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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
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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
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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
  Milward 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
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
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“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
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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
document 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
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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
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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
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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
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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
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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
defereence 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
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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
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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

GROUNDS 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
GROUNDS 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 GROUNDS FOR
JUDICIAL REVIEW GENERALLY

JUDICIAL REVIEW PROCEDURE ACT (ONTARIO), Appendix 3

JURISDICTION See also GROUNDS 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
formulation 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

Ann's 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

Ann's two stage approach to liability applied and refined in Canada, 755-756

Australia approach, 755

England approach, 755

liability of public authorities, 738-740

case of 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,

whether strong private analogue, 740

limited scope of negligence liability, 740

starting point: Ann's, 740-743

Canadian courts embracing Ann's principles, 742-743

discretionary governmental action, reluctance to judge reasonableness of,

471-742

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
remediating 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
effects of appeal cases where correctness standard applied, 570-572
effects of appeal case where patently unreasonable standard applied, 573-574
effects 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
INDEX 863

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
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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 Deschanps, 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
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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