

INDEX

ABDICATION OF LEGISLATIVE POWER, 30-37 *See also* CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS OF CANADIAN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

ABUSE OF DISCRETION *See also* JURISDICTION

fettering discretion, 168, 206-212
improper intention, 185-196
improper result, 198-205
inadequate material, 197-198
misconstruing law, 205-206

ACQUIESCENCE

effect on judicial review, 381
effect on prerogative remedies, 697

ADJOURNMENT *See also* AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM RULE

availability of, 327-332

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW GENERALLY

defined, 3-4
delegation, jurisdiction and doctrine of *ultra vires*, 6
delegation of governmental powers, statutory, 4-5
factors justifying delegation, 4-5
historical development, 9-10
central features of our system, 9
inherent jurisdiction of superior courts to supervise, 9
prerogative remedies, 9-10
judicial review, grounds for, 6-9
judicial review vs. appeal, 6-7
jurisdictional defects, 7-8
jurisdictional errors, 7
prerogative remedies, 6
procedural errors going to jurisdiction, 8
ultra vires doctrine, 6, 7, 8
privative clauses, 14-15
effect of privative clauses, 14-15
judicial review vs. legislative sovereignty, 15
“privative clauses” defined, 14
remedies and standing, 10-13
application for judicial review, 12-13
certiorari, 10
damages, claim for, 11
declaratory relief, 11
grounds for judicial review increased, 13
habeas corpus, 11
mandamus, 10-11
non-judicial remedies, 13
quo warranto, 11
summary, 16

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES AND JURISDICTION ACT (ALBERTA), Appendix I

ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS ACT (BRITISH COLUMBIA), Appendix 6

ALBERTA RULES OF COURT

- Crown Practice Rules in Civil Matters, Appendix 4
- generally, 601
- Judicial Review in Civil Matters, Appendix 4

APPEALS FROM ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS

- administrative appeals tribunals, 646-647
- appeal's effect on availability of judicial review, 651-657
 - existence of appeal causing court to refuse judicial review, 651-653
 - criteria in determining whether appeal was adequate alternative remedy, 652-653
 - factors not preventing appeal route from being adequate alternative remedy, 653
 - whether appeal to court or another administrative body, 652
 - jurisdictional error and right of appeal to tribunal, where, 654-655
 - non-jurisdictional error and right of appeal to courts, where, 654-655
 - policy of refusing judicial review where right of appeal not inflexible rule, 655
 - right of appeal providing ample opportunity to correct error of law, 654
 - void decision, appealing from, 656-657
- appellate discretion, exercise of, 641-642
 - courts reluctant to substitute their own discretion, 641-642
 - curial restraint in exercising discretion, 641
 - whether right to exercise statutory discretion differently, 641
- conclusion, 660-662
 - appeals on merits of decisions ought to lie to other statutory bodies, 662
 - lack of comprehensive philosophy regarding appeals from administrative decisions, 660
 - need for appeal from delegates' decisions affecting lives and livelihoods, 661
 - question of law or jurisdiction, appeal right to court where, 661
- introduction, 631-632
- issue estoppel, 659-660
- nature and scope of appeals, 636-639
 - appeal from tribunal to courts on question of law or jurisdiction, 637
 - appeal on merits, 637
 - hearing *de novo* or curial deference, 637
 - appearance of appellant not required, 639-640
 - decision-maker, participation by, 640
 - evidence, procedures, and remedies, 638-639
 - whether specified in Act, 639
 - judge on tribunal not converting tribunal to court, 641
 - limits on powers of Court of Appeal, 639
- no appeal, examples of circumstances where, 632
- ombudsman, 647-651
 - functions and duties in preventing abuse of delegated powers, 647
 - no legal means for compelling corrective action, 651
 - report opinion that decision improper to appropriate Minister, 649-650
 - right to investigate propriety of government action, 648
- other administrators, appeals to, 633-634
- reforms to permit appeals to courts, 643-646
 - Alberta Special Committee recommendations for appeals to courts, 643-645
 - recommendations never implemented, 645
 - right of appeal on facts subject to several considerations, 644-645

APPEALS FROM ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS — *continued*

- specific solution for each specific problem, 645
 - where no acceptable standards for determining facts, 644
- right of appeal on question of jurisdiction and question of law, 644
- right of appeal to be more fully recognized, 643
- Scrutiny Committee on Regulations, need for, 645
- England, 643
 - no automatic right of appeal at common law, 643
- restrictions on collateral attacks where appeal available, 657-659
 - availability of collateral attack depending on catalogue of factors, 657-658
 - appeal process, availability of, 657, 658
 - intent of legislation, 657, 658
- challenging validity of administrative order in penal court, 657
 - nature of penal consequences being factor, 658
- specific statutory appeals to courts, 634-636
 - Court of Appeal, 635
 - Court of Queen's Bench, 634-635, 636
 - diversity of appellate courts, 636
 - special appellate courts, 635
- standard of appellate review, 642-643

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM RULE

- conclusion, 406
- introduction, 262-266
 - administrative decision affecting rights, privileges or interests, 263
 - meaning of principle, 263
 - scope of rule depending on subject matter, 263-266
 - Baker* factors relevant to content of fairness, 264-266
- labour and employment matters, 397-406
 - conclusion, 406
 - Cyr and Martin*, 404-405
 - Cyr* case, 404-406
 - "citizen" under *Administration Justice Act*, 404
 - duty of procedural fairness, 404
 - Martin* case, 404-405
 - volunteer members of board having no contract, 404
 - rescission of appointment being "legislative", 405
- introduction, 397
 - Knight v. Indian Head School Division*, 399-401, 405
 - contract of employment with termination clause, 399
 - duty of fairness extending to offices held at pleasure, 400-401
 - rationale for extending procedural fairness, 400
 - statute able to abrogate procedural fairness, 401
 - three-pronged analysis to determine if duty of fairness, 399-401
 - New Brunswick v. Dunsmuir*, 402-404, 405-406
 - decision reversing *Knight* case, 402
 - employment contract governing and not procedural fairness, 402
 - private law applicable to public employee, 402-403
 - public law duty of fairness only applied in two circumstances, 403
 - three category approach of *Ridge v. Baldwin*, 403
 - Nicholson v. Haldimand-Norfolk*, 398-399
 - office holders requiring dismissal for cause, 398-399

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM RULE — *continued*

Ridge v. Baldwin, 397-398, 405

duty to be fair depending on classification of position, 397-398

offices held “during pleasure”, 397

offices requiring cause for dismissal, 397-398

oral hearing processes, 312-352

adjournment, availability of, 340-344

discretion power of tribunal, 340

evening hearing, not entitled to force, 343

no absolute right to adjournment, 340

public interest mandate, where tribunal having, 342

refusal potentially amounting to denial of procedural fairness, 340, 342

request at beginning or during hearing, same principles applying whether, 342-343

request properly refused where stalling tactic, 342

right to adjournment not to be defeated by rigid policies, 341-342

timeliness of application for adjournment, 341

cross-examination of witnesses, 312-316

generally, 312-313

Innisfil (Township) v. Vespra (Township), 313-314

right to cross-examine official introducing letter stating government policy, 314

Murray v. Council of Municipal District of Rocky View, 315-316

cross-examination refused, 315

Strathcona (Municipality) v. Maclab Enterprises, 314-315

report admitted into evidence although expert unavailable, 315

evidentiary considerations, 316-324

hearsay, 322-323

introduction, 316-318

exercise of discretion in manner consistent with procedural fairness, 316-317

relevance and reliability, ensuring, 318

judicial notice, 318-321

disclosure of member’s background of personal knowledge, 319

parol evidence, 323

privileged communications, 324

views, taking, 321-322

legislative prescription for administrative procedure, 351-352

English approach, 352

uniform procedures Acts, 351-352

open court, 324-330

Edmonton Journal case, 329-330

Four factors supporting open court system, 329-330

Informer privilege, 330

open court system subject to other considerations, 330

generally, 324-325

McVey case, 326-329

Charter of Rights and Freedoms, s. 2(b), 326-329

immigration inquiry analogous to judicial proceedings, 328-329

general rule of open proceedings applying, 329

Millward v. Canada, 325-326

rules of common law, 325-326

reverse order questioning, 338-339

claimants not required to be examined by own counsel first, 339

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM RULE — *continued*

- right to counsel, 330-338
 - Charter* context, 334-338
 - Charter* potentially enhancing existing common law rights, 335-336
 - whether principles of fundamental justice providing greater protection, 336
 - factors in operation of s. 7 applying in determining extent of duty of fairness, 335
 - no absolute right to counsel in prison disciplinary hearings, 335-336
 - factors in exercising discretion to permit counsel, 335-336
 - procedural fairness, 337-338
 - outside of prison context, 338
 - generally, 330-331
 - no absolute right to counsel, 331
 - Guay v. Lafleur* case, 331-332
 - inquiry characterized as purely administrative function, 331-332
 - Irvine* case, 333-334
 - application of procedural fairness principles to administrative proceedings, 333-334
 - determinative factor in right to counsel cases being risk to affected party, 334
 - Pett* case, 332-333
 - inquiry where reputation and livelihood at stake triggering right to counsel, 332-333
 - role of board counsel during hearing, 349-351
 - board counsel not to act for party, 350
 - permissible extent of counsel's involvement, 350
 - tribunal not to delegate its decision-making obligations to its counsel, 349-350
 - stay of proceedings, 344-349
 - delay justifying stay in administrative law proceedings where abuse of process, 347-349
 - Charter*, s. 7 protection not engaged in administrative law context, 348
 - test for granting stay of proceedings, 344-346
 - illustrations of test, 345
 - other proceedings, pending determination of, 346-347
 - civil vs. criminal proceedings, 347
 - public interest mandate, 345-346
 - whether appropriate remedy, 346
 - summary, 353
- post-hearing processes, 353-396
 - changes in circumstances: rehearings and re-openings, 375-379
 - correcting procedural or substantive errors, 376
 - denial of opportunity to place entire case before tribunal, 376
 - doctrine of *functus officio* extending to administrative tribunals, 375, 376-377
 - enabling legislation allowing rehearing, 377
 - where retaining jurisdiction to make further decision concerning matter, 375
 - where tribunal not *functus officio*, 375
 - prior to rendering of final decision, 375
 - duty to consult prior to making final decision, 374-375
 - all members of multi-member decision-making panel required to take part, 375
 - generally, 353
 - hearing before person making decision, 353-368
 - collegial consultation among members, permissible limits of, 355
 - Consolidated Bathurst* case, 355-357

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM RULE — *continued*

- “full-board” practice, 355-356
 - institutionalized protection, 356-357
- evidence about consultation and deliberative process, 358-368
 - deliberative secrecy remaining rule, 358-361, 364
 - nature of judicial review to relax some secrecy in process, 362-363
 - presumption of regularity, 361, 362
 - unless allegation of breach of procedural fairness, 358, 367
 - discovery in applications for judicial review not wide-ranging, 366
 - distinction between administrative tribunal and judge, 360
 - justification of general consultative process, 359
- reasonable prima facie case vs. less stringent requirement, 366-367
- voluntary disclosure, 359
- Tremblay* case, 357-358
 - “consensus table” meeting, 357
 - constraints creating coercive atmosphere in plenary meetings, 357
- issue estoppel, 380-381
- reasons for decisions, 382-396
 - benefits of written reasons, 387
 - decision-maker required to provide reasons despite no statutory requirement, 385
 - duty of procedural fairness tending to require written explanation, 382-383
 - “certain circumstances”, dependent upon, 383
 - not all statutory delegates required to give reasons, 384
 - factors considered in determining need for reasons, 386-387
 - failing to give reasons, effect of, 395-396
 - failure rendering decision void, 396
 - flexible approach to reasons requirement, 387
 - rationale for requiring statutory delegate to provide reasons, 390
 - reasons disclosing error in decision, effect of, 388-390
 - duty vs. discretion, 388-389
 - where discretion used in manner not in accord with Act that conferred discretion, 389
 - statutory requirements, 385-386
 - what constitutes adequate reasons, 390-395
 - discrepancy between board’s findings and interpretive evidence, 394
 - notes of immigration officer being sufficient, 391-392
 - parroting matters delegate required to consider not constituting reasons, 392
 - rationale for requiring reasons, 390
 - reasons inadequate if affected person unable to discern reasons for decision, 390-391
 - test for determining adequacy of reasons, 394
 - unintelligible reasons being inadequate, 393
- res judicata*, 366-367
- role of counsel after hearing, 368-374
 - counsel behaviour during hearing, 368, 369
 - legal advice, providing, 369-370
 - counsel’s role in post-hearing consultation, 368, 369
 - permissible assistance vs. involvement in drafting process, 372
 - generally, 368
 - “half-way house” position, 371-382

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM RULE — *continued*

- legal opinions, disclosure of, 370-371
- waiver or acquiescence, 381
- pre-hearing procedures, 267-312
 - bifurcated hearing, 302-304
 - initial hearing on liability, 302-303
 - separate hearing on penalty, 302-303
 - disclosure and privacy, 284-289
 - freedom of information, 288-289
 - generally, 284
 - solicitor-client privilege, 284-289
 - “absolute necessity”, test of, 287
 - records relating to allegations of sexual abuse, 286-287
 - access to employment file containing privileged correspondence, 285-286
 - Commissioner not possessing court-like powers, 285
 - PIPEDA not abrogating solicitor-client privilege, 285
 - where dismissal from employment, 285
 - legal opinion provided by counsel to OHRC, 287-288
 - form of hearing, 290-304
 - context of case determining kind of hearing, 290-291
 - enabling statute and *Baker* factors determining scope of hearing, 291
 - greater degree of participation with greater importance of individual rights, 290
 - oral hearing, requirement for, 291-302
 - common law and statutory requirements, 298-302
 - duty of fairness not necessarily warranting oral hearing, 301-302
 - meaningful participation occurring in different ways, 301
 - factors considered when determining whether required, 299-301
 - no common law right *per se*, 298-299
 - rehearing, 300
 - unnecessary if alternative means of placing evidence, 299
 - constitutional and quasi-constitutional rights, 293-298
 - convention refugee status designation, 293-295
 - Canadian Bill of Rights* and fundamental justice, 293-295
 - Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, s. 7 and fundamental justice, 293-295
 - procedural fairness, 295-296
 - procedural protections required by s. 7 of *Charter*, 296
 - removal order by Immigration Appeal Division (I.A.D.), 297-298
 - I.A.D. procedures designed to meet principles of natural justice, 297-298
 - reply, right of, 302
 - generally, 290-293
 - legitimate expectations, 304-311
 - Agraira*, 311
 - Baker* factor affecting content of duty of fairness, 304-305
 - Moreau-Bérubé c. Nouveau-Brunswick*, 306-309
 - judge not having reasonable expectation of penalty not more serious, 306-309
 - doctrine not creating substantive rights, 307-308
 - judge not misapprehending issues, 308
 - whether procedure unfair, 309
 - Pacific International Securities* case, 310-311
 - procedural, not substantive, relief, 305-306
 - retired judges case, 309-310

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM RULE — *continued*

- unions not having legitimate expectation re appointment of arbitrators, 309-310
- summary of duty of fairness, 312
- generally, 267
- investigative stage, 267-271
- knowing case to be met: disclosure, 274-284
 - disciplinary proceedings, 281-282
 - exclusion of parties from hearing, 282
 - extent of disclosure being context specific, 275, 277, 280
 - Baker* factors considered, 275-277
 - information which will be relied upon by tribunal to be disclosed, 275
 - limits on disclosure, 277-278
 - pertinent facts relating to refusal of certificate of citizenship, 278-279
 - prison and parole matters, 282-283
 - confidentiality of sources vs. providing enough information, 282-283
 - Corrections and Conditional Release Act* imposing obligation, 281
 - whether *Stinchcombe* rules applying, 280-281
 - security certificate case, 282
 - duty of fairness at investigative stage, 267-269
 - examples of fairness, 270
 - factors affecting whether duty of fairness, 269-270
 - degree of finality of decision, 270
 - requirements of enabling legislation, 270-271
 - notice of hearing, 271-274
 - adequate notice, 273-274
 - inadequate notice, effect of, 274

BIAS RULE

- application of rule: to whom does it apply?, 411-412
- evidence of bias, 470-475
 - disclosure, voluntary and compulsory, 472-475
 - deliberative secrecy vs. deliberative openness, 473-474
 - standards to be used court in deciding whether to order disclosure, 474-475
 - record and affidavits, 471-472
 - affidavit evidence typically used, 471-472
 - record, limitations on, 471
- generally, 410-411
 - common sense and other predispositions, 410
 - rule as second principle of duty to be fair, 410
- institutional bias, 437-455
- examples of institutional bias, 440-455
 - five types of situations, 440-442
 - general test for institutional bias, 440
 - apprehension of bias in “substantial number of cases”, 440
 - institutional role of interested parties, 448-450
 - institutional bias not always arising where interested party having influence, 450
 - party to proceedings having institutional role that may influence outcome, 448-449
 - statutory regime overriding principles of natural justice, 449
 - internal tribunal consultations, 451-455
 - Consolidated Bathurst* case, 452-453
 - “full-board” practice not compromising natural justice principles, 453

BIAS RULE — *continued*

- Ellis-Don* case, 454-455
 - consultation changing outcome of draft reasons, 454
 - dissenting judgment, 455
- Tremblay* case, 453-454
 - “institutionalized” decision-making process, legality of, 4
- tribunal interest in outcome, 451
 - awarding of costs defraying regulatory body’s expenses, 451
- tribunal members exercising overlapping functions, 441-446
- tribunal staff with overlapping functions, 446-448
 - outside counsel in conflict of interest due to firm’s representation of other client, 448
 - overlapping functions not always resulting in finding of bias, 447
 - role of lawyers, 446-447
 - whether staff overstepping scope of authority, 447
- introduction, 437-440
 - appearance of impartiality being important for public confidence, 438
 - structure or operation of decision-making body raising impartiality concerns, 437-438
 - structural independence arguments, 439
 - structural guarantees that decision-makers free from external influences, 439
 - validity of decision-making structures, challenging, 438
- reasonable apprehension of bias, legal effect of, 463-466
 - courts retaining residual discretion to fashion practical remedy, 464-465
 - decision rendered void or voidable, 464, 466
 - pragmatic approach to decision made in violation of procedural fairness, 465-466
 - estoppel argument potentially still available, 466
 - quashing decision and requiring rehearing contrary to practical justice, 464-465
 - stay of proceedings where fresh hearing not practical, 465
 - common law principle of independence subject to statutory override, 460
 - constitutional concept of tribunal independence, 460
- structural independence, 455-463
 - constitutional legal principles vs. common law arguments, 455, 459
 - factors in determining adequacy of independence guarantees, 461-463
 - conditions of members’ employment, 462
 - past practice of tribunal or comparable bodies, 462
 - tribunal functions closely aligned to specialized courts, 461
 - structural independence vs. institutional bias, 456
 - types of independence guarantees, 461-462
 - where administrative tribunal performing purely adjudicative functions, 456-458
 - issue of implied constitutional protection of judicial independence, 457
 - functional approach, 457
 - termination of appointment without cause contrary to protection, 457
 - whether equivalent to courts, 456
 - where concerns about impartial decision-making in substantial number of cases, 456
- summary, 475-476
 - difficulty in establishing whether test met, 476
 - tests for bias, 475-476
- test for bias, 412-417
 - National Energy Board* case, 413-417
 - “reasonable apprehension of bias” test, 412-413
- waiver of rule against bias, 466-470

BIAS RULE — *continued*

- difficulty in raising bias allegation at tribunal hearing, 470
- factors to be considered in determining proper forum to hear bias allegation, 469
- flexible rule preferred in raising of bias allegation, 469
- non-attendance not acting as waiver, 467
- waiver treated with caution, 467-468
- what constituting bias in law, 418-437
 - comments or behaviour, inappropriate, 429-437
 - generally, 429-432
 - actual bias not required, proof of, 429
 - comments or behaviour during hearing or deliberations, 430-431
 - Old St. Boniface* case, 432-434
 - Save Richmond Farmland* case, 433, 435, 436
 - Newfoundland Telephone* case, 434-436
 - financial interest in outcome of dispute, 418-423
 - direct financial interest giving rise to reasonable apprehension of bias, 418-421
 - “*de minimis* principle” exception, 420
 - four situations where permitted to participate, 420-421
 - indirect financial interest more problematic, 421-423
 - potential for financial advantage raising apprehension of bias, 421-422
 - some indirect forms of pecuniary bias not sufficient, 423
 - generally, 418
 - outside knowledge of or involvement with subject matter in dispute, 425-428
 - concern that decision-maker unable to avoid using outside information, 426
 - passage of time and nature of prior involvement in case being factors, 428
 - source of knowledge, 428
 - relationships with persons involved with dispute, 423-425
 - current vs. ongoing relationships, 425
 - decision-maker previously solicitor or client of party in proceedings, 424
 - nature of relationship, 423-424
 - type of relationship, 424-425

CERTIORARI *See* ERRORS OF LAW ON FACE OF RECORD, PREROGATIVE REMEDIES and STANDARDS OF REVIEW

CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS *See also* CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS OF CANADIAN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

- conclusion, 88-89
- damages, constitutional aspect of, 767-771
 - Charter* expanding liability of government and its officials, 767-771
- introduction, 61-62
 - post Charter, 62
 - pre-Charter, 61-62
- section 2 and administrative law, 82-84
 - application to disciplinary decision, 82-83
 - infringement justified for purpose of s. 1, 82-83
 - Personal Information Protection Act*, constitutionality of, 83-84
 - reasonable accommodation, 82
- section 7, impact of, 69-81
 - fundamental justice, principles of, 72-81
 - generally, 72
 - procedural fundamental justice, principles of, 73-77

CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS — *continued*

- level of procedural protection, factors affecting, 74-77
 - balancing of competing interests of state and individual, 75-76
 - “characterization of functions” approach, 76
 - continuum of administrative decision-making, 76
 - right to oral hearing at judicial stage, 75
 - shocking Canadian conscience if remedy denied, 75
 - principles not immutable, 74
 - rules of natural justice, 73-74
 - impartial decision-maker, 73
- introduction, 69-70
 - two-step analysis, 69
- “life, liberty and security of the person”, 70-72
 - liberty interest, scope of, 70-72
 - potential penal consequences for failure to comply with procedural demand, 71
 - security interest, scope of, 72
 - psychological prejudice, serious state-imposed, 72
- substantive fundamental justice and doctrine of vagueness, principles of, 77-81
 - arbitrary laws, 81
 - doctrine of vagueness, rationales supporting, 78-79
 - fair notice, 79-80
 - limit on discretion by officials enforcing legislation, 79-80
 - vagrancy ordinance, 79
 - intelligible standard, 80-81
 - overbreadth, 81
 - sufficient guidance for legal debate, 80
 - “danger to the security of Canada”, 80
 - vague provision not sufficiently delineating areas of risk, 80
- section 8 and administrative law, 84-88
 - procedural safeguards, 85
 - public’s interest vs. government’s interest, 84-85
 - reasonable expectation of privacy, protection of, 84, 85
 - contextual analysis, 86-87
 - corporations not having same reasonable expectation, 86
 - inspection of documents vs. search of business premises, 86-87
 - factors considered in determining context, 86-87
 - tax audit vs. investigation functions, 87-88
 - differing levels of Charter protection, 88
- section 15, 88
- whom Charter applying to, 62-69
 - Cabinet decisions, 63
 - college part of government apparatus, 64-65
 - collective agreement, 64
 - common law, 63
 - government, all aspects of, 63
 - hospitals, 64
 - hospital not government actor, 64, 66-67
 - medical services commission subject to Charter, 65-66
 - administrative body carrying out governmental policy, 67
 - human rights commission implementing government policy, 67-68
 - section 32 of Charter, 62-63

CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS — *continued*

- universities not subject to Charter scrutiny, 63-64
- whether body carrying out government objective, 66-68

CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS OF CANADIAN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW *See also*

CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

- British law, relevance of, 22-23
- British Parliament, sovereignty of, 23-26
 - administrative powers derived from statute or Royal Prerogative, 25
 - courts bound by Acts of Parliament, 24
 - introduction, 23
 - no constitutional separation of powers, 25-26
 - omnipotent, 23
 - separation of powers, no constitutional, 25-26
 - unfettered for future, 24
- Canadian model, 27-50
 - Constitution Act, 1867* being basic constitutional document, 27
 - delegate, ability to, 29-30
 - delegation but not abdication of legislative functions, 30-37
 - abdication principle rarely applied, 30, 36-37
 - broad delegations being lawful, 31
 - federal delegation, cases dealing with, 32-37
 - Commission's report incorporated into legislation, 34
 - constitutional necessity, 36
 - delegation to Cabinet of legislative power, 31, 33, 35
 - delegation to Governor General of power to proclaim part of section, 34-35
 - delegation to Governor in Council of legislative power, 33-34
 - limitations on delegation, 34
 - division of judicial philosophy, 35-36
 - extensive hand-off of legislative powers constituting unlawful abdication, 36
 - resolution asking British Parliament to amend *B.N.A. Act, 1867*, 35-36
 - unwritten constitutional principles, 36
 - provincial delegation, cases dealing with, 31-32
 - delegation of legislative powers, 30
 - federalism and division of legislative powers, 28-29
 - courts having duty to determine constitutionality of legislation, 28
 - inter-delegation not permitted, 40
 - judicially enforced constitutional restrictions, 27
 - Queen, Governor General and Lieutenant Governor constitutionally protected, 37-39
 - Constitution Act, 1867* requiring unanimous consent to amend offices, 37
 - limitation on ability of legislatures to delegate being untenable, 39
 - restriction presenting obstacle to delegation of legislative powers, 37-38
 - section 96: federal appointment of superior court judges, 40-50
 - deference and privative clauses, 48-50
 - introduction, 40-41
 - three-step test to determine if judicial functions fall within jurisdiction of s. 96 court, 41-48
 - historical inquiry, 42-46
 - "broadly conforms", 42
 - concurrent jurisdiction, 43-44
 - novel jurisdiction, 44-45
 - institutional setting, 47-48

CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS OF CANADIAN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW — *continued*

- judicial function, 46-47
- jurisdiction to decide constitutional issues, 50-60
 - common law jurisdiction to decide constitutional questions, 51-55
 - administrative tribunals having jurisdiction, 51-52
 - concomitant jurisdiction, 51, 53, 54
 - exclusive jurisdiction privative clause, 51-52
 - common law jurisdiction to grant remedies under Charter, 55-60
 - Mills* test, 57-58
 - s. 52 vs. s. 24 remedies
 - generally, 50, 60
 - statutory grants of jurisdiction, 50-51
- standards of review, 515-517
 - constitutional and conceptual basis for different standards of review, 515-517
 - traditional view of judicial review, 515-517
 - court required to determine what powers given to statutory delegate and to court, 517
- United States: contrasting model, 26-27

CROWN IMMUNITY

- common law immunity from suit in tort, 773-774
- Crown Liability Act* permitting tort actions against governments, 775-779
 - Alberta Act, 776-777
 - “Crown agent”, scope of, 778-779
 - vicarious liability, 777-779
- damages, 773-779
- injunctions, 713-720
- “official liability”, 774-775
 - Crown conducting defence in servant’s name, 775
 - personal liability of Crown servant, 774-775
 - imposition of liability being harsh and unjust, 775
- “Petition of Right” statutes permitting actions in tort against Crown, 775

DAMAGES, 734-774 *See also* PRIVATE LAW REMEDIES AND TORT LIABILITY OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES**DELEGATION OF GOVERNMENTAL POWERS, STATUTORY**

- characterization of delegated powers, reasons for, 97
 - important if delegated power being legislative in nature, 97
 - important in determining ambit of power, procedure, and remedies, 103-104
- delegated legislation, 98-103
- discretionary powers, delegation of, 99-100
 - ambit of discretion, 100
 - discretion within area delegated, 99-100
 - factors in exercising discretion, example of, 98-99
 - duties compared with discretionary powers, 100-101
 - pre-conditions to exercise of discretion, 101
 - conditional delegation of discretionary powers, 101-103
 - “quasi-judicial” power, concept of, 103
 - non-curial power requiring less stringent court-like procedures, 103
 - procedural requirements of natural justice applying to judicial functions, 103
 - quasi-judicial vs. administrative powers distinction less important, 102-103
 - “duty to be fair” obliterating importance of distinction, 102-103

DELEGATION OF GOVERNMENTAL POWERS, STATUTORY — *continued*

- type of function, 102
- reasons for delegation, 98
- section 96 prohibition, 103
- talisman guiding Parliament not available, 103
- generally, 4-5
 - factors justifying delegation, 4-5
- institutions of government, 91-95
 - generally, 91-92
 - executive or administrative branch, 93-95
 - ambit of executive branch, 93-95
 - Crown, Governor in Council and ministers, 93-94
 - independent boards and tribunals, 94
 - no legal rule for determining which functions to externalize to agencies, 94
 - political executive having control of legislative changes to agency structure, 94-95
 - judicial branch, 92-93
 - independence of judiciary, 92-93
 - British constitutional convention, 92
 - Canadian political convention, 93
 - institutions vs. functions of government, 95-97
 - characterizing function not simply by identifying person to whom power delegated, 96-97
 - exercise of functions not rigorously allocated to corresponding institutions, 95
 - principal functions of government, 95

DUTY TO BE FAIR *See* BIAS RULE, NATURAL JUSTICE AND DUTY TO BE FAIR: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND GENERAL PRINCIPLES and *AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM* RULE

ERRORS OF LAW ON FACE OF RECORD

- discretion to refuse prerogative remedies, 503-504
- errors of law vs. errors of fact, 490-496
 - error of fact, 495
 - other circumstances in which error reviewable, 495
 - lack of evidence, 495-496
 - whether error of law, 495-496
 - total lack of evidence being jurisdictional error, 495
 - unreasonable appreciation of facts constituting jurisdictional defect, 496
 - what constituting error of “law”, 491-495
 - difficulty in characterizing alleged error, 492-494
 - error of law, error of fact or mixed error of law and fact, 491-492
 - tribunal ignoring certain kinds of indirect evidence, 494
 - whether facts, once established, satisfying some legal definition or requirement, 491
- introduction, 480-482
 - certiorari*, anomalous use of, 480
 - human rights tribunal example, 481
 - courts not to abdicate duty to review decisions on statutory interpretation, 481
 - labour arbitration example, 480-481
 - no policy of curial deference when construing and applying statute, 481
 - restrictions complicating judicial review, 481-482

ERRORS OF LAW ON FACE OF RECORD — *continued*

- jurisdictional and intra-jurisdictional errors of law, importance of distinction between, 482-483
 - five reasons for importance of distinction, 483
- limitations on availability of *certiorari* as remedy to correct non-jurisdictional errors, 483-485
 - ambit of *certiorari* against administrative decisions, 484
 - whether statutory delegate involved, 484-485
 - certiorari* available for statutory proceedings, 484
 - certiorari* not available against non-statutory decisions, 485
 - privative clauses, effect of, 496-499
 - generally, 496-497
 - not preventing judicial review where jurisdictional error, 497
 - preventing anomalous use of *certiorari* where intra-jurisdictional error, 497
 - patently unreasonable interpretation of law being jurisdictional error not protected by privative clause, 498-499
 - preliminary or collateral matters, 497
- record, 485-490
 - what constituting record, 485-489
 - determination by court prior to hearing, 489
 - extending record by agreement, 489
 - whether evidence presented during proceedings included in record, 486-487
 - whether notes taken by statutory delegate forming part of record, 488
 - correspondence between members, in principal, not forming record, 488
- standards of review, curial deference and intra-jurisdictional errors of law, 499-503
 - anomalous use of *certiorari* restricted to certain errors of law, 500
 - Canadian courts applying three possible standards of review, 500-502
 - correctness standard, 500-501
 - deciding general question of law typically entitled to deference, 502
 - wide degree of deference where specialized statutory context, 501
 - English courts, 500
 - summary on intra-jurisdictional errors of law, 504

FUNCTIONAL AND PRAGMATIC APPROACH *See* STANDARDS OF REVIEW**GROUND FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW GENERALLY**

- ambit of jurisdiction, problems in determining, 150-157
 - delegate's actions incorporated into legislation, 155-157
 - incorporation clause preventing judicial scrutiny, 155-157
 - legislative validation of delegate's actions, 155-156
 - proper approach to be taken, 157
 - grant of delegated powers in broad or subjective terms, 152-154
 - limits of delegated power being difficult to determine, 152
 - subjective grant of power being difficult to review, 152-154
 - board's opinion that witness's attendance desirable, 154
 - Marshall* case, 152-153
 - regulation-making authority, 154
 - subjective determination of Secretary of State, 153
 - preliminary or collateral matters, 151-152
 - statutory intent, implied, 150-151
- discretion to refuse remedy where grounds for judicial review existing, 158
- introduction, 6-9, 147-148

GROUNDNS FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW GENERALLY — *continued*

- judicial review, jurisdiction and privative clauses, 149-150
- jurisdiction, “narrow” and “wide” meanings of, 148-149
- summary, 158
- ultra vires* action void or voidable, 157-158

HABEUS CORPUS *See also* PREROGATIVE REMEDIES

- quashing illegal detention of applicant, 667
- review of errors of law or jurisdiction, 667
- standing to apply and burden of proof, 668

INJUNCTIONS, 701-720 *See also* PRIVATE LAW REMEDIES AND TORT LIABILITY OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

INSTITUTIONAL BIAS *See* BIAS RULE

JUDICIAL REVIEW *See* ERRORS OF LAW ON FACE OF RECORD and GROUNDNS FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW GENERALLY

JUDICIAL REVIEW PROCEDURE ACT (ONTARIO), Appendix 3

JURISDICTION *See also* GROUNDNS FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW GENERALLY

- abuse of discretion, losing jurisdiction through, 182-213
 - fettering discretion, 206-212
 - contractual fetters on exercise of discretion, 211
 - generally, 206-207
 - policy or guidelines, 206-207
 - rough rules of thumb, 207
 - inflexible policy fettering on exercise of discretion, 208-210
 - general policy not necessarily fettering discretion, 209-210
 - pre-existing policy decision, 209
 - reference to other governmental policies, 211-212
- improper result, 198-205
 - discrimination, 201-203
 - retroactivity, 203-204
 - uncertainty, 204-205
 - unreasonableness, 198-201
 - implied limitation, 199
 - legislative approach, 201
 - restrictive test applied by courts, 200
- inadequate material, acting on, 197-198
- introduction, 182-185
 - delegation of broad discretionary powers permitted, 182
 - determining legality of delegated powers, 185
 - jurisdictional error where abuse of discretion, 183
 - delegate’s action being nullity, 183
 - types of abuses, 182, 184-185
 - unreasonableness of actions, 184-185
- misconstruing law, 205-206
 - jurisdictional vs. intra-jurisdictional errors, 205-206
- standard of review of discretionary decisions, 212
- summary, 212-213
- unauthorized or ulterior purpose, in bad faith or irrelevant considerations, 185-196
 - bad faith, 190-192

JURISDICTION — *continued*

- malice demonstrated, 192
- generally, 185-186
- improper intention, 195-196
- irrelevant considerations, 192-195
 - communist leanings, 194
 - municipal discretion to exclude children, 192-194
 - zoning by-law, 194-195
- unauthorized or ulterior purpose, 186-190
 - court's approach, 187-189
 - examples, 186-187
 - failure to deal with matter remitted, 189-190
- defects in acquiring, 161-180
 - constitution of delegate 162-169
 - appointment of members of delegate body, 168-169
 - sub-delegation, 162-168
 - delegatus non potest delegare* maxim, 162, 164
 - express language permitting, 162
 - fettering discretion, 168
 - where no express language, 163-164
 - generally, 161, 179-180
 - preliminary or collateral matters, 171-179
 - "broader curial review", 175
 - jurisdictional errors, what constitutes, 175-178
 - pragmatic and functional analysis, 176-178
 - pre-condition to jurisdiction, 171-174
 - statutory requirements, compliance with, 169-171
 - mandatory vs. directory statutory provisions, 170-171
 - substantive ultra vires, 162

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT MATTERS *See also AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM RULE*

- conclusion, 405-406
 - Cyr vs. Dunsmuir* cases, 406
 - duty of fairness in two circumstances, 405
 - Knight vs. Dunsmuir* cases raising potential inconsistencies, 405-406
 - public office holders, 405
- Cyr and Martin*, 404-405
 - Cyr* case, 404, 406
 - "citizen" under *Administration Justice Act*, 404
 - duty of procedural fairness, 404
 - Martin* case, 404-405
 - volunteer members of board having no contract, 404
 - rescission of appointment being "legislative", 405
 - introduction, 397
- Knight v. Indian Head School Division*, 399-401, 405
 - contract of employment with termination clause, 399
 - duty of fairness extending to offices held at pleasure, 400-401
 - rationale for extending procedural fairness, 400
 - statute able to abrogate procedural fairness, 401
 - three-pronged analysis to determine if duty of fairness, 399-401
- New Brunswick v. Dunsmuir*, 402-404, 405-406
 - decision reversing *Knight* case, 402

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT MATTERS — *continued*

- employment contract governing and not procedural fairness, 402
 - private law applicable to public employee, 402-403
 - public law duty of fairness only applied in two circumstances, 403
 - three category approach of *Ridge v. Baldwin*, 403
- Nicholson v. Haldimand-Norfolk*, 398-399
 - office holders requiring dismissal for cause, 398-399
- Ridge v. Baldwin*, 397-398, 405
 - duty to be fair depending on classification of position, 397-398
 - offices held “during pleasure”, 397
 - offices requiring cause for dismissal, 397-398

LOCUS STANDI, 676-686, 729-734 *See also* PREROGATIVE REMEDIES

MANDAMUS *See also* PREROGATIVE REMEDIES

- compelling performance of statutory duty owed to applicant, 673
- conditions to be fulfilled before order issued, 673-675
 - public legal duty to act, 673
 - where discretionary duty, 674-675
- covering all forms of administrative action, 673
- Crown not subject to *mandamus*, 675-676
- Federal Court of Appeal’s jurisdiction, 676

MISFEASANCE IN PUBLIC OFFICE, 757-765 *See also* PRIVATE LAW REMEDIES AND TORT LIABILITY OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

NATURAL JUSTICE AND DUTY TO BE FAIR: HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND GENERAL PRINCIPLES *See also* *AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM* RULE and BIAS RULE

- breach of duty to be fair, effect of, 257-259
 - delegate’s actions *ultra vires* if errors committed, 257-258
 - delegate’s decision subject to judicial review, 258
 - delegate’s jurisdiction dependent upon preliminary or collateral matters, 257
 - privative clause, effect of, 259
 - procedural error being error of law, 258-259
- duty to be fair, and incorrect attempts to apply to merits of decision, 253-255
 - substantive limitations, 253-255
- duty to be fair, and legislative functions and decisions of Cabinet, 247-253
 - Cabinet and duty to be fair, 250-253
 - Crown prerogative and duty to be fair, 252-253
 - judicial review of Cabinet decision, 250-251
 - legislative function not subject to duty of fairness, 248-250
 - generally, 247-248
 - legislative functions and duty to be fair, 248-250
 - delegated legislation, 248-250
- duty to be fair in Canada, 231-247
 - Campeau* case, 235-236
 - council refusing reclassification of land, 235-236
 - improper purpose and duty to be fair, 236
 - conclusion, 245-247
 - duty of procedural fairness not dependent on quasi-judicial function, 246
 - factors in determining whether procedure was fair, 246-247
 - legislative functions not affected by duty to be fair, 247
 - quasi-judicial function remaining important, 247

NATURAL JUSTICE — continued

- Harvie* case, 236-239
 - subdivision approval process characterized as quasi-judicial function, 236-239
 - duty to be fair resulting from quasi-judicial function, 237, 239
- Martineau (No. 2)*, 241-245
 - certiorari* available to remedy breach of duty to be fair procedurally, 243
 - certiorari* available to remedy breach of duty when executive function, 241-242
 - disciplinary proceedings, availability of judicial review of, 245
 - supervisory jurisdiction of Federal Court, 242
- McCarthy* case, 239-241
 - duty to be fair although executive function, 240
 - certiorari* available to correct breach of duty, 240-241
- Nicholson* case, 231-235
 - general duty to be fair although principles of natural justice not applying, 233, 234-235
 - status of probationary constable not attracting principles of natural justice, 233
- duty to be fair in England, 226-231
 - advantages of new approach, 230-231
- Re H.K.*, 229-230
- Ridge v. Baldwin*, 226-229
 - restoration of principles of natural justice, 226-229
 - super-added duty concept rebuffed, 227-228
- duty to be fair, summary on, 259
- duty to be fair vs. “principles of fundamental justice” in Charter, 255-256
 - substantive fairness, 255-256
- historical development, 217-226
 - Canadian development of law, 223-226
 - Alliance* case, 223-224
 - Calgary Power v. Copithorne*, 224-226
 - quasi-judicial vs. executive power, 225
 - Saltfleet v. Knapman*, 224
 - early English cases applying natural justice: *Cooper* and *Rice*, 218-220
 - statutory bodies and regulatory agencies governed by principles, 218-220
 - judicial or quasi-judicial functions, when exercising, 219
 - right to be heard, 219
 - erosion of natural justice, 220-223
 - initial erosion: concentrating on identity of decision-maker, 220-221
 - second erosion: super-added duty to act judicially, 221-223
 - origins of phrase: “judicial or quasi-judicial”, 217-218
 - “judicial” vs. “legislative” or “executive”, 218
 - “duty to be fair” supplanting need for characterization, 218
- introduction, 216-217

ORAL HEARING PROCESSES, 312-352 *See also* AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM RULE

POST-HEARING PROCESSES, 353-396 *See also* AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM RULE

PRE-HEARING PROCEDURES, 267-312 *See also* AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM RULE

PREROGATIVE REMEDIES

- Alberta application for judicial review, 692-694
 - appeal, 694
 - application combined with application for private law injunction or declaration, 693

PREROGATIVE REMEDIES — *continued*

- originating application, 692
 - service of application, 692-693
 - stay of proceeding, 694
 - style of cause, 692
- record required to be filed by delegate, 694
- time limit, 693
- certiorari* and prohibition, 668-673
 - availability now to control administrative decisions, 669
 - availability where impugned decision characterized as judicial or quasi-judicial, 669
 - certiorari* vs. prohibition, 668-669
 - decision or determination by delegate, 670
 - final decision reviewable, 670
 - Federal Court of Appeal's jurisdiction, 672-673
 - historical development, 669
 - illegal governmental action, controlling, 671
 - limitations on availability of remedies, 671-672
 - public law field, confined to, 671
 - supervisory role of superior courts, 669
 - beyond traditional judicial context, 669
 - void decision, 670
- conclusion, 696
- discretionary nature of prerogative remedies, 686-692
 - alternative remedies, availability of, 691-692
 - clean hands and general conduct of applicant, 689
 - delay, unreasonable, 688-689
 - futility, mootness and non-material errors, 690-691
 - generally, 686-687
 - waiver and acquiescence, 687
- Federal Courts Act*, 694-696, Appendix 5
 - application against federal board, commission or other tribunal, 694
 - application for judicial review, 695
 - Federal Court of Appeal's jurisdiction, 695
 - grounds upon which Federal Courts able to review decision specifically articulated, 695-696
 - listed federal delegates, 695
- habeas corpus*, 666-668
 - quashing illegal detention of applicant, 667
 - review of errors of law or jurisdiction, 667
 - standing to apply and burden of proof, 668
- introduction, 663-666
 - application for judicial review, 663-664
 - purpose for new procedure, 666
 - uniform procedure for obtaining remedies, 665-666
 - five prerogative remedies, 664
 - "prerogative" nature of remedies, 664-665
 - two-step procedure, 665
 - standard procedure not constituting new substantive remedy, 663-664
- mandamus*, 673-676
 - compelling performance of statutory duty owed to applicant, 673
 - conditions to be fulfilled before order issued, 673-675

PREROGATIVE REMEDIES — continued

- public legal duty to act, 673
 - where discretionary duty, 674-675
- covering all forms of administrative action, 673
- Crown not subject to *mandamus*, 675-676
- Federal Court of Appeal's jurisdiction, 676
- quo warranto*, 676
- standing, 676-686
 - common law, standing under, 678-680
 - narrower view of standing, 679-680
 - wider view of standing, 679-680
 - who qualifying, 678
 - criteria, 676-677
 - discretion of court to grant standing, 680-681
 - intervention in judicial review application, 686
 - legal personality and standing of decision-makers, 683-685
 - applicant recognized as person in law, 683
 - respondent's legal personality irrelevant, 684
 - statutory delegate's standing restricted, 684-685
 - public interest standing, 681
 - rationales for limiting standing, 678
 - statutory provisions, standing under, 682-683
 - timing, 685

PRIVATE LAW REMEDIES AND TORT LIABILITY OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

- class actions, 765-767
 - increase in number of, 765-766
 - three advantages over multiple suits, 766
 - significance of, 766-767
- conclusion, 784-786
 - damages, 785, 786
 - declaration, 785
 - injunction, 784-785
 - misconduct, intentional and abusive, 785-786
- damages, 734-784
 - constitutional aspect of damages, 767-771
 - Charter* expanding liability of government and its officials, 767-771
 - constitutional tort, 767-771
 - Charter*, s. 24 remedial powers, 767, 769
 - failure of police to warn of risk of injury, 767-769
 - deprivation of *Charter*, s. 7 rights, 768-769
 - immunities, 771-784
 - conclusion, 784-786
 - Crown immunity, 773-779
 - common law immunity from suit in tort, 773-774
 - Crown Liability Act* permitting tort actions against governments, 775-779
 - Alberta Act*, 776-777
 - "Crown agent", scope of, 778-779
 - vicarious liability, 773-774, 777-779
 - "official liability", 774-775
 - Crown conducting defence in servant's name, 775
 - personal liability of Crown servant, 774-775

PRIVATE LAW REMEDIES — *continued*

- imposition of liability being harsh and unjust, 775
- “Petition of Right” statutes permitting actions in tort against Crown, 775
- generally, 700-701
- judicial officers, 780-782
 - Canadian cases, 780-782
 - broadly based immunity justified, 781-782
 - constitutional immunity, 783
 - common law immunity for judges, 780-782
 - liable for malicious acts within jurisdiction, 780-781
 - immunity for acts within jurisdiction, 780-781
 - superior court judges enjoying extensive immunity, 780-781
 - absolute immunity where acting within jurisdiction, 780-781
- members of Parliament and provincial legislatures, 779
- public officials acting legislatively, 782-783
 - municipality immune when exercising legislative power, 782-783
- public officials acting quasi-judicially, 783-784
 - immunity where city acting quasi-judicially, 784
 - recent developments raising doubts as to continuing immunity, 784
 - rezoning function characterized as having quasi-judicial element, 784
- introduction, 734-737
 - public authorities personally liable in damages for injurious misconduct, 735-736
 - abuse of official power under tort of misfeasance, 735
 - nominate tort or negligence, where injurious action constituting, 734
 - pre-conditions for official liability, 735-736
 - illegal or *ultra vires* action, 736
 - tortious action, 735
 - same extent as private citizen, liability for damages, 735
- misfeasance in public office, 757-765
 - generally, 757-758
 - modern authority, 760-761
 - broader view of what constituting “malice”, 763-765
 - objective definition of “malice” affording greater scope for action, 760-761
 - subjective view of malice limiting nature of misfeasance action, 759-761
 - foreseeable consequences, 761
 - intention to cause harm required or knowingly acting without authority, 760-761
- origins of action in damages, 758-759
 - malicious misconduct or extreme bad faith, 759
 - “malice”, uncertainty of term, 759
- recent authority, 761-765
 - Canadian cases, 761-765
 - broad view of tort well established, 764-765
 - improper releasing of information to media, 761
 - land use context, 762
 - abuse of power in sense of illegal act, 761-762
 - reckless indifference to legality of actions, 762
 - targeted malice, 760-762
 - modern view of misfeasance tort, 765
 - broad view, 764-765
 - inadequate investigation by SIU, 763

PRIVATE LAW REMEDIES — *continued*

- key elements of modern tort, 758-768
- misfeasance in public office, 757
- two categories of official misconduct, 757
- seminal authority limiting misfeasance tort to two forms of abuse, 760-761, 763
 - acts undertaken with actual knowledge that unlawful and likely to cause harm, 760-761
 - malice not required, 760-761
 - mental element difficult to prove, 761
 - subjective recklessness, 760-761
 - targeted malice, 760-762
- negligence, 738-757
 - generally, 738-740
 - policy concerns, 738-739
 - restrictions applicable to law of negligence generally, 740
 - Canadian law evolution of, 743-755
 - Brown, Swinamer*, 747-748
 - actions against provincial Crown for failure to maintain highways, 747-748
 - decision to identify and later remove diseased trees being policy decision, 748
 - removal of trees dependent on reallocation of funding, 748
 - decision to operate on summer schedule being policy decision, 747-748
 - cases criticized as immunity extending to decisions associated with policy, 748
 - Imperial Tobacco*, 753-755
 - reaffirmation of *Anns* test in Canada, 755
 - review of evolution of law on governmental liability in England, Australia and U.S., 755
 - two potential sources of a prima facie duty of care, 754
 - Just case*, 746-747
 - broader range of governmental activity subject to judicial scrutiny, 747
 - “policy” label limited to true policy decisions, 746-747
 - rock-face inspection falling within operational area of province’s functions, 746-747
 - Kamloops case*, 743-746
 - negligence occurring in council’s failure to enforce by-law, 745-746
 - policy/operational dichotomy, difficulty for courts in applying, 745-746
 - prima facie* duty of care owed by city to subsequent owner of building, 744
 - city’s omissions falling outside of *bona fide* exercise of discretion, 744
 - failure of city to secure compliance with by-law, 743-744
 - new direction: *Cooper, Edwards*, 749-753
 - Law Society exercising discretionary powers in its disciplinary functions, 751
 - overriding policy considerations negating *prima facie* duty of care, 750, 751
 - reformulation of two-stage approach to duty issue, 749-751
 - close relationship warranting imposition of duty of care, 751, 752
 - policy considerations at second stage, 752
 - proximity not satisfied as investors not clients of regulated lawyer, 751
 - proximity supplementing reasonable foreseeability test, 749

PRIVATE LAW REMEDIES — continued

- registrar of mortgage brokers not owing duty of care to investors, 749
 - conclusion on negligence by public authorities, 755-757
 - Anns* refinement extending negligence liability of public authorities, 755-757
 - novel situations, public authorities held to owe duty of care in, 756
 - pure economic loss, public authority liability including claims for, 756-757
 - Anns* two stage approach to liability applied and refined in Canada, 755-756
 - Australia approach, 755
 - England approach, 755
 - liability of public authorities, 738-740
 - law of negligence not uniformly applied to wide-ranging activities, 738
 - distinction between misfeasance and nonfeasance, 739
 - distinction between statutory duty and statutory power, 739
 - reasons for reluctance to subject activities to standards of negligence, 739
 - whether strong private analogue, 740
 - limited scope of negligence liability, 740
 - starting point: *Anns*, 740-743
 - Canadian courts embracing *Anns* principles, 742-743
 - discretionary governmental action, reluctance to judge reasonableness of, 741-742
 - discretionary immunity at operational level based on *vires* of official action, 742
 - distinction between policy area and operational area, 741-742
 - acts at operational level giving rise to common law duty of care, 741-742
 - “operational” defined, 742
 - “policy” defined, 742
 - policy decision-making requiring responsible exercise of discretion, 742
 - two-stage approach as to whether duty of care arising in circumstances, 740-741
 - concept of proximity defined in terms of foreseeability of harm, 741
 - nominate torts, 737-738
- declarations, 721-729
 - availability, 725-728
 - discretionary remedy, 728
 - premature claim or hypothetical question, 727
 - exclusion where authority delegated to statutory body, 725
 - flexible nature and few limitations, 725
 - legal personality of entity sued requirement, 725
 - practical value, 727
 - requirement of justiciability, 725-727
 - Crown liability, 728-729
 - nature of declarations, 721-725
 - alternative form of proceeding to application for *certiorari*, 722-723
 - defined, 721
 - flexible nature, 722
 - historical development, 721
 - public law remedy, 722
 - alternative means of determining *vires* of government action, 722-723
 - appropriate response to illegal government action, 722-723
 - res judicata* on *ultra vires* issue, 723-724
 - supervisory remedy, 722-723
 - procedure, 723

PRIVATE LAW REMEDIES — continued

relator actions, 730

standing, 729-734

current test for public interest standing, 732-734

liberal approach to question of standing, trend to, 730-732

constitutional challenge, 730-731

“public interest” standing, 730

restrictive view of standing, 729-730

injunctions, 701-720

availability of injunctive relief, 703-706

Attorney General, at suit of, 706

interim form of relief, 705

mandatory injunctions granted to enforce public law rights, 705-706

parliamentary proceedings, 707-708

restraining enforcement of unconstitutional laws, 707-708

preventing wrongful conduct of public authorities, 704

prohibition used to restrain *ultra vires* proceedings before quasi-judicial tribunals, 704

restraining or preventing unauthorized action by governmental bodies, 704

standing, liberal view of, 705

directly and detrimentally affected by administrative decision, 705

Crown immunity, 713-720

common law immunity, 713-716

generally, 713-714

prohibitory injunctions, availability of, 714

Crown servant enjoined in personal capacity, 715

restraining Crown servant from exceeding lawful limits, 714

statutory immunity, 716-720

declaratory relief providing effective remedy, 716

English courts restrictively interpreting legislation, 718-720

exception to immunity of Crown servants from injunctive relief, 719-720

interim injunctive relief against Crown and its servants, 719-720

purpose, stated, 716

“no injunction” provision, 720

Crown agent’s entitlement to immunity being less clear, 720

introduction, 701

remedying *ultra vires* acts or omissions, 701

nature of injunctions, 701-703

discretionary nature of injunctions, 712-713

interim or interlocutory injunctions, 708-712

court balancing risk of granting vs. risk of not granting, 708

factors considered in application, 708-709, 711

preliminary assessment of merits of case, 708-709

public interest considered, 709, 710

serious question raised, 708

undertaking in damages as condition of obtaining injunction, 711-712

mandatory injunctions, 701-702

mandamus, similarity to, 701-702

permanent injunctions, 702

prohibitory injunction, 702

prohibition, similarity to, 702

PRIVATE LAW REMEDIES — continued

- procedure, 723
 - application for judicial review, 723
 - providing for combining of remedies, 723
 - statement of claim, 723
- relator actions, 730
- standing, 729-734
 - cautious approach to standing, 729-730
 - restrictive view of standing, 729-730
 - rules of standing in Canada being liberalized, 730-732
- introduction, 700-701
- stay of proceedings, 712-713
 - discretionary nature of stay, 712-713

PRIVATIVE CLAUSES See also STANDARDS OF REVIEW

- absence of privative clause not automatically engaging correctness standard, 558-559
- error of law on face of record, 496-499
 - generally, 496-497
 - not preventing judicial review where jurisdictional error, 497
 - preventing anomalous use of *certiorari* where intra-jurisdictional error, 496-497, 499-500
 - patently unreasonable interpretation of law being jurisdictional error not protected by privative clause, 498-499
 - preliminary or collateral matters, 497
- generally, 14-15, 628-629
 - effect of privative clauses, 14-15
 - judicial review vs. legislative sovereignty, 14-15
 - “privative clauses” defined, 14
- introduction, 557-558
- presence of appeal provision implying less deference, 570-574
 - examples of appeal cases where correctness standard applied, 570-572
 - examples of appeal case where patently unreasonable standard applied, 573-574
 - examples of appeal cases where reasonableness simpliciter standard applied, 572-573
- post-*Dunsmuir* deference in appeals, 574
- presence of privative clause implying deference, 560-570
 - constitutional limitations on privative clauses in Canada, 565-567
 - privative clause not to oust superior court’s power to review, 565
 - section 96 protecting administrative law jurisdiction of superior courts, 565-567
 - federal tribunals, issue of applicability to, 567
 - elastic jurisdiction clauses, 564-565
 - exclusive jurisdiction clauses, 562
 - final and binding clauses, 560-563
 - lesser privative effect and lesser standard of deference, 562
 - “full” or “true” privative clauses, 564
 - no-*certiorari* clauses, 562-564
 - stronger privative effect and higher curial deference, 564
 - “privative clause” defined, 560
 - statutory abolition of privative clauses, 567-569
 - Canada not eviscerating effectiveness of privative clauses, 569
 - England and Wales, 567-568
 - summary, 569-570
- specific statutory identification of standard of review to be applied, 575

PROHIBITION, 668-673 *See also* PREROGATIVE REMEDIES, *certiorari* and prohibition, and PRIVATE LAW REMEDIES AND TORT LIABILITY OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES, injunctions

QUO WARRANTO, 676 *See also* PREROGATIVE REMEDIES

REASONS FOR DECISION, 382-396 *See also* *AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM* RULE, post-hearing processes

REGULATIONS *See* SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

REMEDIES GENERALLY *See also* PREROGATIVE REMEDIES and PRIVATE LAW REMEDIES AND TORT LIABILITY OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

Alberta procedural reforms, 627

appeals, 625

federal procedural reforms, 627-628

Ontario procedural reforms, 627

prerogative remedies, 626

private law remedies, 626-627

privative clauses, 628-629

substantive reforms, 628

RIGHT TO COUNSEL, 330-338 *See also* *AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM* RULE, oral hearing processes

STANDARDS OF REVIEW

consensual tribunals, applicability of standards of review analysis to, 620

constitutional and conceptual basis for different standards of review, 515-517

traditional view of judicial review, 515-516

court required to determine what powers given to statutory delegate and to court, 516-517

discretionary decisions, application of standard of review analysis to, 606-620

introduction, 606-607

two separate inquiries, 606-607

Chieu case, 612-614

certified question being of considerable precedential value, 612

correctness standard being appropriate, less deferential, standard, 613

factors considered, 613-614

Moreau-Bérubé case, 614

patently unreasonable standard, 614

Retired Judges Case, 614-619

appointment of retired judges to interest arbitration boards, 614-615

patently unreasonable as frustrating legislative scheme, 615

labour relations expertise and broad acceptability to be inferred, whether, 616-617

Minister's discretion not unfettered, 618

relevant criteria for exercise of discretion, determining, 615-617

criteria constraining exercise of discretion, 615-616

caution in implying criteria, 616-617

labour relations expertise and broad acceptability criteria, 616-617

specified in Act or regulations, 616

unwritten and derived from context of statute, 616

summary on review of exercise of discretionary powers, 620

Suresh case, 607-612

court determining whether Minister's exercise of discretion within constraints, 610

STANDARDS OF REVIEW — *continued*

- reasonableness *simpliciter* standard, 611
- standard selected with respect to Minister's refugee determination, 607-608
 - factors considered, 607-609
 - intention of Parliament, 608
 - nature of question, 608
 - purpose of legislation, 608
 - relative expertise of decision-maker, 608
 - factors suggesting broad ministerial discretion, 608
 - pragmatic and functional approach to deference, 608
 - weighing of factors used by Minister not function of court, 607, 609, 610
- unreasonableness *simpliciter* standard, 611-612
- distinction between standard of review and content of duty of procedural fairness, 601-606
 - acts or omissions isolated that were relevant to procedural fairness, 602
 - degree of deference, determining, 602
 - fairness not engaging spectrum of deference, 604
 - legislative scheme, examining, 602
 - procedural fairness vs. standards of review, 601, 603-604
 - reasons, standard for reviewing adequacy of, 605-606
- functional and pragmatic approach to deference, factors in, 557-575
 - first "Pushpanathan factor": presence or absence of privative clause, or right of appeal, 557-575
 - absence of privative clause not automatically engaging correctness standard, 558-559
 - introduction, 557-558
 - presence of appeal provision implying less deference, 570-574
 - examples of appeal cases where correctness standard applied, 570-572
 - examples of appeal case where patently unreasonable standard applied, 573-574
 - examples of appeal cases where reasonableness standard applied, 572-573
 - post-*Dunsmuir* deference in appeals, 574
 - presence of privative clause implying deference, 560-570
 - constitutional limitations on privative clauses in Canada, 565-567
 - privative clause not to oust superior court's power to review, 565
 - section 96 protecting administrative law jurisdiction of superior courts, 566-567
 - federal tribunals, issue of applicability to, 565-567
 - elastic jurisdiction clauses, 564-565
 - exclusive jurisdiction clauses, 562
 - final and binding clauses, 560-562
 - lesser privative effect and lesser standard of deference, 562
 - "full" or "true" privative clauses, 564
 - no-*certiorari* clauses, 562-564
 - stronger privative effect and higher curial deference, 564
 - "privative clause" defined, 560
 - statutory abolition of privative clauses, 567-569
 - Canada not eviscerating effectiveness of privative clauses, 569
 - England and Wales, 567-568
 - summary, 569-570
- fourth "Pushpanathan factor": "nature of the problem": question of law or fact, 583-585
- limitations of distinction, 583
- second "Pushpanathan factor": expertise, 575-581

STANDARDS OF REVIEW — continued

- different types of expertise, 577-578
- how expertise established, 580-581
- indicator of legislative intent, importance as, 581
- introduction, 575-577
- relative expertise, 578-580
 - whether issue being specialized legal concept, 579
- specific statutory identification of standard of review to be applied, 575
- third factor: purpose of Act as whole and provision in particular, 581-582
- historical development of different standards, 517-546
- complexity of modern standards of review, 543-545
 - Toronto (City) v. C.U.P.E., Local 79*, 543-545
 - distinctions and fundamentals needing rethinking, 543-545
- “correctness test” applied to jurisdictional matters, 523-526
 - generally, 523
 - other types of jurisdictional issues, 524
 - Syndicat* case, 524-526
 - unreasonable test not applied where jurisdictional error, 524-525
 - preliminary or collateral matters, 523-524
- English extension: all errors of law being jurisdictional, 519-520
 - absence of privative clauses to prevent use of *certiorari*, 519-520
- factors used in functional and pragmatic approach, 539
- “functional and pragmatic” test for identifying jurisdictional matters, 526-530, 539
 - Bibeault* case, 526-527
 - Econosult* case, 527-528
 - four factors, 539
- “jurisdictional consequences” not necessarily resulting in correctness standard, 529-530
- high water mark for intensive judicial review: *Anisminic*, 517-519
 - microscopic examination of delegate’s actions to find jurisdictional defects, 528
- low water mark for judicial review in Canada, 520-523
- C.U.P.E.* and “not patently unreasonable” test as shield from judicial review, 520-521
- post-*C.U.P.E.* euphoria, 522-523
- “patently unreasonable” test, 530-533
 - “patently”, meaning of, 530-531
 - relationship between patently unreasonable decision and jurisdiction, 532-533
 - “unreasonableness” going beyond questions of law, 531-532
- spectrum of standards of review, 533-538
 - appeals and applications for judicial review, applicability to both, 533, 536
 - initial doubt, 536-537
 - Pushpanathan* case, 537-539
 - pragmatic and functional approach in determining appropriate standard, 539
 - fleeting thought that many standards along spectrum, 539
 - intermediate standard of “reasonableness *simpliciter*”, 533
 - Pezim* case, 534-535
 - Southam* case, 535-536
 - Pezim* case: spectrum concept first enunciated, 534
 - three standards of review: *Dr. Q* and *Ryan* cases, 540-543
 - only three standards: *Ryan* case, 540-541
 - overall functional and pragmatic approach, 542-543
 - no necessary correlation between type of error and standard of review, 542
 - reasonableness *simpliciter*, fixed meaning of, 542

STANDARDS OF REVIEW — *continued*

- spectrum of standards converted to spectrum of deference, 541
- introduction, 511-515
 - identifying “standard of review” in each administrative law case, 511-513
 - “correctness” or “patently unreasonable” or “reasonableness *simpliciter*”, 512-513
 - pragmatic and functional approach for weighing various factors, 513
 - principal factors considered in determining applicable standard, 513
 - intention of legislature being central question, 513
 - reasonableness standard, 586
 - “standard of review” defined, 511-512
- practical issues in identification and application of appropriate standard, 586-600
 - appropriate standard changing over time, 600
 - different judges applying same standard differently, 590-592
 - different judges selecting different standards, 589-590
 - different standards of review applying to different issues, 592-600
 - warning against identifying sub-issues which attract different standards, 593-595
 - distinction between legal and factual determinations, 594
 - whether some statutory provisions requiring greater deference, 593
 - distinction between standard applied by delegate and by courts, 588-589
 - Dunsmuir* leaving unanswered questions, 586
 - higher court applying correctness standard to lower court’s choice and application, 589
 - predictability, lack of, 587-588
 - proof, issues of, 588-589
 - standard of review to be addressed in every case, 586-587
 - whether case to be “segmented” into different issues, 595-600
 - integrated approach, 596-597
 - segmentation approach, 595-596, 599-600
 - unduly interventionist approach, danger of, 595-596
- simplification in *Dunsmuir*, 546-557
 - background, 546-547
 - decision by Justice Binnie, 550-552
 - new reasonableness standard, 551
 - decision by Justice Deschamps, 552-554
 - “nature of question”, focusing on, 553
 - majority decision, 547-550
 - single reasonableness standard, 547, 548
 - summary, 556-557
 - unresolved questions, 554-556
- summary on standards of review, 621

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

- challenging subordinate legislation, 137-140
 - composition or procedure of delegate, 139
 - conditions precedent, 139
 - conflict with other Acts, 139
 - parent Act repealed, 139
 - parent Act *ultra vires*, 139
 - restrictions, implied, 139-140
 - good faith, 139-140
 - legitimate expectations doctrine, 140
 - reasonableness, 140
- ultra vires*, 138-139

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION — *continued*

- subordinate legislation to be within scope of authority granted to delegate, 138
- examples of power to enact subordinate legislation, 119-120
 - broad regulation-making power, 119
 - Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act* (Alberta), 119
- growth of subordinate legislation, 108-109
 - Canada, 109
 - United Kingdom, 108-109
- introduction, 106
- municipal bylaws: particular type of subordinate legislation, 130-132
 - procedural requirements of natural justice applying, 131-132
 - breach of requirements rendering bylaw void, 131
 - municipalities as creatures of provincial legislation, 130
 - statutory procedures exceeding common law requirements, 131
- other forms of subordinate legislation, 113
 - First Nations, law-making powers delegated to, 113
 - municipal by-laws, 113
 - Territorial jurisdictions, 113
- Parliamentary scrutiny of subordinate legislation, 132-137
 - generally, 132
 - Standing Joint Committee, 132-137
 - disallowance procedure, statutory, 134-135
 - goals, 136-137
 - parliamentary supremacy and control, maintenance of, 133, 136
 - recommendations, 133-134
 - scrutiny committee, approach of, 136
 - terms of reference, 132-133
- reasons for subordinate legislation, 107-108
 - political expediency, 108
- regulations, 114-130
 - filing and publication of, 122-124
 - definition of “regulation”, 114-119
 - Alberta definition, 114
 - Interpretation Act*, 114
 - legislative nature, 114-115
 - not regulations under *Regulations Act*, 115
 - federal definition, 117-119
 - generally, 117
 - statutory instrument, 117-119
 - failure to file or register regulations, effect of, 124-126
 - Alberta’s mandatory approach, 124
 - exempting regulations, 124
 - retrospective regulations, 125
 - federal directory approach, 125
 - filing or registration of regulations, 122-124
 - Alberta requirements, 123
 - federal requirements, 122
 - coming into force before registration, conditions for, 124
 - pre-implementation examination, 123-124
 - registration within seven days unless exemption, 124
 - publication of regulations and exemption from publication, 126-129

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION — *continued*

- Alberta publication requirement, 127-128
 - deemed regulation, 127
 - dispensing with publication, 127
 - enforceability, 127
 - exempted regulation, 128
 - time limit of one month, 127
- federal publication requirement, 128-129
 - Statutory Instruments Act*, 128
- ignorance of regulation as defence, 126, 127
- introduction, 126-127
- non-publication, effect of, 129
- parent legislation vs. subordinate legislation, enacting of, 126-127
- preparation of, 112-113
 - judicial review not available, 112
 - prior consultation with interested persons, desirability of, 113
- subordinate legislation as effective as parent legislation, 110-112
 - constitutional relationship, 111-112
 - validity explicitly recognized, 111
- subordinate legislation that not regulation, 129-130
- summary, 140-141
- what constituting subordinate legislation, 106-107
 - Canada's federal system restricting delegation of legislative power, 107
- who making subordinate legislation, 109-110

TORT LIABILITY OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES *See* PRIVATE LAW REMEDIES
AND TORT LIABILITY OF PUBLIC AUTHORITIES