

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Dedication</i>	iii
<i>Summary of Contents</i>	v
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vii
<i>Preface</i>	xxxvii
<i>About the Author</i>	xli
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xliii

CHAPTER I — The Foundation of Environmental Class Actions in

Canada	1
1. <i>Introduction</i>	1
2. <i>The Case That Started Environmental Class Actions in Québec: Comité d'environnement de La Baie inc. c. Société d'électrolyse et de chimie Alcan ltée</i>	2
A. Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action.....	3
B. Appeal.....	5
C. Motion to Strike the New Allegations and Conclusions.....	10
D. Appeal.....	11
E. Settlement and the Motion for a Stay of the Proceedings.....	14
3. <i>The Most Important Case of All: Hollick v. Metropolitan Toronto (Municipality)</i>	16
A. Certification Motion Before the Ontario Superior Court of Justice.....	16
B. Appeal before the Divisional Court.....	22
C. Court of Appeal.....	24
D. Judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada.....	25

CHAPTER II — The Problem of Historical Contamination..... 31

1. <i>Introduction</i>	31
2. <i>A Nickel Refinery in Port Colborne: Smith v. Inco Limited</i>	32
A. Application by the Plaintiff under Section 12 of the <i>Class Proceedings Act</i> for an Order Compelling Inco to Produce a List of the Proposed Class Members Who Have Been Provided with a Letter and Attached Consent and Notice Regarding a Proposed Indoor Sampling Program.....	34
B. Motion by Inco to Strike Out Paragraphs of the Statement of Claim and for the Determination of Points of Law ...	37
C. Motion by the Crown to Strike Out Paragraphs of the Statement of Claim.....	41

TABLE OF CONTENTS

D. Costs for the Three Previous Motions.....44

E. Motion by Inco for an Order Compelling the Plaintiff to Answer Questions Refused During Hearing of the Cross-Examination on his Affidavit..... 46

F. Application for Leave to Appeal the Decision of Justice Nordheimer Dismissing the Motion for an Order Compelling Inco to Produce a List of the Proposed Class Members Who Have Been Provided With a Letter and Attached Consent and Notice 48

G. Costs Respecting the Motion to Compel Answers from Pearson 49

H. Application to Certify the Action as a Class Proceeding..... 49

I. Application by Inco and the Other Defendants for Costs 61

J. Appeal by Pearson before the Divisional Court from the Order of Justice Nordheimer Refusing to Certify the Action as a Class Proceeding and from the Order Awarding Inco Limited and the Other Defendants Their Costs..... 62

K. Determination of Costs between the Appellant Pearson and the Respondent Inco 64

L. Application by Pearson for Leave to Appeal to the Court of Appeal 64

M. Motion by the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario for Leave to Intervene as an Added Party on Appeals from the Judgment of the Divisional Court 64

N. Appeal Before the Ontario Court of Appeal 65

O. Application for Costs in Appeal 72

P. Pearson’s Motion for an Order Compelling Inco to File a Further and Better Affidavit of Documents 74

Q. Motions by Inco and Pearson to Compel Answers to Numerous Refusals and Undertakings Provided at the Examination for Discovery 75

R. Motion by Inco to Decertify the Class Proceeding 75

S. Judgment of the Superior Court on the Merits 77

T. Motion to Intervene as a Friend of the Court by Friends of the Earth Canada 84

U. Appeal before the Court of Appeal..... 84

V. Motion by the Parties Respecting the Procedure to be Followed in Determining the Trial Costs Order 91

W. Application for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada 92

X. Motion to Strike the Affidavits of the Law Foundation of Ontario 92

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Y.	Costs Decision: \$1,760,000 to Inco	95
Z.	Appeal of the Costs Order	98
3.	<i>The Sydney Tar Ponds Class Action: MacQueen v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	101
A.	Motions to Strike Out Portions of the Statement of Claim	103
B.	Appeal of the Judgment Striking Out Pleading and Allegations	105
C.	Motions for Discovery of the Plaintiffs by the Attorney General of Canada	107
D.	Appeals before the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal	107
E.	Judgment of the Nova Scotia Supreme Court on the Certification Application	108
F.	Motion for a Stay of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia	114
G.	Motions for Leave to Appeal to the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal by the Sydney Steel Corporation, the Attorney General of Canada, and the Attorney General of Nova Scotia	115
H.	Costs Decision	116
I.	Appeal Before the Nova Scotia Court of Appeal of the Certification Order	120
J.	Motion for Reconsideration	127
K.	Costs Order	128
L.	Application for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada	131
M.	August 25, 2015 Press Release	131

CHAPTER III — The Two Cases that Settled the Law on the Neighbourhood Disturbances Doctrine in Québec

1.	<i>Introduction</i>	137
2.	<i>Dust Over the City: Barrette c. Ciment du St-Laurent inc.</i>	139
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	139
B.	Application for Access to Documents Held by the Minister of the Environment	142
C.	Motion by St. Lawrence Cement to Examine a Third Party	143
D.	Motion from the Plaintiffs to Compel St. Lawrence Cement to Disclose Documents	144
E.	Motion from St. Lawrence Cement to Revoke the Judgment Authorizing the Class Action Under Article 1022 of the Code of Civil Procedure	146

TABLE OF CONTENTS

F.	Motion by St. Lawrence Cement to Examine Two Experts for the Plaintiff	148
G.	Motion by St. Lawrence Cement Objecting to the Filing of a Redacted Document by the Representative Claude Cochrane	148
H.	Motion by the Plaintiffs for Permission to Adduce Additional Evidence	148
I.	Trial on the Merits	149
J.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal	156
K.	Judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada	164
L.	The Motion for the Approval of the Attorneys' Fees... ..	167
M.	Back to the Superior Court: What is the Starting Date for the Calculation of Interest?	167
N.	Judgment on Claim No. 554	168
O.	Judgment on Claim No. 774	168
P.	Finality at Last (So it Seemed): Declaration of Satisfaction of Judgment	168
Q.	Motion for the Approval of a Special Honorarium	168
3.	<i>The Sequel of Barrette c. Ciment du St-Laurent inc.: Roy c. Ciment Saint-Laurent inc.</i>	169
A.	Judgment of the Superior Court	169
B.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal	169
C.	St. Lawrence Cement Part II: <i>Renaud c. Holcim Canada inc.</i>	170
D.	Motion by Holcim Canada Asking that Justice Martin Dallaire be Recused	171
E.	Motion for Leave to Appeal from the Judgment of Justice Dallaire Refusing to Recuse Himself: <i>Renaud c. Holcim Canada inc.</i>	171
F.	Motion to Split the Proceeding to Deal First With the Prescription Issue	172
G.	Motion by Holcim Canada to Examine Class Members before Plea	172
H.	Motion by Holcim Canada to Revoke the Authorization Judgment	172
I.	Appeal before the Court of Appeal of the Judgment Revoking the Authorization to Institute a Class Action	173
J.	Notice to the Class Members	173
K.	The Aftermath: <i>Flamand c. 9174-3641 Québec inc.</i>	173
4.	<i>The Other Dust Case: Comité d'environnement de Ville-Émard (C.E.V.E.) c. Domfer Poudres Métalliques ltée</i>	174
A.	Introduction	174

TABLE OF CONTENTS

B.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action in the Superior Court	174
C.	Trial on the Merits	177
D.	Appeal Before the Court of Appeal of the Judgment of the Superior Court on the Merits.....	178
E.	Bankruptcy of Domfer Poudres Métalliques and the Settlement.....	185
5.	<i>The Sequel of Comité d'environnement de Ville-Émard (C.E.V.E.) c. Domfer Poudres Métalliques ltée: Comité d'environnement de Ville-Émard c. Stodola</i>	186
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	186
B.	Examination Before Plea of the Designated Person and the Objection	187
C.	The Settlement.....	189
CHAPTER IV — Air Pollution		191
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	191
2.	<i>A Plywood Manufacturer in Longueuil: Association des citoyens et citoyennes pour un environnement sain de Fatima inc. c. Bois & Placages généraux ltée</i>	192
A.	Motion for Permission to Adduce Relevant Evidence at the Authorization Hearing	192
B.	Motion for <i>Lis Pendens</i> and Stay of Proceedings	193
C.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	193
D.	Motion to Amend the Class Action	194
E.	Motion to Quash the Seizure Before Judgment	195
F.	Motion for the Approval of the Settlement.....	196
3.	<i>An Aluminum Smelter in Baie-Comeau: Regroupement des citoyens du quartier St-Georges inc. c. Alcoa Canada ltée</i>	196
A.	Judgment of the Superior Court Authorizing the Institution of a Class Action	197
B.	Motion for Particular	207
C.	Motion by Alcoa to Strike Out Paragraphs of the Statement of Claim	208
D.	Motion by Alcoa to Strike Out Allegations of the Representative Answer.....	208
E.	Motion of the Representative for the Designation of an Independent Expert	208
4.	<i>An Asphalt Plant in the Magdalen Islands: Gaudet c. P. & B. Entreprises ltée</i>	209

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Motion for Certification to Institute Class Proceedings	209
B.	Motion to Strike Out Paragraphs and Exhibits	212
C.	Motion to Dismiss	212
5.	<i>Another Cement Plant Class Action: Kennedy c. Colacem Canada inc.</i>	213
A.	Motion for Permission to Adduce Evidence at the Authorization Hearing	213
B.	Motion For Authorization to Institute a Class Action	214
6.	<i>A Quarry and Asphalt Plant in New Brunswick: O’Neill v. St-Isidore Asphalte Ltée</i>	218
CHAPTER V — Trichloroethylene Contamination in Soil and Groundwater		223
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	223
2.	<i>TCE Contamination in the Eastern Townships: Lavoie c. Stanley Canada Corporation</i>	224
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	225
B.	Settlement	225
3.	<i>TCE Contamination in Ogden: Windsor v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company</i>	227
A.	Motion for Certification of the Action as a Class Proceeding	227
B.	Appeal of the Certification Order Before the Court of Appeal of Alberta	235
C.	Motion for Summary Dismissal	238
D.	Appeal to the Court of Appeal	238
E.	Settlement	241
4.	<i>TCE Contamination in Cambridge: Wamboldt v. Northstar Aerospace (Canada) Inc.</i>	241
5.	<i>TCE Contamination in Shannon: Spieser c. Canada (Procureur général)</i>	245
A.	Motions for Permission to Amend the Allegations and the Conclusions of the Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	246
B.	Motion for Permission to Conduct a Medical Examination	247
C.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	248
D.	Motion for a Safeguard Order	252

TABLE OF CONTENTS

E.	Motion for Substitution and Addition of Parties to the Motion to Institute Proceedings.....	252
F.	Motion for Extension of the Delay to Institute the Class Action	253
G.	Motion for Leave to Appeal to the Court of Appeal ...	253
H.	Motion for Particulars	253
I.	Motion for a Further Safeguard Order and Filing of the Expert Reports	254
J.	Motion by the Representative for Permission to Re-Amend the Amended and Particularized Motion to Institute Proceedings and to Amend the Definition of the Class, and Motion by the Defendants to Modify the Authorization Judgment.....	255
K.	Judgment Respecting an Objection to a Question at an Examination of a Class Member.....	256
L.	Motion to Revoke the Judgment Authorizing the Institution of a Class Action.....	257
M.	Judgement Respecting a Verbal Motion for the Return of a Document Forwarded Inadvertently	259
N.	Judgment Respecting a Motion of the Class Representative for Permission to Adduce an Additional Expert’s Report.....	259
O.	Judgment Respecting Objections to Questions and Undertakings Contracted at the Examination After Plea of Class Members.....	262
P.	Motion for Permission to Re-Amend the Motion to Institute Proceedings.....	263
Q.	Application by the Director of the Public Health Department of the Québec City Region to Access the Medical Records: <i>Desbiens c. Spieser</i>	264
R.	Judgment on the Trial on the Merits	265
S.	Amended Motion for Permission to Introduce New Evidence.....	273
CHAPTER VI — Fires, Gas Leaks, and Other Industrial Accidents.....		275
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	275
2.	<i>The Plastimet Fire in Hamilton: Cotter v. Levy</i>	277
A.	Motion for a Change of Venue.....	277
B.	Motion Respecting the Duty of Plaintiff’s Solicitor in a Class Action to Notify Potential Claimants of the Hearing of a Motion.....	278
C.	Application by the Plaintiff Cotter for Certification of His Action as a Class Proceeding (The First Attempt);	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Application by All the Defendants to Dismiss Cotter’s Claim for Punitive and Aggravated Damages and Application by Defendants Madeline Levy, Monte Levy, and Phoenix International Ltd. to Dismiss the Action against Them.....	278
	D. Motion to Certify the Action as a Class Proceeding (Second Attempt)	280
	E. Motion to Certify the Action as a Class Proceeding (Third Attempt).....	284
	F. The Settlement.....	287
3.	<i>The Kingsville Fire: Ludwig v. 1099029 Ontario Ltd.; Horti-Pak Inc. v. Siemens Canada Ltd.</i>	289
	A. Motion to Certify the Action as a Class Proceeding.....	289
	B. Motion by Some Defendants to Quash the Appeal from the Certification Order.....	292
	C. Defendants’ Appeal to the Divisional Court from the Judgment for Quashing Appeal on the Basis that the Plaintiffs Had Not Received Leave to Appeal	293
	D. Appeal to the Court of Appeal from the Judgment of the Divisional Court.....	293
	E. Settlement.....	294
4.	<i>A Gas Release in Sudbury: Mangan v. Inco Ltd.</i>	295
	A. Motion for Certification of a Class Proceeding for the Purposes of a Settlement and Motion for Notice of a Proposed Settlement	297
	B. Motion for a Remedy in Respect of Unauthorized Notice in a Class Proceeding.....	300
	C. Motion for the Determination of Costs	304
5.	<i>A Release Flare in Corunna: Lewis v. Shell Canada Ltd.</i>	305
	A. Motion of Lewis and Weeke Respecting Pre-Certification Communications of the Defendant With Members of the Class.....	306
	B. Motion for Certification of the Action as a Class Proceeding and for Approval of the Settlement	307
6.	<i>A Gas Release in Valleyfield: Deraspe c. Zinc électrolytique du Canada ltée (CEZinc.)</i>	316
	A. Motion to Compel the Federal Minister of the Environment and Others to Conduct an Investigation and to Disclose a Report and Motion for Declaratory Exception by the Attorney General of Canada.....	319
	B. Application for Judicial Review before the Federal Court of Canada.....	320

TABLE OF CONTENTS

C.	Application for Judicial Review of a Decision of the Fonds d'aide aux recours collectifs.....	321
D.	Motion to Amend the Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action and to Add the Attorney General of Canada as an Impleaded Party and Motion by the Attorney General of Canada to be Excluded from the Proceedings.....	322
E.	Motion by Zinc électrolytique du Canada ltée for Permission to Examine Deraspe.....	322
F.	Motion by Zinc électrolytique du Canada ltée for Permission to Adduce Evidence at the Hearing of the Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	324
G.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action (The First Attempt)	325
H.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal Dismissing Deraspe's Appeal.....	329
I.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action (The Second Attempt).....	330
J.	Motion to Dismiss the Second Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action on the Basis of <i>Res judicata</i> by Zinc électrolytique du Canada.....	333
K.	Motion by Zinc électrolytique du Canada to Adduce Evidence at the Hearing of the Second Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action.....	333
L.	Motion by Zinc électrolytique du Canada for Leave to Appeal from the Judgment on the Motion to Dismiss on the Basis of <i>Res judicata</i>	333
M.	Motion for a Stay of the Proceedings in the Superior Court Pending a Decision of the Supreme Court of Canada on the Motion for Leave to Appeal.....	334
N.	Motion for Leave to Appeal before Supreme Court of Canada.....	334
O.	Judgment of the Superior Court Granting Deraspe's Second Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	334
P.	Motion by Deraspe Asking the Designated Judge Eva Petras to Recuse Herself	335
Q.	Motion for Leave to Appeal to the Court of Appeal ...	336
R.	Motion for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.....	337
S.	Motion of the Class Representative to Amend the Designation of the Defendant or to Add a Defendant and a Safeguard Order	337

TABLE OF CONTENTS

T.	Motion for a Case Management Conference and for Permission to File a Factum with More Pages than Allowed by the Rules of the Court of Appeal.....	339
U.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal	339
V.	Motion for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.....	340
W.	Motion to Revoke the Status of Class Representative of François Deraspe and to Disqualify his Attorney.....	340
X.	The Aftermath: <i>Barreau du Québec (Syndic Adjoint) c. Desjardins</i>	341
7.	<i>An Explosion in Toronto: Durling v. Sunrise Propane Energy Group Inc.</i>	341
A.	Motion for an Order Compelling the Ministry of the Environment and Other Regulatory Agencies to Produce the Results of their Investigation	342
B.	What Comes First, the Motion of the Plaintiffs for Certification or the Motion of the Defendants for Summary Judgment?	346
C.	Motion by the Plaintiffs for Directions in Advance of a Proposed Motion to Discontinue Separate Actions Commenced as Class Proceedings in Favour of One Consolidated Action.....	346
D.	Motion for an Order Staying the Individual Actions and for a Costs Order	347
E.	Motion for the Approval of a Claims Bar.....	349
F.	Motion for Certification (The First Attempt).....	352
G.	Motion to Restrain Wawanesa and its Counsel From Communicating with Class Members	360
H.	Motion to Amend the Statement of Claim and for Certification of a Class Action Against the Teskey Defendants	361
I.	Motion For Leave to Appeal.....	371
J.	Appeal.....	372
K.	Settlement.....	374
8.	<i>A Spill in the Slocan Valley: Kirk v. Executive Flight Centre Fuel Services</i>	375
CHAPTER VII — Fish Farms		383
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	383
2.	<i>A Fish Farm in Lake Heney: Association pour le lac Heney c. Gestion Serge Lafreniere inc.</i>	384
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action in the Superior Court	386

TABLE OF CONTENTS

B.	Injunction Proceedings: <i>Calvé c. Gestion Serge Lafrenière inc.</i>	388
C.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal in the Appeal of the Injunction Issued by Justice Landry.....	390
D.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal in the Appeal of the Judgment of Justice Frenette Dismissing the Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	394
E.	Settlements and Their Implementation	395
3.	<i>Salmon Farms in the Broughton Archipelago: Kwicksutaineuk/Ah-Kwa-Mish First Nation v. British Columbia (Minister of Agriculture and Lands)</i>	397
A.	Applications for Particulars by the Attorney General of British Columbia and Canada and Application to Strike by the Attorney General of British Columbia	401
B.	Application for Certification of a Class Proceeding.....	404
C.	Application for Intervener Status in the Appeal by the British Columbia Salmon Farmers Association	418
D.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal Rescinding the Certification Order	419
CHAPTER VIII — Pig Farms and Noxious Odours		423
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	423
2.	<i>A Pig Farm in Saint-Didace: Branconnier c. 2848-7395 Québec inc.</i>	423
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	424
B.	Settlement.....	426
CHAPTER IX — Genetically-Modified Crops		429
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	429
2.	<i>Genetically-Modified Canola in Saskatchewan: Hoffman v. Monsanto Canada Inc.</i>	430
A.	Motion by Plaintiffs to Compel the Defendants to File a Statement of Defence Before the Hearing and Determination of the Certification Application Hearing.....	433
B.	Motion For Leave to Appeal the Order of Justice Smith Requiring the Defendants to File Their Statements of Defence Prior to the Determination of the Certification Application.....	434
C.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal Respecting the Order of Justice Smith	435

TABLE OF CONTENTS

D.	Application by Monsanto and Aventis Cropscience to Strike Portions of the Affidavit Evidence of the Plaintiffs	436
E.	Application by Monsanto to Cross-Examine One Proposed Representative and Other Affiants	440
F.	Application for Certification	441
G.	Application for Leave to Appeal to the Court of Appeal.....	467
H.	Friends of the Earth Canada and Saskatchewan Environmental Society Want to Intervene in the Appeal	468
I.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal for Saskatchewan	468
J.	Application for Leave to Appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada	470
CHAPTER X — Mines, Quarries, and Sandpits		471
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	471
2.	<i>A Quarry in a Residential Neighbourhood: Robitaille c. Constructions Désourdy inc.</i>	472
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	472
B.	Motion to Revoke the Judgment Authorizing the Class Action	475
C.	Appeal before the Court of Appeal by Construction Désourdy and Motion to Dismiss the Appeal by Robitaille.....	476
D.	Application for an Interlocutory Injunction	476
E.	Appeal of the Interlocutory Injunction before the Court of Appeal	478
F.	Class Action on the Merits in the Superior Court	478
G.	Appeal of the Judgment on the Merits before the Court of Appeal	479
H.	Motion for a Special Honorarium	480
3.	<i>A Sandpit in a Residential Neighbourhood: Langevin c. Bouchard</i>	480
A.	Motion to Amend the Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	482
B.	Motion for Leave to Appeal before the Court of Appeal.....	483
C.	Motion for Permission to Adduce Relevant Evidence at the Hearing of the Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	483
D.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	486

TABLE OF CONTENTS

4.	<i>Land Contamination in a Mining Town: Young c. Noranda inc.</i>	487
A.	Motion by Noranda for Permission to Examine the Petitioner.....	488
B.	Motions by the Attorney General of Québec and Falconbridge ltée for Permission to Adduce Evidence.....	488
C.	Motion by Young to Discontinue the Proceedings	489
5.	<i>A Toxic Leak in Guyana: Recherches internationales Québec c. Cambior inc.</i>	489
A.	Motion Asking for Permission to Examine the President of Cambior	494
B.	Declinatory Exception	494
C.	Motion for Special Honorarium before the Superior Court.....	496
D.	Representative Actions against Omai Gold Mines Ltd. in Guyana	497
6.	<i>A Toxic Spill in Spain: Pearson v. Boliden Ltd.</i>	497
A.	Application for Certification of an Action as a Class Proceeding before the British Columbia Supreme Court [In Chambers].....	497
B.	Appeal before the British Columbia Court of Appeal.....	499
C.	Application for Leave to Appeal Before the Supreme Court of Canada	499
D.	Boliden Class Action National Settlement Agreement	499
7.	<i>An Open Pit Gold Mine in Malartic: Trottier c. Canadian Malartic GP</i>	500
A.	<i>Sui Generis</i> Plaintiff's Motion to Inform the Class Members of Their Rights.....	502
B.	Motion For Leave to Appeal.....	503
C.	Motion For Permission to Adduce Evidence at the Authorization Hearing by Canadian Malartic Mine.....	503
D.	Motion for Interlocutory Injunction	504
E.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	507
CHAPTER XI — Harbours		509
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	509
2.	<i>Dust, Noise, and Vibrations in the East End of Montréal: Mayer c. Cast Terminal inc.</i>	509
A.	Motion for authorization to institute a class action.....	510
B.	Settlement.....	512

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.	<i>Red Dust over Limoilou: Lalande c. Compagnie d'arrimage de Québec Itée</i>	513
A.	Motion to Amend the Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	513
B.	Contestation of the Amended Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	514
C.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	515
D.	Defendants' Motion for Particulars and for Communication of an Expert Report	518
E.	Québec Port Authority's Motion to Strike Out Paragraphs and Exhibits from the Amended Motion to Institute Proceedings	520
F.	Second Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	521
G.	Respondents' Motion to Strike Out Paragraphs and Exhibits of the Second Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	522
H.	Amended Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action (The Second Motion)	523
I.	Defendants' Motion to Examine Class Members (The First Case).....	524
J.	Motion for Communication of an Additional Expert Report; Motion for Particulars and Communication of Documents; and Motion for Striking Out Allegations and Exhibits (The Second Case)	525
CHAPTER XII — Railway Nuisances		527
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	527
2.	<i>A Rail Yard in Outremont: Paquin c. Compagnie de chemin de fer Canadien Pacifique</i>	528
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	529
B.	Appeal.....	532
C.	The Settlement.....	533
3.	<i>Not In My Backyard Meets a Suburban Train: Les Voisins du train de banlieue de Blainville inc. c. Agence métropolitaine de transport et Compagnie de chemin de fer Canadien Pacifique</i>	533
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	534
B.	Appeal before the Court of Appeal.....	541
4.	<i>A Rail Yard in Charny: Dorion c. Compagnie des chemins de fer nationaux du Canada (CN)</i>	544

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5.	<i>Coal Trains: Roberts v. Canadian Pacific Railway Company</i>	549
6.	<i>Storage Tanks Systems: Bellefeuille v. Canadian Pacific Railway Limited</i>	560
A.	Motion by the Plaintiffs to Amend and File Statement of Claim Seeking Relief Under the <i>Class Proceedings Act</i>	561
B.	Costs	563
C.	Motion for Leave to Appeal	564
CHAPTER XIII — Train Derailments and Spills		567
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	567
2.	<i>A Derailment in Québec: Dubuc c. Canadian National Railway Company</i>	567
3.	<i>A Derailment in Saskatchewan: Brooks v. Canadian Pacific Railway Limited</i>	568
4.	<i>A Derailment in Alberta: Cuff v. Canadian National Railway Company</i>	577
CHAPTER XIV — Aircraft Noise		581
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	581
2.	<i>A Third Runway at the Vancouver International Airport: Sutherland v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	583
A.	Application for Certification	583
B.	Individual Action in Nuisance Before the Supreme Court of British Columbia	588
C.	Pre-Judgment Interest, Damages Incidental to Moving, and Payment of Hearing Fees	592
D.	Appeal before the British Columbia Court of Appeal	593
E.	Supplementary Reasons of the Court of Appeal on Costs	595
F.	Costs for the Trial Before the Supreme Court of British Columbia	595
G.	Interpretation of the Costs Order	598
H.	Application to Vary or Cancel the Costs Order of the Registrar of the Court	598
I.	Appeal of the Costs Order of the British Columbia Court of Appeal	600
3.	<i>Airport Noise at the Dorval International Airport: Citoyens pour une qualité de vie/Citizens for a quality of life c. Aéroports de Montréal</i>	601

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	601
B.	Appeal Before the Court of Appeal	606
4.	<i>Floatplanes on Saint-Augustin Lake: Filteau c. Aviation Roger Forgues inc.</i>	608
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	608
B.	Action in Warranty brought by Aviation Roger Forgues and Aviation Portneuf against the Attorney General of Canada and Motions to Dismiss brought by the Attorney General of Canada	610
C.	Motion for Permission to File a Discontinuance	610
5.	<i>A Flight School on the South Shore of Montréal: Lavoie c. St-Mathieu-de-Beloeil (Municipalité)</i>	611
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	611
B.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal	612
6.	<i>A Tale of Two Water Aerodromes on Lac-à-la-Tortue: Coalition contre le bruit c. Shawinigan (Ville)</i>	612
A.	Motions for Permission to Adduce Evidence at the Authorization Hearing	613
B.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	616
C.	Motion Respecting the Extension of the Opt-out Process	621
D.	Motion by Bel-Air Aviation to Order that the Class Action be Vacated and the Action Be Continued under article 59 or 67 of the Code of Civil Procedure	623
E.	Motion by the City of Shawinigan to Strike Out Paragraphs of the Motion to Institute Proceedings and Motion for Particulars	623
F.	Examination of the Designated Person	624
G.	Settlement with the City of Shawinigan	624
7.	<i>Another Flight School Class Action on the South Shore of Montréal: Comité anti-pollution des avions - Longueuil c. Max Aviation inc.</i>	624
A.	Motions for Permission to Adduce Evidence at the Authorization Hearing	628
B.	Settlement	630
CHAPTER XV — Waste Management Operations		631
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	631

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2.	<i>A Municipal Incinerator and a Dump: Dubé c. Ville de St-David de l'Aube-Rivière</i>	634
3.	<i>A Rendering Plant on the South Shore of Québec City: Tremblay c. Alex Couture inc.</i>	635
4.	<i>Beach Pollution in Montréal: Guertin c. Communauté urbaine de Montréal</i>	637
5.	<i>Odours, Noise, and Dust Caused by a Solid Waste Disposal Facility: Archambault c. Construction Bérou inc.</i>	639
A.	The Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	640
B.	Discontinuance of the Appeal Before the Court of Appeal.....	641
C.	Motion for a Special Honorarium in the Superior Court.....	641
6.	<i>Methane Gas in Your Basement: Roberge c. Sherbrooke (Ville)</i>	643
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	643
B.	Dismissal of the Class Action by the Superior Court on the Merits.....	647
C.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal	653
7.	<i>Negligent Oversight of a Landfill and the Concept of “Laxness” or “Complacency”: Girard c. 2944-7828 Québec inc.</i>	655
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	658
B.	Motion for the Permission to Examine 22 Additional Class Members	660
C.	Judgment of the Superior court on the Merits	660
D.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal	666
E.	Motion for Revision of the Costs, Approval of the Attorney’s Fees for a Special Honorarium, and Approval of the Settlement	667
F.	Motion for the Approval of the Attorney’s Fees.....	671
8.	<i>Process Water from a Chicken Processing Plant: Therrien c. Compagnie de volailles Maxi ltée</i>	672
9.	<i>A Rendering Plant on the South Shore of Québec City, the Sequel: Regroupement des citoyens contre la pollution c. Alex Couture inc.</i>	673
A.	Motion for Declinatory Exception	673
B.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	674
C.	Motions to Dismiss the Appeal of the Regroupement	678

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	D. Motion to Strike Out Paragraphs and for Particulars	678
	E. Motion Respecting an Objection to the Filing of an Expert Report and to the Testimony of the President of the Monitoring Committee	680
	F. Objection to the Expert’s Report (Second Attempt)	680
	G. Motion to Amend the Particularized Motion to Institute Proceedings	681
	H. Motion to be Excused From Having Failed to Comply With a Peremptory Delay	681
	I. Judgment on the Motion to Dismiss the Class Action..	682
	J. Motion to Amend the Motion to Institute Proceedings	684
	K. The Settlement and the Motion to Approve It	684
10.	<i>Another Rendering Plant in a Residential Neighbourhood: Raymond c. Lomex inc.</i>	685
11.	<i>Noxious Odours and Other Nuisances Caused by a Water Purification Plant: Protection environnement Boisbriand c. Boisbriand (Ville)</i>	685
	A. Motion For Authorization to Institute a Class Action	685
	B. Partial Settlement	687
	C. Final Settlement	688
12.	<i>A Landfill Site on the South Shore of Montréal: Robillard c. Écoservices Tria inc.</i>	688
	A. Motion for Permission to Adduce Evidence	689
	B. Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	690
	C. Application to Lift the Confidentiality Order Respecting the Schedules of the Certificates of Authorization	694
	D. Motion for Particular and Communication of Documents by Ecoservices Tria and Gestion Tria	695
13.	<i>Compost Odours on Vancouver Island: Baker v. Rendle</i>	695
	A. Certification Application	699
	B. Judgment of the Court of Appeal	703
14.	<i>Dust, Noise, and Odours at the former St. Lawrence Cement Quarry: Flamand c. 9174-3641 Québec inc. (Excavation René St-Pierre)</i>	705
CHAPTER XVI — Cottage Country		707
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	707

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2.	<i>Wood Debris on the Beach of Taureau Lake: Association des propriétaires et locataires de Saint-Ignace-du-Lac c. Consolidated-Bathurst</i>	709
A.	Motion For Authorization to Institute a Class Action	709
B.	Settlement.....	711
C.	Motion for Determination of a Special Honorarium	711
3.	<i>Shore Erosion on Lake Timiskaming: Ouimette c. Canada (Procureur général)</i>	712
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	712
B.	Trial on the Merits	715
C.	Appeal.....	716
4.	<i>Shore Erosion on Wabamum Lake: Paron v. Alberta (Minister of Environmental Protection)</i>	719
A.	Alberta Government’s Motion to Dismiss.....	720
B.	TransAlta’s Motion to Dismiss	721
C.	Motion for Case Management Advice and Directives ..	722
D.	Application for Certification of a Class Proceeding.....	722
5.	<i>Wood Debris on the Beaches of Thurson and Saint-François Xavier Lakes: Clark c. 4107781 Canada inc.</i>	727
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	727
B.	Motion to Compel the Mutuelle des Municipalités du Québec to Assume its Duty to Defend the Municipality of Wentworth-Nord	730
C.	Settlement.....	731
6.	<i>Shore Erosion on the La Lièvre River and the Poisson Blanc Reservoir: Association des résidents riverains de La Lièvre inc. c. Canada (Procureur général)</i>	731
A.	Introduction	731
B.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	732
C.	Motion to Dismiss the Amended Motion to Institute Proceedings	735
D.	Trial	736
7.	<i>Shore Erosion on Round Lake: Plaunt v. Renfrew Power Generation Inc.</i>	737
A.	Introduction	737
B.	Certification Motion	738
C.	Decision Regarding Costs	742
D.	Reasons for Decision in Procedure to Determine the First Common Issue.....	743
E.	Motion to Decertify.....	744

TABLE OF CONTENTS

8.	<i>Lake and River Overflow in the Eastern Townships: Lessard c. Arcand</i>	747
A.	Motion for Permission to Adduce Relevant Evidence at the Authorization Hearing.....	747
B.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	748
CHAPTER XVII — Catastrophic Dam Failures		751
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	751
2.	<i>Lemay c. Société immobilière du Québec</i>	753
3.	<i>Arseneault c. Société immobilière du Québec</i>	754
4.	<i>The Settlement of the Lemay and Arseneault Class Actions</i>	756
5.	<i>Bouchard c. Corporation Stone Consolidated</i>	757
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	757
B.	Settlement.....	758
6.	<i>Fournier c. Hydro-Québec</i>	760
A.	Motion for Declaratory Judgment by the City of Saguenay	761
B.	Motions for a Stay of All Proceedings in the Class Action by the City of Saguenay	761
C.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	762
7.	<i>The Alouette River Flood: Pausche v. British Columbia Hydro & Power Authority</i>	765
A.	Motion to Dismiss by the District on the Ground that the Claim was Statute-Barred	765
B.	Settlement.....	766
8.	<i>The 2011 Floods in Manitoba: Anderson v. Manitoba</i>	767
A.	Application for Certification of a Class Action	768
B.	Motion Seeking Leave to Appeal to the Court of Appeal.....	780
C.	Appeal.....	783
D.	The Settlement.....	784
CHAPTER XVIII — Toxic Mould in Buildings		785
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	785
2.	<i>Toxic Mould in My Condo: Taub v. Manufacturers Life Insurance Co.</i>	786
3.	<i>Toxic Mould in an Indian Reserve: Grant v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	787
A.	Crown’s Motion to Strike Portions of the Statement of Claim	788

TABLE OF CONTENTS

B.	Attorney General of Canada’s Motion to Summon Dr. Hari M. Vijay	792
C.	Motion for Certification	792
D.	Crown’s Application for Leave to Appeal.....	799
E.	Consent Order (Removing the Breach of Fiduciary Duties Common Issues)	800
4.	<i>Toxic Mould in the Court Room: Dumoulin v. Ontario</i>	800
A.	Crown’s Motion for an Order that All Motions in Two Related Proceedings be Heard by the Same Judge	801
B.	Crown’s Motion to Strike	801
C.	Motion for Certification	802
D.	Supplementary Reasons for Decision: <i>Dumoulin v. Ontario</i>	807
5.	<i>Toxic Mould the Class Room: MacDonald (Litigation Guardian of) v. Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board</i>	808
CHAPTER XIX — Municipal Tap Water		811
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	811
2.	<i>The Walkerton Water Contamination Class Action: Smith v. Brockton (Municipality)</i>	812
A.	Certification Motion	814
B.	Walkerton Class Action Settlement	814
3.	<i>Drinking Water in Fort Erie: Grace v. Fort Erie (Town)</i>	818
4.	<i>Water Quality in Sainte-Anne-de-Beaupré: Blouin c. Ville de Sainte-Anne-de-Beaupré</i>	825
A.	Motion for Permission to Require the Presence of Witnesses at the Authorization Hearing	826
B.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	826
C.	Motion of the Town of Sainte-Anne-de-Beaupré to Strike Paragraphs and Obtain Particulars and Documents	827
D.	Motion of the Town to Compel the Class Representative to Disclose the Notes of His Investigation.....	828
E.	Motion of the Representative to Sever the Trial into Two Phases	829
F.	Motion of the Class Representative to Strike Paragraphs of the Town Reply	829
G.	Judgment Respecting an Objection to the Testimony of a Witness Respecting the Taste and the Odour of a Sample of the Municipal Drinking Water.....	831
H.	Motion for the Approval of a Settlement.....	832
5.	<i>A Boil-Water Advisory Triggers a Class Action: Bayard c. St-Gabriel (Ville)</i>	832

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	832
B.	Motion to Amend the Motion to Institute Proceedings	834
C.	Motion to Approve the Settlement	834
6.	<i>Racoons in a Municipal Drinking Water Tank: Cyr c. Sainte-Adèle (Ville)</i>	835
7.	<i>Eighty Days Without Drinking Water: Dubois c. St-Esprit (Municipalité)</i>	836
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	836
CHAPTER XX — Sewer Backups and Floods		841
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	841
2.	<i>Heavy Rains and Flooding in Montréal: Nagar c. Montréal (Ville)</i>	843
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	843
B.	Appeal.....	846
3.	<i>Two Class Actions Arising from the Same Heavy Rains: Larochelle v. Ville de Saint-Hubert and Blanchet c. Ville de Saint-Hubert</i>	847
A.	Motions for Authorization to Institute a Class Action Arising Out of the Same Event; a Motion for Discontinuance from Larochelle; a Motion to Amend from Blanchette; and a Motion for <i>Lis Pendens</i> from the Town of Saint-Hubert.....	847
B.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	849
C.	Motion to Divide the Class into Five Sub-Classes.....	850
D.	Motion for the Approval of a Settlement.....	851
4.	<i>Heavy Rain and Flooding on the South Shore of Montréal: Dicaire c. Chambly (Ville)</i>	852
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	852
B.	Appeal.....	853
C.	Motion of the Town to Examine Class Members.....	854
D.	Trial	854
E.	Appeal.....	855
5.	<i>A Flood in Stratford: McLaren v. Stratford (City)</i>	856
A.	Motion by the Plaintiffs for an Order Directing the Motions in this Class Proceedings Be Heard in Stratford, Ontario.....	856
B.	Motion for Certification of the Action as a Class Proceeding (The First Attempt)	857
C.	Amended Motion for Certification of the Action as a Class Proceeding (The Second Attempt).....	859

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	D. Settlement.....	862
6.	<i>A Torrential Rain in August 2008: Rainville c. Montréal (Ville) and Côté c. Montréal (Ville)</i>	862
	A. Motion by the City of Montréal for Permission to Adduce Evidence at the Authorization Hearing.....	862
	B. Motion for Authorization to Institute Class Action (First Attempt).....	864
	C. Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action (Second Attempt): Patenaude c. Montréal (Ville)	867
7.	<i>Another Class Action From the Same August 2008 Torrential Rain: Comité des citoyens inondés de Rosemont c. Montréal (Ville)</i>	869
	A. Motion by the Petitioner Asking the Court to Order the Production of Documents.....	869
	B. Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	870
8.	<i>The Richelieu River Floods of 2011: Dupuis c. Canada (Procureur général)</i>	872
	A. First Motion for Permission to Adduce Evidence at the Authorization Hearing.....	873
	B. Second Motion for Permission to Adduce Evidence at the Authorization Hearing.....	874
	C. Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	875
9.	<i>Sewer Back-Up in Marieville: Association des résidentes et résidents du Domaine des Ruisseaux de Marieville c. Genivar inc.</i>	878
	A. Motion for Permission to Adduce Relevant Evidence at the Authorization Hearing.....	878
	B. Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	879
CHAPTER XXI — Ragweed Pollen		881
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	881
2.	<i>Nadon c. Anjou (Ville)</i>	881
	A. Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	882
	B. Appeal Before the Court of Appeal of the Judgment of the Superior Court Dismissing the Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action.....	887
	C. Motion to Amend the Declaration, to Amend the Class Definition and to Amend the Questions of Law or Fact to Be Determined on Collective Basis	890
	D. Motion for the Immediate Adjudication of a Point of Law.....	891
	E. Motion to Strike Out a Counter Claim.....	891

TABLE OF CONTENTS

F.	Motion to Revoke the Judgment Authorizing the Institution of a Class Action.....	892
G.	Amended Motion to Amend Again the Reamended Declaration and to Amend Some Questions of Law or Fact and the Class Definition	892
H.	Action in Nullity of Section 7.03 of By-law 90.....	893
I.	Appeal.....	894
J.	Trial on the Merits	896
K.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal	911
CHAPTER XXII — Snowmobile Noise		913
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	<i>913</i>
2.	<i>Coalition pour la protection de l'environnement du parc linéaire « Petit Train du Nord » c. Laurentides (Municipalité régionale de comté des)</i>	<i>913</i>
A.	Motion for Intervention at the Authorization Hearing by Motoneige Tremblay inc.....	920
B.	Objection to Questions at the Examination of the Two Designated Persons and Another Potential Class Member.....	921
C.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	922
D.	Insurer's Motion for Particulars, Production of Documents and to Strike Irrelevant Allegations and Exhibits.....	923
E.	Coalition's Motion to Add the Attorney General of Québec as a Defendant	927
F.	Coalition's First Motion for Interlocutory Injunction ..	928
G.	Motoneige Tremblay's Motion for Intervention at Trial	930
H.	Defendants' Motion for Examination of Class Members Out of Court	931
I.	Coalition's Second Motion for Interlocutory Injunction.....	931
J.	Plaintiffs' Motion Respecting Objection to Questions to Class Members	931
K.	Appeal to the Court of Appeal from the Judgment of Justice Langlois Dismissing the Second Motion for Interlocutory Injunction.....	932
L.	Coalition's Motion to Amend the Safeguard Order.....	932
M.	Confidentiality Order.....	934
N.	Trial on the Merits	934
O.	Attorney General of Québec's Motion to Determine the Contents of a Notice of Appeal to the Class Members	943

TABLE OF CONTENTS

P.	Bill 90: The Legislative Response to the Judgment of the Superior Court	944
Q.	Motions to Dismiss the Appeals and the Cross Appeal	945
R.	Bill 9: Extension of the moratorium.....	946
S.	Motion of the Coalition for Approval of the Attorneys’ Fees, for Approval of the Notice to Class Members and for the Approval of an Agreement on the Implementation of the Final Judgment.....	947
CHAPTER XXIII — Racetrack Noise		949
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	949
2.	<i>Courses Automobiles Mont-Tremblant inc. c. Mont-Tremblant (Ville)</i>	949
A.	<i>Introduction</i>	949
B.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	950
C.	Racetrack Operator’s Motion to Stay the Class Proceedings	952
D.	Motions to Strike Out Allegations and Exhibits and for Permission to Adduce Relevant Evidence at the Authorization Hearing and Other Preliminary Motions.....	953
E.	Judgment of the Superior Court Authorizing the Class Action	955
F.	Motion for Permission to Examine the Representatives Noise Expert, To Conduct a Survey and to Examine 48 Class Members.....	956
CHAPTER XXIV — Highway Noise		957
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	957
2.	<i>Highway Noise in Charlesbourg: Filion c. Québec (Procureure générale)</i>	957
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	958
B.	Motion for Permission to Examine the Three Petitioners and to Adduce Relevant Evidence at the Authorization Hearing	960
C.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action in the Superior Court	961
D.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal	963
E.	Motion for Permission to Examine 38 Class Members	963
F.	Plaintiff’s Motion to Strike Out an Expert Report	964
G.	Defendant’s Motion to Strike Out an Expert Report ...	964
H.	Defendant’s Motion Requesting the Names of the Class Members Registered in the Class Action.....	965

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal	965
3.	<i>Highway Noise in Brossard: Belmamoun c. Brossard (Ville)</i> ..	966
A.	Motion for the Town of Brossard for Permission to Adduce Evidence at the Authorization Hearing	967
B.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	968
C.	Appeal.....	969
CHAPTER XXV — Wind Farm Noise		971
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	971
2.	<i>A Wind Farm in Saskatchewan: McKinnon v. Red Lily Wind Energy Group</i>	972
A.	Interlocutory Injunction.....	975
B.	Damages Arising from the Plaintiff Obtaining an <i>Ex Parte</i> Injunction (the Process)	981
C.	Damages Arising from the Plaintiff Obtaining an <i>Ex Parte</i> Injunction (the Assessment)	983
D.	Application by Red Lily for an Order Dismissing the Plaintiff's Claim for Delay	984
3.	<i>A Wind Farm in Arthabaska: Rivard c. Éoliennes de l'Érable inc.</i>	985
A.	Motion for Particulars and Motion to Strike Out Allegations; Motion for Permission to Examine the Petitioners; and Motion to Adduce Evidence at the Authorization Hearing	986
B.	Judgment Granting the Amended and Particularized Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action.....	989
C.	Motion for Permission to Examine Various Class Members	992
D.	Motion for Permission to Examine Ms. Marie-Ève Maillé.....	992
E.	Motion by Marie-Ève Maillé to Quash a Subpoena; Motion by Marie-Ève Maillé to Review the Judgment Granting Éoliennes de l'Érable Permission to Examine Her; and Motion by Marie-Ève Maillé to Revoke the Same Judgment	993
4.	<i>A Wind Farm in Saint-Ferréol-les-Neiges: Blouin c. Parcs éoliens de la Seigneurie de Beaupré 2 et 3, s.e.n.c.</i>	993
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action ..	993
B.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal	996
C.	Defendants' Motion to Examine 14 Class members	997
D.	Motion for Leave to Appeal of the Judgment of the Superior Court Dismissing the Defendants' Motion to Examine 14 Class members	998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5.	<i>A Wind Farm in Thetford Mines: Labranche c. Énergie éolienne des Moulins, s.e.c.</i>	998
A.	Motion for Permission to Adduce Relevant Evidence	1000
B.	Judgment on the Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	1001
C.	Appeal.....	1003
D.	The Notice to the Class Members.....	1003
E.	Case Management Decision on the Issue of Common Experts.....	1005
CHAPTER XXVI — Highway Repairs and Public Work		1007
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	1007
2.	<i>The Ville-Marie Expressway in Downtown Montréal: Krantz c. Québec (Procureur général)</i>	1007
A.	Motion for Authorization to Institute a Class Action	1007
B.	Motions to Dismiss the Motion in Warranty of Construction DJL inc.	1010
C.	The Settlements	1011
CHAPTER XXVII — The Moose-Car Collision Case in Newfoundland and Labrador		1013
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	1013
2.	<i>George v. Newfoundland and Labrador</i>	1014
A.	Certification Consent Order.....	1014
B.	Consent Statement of Facts	1016
C.	Application by the Province for a Pre-trial Determination of the Common Issue of the Applicability of the Doctrine of Discoverability to the Running of the Limitation Period in this Action.....	1016
D.	Application to Qualify an Expert Historian at the Trial of the Common Issues	1020
E.	Application to Qualify an Expert in the Area of Public Administration at the Common Issues Trial.....	1021
F.	Common Issues Trial.....	1022
G.	Judgment of the Court of Appeal	1031
CHAPTER XXVIII — Agent Orange Class Actions against the Federal Government and the Herbicides Manufacturers		1035
1.	<i>Introduction</i>	1035
2.	<i>The Federal Court of Canada Case: Dobbie v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	1037
3.	<i>The Manitoba Case: Ward v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	1040

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Application to Strike or Stay the Plaintiff’s Proposed Class Action in the Manitoba Court of Queen’s Bench	1040
B.	Appeal before the Manitoba Court of Appeal.....	1041
4.	<i>CFB Gagetown Herbicide Spray Programs 1952-2004. Fact-Finder’s Report, Dr. Dennis Furlong</i>	1044
5.	<i>The Newfoundland and Labrador Case: Ring v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	1051
A.	Application for Class Certification before the Trial Division Newfoundland and Labrador Supreme Court	1051
B.	Plaintiffs’ Application to Lift the Stay of the Certification Order Before the Trial Division of the Newfoundland and Labrador Supreme Court.....	1063
C.	Application by the Representative Plaintiff for an Order Approving the Manner and Timing of the Publication of a Notice and Requesting that the Defendant Pay the Costs of that Publication	1068
D.	Application by the Attorney General of Canada Seeking Advice and Directions Respecting the Circumstances Under Which a Variance Order of the Implied Undertaking Rule May Be Granted.....	1069
E.	Application for Leave to Appeal to the Court of Appeal of the Judgment of Justice Adams Refusing to Set Aside his Ruling on the Applicability of the Implied Undertaking Rule	1070
F.	Appeal of the Certification Order before the Newfoundland and Labrador Court of Appeal.....	1072
6.	<i>The New Brunswick Case: Bryson v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	1079
A.	Plaintiffs’ Motion to Exclude Third Parties.....	1080
B.	Motion for Certification before the Court of Queen’s Bench of New Brunswick	1081
7.	<i>The Saskatchewan Case: Brooks v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	1089
A.	Motion for Direction	1089
B.	Application for Certification	1091
C.	Plaintiff’s Application for Leave to Appeal.....	1093
D.	<i>Ex Gratia</i> Payments.....	1093
CHAPTER XXIX — CONCLUSION		1097
INDEX		1105