

Court File No.: CV-21-00656040-00CL

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*,
R.S.C. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR
ARRANGEMENT OF **LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY OF SUDBURY**

BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE MOVING PARTY,
LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY OF SUDBURY
(STAY OF SPEAKER'S WARRANTS)

January 5, 2022

THORNTON GROUT FINNIGAN LLP
3200 - 100 Wellington Street West
TD West Tower, Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON M5K 1K7

D.J. Miller (LSO# 34393P)

Email: djmiller@tgf.ca

Mitchell W. Grossell (LSO# 69993I)

Email: mgrossell@tgf.ca

Andrew Hanrahan (LSO# 78003K)

Email: ahanrahan@tgf.ca

Derek Harland (LSO# 79504N)

Email: धारland@tgf.ca

Tel: 416-304-1616

Fax: 416-304-1313

Co-Counsel for Laurentian University

STOCKWOODS LLP
TD North Tower
77 King Street West, Suite 4130
Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON M5K 1H1

Brian Gover (LSO# 22734B)
Email: briang@stockwoods.ca

Fredrick Schumann (LSO#59377L)
Email: fredricks@stockwoods.ca

Tel: 416-593-7200
Fax: 416-593-9345

Co-counsel for Laurentian University

TO: THE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

**AND TO: SPEAKER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO, THE
HONOURABLE TED ARNOTT (ted.arnott@pc.ola.org)**

CONWAY BAXTER WILSON LLP/s.r.l.
400-411 Roosevelt Avenue
Ottawa, ON K2A 3X9

David Conway
Tel: 613-691-0368
Fax: 613-688-0271
Email: dtaylor@conwaylitigation.ca

AND TO: MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
Constitutional Law Br., 4th Floor
720 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M7A 2S9

Joshua Hunter
Tel: 416-908-7465
Fax: 416-326-4015
Email: joshua.hunter@ontario.ca

AND TO: DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE CANADA
Suite 3400, Exchange Tower
Box 36, First Canadian Place

Toronto, Ontario M5X 1K6

Jon Bricker

Tel: 416-973-7171

Fax: 416-973-0809

Email: jon.bricker@justice.gc.ca

AND TO: GOWLING WLG (CANADA) LLP

Barristers and Solicitors

1 First Canadian Place

100 King Street West

Suite 1600

Toronto, ON M5X 1G5

Richard Dearden (LSO#: 19087H)

Tel: 613-786-0135

Email: richard.dearden@gowling.com

Heather Fisher (LSO#: 75006L)

Tel: 416-369-7202

Email: heather.fisher@gowling.com

Sarah Boucaud (LSO#: 76517I)

Tel: 613-786-0049

Email: sarah.boucaud@gowling.com

Tel: 416-862-7525

Fax: 416-862-7661

Lawyers for the Auditor General of Ontario

INDEX

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

Tab

- 1 Ruling of the Honourable Peter Milliken, Speaker of the House of Commons, April 27, 2010, Hansard pp2039-2045; quoted passage at p2043
- 2 Ruling of the Honourable Dave Levac, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, September 13, 2012, Hansard pp3606-3608; quoted passage at p3607

TAB 1



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 145



NUMBER 034



3rd SESSION



40th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, April 27, 2010



Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

PRIVILEGE

PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE
CANADIAN MISSION IN AFGHANISTAN—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: I am now prepared to rule on the question of privilege raised on March 18, 2010, by the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River, the hon. member for St. John's East and the hon. member for Saint-Jean concerning the order of the House of December 10, 2009, respecting the production of documents regarding Afghan detainees.

[Translation]

I would like to thank those three members raising these issues. I would also like to thank the hon. Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, the hon. House Leader of the Official Opposition, and the hon. members for Toronto Centre, Joliette, Windsor—Tecumseh, Yukon, Toronto—Danforth, Outremont and Kootenay—Columbia for their interventions on this important matter on March 18, 25, and 31, and on April 1 and 12, 2010.

The facts that have led the House, and the Chair, to be seized of this case are the following:

On February 10, 2009, the House recreated the Special Committee on the Canadian Mission in Afghanistan. This committee conducted its business in the usual way and began, in the fall of that year, to seek information from the government on the treatment of Afghan detainees.

[English]

On November 27, 2009, the committee reported to the House what it considered to be a breach of its privileges in relation to its inquiries and requests for documents.

On December 10, 2009, the House adopted an order for the production of documents regarding Afghan detainees.

On December 30, 2009, the session in which this order was adopted was prorogued.

● (1505)

[Translation]

On March 3, 2010, when the present session began, the Special Committee was re-constituted and resumed its work. Since Orders of the House for the production of documents survive prorogation, the House Order of December 10, 2009, remained in effect.

[English]

On March 5, 2010, the Minister of Justice rose in the House to announce that the government had appointed former Supreme Court Justice Frank Iacobucci to undertake “an independent, comprehensive and proper review of the documents at issue”.

The minister described Mr. Iacobucci's mandate in relation to the order of December 10, 2009 specifying that the former justice would report to him.

Speaker's Ruling

[Translation]

On March 16, 2010, the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons tabled the specific terms of reference for Mr. Iacobucci.

On March 18, 2010, three members raised questions of privilege related to the order of December 10, 2009. A number of other members also contributed to the discussion.

[English]

On March 25, 2010 and again on April 1 and 26, 2010 the government tabled a large volume of documents regarding Afghan detainees “without prejudice” to the procedural arguments relating to the order of December 10, 2009.

On March 25 and April 1 the Chair also heard interventions from members.

On March 31, 2010 the government responded to the arguments made in relation to the questions of privilege raised on March 18, 2010.

[Translation]

Last, on April 1, and again on April 12, 2010, the Chair heard arguments on the questions of privilege from several members, took the matter under advisement and undertook to return to the House with a ruling.

[English]

Before addressing the arguments brought forward, I want to take this opportunity to remind members of the role of the Chair when questions of privilege are raised.

House of Commons Procedure and Practice, second edition, O'Brien and Bosc, at page 141 states:

Great importance is attached to matters involving privilege. A Member wishing to raise a question of privilege in the House must first convince the Speaker that his or her concern is *prima facie* (on the first impression or at first glance) a question of privilege. The function of the Speaker is limited to deciding whether the matter is of such a character as to entitle the Member who has raised the question to move a motion which will have priority over Orders of the Day; that is, in the Speaker's opinion, there is a *prima facie* question of privilege. If there is, the House must take the matter into immediate consideration. Ultimately, it is the House which decides whether a breach of privilege or a contempt has been committed.

[Translation]

As Speaker, one of my principal duties is to safeguard the rights and privileges of members and of the House. In doing so, the Chair is always mindful of the established precedents, usages, traditions and practices of the House and of the role of the Chair in their ongoing evolution. It is no exaggeration to say that it is a rare event for the Speaker to be seized of a matter as complex and as heavy with consequence as the matter before us now.

Because of the complexity of the issues that have been raised, and the large number of lengthy interventions made by hon. members, I have taken the liberty of regrouping the issues thematically in order to address the arguments presented more effectively.

Speaker's Ruling

[English]

The main and most important issue that the Chair must address today concerns the right of the House to order production of documents, including the nature of the right, questions related to the extent of the right and the manner in which the right can or ought to be exercised. All members who have intervened on these matters of privilege have touched on these fundamental questions in one way or another. In addition, the Chair has been asked to determine whether or not the order has been complied with, and if not, whether this constitutes, *prima facie*, a contempt of the House.

[Translation]

A second matter before the Chair is the contention—made primarily by the member for Scarborough—Rouge River—that witnesses were intimidated by answers given in Question Period by the Minister of National Defence and that a letter written by an official from the Department of Justice was contemptuous of the House in setting out for potential witnesses a false basis for refusing to answer questions in a committee of this House.

Arguments were also made in relation to a third theme, namely the form, clarity and procedural validity of the December 10 order of the House. These issues arose when the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons contended on March 31, 2010, that the order of December 10 was fatally flawed in that it seeks documents that he claims can only be obtained by way of an Address to the Governor General. Related issues were brought to the Chair's attention on the same day by the Minister of Justice, who stated, at page 1225 of the *Debates*:

Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, the December order called for uncensored documents. It listed eight different categories of documents to be produced. The order did not specify exactly when such documents should be produced, who should produce them or to whom they should be produced. The order made no reference to the confidential information being protected...

● (1510)

[English]

The fourth theme that the Chair wishes to address concerns the issue of accommodation and trust which a number of members on both sides of the House have raised. Several members have made reference to the need to safeguard confidential information that, in the words of the Minister of Justice, as found at page 7881 of the *Debates* of December 10, 2009, “if disclosed, could compromise Canada's security, national defence and international relations”. More significantly, a number of members have indicated that they wish to find a way to accommodate the desire of the House for information while also accommodating the desire of the government to protect sensitive information.

The first arguments the Chair wishes to address are those related to the form, clarity and procedural validity of the December 10 order.

The Minister of Justice has called into question the clarity of the order. On reading the order, it is abundantly clear to the Chair that it is the government that is expected to produce the documents demanded, and that in the absence of instructions to the contrary, the documents are to be tabled in the House in the usual manner. In this sense the minister and the parliamentary secretary are correct in asserting that no provision is made in the order for confidential

treatment of the material demanded. The Chair will return to this aspect of the question later in this ruling.

[Translation]

As to when the material is to be tabled, the order says very clearly “forthwith”. *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Second Edition, at page 475 states:

...if the House has adopted an Order for the production of a document, the Order should be complied with within a reasonable time. However, the Speaker has no power to determine when documents should be tabled.

[English]

As to the procedural validity of the order, as well as its form, the Chair wishes to draw the attention of the House to Bourinot's *Parliamentary Procedure and Practice in the Dominion of Canada*, fourth edition, which states at pages 245 and 246:

Previous to the session of 1876, it was customary to move for all papers by address to the Governor General, but since that time the regular practice of the English houses has been followed. It is now the usage to move for addresses only with respect to matters affecting imperial interests, the royal prerogative or the Governor in Council. On the other hand, it is the constitutional right of either House to ask for such information as it can directly obtain by its own order from any department or officer of the government...papers may be directly ordered when they relate to canals and railways, post office, customs, militia, fisheries, dismissal of public officers, harbours and public works and other matters under the immediate control and direction of the different departments of the government.

As this passage makes clear, an order is issued when seeking papers that fall under the “immediate control and direction of the different departments of the government”. As an example, in the case of the documents related to the Chief of the Defence Staff referred to by the parliamentary secretary, it is simply not credible to claim that these documents are not under the control of the government.

[Translation]

The parliamentary secretary has referred to certain rulings of my predecessors in making his arguments and has also provided additional material in support of his contention. The Chair has examined these precedents—a ruling from 1959 by Mr. Speaker Michener and a ruling from 1982 by Madam Speaker Sauvé—but is not convinced that they directly support the particular circumstances faced by the House in this case.

● (1515)

[English]

A further point to be made on this issue has to do with the documents tabled “without prejudice” so far by the government in response to the order of December 10. The Chair wishes to point out that of the documents tabled, several appear to fall into the categories which the parliamentary secretary claims require an address before they can be produced. In addition, the fact that these documents have been tabled has been cited by the government as a gesture of good faith on its part and an indication that it is complying, to the extent that it feels it can, with the order of December 10.

Speaker's Ruling

[Translation]

Finally, as the member for St. John's East noted, in response to objections raised at the time debate was commencing on the original motion, a decision was rendered that the motion was in order. Consequently, the House went on to debate and decide the matter: the House has expressed its will, and that is where the matter now stands.

I have considered the arguments put forward, and for the reasons stated above, the Chair concludes that it was procedurally acceptable for the House to use an order and not an address to require the production of these documents.

[English]

The Chair will now turn to the allegations related to witness intimidation. The member for Scarborough—Rouge River has contended that the comments made by the Minister of National Defence in reply to a question during oral questions on December 1, 2009, amounted to intimidation. He argued that the minister's contention that the documents in question could be released to the Special Committee on the Canadian Mission in Afghanistan only under the provisions of the Canada Evidence Act was wrong and misleading, obstructed the House and intimidated witnesses, especially armed forces personnel and public servants, thereby lessening the likelihood of their compliance with House requests and orders.

[Translation]

The hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River also took exception to a December 9, 2009, letter to the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel of the House from an Assistant Deputy Minister from the Department of Justice on the obligations of witnesses before committees, and on the obligation to provide documents ordered by committees. He argued that the letter constituted a contempt of the House by setting out for witnesses a false basis for refusing to provide disclosure to the House or its committees after being ordered to do so. In particular, the member for Scarborough—Rouge River stressed that if the contents of the letter were crafted with ministerial approval, it could constitute a conspiracy to undermine Parliament and the ability of the House to carry on its constitutional functions.

[English]

The government responded that the remarks made by the Minister of National Defence were simply matters of debate and differences of opinion between members. Of the second complaint, the government took the view that the letter from the justice official constituted nothing more than an exchange of views between legal professionals and it could not be construed as “an attempt to intimidate the government witnesses”.

The hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River had argued that the minister's reply constituted a slander of Parliament's core powers to hold the government to account and thus was a contempt. However, particularly since this exchange between the minister and the member for Vancouver South occurred during question period, I find that I must agree with the parliamentary secretary's characterization of this exchange as a matter of debate.

I have no need to remind the House that freedom of speech is one of our most cherished rights. Although members may disagree with the comments made by the minister, I cannot find that the minister's words in and of themselves constitute witness intimidation, hence nor do they constitute a *prima facie* contempt of the House.

[Translation]

As for the member for Scarborough—Rouge River's other concern regarding the letter from the assistant deputy minister, the procedural authorities are clear that interference with witnesses may constitute a contempt. *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Second Edition, at page 1070, states: “Tampering with a witness or in any way attempting to deter a witness from giving evidence may constitute a breach of parliamentary privilege.”

It is reasonable to assume that a letter signed by an assistant deputy minister, acting under the authority of the Minister of Justice, is an expression of the government's view on an issue, and given that its contents have been widely reported and circulated, the letter could leave the impression that public servants and government officials cannot be protected by Parliament for their responses to questions at a parliamentary committee, when this is not the case.

● (1520)

[English]

Specifically, I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the section of the letter in question, which the member for Scarborough—Rouge River tabled in the House on March 18, 2010, where the assistant deputy minister lays out a view of the duties of public servants in relation to committees of the House. The letter states:

Of course, there may be instances where an Act of Parliament will not be interpreted to apply to the Houses of Parliament (or their committees). However, that does not mean automatically that government officials—who are agents of the executive, not the legislative branch—are absolved from respecting duties imposed by a statute enacted by Parliament, or by requirements of the common law, such as solicitor-client privilege or Crown privilege.

This is so even if a parliamentary committee, through the exercise of parliamentary privilege, may extend immunity to witnesses appearing before it. A parliamentary committee cannot waive a legal duty imposed on government officials. To argue to the contrary would be inimical to the principles of the rule of law and parliamentary sovereignty. A parliamentary committee is subordinate, not superior, to the legislative will of Parliament as expressed in its enactments.

[Translation]

It does concern me that the letter of the assistant deputy minister could be interpreted as having a “chilling effect” on public servants who are called to appear before parliamentary committees, as contended the members for Scarborough—Rouge River and Toronto Centre. This could be especially so if the view put forth in the letter formed the basis of a direction given by department heads to their employees who have been called to testify before parliamentary committees.

At the same time, it is critically important to remember in this regard that our practice already recognizes that public servants appearing as witnesses are placed in the peculiar position of having two duties. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Second Edition, states at pages 1068 and 1069:

Speaker's Ruling

"Particular attention is paid to the questioning of public servants. The obligation of a witness to answer all questions put by the committee must be balanced against the role that public servants play in providing confidential advice to their Ministers. ...In addition, committees ordinarily accept the reasons that a public servant gives for declining to answer a specific question or series of questions which...may be perceived as a conflict with the witness' responsibility to the Minister...."

The solution for committees facing such situations is to seek answers from those who are ultimately accountable, namely, the ministers themselves.

[English]

It has been argued that there may be a chilling effect, which could come dangerously close to impeding members of committees in carrying out their duties; however, I remind the House that this letter was sent to our Law Clerk, so on balance, I would need to see the use made of this letter, in particular whether it was ever presented to a person who was scheduled to testify before the special committee with the intent of limiting the person's testimony.

As things stand, there does not appear to the Chair to be sufficient evidence for me to conclude that this letter constitutes a direct attempt to prevent or influence the testimony of any witness before a committee, and for these reasons, I cannot find that there is a prima facie question of contempt on this point.

I now turn to the questions of the House's right to order the production of documents and the claim that the government has failed to comply with the order of the House.

The hon. member for Kootenay—Columbia argued that even if the documents were provided to the committee, the committee could not, given their sensitive nature, make use of them publicly. However, I cannot agree with his conclusion that this obviates the government's requirement to provide the documents ordered by the House. To accept such a notion would completely undermine the importance of the role of parliamentarians in holding the government to account.

Before us are issues that question the very foundations upon which our parliamentary system is built. In a system of responsible government, the fundamental right of the House of Commons to hold the government to account for its actions is an indisputable privilege and in fact an obligation.

Embedded in our Constitution, parliamentary law and even in our Standing Orders, it is the source of our parliamentary system for which other processes and principles necessarily flow, and it is why that right is manifested in numerous procedures of the House, from the daily question period to the detailed examination by committees of estimates, to reviews of the accounts of Canada, to debate, amendments, and votes on legislation.

● (1525)

[Translation]

As I noted on December 10, 2009, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Second Edition, states at page 136:

By virtue of the Preamble and section 18 of the Constitution Act, 1867, Parliament has the ability to institute its own inquiries, to require the attendance of witnesses and to order the production of documents, rights which are fundamental to its proper functioning. These rights are as old as Parliament itself.

And on pages 978 to 979:

The Standing Orders do not delimit the power to order the production of papers and records. The result is a broad, absolute power that on the surface appears to be without restriction. There is no limit on the type of papers likely to be requested, the only prerequisite is that the papers exist—in hard copy or electronic format—and that they are located in Canada....

No statute or practice diminishes the fullness of the power rooted in the House privileges unless there is an explicit legal provision to that effect, or unless the House adopts a specific resolution limiting the power. The House has never set a limit on its power to order the production of papers and records.

[English]

Further, at page 70, Bourinot's 4th edition states:

The Senate and House of Commons have the right, inherent in them as legislative bodies, to summon and compel the attendance of all persons, within the limits of their jurisdiction, as witnesses, and to order them to bring with them such papers and records as may be required for the purpose of an inquiry.

In the arguments presented, the Chair has heard this power described as unabridged, unconditional, unqualified, absolute and, furthermore, one which is limited only by the discretion of the House itself. However, this view is not shared by all and so it is a privilege whose limits have now been called into question.

The government's view is that such an unqualified right does not exist for either House of Parliament or their committees. The executive, the holder of the sensitive information sought by the House, has competing obligations. On the one hand, it recognizes that there is an expectation of transparency so that government actions can be properly monitored to ensure that they respect the law and international agreements. On the other hand, the government contends that the protection of national security, national defence and international relations demand that some information remain secret and confidential, out of the reach of those obliged to scrutinize its actions and hold it to account.

In his March 31 intervention, the Minister of Justice quoted from the 1887 parliamentary treatise of Alpheus Todd to support the view that "a due regard to the interests of the State, occasionally demand... that information sought for by members of the legislature should be withheld, at the discretion and upon the general responsibility of ministers".

The minister also cited Bourinot in 1884, observing that the government may "feel constrained to refuse certain papers on the ground that their production would be...injurious to the public interest". Had he read a little further, he might have found the following statement by Bourinot at page 281:

But it must be remembered that under all circumstances it is for the house to consider whether the reasons given for refusing the information are sufficient. The right of Parliament to obtain every possible information on public questions is undoubted, and the circumstances must be exceptional, and the reasons very cogent, when it cannot be at once laid before the houses.

[Translation]

As the members for Saint-Jean and Joliette commented on March 25, 2010, Bourinot's Second Edition notes that even in instances where a minister refuses to provide documents that are requested, it is clear that it is still ultimately up to the House to determine whether grounds exist to withhold documents.

Bourinot, in referring to procedures for notices of motions for production of papers, wrote at pages 337 and 338:

• (1530)

[English]

Consequently, there are frequent cases in which the ministers refuse information, especially at some delicate stage of an investigation or negotiation; and in such instances the house will always acquiesce when sufficient reasons are given for the refusal...But it must be remembered that under all circumstances it is for the house to consider whether the reasons given for refusing the information are sufficient.

[Translation]

Joseph Maingot's *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, Second Edition, also supports the need for Parliament to have a voice in these very matters when it states at page 190:

The only limitations, which could only be self-imposed, would be that any inquiry should relate to a subject within the legislative competence of Parliament, particularly where witnesses and documents are required and the penal jurisdiction of Parliament is contemplated. This dovetails with the right of each House of Parliament to summon and compel the attendance of all persons within the limits of their jurisdictions.

[English]

Similarly, in *Erskine May*, 23rd edition, in a discussion of the exclusive cognizance of proceedings at page 102, we find the following:

...underlying the Bill of Rights [1689] is the privilege of both Houses to the exclusive cognizance of their own proceedings. Both Houses retain the right to be sole judge of the lawfulness of their own proceedings, and to settle—or depart from—their own codes of procedure. This is equally the case where the House in question is dealing with a matter which is finally decided by its sole authority, such as an order or resolution, or whether (like a bill) it is the joint concern of both Houses.

In David McGee's *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*, second edition, at page 621 he asserts, "The Australian legislation", referring to the Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1987, "in respect of article 9 of the *Bill of Rights*...may be taken to indicate the types of transactions falling within the term 'proceedings of Parliament'"

He then goes on to state that such proceedings to which privilege attaches include "...the presentation of a document to a House or a committee..."

Ogders' *Australian Senate Practice*, 12th edition, at page 51 states clearly:

Parliamentary privilege is not affected by provisions in statutes which prohibit in general terms the disclosure of categories of information....

Statutory provisions of this type do not prevent the disclosure of information covered by the provisions to a House of the Parliament or to a parliamentary committee in the course of a parliamentary inquiry... They...do not prevent committees seeking the information covered by such provisions or persons who have that information providing it to committees.

In light of these various authorities, the Chair must conclude that the House does indeed have the right to ask for the documents listed in the order of December 10, 2009.

With regard to the extent of the right, the Chair would like to address the contention of the Minister of Justice, made on March 31, that the order of the House of December 10 is a breach of the constitutional separation of powers between the executive and the legislature.

Having noted that the three branches of government must respect the legitimate sphere of activity of the others, the minister argued

Speaker's Ruling

that the order of the House was tantamount to an unlawful extension of the House's privileges. This can only be true if one agrees with the notion that the House's power to order the production of documents is not absolute. The question would then be whether this interpretation subjugates the legislature to the executive.

It is the view of the Chair that accepting an unconditional authority of the executive to censor the information provided to Parliament would in fact jeopardize the very separation of powers that is purported to lie at the heart of our parliamentary system and the independence of its constituent parts. Furthermore, it risks diminishing the inherent privileges of the House and its members, which have been earned and must be safeguarded.

As has been noted earlier, procedural authorities are categorical in repeatedly asserting the powers of the House in ordering the production of documents. No exceptions are made for any category of government documents, even those related to national security.

Therefore, the Chair must conclude that it is perfectly within the existing privileges of the House to order production of the documents in question. Bearing in mind that the fundamental role of Parliament is to hold the government to account, as the servant of the House and the protector of its privileges, I cannot agree with the government's interpretation that ordering these documents transgresses the separation of powers and interferes with the spheres of activity of the executive branch.

• (1535)

[Translation]

But what of the House's responsibility regarding the manner in which this right can or ought to be exercised? The authorities cited earlier all make reference to the long-standing practice whereby the House has accepted that not all documents demanded ought to be made available in cases where the Government asserts that this is impossible or inappropriate for reasons of national security, national defence or international relations.

O'Brien and Bosc, at page 979, states: "—it may not be appropriate to insist on the production of papers and records in all cases."

The basis for this statement is a 1991 report by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, which, as recorded on page 95 of the *Journals* of May 29, 1991, pointed out:

The House of Commons recognizes that it should not require the production of documents in all cases; considerations of public policy, including national security, foreign relations, and so forth, enter into the decision as to when it is appropriate to order the production of such documents.

[English]

In his comments on this aspect of the matter before us, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons referred to my ruling of June 8, 2006, where I stated that national security, when asserted by a minister, was sufficient to set aside a requirement to table documents cited in debate. The examples cited by the parliamentary secretary related strictly to documents that have been cited by a minister in the absence of any other explicit expression of interest by the House in the said documents.

*Speaker's Ruling**[Translation]*

Having reviewed the June 8 ruling, it is clear to the Chair that there is a difference between the practice of the House which allows a minister, on the sole basis of his or her judgment, to refrain from tabling a cited document for reasons of confidentiality and national security, and an order, duly adopted by the House following notice and debate, requiring the tabling of documents.

Another important distinction between the order adopted by the House on December 10, 2009, and the practice respecting notices of motions for the production of papers, referred to by the member for St. John's East on April 12 is that, with respect to such notices, there is an opportunity for a minister or parliamentary secretary to indicate to the House that the notice is acceptable to the government subject to certain reservations, such as confidentiality, or national security.

[English]

Thus the House, prior to the adoption of the motion, is fully aware that some documents will not be produced if the motion is adopted. If the House does not agree, the motion must either be transferred for debate or be put immediately to the House without debate or amendment.

Something similar happened on December 10, 2009. Before the House voted on the motion that became an order to produce documents, the ministers of justice, national defence and foreign affairs all rose in the House to explain the reasons why the documents in question should not be made available. This is in keeping with what Bourinot refers to as the government's responsibility to provide "reasons very cogent" for not producing documents.

Under normal circumstances, reflecting on past history in the House, these assertions by the government might well have been found to be acceptable by the House. In the current circumstances, however, the reasons given by the government were not found to be sufficient. The House debated the matter and voted to adopt an order for the production of documents despite the request of the government.

The reason for this, it seems, has to do with the issue of accommodation and trust. On December 10, 2009, as found on page 7877 of the *Debates*, I stated:

It is unfortunate, if I may make this comment, that arrangements were not made in committee to settle this matter there, where these requests were made and where there might have been some agreement on which documents and which format would be tabled or made available to members. How they were to be produced or however it was to be done, I do not know, but obviously that has not happened.

[Translation]

Several members have made the point that there are numerous ways that the documents in question could have been made available without divulging state secrets and acknowledged that all sides in the House needed to find a way to respect the privileges and rights of members of Parliament to hold the government to account, while at the same time protecting national security.

The government, for its part, has sought to find a solution to the impasse. It has appointed former Supreme Court Justice Frank Iacobucci and given him a mandate to examine the documents and to

recommend to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General what could be safely disclosed to the House.

The government has argued that in mandating this review by Mr. Iacobucci, it was taking steps to comply with the order consistent with its requirements to protect the security of Canada's armed forces and Canada's international obligations.

However, several members have pointed out that Mr. Iacobucci's appointment establishes a separate, parallel process outside of parliamentary oversight, and without parliamentary involvement. Furthermore, and in my view perhaps most significantly, Mr. Iacobucci reports to the Minister of Justice; his client is the government.

● (1540)

[English]

The authorities I have cited are unanimous in the view of the House's privilege to ask for the production of papers and many go on to explain that accommodations are made between those seeking information and those in possession of it to ensure that arrangements are made in the best interests of the public they both serve.

Certainly from the submissions I have heard, it is evident to the Chair that all members take seriously the sensitive nature of these documents and the need to protect the confidential information they contain.

The Chair must conclude that it is within the powers of the House of Commons to ask for the documents sought in the December 10 order it adopted. Now it seems to me that the issue before us is this: Is it possible to put in place a mechanism by which these documents could be made available to the House without compromising the security and confidentiality of the information they contain? In other words, is it possible for the two sides, working together in the best interests of the Canadians they serve, to devise a means where both their concerns are met? Surely that is not too much to hope for.

The member for Toronto Centre has made a suggestion, as recorded on page 615 of the *Debates* of March 18, 2010:

What we believe can be done is not beyond the ability of the House. It is done in many other parliaments. Indeed, there are circumstances under which it has even been done in this House. It is perfectly possible for unredacted documents to be seen by members of Parliament who have been sworn in for the purpose of looking at these documents.

O'Brien and Bosc, at page 980, points to ways of seeking a compromise for members to gain access to otherwise inaccessible material:

Normally, this entails putting measures in place to ensure that the record is kept confidential while it is being consulted: *in camera* review, limited and numbered copies, arrangements for disposing of or destroying the copies after the committee meeting, *et cetera*.

In some jurisdictions, such as the Legislative Council in the Australian state of New South Wales, and I would refer members to *New South Wales Legislative Council Practice* by Lovelock and Evans at page 481, mechanisms have been put in place, which satisfy the confidentiality concerns of the government as well as those of the legislature. Procedures provide for independent arbiters, recognized by both the executive and the legislature, to make determinations on what can be disclosed when a dispute arises over an order for the production of documents.

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

Finding common ground will be difficult. There have been assertions that colleagues in the House are not sufficiently trustworthy to be given confidential information, even with appropriate security safeguards in place. I find such comments troubling. The insinuation that members of Parliament cannot be trusted with the very information that they may well require to act on behalf of Canadians runs contrary to the inherent trust that Canadians have placed in their elected officials and which members require to act in their various parliamentary capacities.

The issue of trust goes in the other direction as well. Some suggestions have been made that the government has self-serving and ulterior motives for the redactions in the documents tabled. Here too, such remarks are singularly unhelpful to the aim of finding a workable accommodation and ultimately identifying mechanisms that will satisfy all actors in this matter.

• (1545)

[English]

But the fact remains that the House and the government have, essentially, an unbroken record of some 140 years of collaboration and accommodation in cases of this kind. It seems to me that it would be a signal failure for us to see that record shattered in the third session of the 40th Parliament because we lacked the will or the wit to find a solution to this impasse.

The House has long understood the role of the government as “defender of the realm” and its heavy responsibilities in matters of security, national defence and international relations. Similarly, the government understands the House’s undoubted role as the “grand inquest of the nation” and its need for complete and accurate information in order to fulfill its duty of holding the government to account.

Examples have been cited of mechanisms that might satisfy the competing interests of both sides in this matter. In view of the grave circumstances of the current impasse, the Chair believes that the House ought to make one further effort to arrive at an interest-based solution to this thorny question.

Accordingly, on analyzing the evidence before it and the precedents, the Chair cannot but conclude that the government’s failure to comply with the order of December 10, 2009, constitutes *prima facie* a question of privilege.

I will allow House leaders, ministers and party critics time to suggest some way of resolving the impasse, for it seems to me we would fail the institution if no resolution can be found. However, if in two weeks’ time, the matter is still not resolved, the Chair will return to make a statement on the motion that will be allowed in the circumstances.

In the meantime, of course the Chair is disposed to assist the House in any way it can, and I am open to suggestions on any particular role that I as your Speaker can play.

I thank the House for its attention.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing the House that the Senate has passed the following public bill, to which the concurrence of the House is desired: Bill S-210, An Act to amend the Federal Sustainable Development Act and the Auditor General Act (involvement of Parliament).

GOVERNMENT ORDERS*[English]***BALANCED REFUGEE REFORM ACT**

The House resumed from April 26 consideration of the motion that Bill C-11, An Act to amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act and the Federal Courts Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Ms. Libby Davies: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Because of what happened, we did not quite catch what you just said in terms of the bill being debated. Would you mind repeating that, please?

The Speaker: I was calling for debate. We are ready to start a new speech on Bill C-11.

Ms. Libby Davies: Mr. Speaker, could you clarify why we are not returning to routine proceedings? We were at motions, but we had not yet gotten to petitions. Are we to go back to petitions before we go back to Bill C-11?

The Speaker: I am sure the hon. member for Vancouver East knows that when the whole morning is expended on that, we go straight to government orders after question period. We are now in government orders discussing Bill C-11. We will have to wait for petitions and answers to questions tomorrow, difficult as that may be.

Resuming debate with the hon. member for Parkdale—High Park.

• (1550)

[Translation]

Mr. Gerard Kennedy (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to this debate on refugee status in Canada.

[English]

We have in front of us a very fundamental bill, a bill that is not just about how we treat refugees but how we consider ourselves.

I want to say at the outset that we want to see the backlog dealt with, we want to see a way of reducing the number of people who make claims that are not accurate or false and we want to see fairness and speed put into the system. However, there are fundamental questions.

[Translation]

Is this a reform bill? Does it ensure fairness and balance?

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and
Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the
following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les
Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

TAB 2



Legislative Assembly
of Ontario

First Session, 40th Parliament

Assemblée législative
de l'Ontario

Première session, 40^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Thursday 13 September 2012

Jeudi 13 septembre 2012

Speaker
Honourable Dave Levac

Clerk
Deborah Deller

Président
L'honorable Dave Levac

Greffière
Deborah Deller

Hansard on the Internet

Hansard and other documents of the Legislative Assembly can be on your personal computer within hours after each sitting. The address is:

Le Journal des débats sur Internet

L'adresse pour faire paraître sur votre ordinateur personnel le Journal et d'autres documents de l'Assemblée législative en quelques heures seulement après la séance est :

<http://www.ontla.on.ca/>

Index inquiries

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at 416-325-7410 or 325-3708.

Renseignements sur l'index

Adressez vos questions portant sur des numéros précédents du Journal des débats au personnel de l'index, qui vous fourniront des références aux pages dans l'index cumulatif, en composant le 416-325-7410 ou le 325-3708.

Hansard Reporting and Interpretation Services
Room 500, West Wing, Legislative Building
111 Wellesley Street West, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Telephone 416-325-7400; fax 416-325-7430
Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario



Service du Journal des débats et d'interprétation
Salle 500, aile ouest, Édifice du Parlement
111, rue Wellesley ouest, Queen's Park
Toronto ON M7A 1A2
Téléphone, 416-325-7400; télécopieur, 416-325-7430
Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Carleton. They're the family of Eric Leighton. I have with us Sheri and Patrick and their daughter, Kaitlyn Leighton. I want to thank them for coming to Queen's Park today and for being so courageous over the past year.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Welcome.

Today, visiting us from the riding of Niagara Falls, we have with us in the members' gallery Jacquie and Sam Seaver, parents of page Ethan Seaver, and their friend Judy Murray. Welcome to Queen's Park.

We also have in the Speaker's gallery today a delegation from the Empowered Committee of State Finance Ministers of India, a multi-legislative body made up of federal and state parliamentarians from the Republic of India. They are accompanied today by the Consul General of India. Please join me in warmly welcoming our guests today.

Applause.

MEMBERS' PRIVILEGES

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): On Monday, August 27, 2012, the member from Cambridge, Mr. Leone, rose on a question of privilege concerning the government's failure to produce certain documents requested by the Standing Committee on Estimates.

The government House leader, Mr. Milloy; the member from Timmins-James Bay, Mr. Bisson; the member from Chatham-Kent-Essex, Mr. Nicholls; the member from Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke, Mr. Yakabuski; the member from Nipissing, Mr. Fedeli; the member from Leeds-Grenville, Mr. Clark; and the member from Beaches-East York, Mr. Prue, also spoke to this matter.

Having reviewed the notice provided by the member from Cambridge, the subsequent written submissions of the government House leader and of the member from Cambridge, the August 27 report of the Standing Committee on Estimates, relevant Hansards for the committee and various parliamentary authorities, I am now prepared to rule on that matter.

The details of what occurred in the committee are contained in the above-mentioned documents, but the essential chronology is as follows:

On May 16, the Standing Committee on Estimates formally adopted a motion requesting that the Minister of Energy, the Ministry of Energy and the Ontario Power Authority provide, within two weeks, all correspondence relating to decisions in 2010 and 2011 not to proceed with the construction of the power plants in Oakville and Mississauga, respectively.

On May 30, the minister responded to the request by indicating that it would not be appropriate to disclose the correspondence because the files were confidential and because many of them were either subject to solicitor-client or litigation privilege or else highly commercially sensitive; their disclosure would tend to prejudice ongoing negotiations and litigation. The Ontario Power Authority responded in a similar vein on the same day.

On June 5, in the Standing Committee on Estimates, a motion was brought forward by Mr. Leone calling for a report from the committee to the House with respect to the minister's May 30 decision not to provide the requested documents. The committee debated the motion and amendments to it on that day and three subsequent meetings of the committee—June 6, June 12 and July 11—finally adopting the version of the motion contained in the committee's August 27 report to the House.

On July 11, an agreement having been just reached to relocate the Mississauga plant, the minister provided some of the requested documents. The minister indicated that other documents would not be provided to the committee because they were subject to various legal privileges.

On August 27, shortly before the member for Cambridge rose on his question of privilege, the Standing Committee on Estimates reported that, for reasons indicated in the report, the government had not produced certain correspondence that the committee had ordered to be produced, and that this non-production may raise a matter of privilege. The report also recommended that the Minister of Energy be compelled to provide the documents requested by the committee without delay and that the minister be held in contempt if he refuses to do so.

Given these developments, the nature of parliamentary powers respecting the production of documents requires some examination. With respect to committee powers, standing order 110(b) provides as follows: "Except when the House otherwise orders, each committee shall have power to send for persons, papers and things." This standing order effectively empowers committees, including the Standing Committee on Estimates, to order the production of documents.

Further to this point, in a March 9, 2011, ruling dealing with a non-production incident in the Canadian House of Commons, Speaker Milliken found that there was a *prima facie* question of privilege where there was non-compliance with a production order made by a committee; the committee's report on non-compliance was not concurred in before a question of privilege was raised in the House.

Between the time of the raising of that question of privilege and the time that the Speaker ruled that there was a *prima facie* question of privilege, the House made an order for production with respect to the same documents; nevertheless, the ruling clearly indicates that it was based on non-compliance with the production order of the committee, not of the House.

Therefore, non-compliance with a production order made by either a committee or a House can, in a proper case, constitute a matter of privilege.

Turning to the issue of whether the matter before me is such a case, members will know that as a matter of parliamentary privilege the House has the right to institute inquiries, to require the attendance of witnesses and to order the production of documents. The House exercises this right when it gives mandates to committees and delegates powers to them; the committees in turn carry out

the mandates and exercise the powers within the limits of their authority. Therefore, when the Standing Committee on Estimates considers the estimates, it does so pursuant to standing orders 59 and 60, and the order of the House referring the estimates to that committee; when it orders production of documents relevant to its mandate, it does so pursuant to standing order 110(b).

The right to order production of documents is fundamental to and necessary for the proper functioning of the assembly. If the House and its committees do not enjoy this right, then the accountability, scrutiny and financial functions of Parliament—which go to the core of our system of responsible government—would be compromised.

At meetings of the Standing Committee on Estimates, the Minister of Energy did not assert that the committee had no right to inquire into the matter before it or that it had no power to send for the documents in question. Rather, the minister indicated that legal and other considerations should militate against the production of all requested documents.

But as Speaker Milliken indicated in the following excerpt from the Afghanistan ruling, page 2,043 of Hansard for April 27, 2010, parliamentary privilege—of which the right to order production of documents is but one category—trumps such considerations:

“Procedural authorities are categorical in repeatedly asserting the powers of the House in ordering the production of documents. No exceptions are made for any category of government documents, even those related to national security.”

Furthermore, pages 978 and 979 of the second edition of the House of Commons Procedure and Practice provides as follows:

“The standing orders do not delimit the power to order the production of papers and records. The result is a broad, absolute power that on the surface appears to be without restriction. There is no limit on the types of papers likely to be requested; the only prerequisite is that the papers exist in hard copy or electronic format—and that they are located in Canada. They can be papers originating from or in the possession of governments, or papers the authors or owners of which are from the private sector or civil society (individuals, associations, organizations, etc.).

1040

“In practice, standing committees may encounter situations where the authors of or officials responsible for papers refuse to provide them or are willing to provide them only after certain parts have been removed. Public servants and ministers may sometimes invoke their obligations under certain legislation to justify their position. Companies may be reluctant to release papers which could jeopardize their industrial security or infringe upon their legal obligations, particularly with regard to the protection of personal information. Others have cited solicitor-client privilege in refusing to allow access to legal papers or notices.

“These types of situations have absolutely no bearing on the power of committees to order the production of

papers and records. No statute or practice diminishes the fullness of that power rooted in House privileges unless there is an explicit legal provision to that effect, or unless the House adopts a specific resolution limiting the power. The House has never set a limit on its power to order the production of papers and records. However, it may not be appropriate to insist on the production of papers and records in all cases.”

In many parliamentary jurisdictions, the House and its committees often accommodate or respect security, legal and public policy considerations; they often accept reasonable excuses for non-production. However, these authorities also indicate that a decision to be selective with respect to production is a decision for the House or the committee.

In the case at hand, the Standing Committee on Estimates made a production order despite the arguments made by the minister. My response to the government House leader’s claim that the committee did not turn its mind to the reasons for non-production proffered by the minister is,

—First, it was not obliged to do so.

—Second, the documents could have been offered to the committee under conditions that would both satisfy the needs of the committee and the minister: for instance, being received in a closed session without public disclosure, or in an acceptably redacted version. The Chair put forward this notion on one occasion, and it was passed by without comment by any member.

—Third, the government House leader in his written submission repeatedly points to what a difference a clear motion would have made to the Minister of Energy’s ability to fully respond to the committee’s request; that is, a motion that explicitly expressed the committee’s request even for documents that are highly commercially sensitive, for which solicitor-client privilege is claimed and/or are subject to litigation privilege. It is claimed that the minister could have and would have complied in that scenario. During the time in question, the minister could have requested the committee to pass just such a motion, making it explicit that it still demanded the requested documents, notwithstanding the minister’s wish to withhold disclosure for reasons stated in his May 30 reply to the committee’s original request. The record does not show that the minister proactively did so.

The Standing Committee on Estimates was unquestionably entitled to request the documents sought from the Minister of Energy, and in the end the minister had an obligation to comply with the committee’s call for those documents. The committee did not accept the minister’s reasons for withholding the document and persisted in its demand during an extended period of time.

I am therefore satisfied that a *prima facie* case of privilege has been established.

However, in the face of all of the submissions, the committee transcripts and its report to the House, it seems possible to me that, but for the lack of frank communication, this matter might have been settled in the estimates committee some time ago. Further, given that

in his submission the government House leader wrote, "If the House chooses to issue the requested order or the committee chooses to pass a motion that clarifies its position with respect to the motion of May 16, the government will abide by the will of the Legislature," I am hopeful that there is a possibility that the matter still can be settled.

I want to quote two passages from Speaker Milliken's April 27, 2010, Afghan detainee ruling: "(I)t seems to me, that the issue before us is this: Is it possible to put into place a mechanism by which these documents could be made available to the House without compromising the security and confidentiality of the information they contain? In other words, is it possible for the two sides, working together in the best interest of the Canadians they serve, to devise a means where both their concerns are met? Surely that is not too much to hope for...."

"The fact remains that the House and the government have, essentially, an unbroken record of some 140 years of collaboration and accommodation in cases of this kind. It seems to me that it would be a signal failure for us to see that record shattered in the third session of the 40th Parliament because we lacked the will or the wit to find a solution to this impasse."

I, too, have immense faith in the abilities of the honourable members of this House. I know that a solution can be found to this impasse. All sides need to exercise sobriety in this. Political fortunes should not be the motive for eroding the supremacy of Parliament or ignoring the best interests of citizens in this province. Assiduous attention should be paid to dealing with matters such as this responsibly.

Therefore, inspired by the precedent of Speaker Milliken's innovative ruling in this Afghan detainee case, I am going to presume leave of this House and set this matter aside for the moment. I ask that the three House leaders take it upon themselves to find a path that can satisfy the request of the estimates committee. If this cannot be accomplished by the end of the day, Monday, September 23, then I will return to the House with a statement on a motion by the member from Cambridge that would be appropriate in the circumstances.

I thank the member for Cambridge, the government House leader, the member for Timmins-James Bay, the member for Chatham-Kent-Essex, the member for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke, the member for Nipissing, the member for Leeds-Grenville and the member from Beaches-East York for speaking to this matter, and I thank the member for Cambridge and the government House leader for their written submissions.

Mr. Gilles Bisson: Point of order, Speaker.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): Point of order for the member of Timmins-James Bay.

Mr. Gilles Bisson: Where do I start? I'm a little bit surprised. I just want—a couple things need to be said at this point.

First of all, what is clear is that there has been a prima facie case of contempt that has been found. If we look at the precedent in regard to what Speakers have done both

nationally and provincially, we have—you know, I can go through and cite all of the various cases, but the presumption has always been, on the part of the Speakers, except for the Afghanistan case, to immediately take up that matter before the House. The case of Afghanistan was very different because we were talking about national security and there was some sense on the part of everyone, "Okay, we kind of get it." But this, as you said, has nothing to do with that. You can't hide behind sub judice, client-solicitor privileges etc., in order to not produce the documents. There's a clear responsibility on the part of whoever is summoned before a committee to co-operate with the committee when it comes to evidence, including what is given as far as paper.

If you look at the various cases in 2001, March 19, the case of Speaker Milliken, there was such a case and immediately the motion was taken up. On March 9, 1998, under Parent, again, the motion was taken up immediately following the finding of a prima facie case of contempt. The list goes on. I'm not going to go through it because it would just be going on further.

But, listen, if the House leaders would have been able to resolve this by now, we would have done it. That's the point. It's abundantly clear, Speaker, that the government members at committee did not want to compel the minister to produce those documents. The minister didn't want to produce the documents, and I would presume that the government, in its whole, didn't want to produce those documents. If there was a way forward, there would have been some attempt on the part of the minister or the House leader to try to find a way for us to deal with this. That's why this is a matter that has to be taken up immediately by the House by way of motion. It is up to this House to decide at this point how we're going to deal with it and the precedent is pretty clear that it is us, the House, that makes these decisions and it's not, in this particular case, to be punted off to the House leaders. I'll wait for further comment from my colleagues, but I urge you strongly that we don't go down this path.

1050

We are currently trying to negotiate how we're going to get various legislation through the House, with the House leaders. We're trying to deal with trying to strike our committees. Throwing this into the House leaders' meetings, quite frankly, is not going to help the creation of committees in this House or the movement of the legislative agenda of the government through the House.

Your punting that issue to the House leaders' meeting, I think, is going to lead to very difficult House leaders' meetings at which the government's House agenda will be held up because we'll be seized with this matter. The government will never agree, and we'll have to come back in September and deal with the motion. So let's deal with it now.

The Speaker (Hon. Dave Levac): The member from Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke on a point of order.

Mr. John Yakabuski: Thank you very much, Speaker. I share the concerns of the member for Timmins-James Bay, but by way of clarification, I want to get

IN THE MATTER OF THE *COMPANIES' CREDITORS ARRANGEMENT ACT*, R.S.C.. 1985, c. C-36, AS AMENDED

AND IN THE MATTER OF A PLAN OF COMPROMISE OR ARRANGEMENT OF **LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY OF SUDBURY**

Court File No. CV-21-656040-00CL

**SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
(COMMERCIAL LIST)**

Proceeding commenced at TORONTO

**BOOK OF AUTHORITIES OF THE MOVING PARTY,
LAURENTIAN UNIVERSITY OF SUDBURY**

THORNTON GROUT FINNIGAN LLP
3200 – 100 Wellington Street West
TD West Tower, Toronto-Dominion Centre
Toronto, ON M5K 1K7

D.J. Miller (LSO# 34393P)

Email: djmiller@tgf.ca

Mitchell W. Grossell (LSO# 69993I)

Email: mgrossell@tgf.ca

Andrew Hanrahan (LSO# 78003K)

Email: ahanrahan@tgf.ca

Derek Harland (LSO# 79504N)

Email: धारland@tgf.ca

Tel: 416-304-1616

Fax: 416-304-1313

Co-Counsel for Laurentian University