

February 2010  
Vol. 10, No. 1

**CANADIAN LEADERSHIP IN  
ETHICS PRACTICE: MOVING  
FORWARD**

Inside this Issue

- 2 Jim Gray on Regulation  
and Leadership in  
Business Ethics.
- 3 Ethical Investment  
Management – In the  
Eye of the Beholder?
- 4 Resilient Leadership
- 5 Challenge to the  
Members of EPAC
- Four Key Questions:  
Whither and Whether  
Forward
- 7 Organizational Ethics:  
the Need for Systemic  
Approach

Thank you to all of our contributors. Please continue to forward your letters and article submissions to: [editor@epac-apec.ca](mailto:editor@epac-apec.ca)

*The positions articulated by all individuals who publish in the EPAC Magazine are not meant to be representative of the official position of EPAC, nor are they meant to be advocacy on the part of EPAC in any way.*



# Magazine

## MESSAGE FROM THE EDITOR

By Inga Gusarova

Welcome to the new issue of EPAC magazine, "Canadian Leadership in Ethics Practice: Moving Forward". The world is full of uncertainty, with the recession, the dubious progress of climate change accord, and the implications of the terrorist attack on December 25th, all casting a shadow upon us. And the EPAC itself is at a crossroads, asking where it should go and how can it become more relevant.

It's in time like this that taking action and truly moving forward – in other words, showing leadership – becomes absolutely crucial. So we are presenting you with five articles, covering different angles of practical ethical leadership from people who know what they speak of – people with decades of experience in their respective fields:

- ✓ Thoughts on leadership and regulation of business (Jim Gray)
- ✓ Insight into the complexity of ethical investing (William MacLachlan)
- ✓ Resiliency of leadership in the non-profit sector (Donna Kennedy-Glans)
- ✓ Critical overview of EPAC's history and questions about its future (David Nitkin, EPAC's co-founder and the initial Chair).
- ✓ Vision for a systemic approach to organizational ethics and the role EPAC could play (Allan Pedden, current Chair).

We hope that you will find them interesting and useful in your own work. And of course, we want to hear from you: your views, responses, and ideas. After all, what is this magazine without you?

Thank you to our translator, Jean-François Pellecier

---

## Jim Gray on Regulation and Leadership in Business Ethics

---

*Jim Gray is a prominent businessman, who co-founded and managed a natural gas company, Canadian Hunter Exploration, for 28 years focusing on an employee-friendly work culture and encouraging environmental conservation. He serves on a number of corporate boards including Canadian National Railway, Hudson's Bay Company, and many others. Jim Gray also places his energies in community programs, focusing on education, the sciences, and social issues. He has been awarded with the YMCA Fellowship of Honour, a Honourary Doctor of Laws degree from the University of Calgary, a Citation for Citizenship from the Government of Canada in 1992, was appointed an Officer of the Order of Canada, and inducted into the Alberta Order of Excellence in 2002.*

Once I had a chance to participate in a debate on business ethics. The topic discussed was: "Which approach is more likely to result in ethical management of business: business leaders setting an ethical tone at the top and walking the talk, or extensive external regulations, independent monitoring and tough penalties?"

The word "debate" suggests that it's going to be one or the other. Either people will be in favour of regulation and putting down the clamps – after all, we simply have to have regulations due to human nature: imagine voluntary speed control on our highways. Or it can be a matter of leadership and values that we should follow.

I think rather it falls somewhere in the middle. I would like to think that people can build corporate value on their principles and align that with the interests of their shareholders.

In the company my partner and I started, ethical behaviour and principled behaviour was one of our core business objectives. We felt that it enabled us to attract and retain the very best people. And if we attract and retain the very best people, we will produce value for our shareholders in an ethical

and principled way. This has to be a founding value of a company.

As I watch various things blow up everywhere, I believe that the culture is an important ingredient. And this culture is, "I've made more money, I have more toys, so I win and you lose". This becomes an argument of quantity versus quality.

People who lead quality lives create value. They have an interest in family and community, as well as an interest in enterprise. And those people create sustainable value in all three areas: their own lives, work environment and community at large. This is why I've always felt that having ethical and principled behaviour in a corporation is the finest of business practices. It's the best way to create sustainable value for shareholders.

And when you do that, you don't just rock it up and down like a shooting star. Yes, you could work 24 hours a day and retire at 37 as a multi-millionaire... but then, what? You only have a bit of money. You have nothing else...

Our society today seems to be based on money, and greed, and buying new cars, and buying bigger homes, and spending more money... It's the way we are brought up; what else do children see on television? We are a consumer driven society. We quantitatively measure success.

It is indeed much more difficult to measure success in a qualitative way. But this should be the topic for debate. And the present state of society dictates some degree of regulation.

Existing excesses have not been just a product of corporate leaders – but a product of our society. It's very deeply rooted, and for that reason it cannot all be the leadership. Digging our way out merely with ethical leadership is not going to happen.

But we must not completely rely on regulation either. Because then everybody would say, "well, I can get away with this, and that's as far as I go"; which isn't the way to run your life either. There are many things that are allowed legally to do that you shouldn't do. So, we get back to personal values - ethics, responsibility, and interests.

We should start at our schools. Business isn't just a matter of making money or dramatically increasing shareholder return. It's a matter of creating sustainable value. We have to start teaching ethics and the principles above to our children. Not just in MBA programs but throughout schools.

Fundamentally, putting the dollar ahead of everything else will inevitably lead to abuses and abhorrent behaviour. I do think that today our finest corporations are those with principled values. They stay profitable. People want to join them and people don't want to leave them.

Consequently, to succeed in promoting business ethics, we have to drive home that it is in the interest of everybody associated with a corporation – shareholders, employees, customers, and suppliers – to ensure transparency and ethical behaviour. To be able to talk about everything you're doing in that corporation and be proud of it.

---

## Ethical Investment Management – In the Eye of the Beholder?

By William MacLachlan

---

*William MacLachlan is a Director, Past Chairman and Senior Portfolio Manager at Mawer Investment Management Ltd. A Chartered Financial Analyst charterholder with 32 years of investment experience, he is a Past President of the Calgary CFA Society and is a regular commentator on investment issues for CBC NewsWorld, CBC Radio, and BNN (Business News Network).*

The phrase – “Beauty is in the eye of the beholder” – can be traced back to the third century BC, and its perspective has been echoed by figures as diverse as Shakespeare, Franklin, and Hume. A thirty-three year career in investment management has convinced me that ethical investment management is also in the eye of the beholder. Relativity in ethics may be controversial, but in investment management it is a fact.

There are a number of investment managers that offer ethical mutual funds or ethical institutional mandates. Some offer ethical product exclusively,

while for others it is part of a wider menu. There is no generally accepted standard of ethical investment management; and while some ethical funds may accept a company in the oil sands, for others it would be anathema. Indeed, it is often difficult to determine why a certain investment product is labeled ethical, other than for marketing reasons. Ethical does sell, but is that ethical?

The concepts of fiduciary duty (i.e. the legal duty to act in the best interests of the beneficiary) and the prudent person are essential in understanding how an investment management committee approaches ethical investing. The committee has a fiduciary duty to the stakeholders, and common law has determined that the standard is what a prudent person would do in a particular situation. Further, it is accepted, even encouraged, that said committee will delegate its fiduciary responsibility to experts from time to time. In ethical investing, these experts, who consult to clients and investment managers, determine whether portfolios are in compliance with ethically explicit Investment Policy Statements (IPS). However, they will have differing views as well. As volunteer Chair of the Investment Committee of a foundation governed by an ethical IPS, I was queried by a stakeholder as to a specific stock. One consultant judged it unethical, citing its failure to successfully engage indigenous people in a dialogue regarding a mine; while another noted significant improvement in the same area and judged them acceptable.

Some clients, even large ones, will be very specific in their IPS and will not use consultants. This works quite well for a homogenous organization with a well-defined belief structure. Religious organizations are a good example. More complex organizations, however, present a separate set of challenges. In one portfolio I manage, the original IPS stated: no alcohol, gambling, pornography or weapons. That seemed straightforward but was not. A well loved chocolate company owned a lottery, virtually every hotel company in the world derived revenue from explicit adult programming, and a Canadian industrial icon derived revenues from weapons manufacture. Add in the fact that most banks and insurance companies have dealings with businesses that did not pass muster the original IPS, and the problems are obvious.

The solution lies in specificity, materiality\*, measurement, and disclosure. Underlying this is an

understanding that each ethical IPS is informed by a belief system, whether religious, social, environmental or other. The IPS should be as specific as possible to what is acceptable or not. Let's use weapons manufacture as an example. If the intent is that a company with any exposure to weapons manufacture is unacceptable, the IPS should state that. If materiality comes into place, which is usually the case, a specific percentage of revenues or profits should be stated as the hurdle, then measured and reported to the stakeholders. For example, an IPS might stipulate that a company who derives more than 10% of its revenues from weapons must be excluded from the portfolio.

Ethical investing will continue to grow at a pace far in excess of traditional investing, as more investors balance return objectives with moral objectives. This growth will cause more shareholder activism and in time, higher governance standards at public corporations and large institutional investors.

Finally, it should be noted that for some investors, the ethical decision is to own stocks in companies they view as unethical. After all, it is only as a shareholder that one can speak and vote for change at shareholder meetings.

\*Materiality is an accounting guidance principle, summed up in plain words as "if it requires more effort than it's worth – forget it".

---

## Resilient Leadership

By Donna Kennedy-Glans

---

*Donna Kennedy-Glans's expertise is drawn from more than twenty-five years as a lawyer and business executive, representing large international corporations struggling to manage integrity dilemmas at head office and on the ground in more than thirty jurisdictions. Today, she works on bridging relationships between the private and voluntary sector and can be found at <http://www.canadabridges.com/>*

As executive director of a Canadian-based volunteer organization and registered charity ([Bridges Social Development](http://www.bridgesocialdevelopment.com/)), I've been inundated

with surveys from pollsters seeking to quantify the impacts of the recession on Canadian charities. What these surveys tell us will surprise no one: corporate and government funding for charities is down, needs in communities are rising, and volunteerism is more important than ever. Stretched to the limit, Canadian nonprofits and charities have proven surprisingly resilient.

At times, it feels like the volunteer sector is holding its collective breath. There is a sense of foreboding about the lag effect: while for profits are anticipated to be pulling out of the recession in the coming months, the volunteer sector is not predicted to feel the full force of the economic downturn until 2010. And yet, in spite of the turbulence, the voluntary sector is not waiting until we have absolute certainty, and seems to be moving forward with *Gentle Action*:

- Rather than going for one single solution, the voluntary sector is more apt to choose many small actions.
- Although we make plans, we know that complex systems are inherently unpredictable; we cannot know how these systems will respond to our actions so we are used to making continual adjustments as we implement.
- When we don't see a dramatic change, we are less likely to be discouraged and give up. We know that a system stays in equilibrium until a 'tipping point' is reached. Although our actions may seem like they are having little effect, we understand that once critical momentum is achieved, real changes take root and spread.

(For more on *Gentle Action*, see David Peat's book by the same name and online materials at <http://www.csh.umn.edu/wsh/gentleaction/home.html>).

For a great example of resiliency in the voluntary sector, let's look at one of Canada's more stressed environments – Fort McMurray, Alberta. Charities responding to social services, development, housing, health, recreation, and environmental needs in Fort McMurray have historically been well funded by companies invested in intensive Oilsands operations. But in October 2009, the

Calgary Chamber of Voluntary Organizations reported: “More than 70% of Fort McMurray and area [voluntary organizations and charities] reported decreases in corporate support.” Government cuts and decreased revenues have exacerbated this situation. Some even argue that government cuts were the catalyst for a withdrawal in corporate investment in communities, leading to finger-pointing and often inconclusive chicken-and-egg debate about responsibility for social and environmental needs in at risk communities. All of this unfolds in Fort McMurray against an international backdrop that demonizes participants in Canada’s Oilsands as “thuggish” tar barons.

While lines are being drawn to demarcate corporate and government boundaries of responsibility for social needs in Fort McMurray, the voluntary sector remains pretty clear about why it is doing this work. The voluntary sector also seems to have a pretty good handle on what is valued by citizens in Fort McMurray.

The voluntary sector has been adapting to the financial crisis (and, as well, to the coinciding social and environmental crises) by diversifying funding sources, leaning harder on volunteers and choosing to introduce efficiencies rather than cutting programs. To survive, organizations are rethinking how they do what they do. In the face of shrinking funding sources, you might expect organizations to become more competitive in their fund-raising. Instead, the recession has been a catalyst for the voluntary sector to explore collaboration opportunities, and has sparked honest and transparent dialogue on the most effective means to deliver programming.

So, maybe we need to learn from the purpose-driven determination of the voluntary sector and stop trying to smudge the lines separating the world of philanthropy and the world of business? Perhaps the world of charity and the world of business are two different worlds, and especially so in a recession. Pure charity is about giving and abundance. Economic principles are based on reciprocity and scarcity.

Sometimes it’s tempting to divide up the world into clearly marked sub-worlds, each with their own rules and values. Of course, this is overly simplistic. In business, governance and in development, we struggle to answer the same questions: Do we give

to communities or do we invest in communities? Where do the worlds of pure charity and economic principles meet? Our deeper understanding of the intersection of these two worlds can change how we see existing economic and governance systems, and as well, how we see the role of the voluntary sector.

The current crises give us the opportunity and incentive to reach deeply into the dialogue needed to figure out:

- What responsibilities companies, governments and voluntary organizations need/want to take in leading us out of these crises? Who wants to have their hands on the steering wheel guiding responsive change in places like Fort McMurray?
- How to design and prioritize strategies that can respond to the impacts of these crises in communities? How do we know what is really valued in the community?
- Ways to measure the progress of this leadership and these strategies, knowing that some community-held values cannot be measured in financial terms?

Resiliency, for example, is a value not easily measured in financial terms. It reflects the ability of a person or organization to survive and adapt in situations of adversity and challenge. The worth of resilient leadership is valued, across sectors.

---

## Challenge to the Members of EPAC. Four Key Questions: Whither and Whether Forward

By David Nitkin

---

*David Nitkin is founder of EthicScan Canada, initial Chair of EPAC, publisher of a series of corporate responsibility consumer guidebooks, and lead director of EthicsAssurance™.*

All professional organizations are continually in flux, some times more active than at others. Today may be a period of less obvious activity and visibility for the Ethics Practitioners Association of Canada

(EPAC) and, as such, an opportunity for reflection. In this regard I want to ask four questions. What are we collectively about? What have we accomplished? Where might we go professionally? And, finally, does such introspection matter? This opinion piece reflects no-one's opinion other than the author's.

### **A. What are we collectively about?**

EPAC was formed almost 15 years ago by a small group of six professionals who saw themselves on a threshold of opportunity. We were full of optimism of shared purpose. Our shared tent of aspiration was to be a home for teachers, consultants and officers within organizations. With shared promise, we created a constitution, a Board, and a national and regional structure, as well as a web-site presence.

From that start in 1996, we have been a professional association. We are not a consulting practice, though we have members who earn a living that way. We don't need to make clients happy, though we have members who do that in successfully plying their arts and talents. (Sometimes we're successful, precisely because a client is unhappy). Over the years, we have debated worthy subjects like best practice-based certification, establishing a professional corpus of knowledge, and organizationally taking certain public policy or political positions.

EPAC is not now, nor have we ever been, an industry association. Until this past year, our corporate mission has been to enhance the application of ethics in decision making throughout all kinds of organizations. We share a professional affinity to address issues of transparency, responsibility, corruption, accountability, equality and whistle-blower protection. This has meant a shared passion and focus on what should be done to build a better, more ethical, world.

### **B. What have we accomplished?**

One positive accomplishment has been efforts to define professional competency. This involves useful personal resources, like a code of practice and a framework to help individuals clarify areas of personal practice and competency. That self

assessment tool, which elicits international attention, is a work in progress.

Another accomplishment has been a web-based directory of members. Member-wise, we've grown over the years. However, in part because we're not driven by member services mantra, we're not visible to many outside our ranks as having enhanced the professional status or reputation of members. The public can't access our website to learn who are our members and what are their specialties – a current practice that baffles me.

We have had more success as an organization in establishing regional chapters than in maintaining them. We have been less successful in organizing or staging educational programs with other organizations like the Chumir Foundation, Canadian Business for Social Responsibility, the EthicsCentre, or the Conference Board of Canada. Likewise, we've not had particularly impactful relationships with international bodies like the Ethics Resource Centre, the Institute for Global Ethics, or Business for Social Responsibility. Unlike counterparts in the U.S. and the U.K., we don't organize or deliver ethics practitioner credit courses through educational institutions.

### **C. Where might we go professionally?**

We haven't done a very effective job in mentoring, encouraging and promoting the next generation of consultants and teachers. Uncertainty, loneliness, self promotion and individual isolation seem to be a reality for today's new generation of corporate responsibility educators and consultants. Vibrant sustained local chapters, formal mentorships, and trial work placements are few and far between.

The print and television media don't consistently seek out our elected Board members to comment on public policy dilemmas as thought leaders. We could be doing more to promote practitioner-led imagination. Individual members or related consultants have developed national and international newsletters, Web-based tools, and assurance initiatives largely without EPAC acknowledgement or involvement. (ClearView, EthicsPoint and EthicsAssurance are three of many examples).

From the start, some of us have pressed for certifying officers and consultants, with a grandfather clause for established professionals. This would involve practice-based professional service and knowledge standards, qualifying exams, and education programs, both introductory and refresher/advanced, for teachers of ethics, integrity officers, lobbyist registrars, and others. University-level accredited EPAC modules aren't yet offered in areas like addressing ethical dilemmas, corporate responsibility, stakeholder engagement techniques, and ethics assurance.

#### **D. Does this introspection matter?**

Canadians are urgently seeking help and tools to address the growing ethics component to many public issues like CSR, employment contracts, climate change, and corporate governance. If there is less energy at the EPAC Board level and if we aren't party of the solution, then renewal and priority setting become crucial. We need positive leadership that attracts youthful new blood, prospective untried partners, and educates about organizational solutions. We must strive to make the organization's next decade of choices as robust, lively, and commitment enhancing as the last.

We need to pass the baton of leadership, to engage and mentor our next generation of professionals, and to shape knowledge about ethical answers to the world's troubles. We need concrete passion, public presence and position to improve the world. I, and I believe many others, care about EPAC. But our strategy this year has changed to one of self interest just as more and more professional organizations are moving the other way.

One wants to be supportive of actions taken by volunteer leaders. The current General Ethics Framework Project (GEFP) is just such a case in point. Will it intellectually or financially engage ethics PhD students, practitioners, or risk and reputation management professionals? Does our communications plan speak from or to the groups we've yet to engage in this quest of scope of practice clarification? Does it engender enthusiasm, collaboration or shared purpose from our members or potential partners? What GEFP answers will attract a new generation of practitioners or renew our individual and shared mission? Is this time-intensive GEFP study of the practitioner landscape

relevant to a debate that should exist in our ranks about involvement in major societal debates about challenges to organizational responsibility, accountability and transparency?

Ethicists, teachers of ethics, and corporate responsibility professionals will survive and prosper, whether or not there is an EPAC. Without an EPAC, however, we will be less than the synergy of our parts. The key to renewal would seem to lay in defining value-added, network-affirming, reputation-enhancing meaning to members, organizations, the public, new practitioners, and the media. If we agree, let us all help in realizing that better future.

---

## **Organizational Ethics: the Need for Systemic Approach.**

By Allan Pedden

---

*Allan Pedden is the Chair of EPAC-APEC, a partner in PDK Consulting International (globally oriented ethics practice), and a founding member of the Canadian Ethics Leadership Forum. He can be reached by email at [apedden@pdkinternational.com](mailto:apedden@pdkinternational.com)*

EPAC-APEC is one of the original organizations concerned specifically with Ethics in Canada. We spent a good part of our history specifying the qualities and knowledge background that a practitioner of ethics should have. That work led to defining an Ethics Competency Profile, which gathered together useful resources as a reference for individual practitioner development. These efforts culminated in the Self-Assessment Guide, which remains an important cornerstone of cohesion and common identity for our organization as we continue the journey forward.

Another key effort of EPAC-APEC has been to create a national network of practitioners with regional chapters, allowing membership to become more closely involved in the development of our organization; as well as come together to support each other in professional improvement. Guidance materials were created on the establishment and

operation of chapters for community ethics leaders to take up on.

But with limited resources, a fundamental choice facing us at this point is whether to continue this focus on ourselves as individual practitioners – or whether progress in the field of Organizational Ethics in Canada is better served by concentrating on the subject matter, i.e. both public and private enterprises. And if it is in fact the time for us to turn our focus outwards, how should we go about accomplishing that objective?

### The Crossroads

If we maintain our attention on the nature of the practitioner, the next logical steps in developing a profession would be to establish a recognized and widely accepted professional designation. It requires the development of an examination and certification program, where the core competency framework will presumably inform the qualifying criteria. From there, we naturally would have to develop the infrastructure necessary to sustain the ongoing certification process and promote any designation issued to add to its value.

Alternatively, we could turn our focus to defining how organizational ethics is being conducted – and perhaps more importantly, the best practices. That is, to focus on defining the field and its methods. Best practices are the functions and processes that act as levers allowing us to operate a modern enterprise, both profit and non-profit alike. They inform the curricula for business schools and colleges country wide; through which in turn, related professional associations (such as law, accounting, human resources and information technology) garner wide spread recognition for their own disciplines and certifications, not to mention recruit a new generation of members.

### Why the Urgency?

There is a growing crisis of public confidence in the ability of any organizations to act in a manner consistent with society's long-term interest. The ecological peril of our planet, the global financial crisis, and multiple other concerns, such as companies are dabbling in genetic modification techniques without proper safety research – all show that the days are nearly over where for-profit

organizations were viewed simply as the engines to maximize financial gain. Widely acknowledged is the influential role that financial power has with government and elected public officials.

The public is crying out for action on moral obligation of enterprise, and movements like sustainability or corporate social responsibility are answering the call. But without effective mechanisms for dealing with values in the workplace (established from the shop floor to the boardroom), the only answer from these groups is ever increasing regulation – which over the long run has proven an ineffective strategy.

The individual ethics practitioners' world is still largely dependant on their own leadership and vision, and their role as consultants or employees. What seems most important now, is to support them in most effectively raising the bar. We need to move from merely training individual decision-making in ethics or implementing whistle-blowing programs, to a wider discussion on how to influence organizational culture at large. Because only through molding organizational culture we can ensure that once the right thing to do is understood, it is actually encouraged to be acted upon.

Organizations need a systemic approach to pragmatically understanding and internalizing their moral obligations in an ever-changing world. They need processes that elevate ethical awareness and action to the institutional level. It's time for us to begin describing those methods – striving towards a world where a Board of Directors sees an effective ethics program as vital as a controller's function.

### What's next?

The EPAC-APEC Board has been organizing itself to undertake the following steps:

- Create a Canadian General Ethical Practices Framework to describe the field of organizational ethics and arrive at a common understanding.
- Reach out to other organizations in Canada and internationally, who deal with different aspects of ethics practice (e.g. Compliance or Ombudsperson groups), for synergistic and partnering opportunities.

- Open a dialogue with other professional associations to determine the place and role of the ethics field in overall business practice.
- Survey as many practitioners as possible (current, past, and potential) to benchmark the current state of ethics practice in Canada, in order to refine the common framework – and understand where we are and where we yet need to go.

In effect, we will now be creating an organizational competency profile to match the one already

developed for practitioners. We can then establish another self-assessment tool for practitioners to assess the systemic health of ethics in their client organizations, so that decision makers and governors can know where they stand relative to others, and how and where things can be improved.

Stewarding a vibrant and exciting dialogue of this nature is key to both the future of our profession and this association. This is a big job – but we have done its like before, so we should get on with it.

---

## ABOUT US

The Ethics Practitioners' Association of Canada (EPAC) promotes ethical practices in organizations, and supports ethics practitioners across Canada.



Our website, [www.epac-apec.ca](http://www.epac-apec.ca), features a calendar of events (we welcome ethics related events for posting), our Competency Profile of Ethics Practitioners and much other information, in English and French. We invite you to join EPAC, or sponsor an event or publication. Or just browse the site and bookmark it. And please pass on this message to others who may be interested!

Who should become a member?

Anyone working in the field of ethics services or with ethics responsibilities in their organization - as well as anyone interested in becoming an ethics practitioner or in the field itself.

Member Benefits

- Electronic Magazine for members;
- Member rates where applicable at educational events on applied ethics;
- Opportunities to share information and practical experiences with others in your field;
- On-line membership directory designed to facilitate networking
- **A members' EXCLUSIVE page to advertise your ethics consulting services;**
- A chance to improve the standards of this growing profession and add to the corporate awareness of its value;
- Opportunities to showcase your expertise by facilitating educational seminars, workshops or conferences sponsored by EPAC;
- Ability to make other members aware of job openings in your organization; and
- Additional benefits to be developed in response to members' needs.

To join us, fill in this form: <http://www.epac-apec.ca/cont-ang/application-form.htm>

Annual Membership Fee: \$75 for individual, \$25 for student, and \$180 for \*organizations (\* Organizational memberships include up to 3 Individual memberships)