application under section 34 on such terms as the Tribunal may determine having regard to the role and mandate of the Commission under this Act. 2006, c. 30, s. 5.

Intervention as a party

(2) The Commission may intervene as a party to an application under section 34 if the person or organization who made the application consents to the intervention as a party. 2006, c. 30, s. 5.

Rules of Civil Procedure, RRO 1990, Reg 194, r 13.02

LEAVE TO INTERVENE AS FRIEND OF THE COURT

13.02 Any person may, with leave of a judge or at the invitation of the presiding judge or master, and without becoming a party to the proceeding, intervene as a friend of the court for the purpose of rendering assistance to the court by way of argument. R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 194, r. 13.02; O. Reg. 186/10, s. 1.

**THE REGIONAL
MUNICIPALITY OF
WATERLOO et al**

Appellants

-and-

**DUGAS et al,
PERSONS UNKNOWN/
TO BE ASCERTAINED**

Respondents

Court File Nos. COA-26-CV-0836 and COA-26-CV-0897

COURT OF APPEAL FOR ONTARIO

**FACTUM OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENER
ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
ON MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE**

Ontario Human Rights Commission

180 Dundas Street West, 9th Floor
Toronto, ON M7A 2G5

Reema Khawja, LSO #40895M

Tel: (416) 567-1304

Email: reema.khawja@ohrc.on.ca

Nika Farahani, LSO #73491H

Tel: (437) 775-5991

Email: nika.farahani@ohrc.on.ca

**Counsel for the Proposed Intervener
Ontario Human Rights Commission**