

Cases in which the CCLA has been granted intervener status include those listed chronologically below:

*R. v. Morgentaler*, [1976] 1 S.C.R. 616, where the general issue was whether the necessity defence was applicable to a charge of procuring an unlawful abortion under the *Criminal Code*, and the CCLA made submissions on the issue of whether the practices of therapeutic abortion committees violated the due process rights in the *Canadian Bill of Rights* (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Nova Scotia (Board of Censors) v. McNeil*, [1976] 2 S.C.R. 265, in which the issue was whether a taxpayer has standing to challenge legislation concerning censorship of films (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R. v. Miller*, [1977] 2 S.C.R. 680, in which one of the issues was whether the death penalty under the *Criminal Code* constituted cruel and unusual punishment under the *Canadian Bill of Rights* (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Nova Scotia (Board of Censors) v. McNeil*, [1978] 2 S.C.R. 662, in which the issues were whether statutory provisions and regulations authorizing the Board of Censors to regulate and control the film industry in the province were *intra vires* the provincial legislature and whether they violated fundamental freedoms, including freedom of speech (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Reference re Legislative Privilege* (1978), 18 O.R. (2d) 529 (C.A.), in which the issue was whether a member of the legislature has a privilege allowing him or her to refuse to disclose the source or content of confidential communications by informants when testifying at a criminal trial (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Court of Appeal);

*R. v. Saxell* (1980), 33 O.R. (2d) 78 (C.A.), in which one of the issues was whether the provision in the *Criminal Code* for the detention of an accused acquitted by reason of insanity violated guarantees in the *Canadian Bill of Rights*, including the guarantee of due process and the protection against arbitrary detention and imprisonment (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Court of Appeal);

*Nova Scotia (Attorney General) v. MacIntyre*, [1982] 1 S.C.R. 175, in which the issue was whether a journalist is entitled to inspect search warrants and the information used to obtain them (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Re Fraser and Treasury Board (Department of National Revenue)* (1982), 5 L.A.C. (3d) 193 (P.S.S.R.B.), in which the issue was whether termination of a

civil servant for publicly criticizing government policy violated freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened before the Public Service Staff Relations Board);

*R. v. Dowson*, [1983] 2 S.C.R. 144, and *R. v. Buchbinder*, [1983] 2 S.C.R. 159, in which the issue was whether the Attorney General could order a stay of proceedings under section 508 of the *Criminal Code* after a private information has been received but before the Justice of the Peace has completed an inquiry (the CCLA intervened in *R. v. Dowson* in the Ontario Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada. In *R. v. Buchbinder*, the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Re Ontario Film & Video Appreciation Society and Ontario Board of Censors* (1984), 45 O.R. (2d) 80 (C.A.), in which the issue was whether a provincial law permitting a board to censor films violated the Charter's guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Divisional Court and the Ontario Court of Appeal);

*R. v. Rao* (1984), 46 O.R. (2d) 80 (C.A.), in which the issue was whether a provision under the *Narcotic Control Act* permitting warrantless searches violated the Charter's guarantee of protection against unreasonable search and seizure (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Court of Appeal);

*Re Klein and Law Society of Upper Canada; Re Dvorak and Law Society of Upper Canada* (1985), 16 D.L.R. (4<sup>th</sup>) 489 (Div. Ct.), in which the issue was whether the Law Society's prohibitions respecting fees advertising and communications with the media violated the Charter's guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Divisional Court);

*R. v. Oakes* (1983), 40 O.R. (2d) 660, in which the issue was whether the reverse onus clause in section 8 of the *Narcotic Control Act* violated an accused's right to be presumed innocent under the Charter (the CCLA intervened in the Court of Appeal);

*Canadian Newspapers Co. Ltd. v. Attorney-General of Canada* (1986), 55 O.R. (2d) 737 (H.C.), in which the issue was whether the provision in the *Criminal Code* limiting newspapers' rights to publish certain information respecting search warrants violated the Charter's guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario High Court of Justice);

*R. v. J.M.G.* (1986), 56 O.R. (2d) 705 (C.A.), in which the issue was whether a school principal's seizure of drugs from a student's sock violated the Charter's protection from unreasonable search and seizure (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Court of Appeal);

*Re Ontario Film & Video Appreciation Society and Ontario Film Review Board* (1986), 57 O.R. (2d) 339 (Div. Ct.), in which the issue was whether actions taken

by a film censorship board violated the *Charter's* guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Divisional Court);

*Reference Re Bill 30, an Act to amend the Education Act (Ont.)*, [1987] 1 S.C.R. 1148, in which the issues were whether Bill 30, which provided for full funding for Roman Catholic separate high schools, violated the *Charter's* guarantees of freedom of conscience and religion and equality rights (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Zylberberg v. Sudbury Board of Education (Director)* (1988), 65 O.R. (2d) 641 (C.A.), in which the issue was whether an Ontario regulation which provided for religious exercises in public schools violated the *Charter's* guarantee of freedom of conscience and religion (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Divisional Court and the Ontario Court of Appeal);

*Tremblay v. Daigle*, [1989] 2 S.C.R. 530, in which the issue was whether a father of an unborn child could obtain an injunction prohibiting the mother from having an abortion (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Canada (Human Rights Commission) v. Taylor*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 892, in which one of the issues was whether a provision in the *Canada Human Rights Act* that prohibited telephone communication of hate messages offended the *Charter's* guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R. v. Keegstra*, [1990] 3 S.C.R. 697, in which the issue was whether the *Criminal Code* provision which made it an offence to willfully promote hatred against an identifiable group constitutes a violation of the *Charter's* guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R. v. Swain* (1986), 53 O.R. (2d) 609 (C.A.), in which some of the issues were whether the provision in the *Criminal Code* for the detention of an accused acquitted by reason of insanity violated sections 7, 9, 12 or 15(1) of the *Charter* (the CCLA intervened in the Court of Appeal);

*Lavigne v. Ontario Public Service Employees Union*, [1991] 2 S.C.R. 211, in which the issues were whether the use for certain political purposes of union dues paid by non-members pursuant to an agency shop or Rand formula violated the *Charter's* guarantees of freedom of expression and association (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R. v. Seaboyer*, [1991] 2 S.C.R. 577, in which one of the issues was whether the rape shield provisions of the *Criminal Code* violated the *Charter's* guarantee of a fair trial (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada of Canada);

*R. v. Butler*, [1992] 1 S.C.R. 452, in which the issue was whether the obscenity provisions in section 163 of the *Criminal Code* violate the *Charter's* guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*J.H. v. Hastings (County)*, [1992] O.J. No. 1695 (Ont. Gen. Div.), in which the issue was whether disclosure to municipal councilors of a list of social assistance recipients violated the protection of privacy under the *Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario General Division);

*R. v. Zundel*, [1992] 2 S.C.R. 731, in which the issue was whether section 177 of the *Criminal Code* prohibiting spreading false news violated the *Charter's* guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Ramsden v. Peterborough (City)*, [1993] 2 S.C.R. 1084, in which the issue was whether a municipal by-law banning posters on public property violated the *Charter's* guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Ontario Human Rights Commission v. Four Star Variety* (October 22, 1993) (Ont. Bd. of Inquiry), in which the issues were whether convenience stores displaying and selling certain magazines discriminated against women on the basis of their sex contrary to the *Ontario Human Rights Code* and if the Board of Inquiry's dealing with the obscenity issue intruded on the *Charter's* guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened before the Board of Inquiry);

*Ontario (Attorney General) v. Langer* (1995), 123 D.L.R. (4th) 289 (Ont. Gen. Div.), in which the issue was the constitutionality of ss. 163.1 and 164 of the *Criminal Code* relating to child pornography (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario General Division);

*Hill v. Church of Scientology of Toronto*, [1995] 2 S.C.R. 1130, in which the issues were: (1) whether the common law of defamation should be developed in a manner consistent with freedom of expression; (2) whether the common law test for determining liability for defamation disproportionately restricts freedom of expression; and (3) whether the current law respecting non-pecuniary and punitive damages disproportionately restricts freedom of expression and whether limits on jury discretion and damages should be imposed (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R. v. Gill* (1996), 29 O.R. (3d) 250 (Ont. Gen. Div.), in which the issue was whether section 301 of the *Criminal Code*, which creates an offence of publishing a defamatory libel, constitutes a violation of the *Charter's* guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario General Division);

*Ross v. New Brunswick School District No. 15*, [1996] 1 S.C.R. 825, in which one of the issues was the extent to which a teacher's expression of views in his off-duty time could justify an order of a human rights board of inquiry requiring the teacher's removal from his position (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Al Yamani v. Canada (Solicitor General) (T.D.)*, [1996] 1 F.C. 174 (T.D.), in which some of the issues were whether the provision in the *Immigration Act* regarding the deportation of permanent residents on the basis of membership in a class of organizations violated principles of fundamental justice contrary to section 7 of the *Charter* or the *Charter* guarantees of freedom of association and expression (the CCLA intervened in the Federal Court Trial Division);

*Adler v. Ontario*, [1996] 3 S.C.R. 609, in which the issues were whether Ontario's non-funding of Jewish and certain Christian day schools violated the *Charter*'s guarantees of freedom of conscience and religion and of equality without discrimination based on religion (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario General Division, the Ontario Court of Appeal, and the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R. v. Stillman*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 607, in which the issue was the explication of the circumstances, including police conduct, that would bring the administration of justice into disrepute within the meaning of subsection 24(2) of the *Charter* if unconstitutionally obtained evidence were to be admitted into a proceeding (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Winnipeg Child and Family Services (Northwest Area) v. D.F.G.*, [1997] 3 S.C.R. 925, in which the issue was whether the law should permit the state to interfere with the privacy, dignity, and liberty of a pregnant woman where her actions may expose the fetus to serious injury (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R. v. Lucas*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 439, in which the issue was whether section 300 of the *Criminal Code*, which creates the offence of publishing a defamatory libel, constitutes a violation of the *Charter*'s guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Thomson Newspapers Co. (c.o.b. Globe and Mail) v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [1998] 1 S.C.R. 877, in which the issue was whether section 322.1 of the *Canada Elections Act*, which prohibits the publication of public opinion polls during the last 72 hours of a federal election campaign, constitutes a violation of the *Charter*'s guarantee of freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Daly v. Ontario (Attorney General)* (1999), 44 O.R. (3d) 349 (C.A.), in which the issue was the extent to which Ontario's constitutionality protected Catholic separate school boards must adhere to the restrictions on employment

discrimination contained in the *Ontario Human Rights Code* (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario General Division and the Ontario Court of Appeal);

*United Food and Commercial Workers, Local 1518 (U.F.C.W.) v. KMart Canada Ltd.*, [1999] 2 S.C.R. 1083, and *Allsco Building Products Ltd. v. United Food and Commercial Workers International Union, Local 1288 P*, [1999] 2 S.C.R. 1136, in which the issue was whether leafleting by striking employees at non-struck workplaces is constitutionally protected expression (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R. v. Mills*, [1999] 3 S.C.R. 668, in which the central issue was the appropriate balance to be struck between the rights of the accused and the rights of complainants and witnesses with respect to the production of medical and therapeutic records (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Moumdjian v. Canada (Security Intelligence Review Committee)*, [1999] 4 F.C. 624, in which one of the issues was the constitutionality of *Immigration Act* provisions which impacted on the freedom of association (the CCLA intervened in the Federal Court of Appeal);

*Martin Entrop and Imperial Oil Ltd* (2000), 50 O.R. (3d) 18 (C.A.), in which one of the issues was the legality of an employer testing employees' urine for drug use (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario General Division and the Ontario Court of Appeal);

*Falkiner v. Ontario (Ministry of Community and Social Services)* (2002), 59 O.R. (3d) 481 (C.A.), in which the issues were the extent to which regulations made under the *Family Benefits Act* and the *General Welfare Assistance Act* amending the definition of "spouse" in relation to benefit entitlement (1) constituted discrimination under subsection 15(1) of the *Charter*, and (2) set the stage for unwarranted government intrusion into the personal and private circumstances of affected recipients (the CCLA intervened before SARB, the Ontario Divisional Court, the Ontario Superior Court of Justice, and the Ontario Court of Appeal);

*Little Sisters Book and Art Emporium v. Canada (Attorney General)*, [2000] 2 S.C.R. 1120, in which one of the issues was whether certain provisions of Canada's customs legislation which permit customs officers to seize and detain allegedly obscene material at the border unreasonably infringe on the right to freedom of expression (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R. v. Budreo* (2000), 46 O.R. (3d) 481 (C.A.), in which the issue was whether the provision in section 810.1 of the *Criminal Code*, which permits a court to impose recognizance on a person likely to commit sexual offences against a child, violates section 7 of the *Charter* (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Court of Appeal);

*Toronto Police Association v. Toronto Police Services Board and David J. Boothby* (Ont. Div. Ct. Court, File No. 58/2000), in which the issue was the propriety of police fundraising and political activities, and the validity of a by-law and order issued by the Toronto Police Services Board and the Chief of Police, respectively, regarding police conduct (the matter settled prior to the hearing);

*R. v. Latimer*, [2001] 1 S.C.R. 3, in which one of the issues was whether the *Criminal Code* provision for a mandatory minimum sentence of life imprisonment for second degree murder constitutes cruel and unusual punishment under section 12 of the *Charter* (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R. v. Sharpe*, [2001] 1 S.C.R. 45, in which the issue was whether the *Criminal Code* prohibition of the possession of child pornography is an unreasonable infringement on the right to freedom of expression under the *Charter* (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R. v. Golden*, [2001] 3 S.C.R. 679, in which one of the issues was whether a strip search of the accused conducted as an incident to arrest violated section 8 of the *Charter* (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Trinity Western University v. British Columbia College of Teachers*, [2001] 1 S.C.R. 772, in which the CCLA supported a private university's claim to be accredited for certification of its graduates as teachers eligible to teach in the public school system, despite the fact that the university's religiously-based code of conduct likely excluded gays and lesbians (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Ross v. New Brunswick Teachers' Association* (2001), 201 D.L.R. (4th) 75 (N.B.C.A.), in which one of the issues was the extent to which the values underlying the common law tort of defamation must give way to the *Charter* values underlying freedom of expression, especially where a claimant who asserts the former at the expense of the latter freely enters the public arena (the CCLA intervened in the New Brunswick Court of Appeal);

*R. v. Banks* (2001), 55 O.R. (3d) 374 (O.C.J.); appeal heard and reserved before the Ontario Superior Court of Justice in 2002, in which one of the issues was whether provisions of the Ontario *Safe Streets Act* prohibiting certain forms of soliciting violate subsection 2(b) of the *Charter* (the CCLA intervened before the Ontario Court of Justice and the Ontario Superior Court of Justice);

*Ontario (Human Rights Commission) v. Brillinger*, [2002] O.J. No. 2375 (Div. Ct.), in which the issue concerned the balance to be struck between freedom of religion and the right to equality (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice);

*Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, Local 558 v. Pepsi-Cola Canada Beverages (West) Ltd.*, [2002] 1 S.C.R. 156, in which the issue concerned the

extent to which the common law regarding secondary picketing should be modified in light of *Charter* values (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Chamberlain v. The Board of Trustees of School District # 36 (Surrey)*, [2002] S.C.C. 86, which involved the balancing of freedom of religion and equality rights in the context of a public school board's approval of books for a school curriculum (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Odhavji Estate v. Woodhouse*, [2003] S.C.C. 69, which examined the appropriate scope of both the tort of abuse of public office and the tort of negligent supervision of the police, and the appropriate legal principles to be applied when addressing the issues of costs orders against private individuals of modest means who are engaged in public interest litigation (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R. v. Malmo-Levine, R. v. Clay, R. v. Caine*, [2003] S.C.J. No. 79, in which one of the issues was whether the criminal prohibition against the possession of marijuana violates section 7 of the *Charter* (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R v. Glad Day Bookshop Inc.*, [2004] O.J. No. 1766 (Ont. Sup. Ct. Jus.), in which one of the issues was the constitutionality of the statutory regime requiring prior approval and allowing the prior restraint of films (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice);

*In the matter of an application under § 83.28 of the Criminal Code*, 2004 SCC 42, which questioned *inter alia* the constitutionality of investigative hearings and the over breadth of certain provisions of the Anti-Terrorism Act (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Broomer v. Ontario*, ON Sup. Ct. Jus. File No. 346/02, which examined the constitutionality of an Ontario welfare regulation banning those convicted of certain offences from receiving welfare for life (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice);

*R v. Mann*, 2004 SCC 52, which examined whether the police have the authority at common law to detain and search a person in the absence of either a warrant or reasonable and probable grounds to believe an offence has been committed (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Congregation des Temoins de Jehovah de St-Jerome-Lafontaine c. Lafontaine (Ville)*, 2004 SCC 48, which examined the constitutionality of a municipal zoning decision that limited the location of building places of religious worship (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*R v. Tessling*, S.C.C. File No. 29670, which examined the constitutionality of the police conducting warrantless searches of private dwelling houses using infra red technology during the course of criminal investigations (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*In the Matter of a Reference by the Government in Council Concerning the Proposal for an Act Respecting Certain Aspects of Legal Capacity for Marriage for Civil Purposes*, SCC File No. 29866, which examined the equality and religious freedom aspects of proposed changes to the marriage legislation (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Lafferty v. Parizeau*, S.C.C. File No. 30103 (settled before hearing), which examined the application of *Charter* freedom of expression values to defamation and the defense of fair comment (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Genex Communications Inc. v. Attorney General of Canada*, [2005] F.C.J. No. 1440 (F.C.A.), which examined the application of the *Charter's* guarantee of freedom of expression to a decision by the CRTC to refuse to renew a radio station license (the CCLA intervened in the Federal Court of Appeal);

*R. v. Hamilton*, [2005] S.C.J. No. 48, which examined the scope of the offence of counselling the commission of a crime (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*Multani v. Commission Scolaire Marguerite-Bourgeoys*, 2006 SCC 6, which concerned whether the *Charter's* guarantee of freedom of religion allows a student to wear a kirpan in school (the CCLA intervened in the Supreme Court of Canada);

*O'Neill v. Attorney General of Canada*, Ontario Superior Court of Justice File No. 11828 (decision pending), which concerns the interaction of national security and *Charter* rights (the CCLA intervened in the Ontario Superior Court of Justice);

*Owens v. Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission*, Sask. C.A. File No. 678 (decision pending), which concerns the application of the *Charter's* guarantees of freedom of religion and expression to a provincial statute banning hateful speech (the CCLA intervened in the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal);

*Montague v. Page*, Ont. Superior Court of Justice File No. 05-CV-705/05 (decision pending), which concerns the application of the *Charter's* guarantee of freedom of expression to the question of whether municipalities are allowed to file defamation suits against residents;

*R. v. A.M.*, Ont. C.A. File No. C42056 (decision pending), which concerns the legality of police-guided drug dog searches in public schools in light of the *Charter*'s protection against unreasonable searches and seizures; and

*R. v. Déry*, SCC File No. 30948 (decision pending), which concerns whether the *Criminal Code* contains the offence of "attempted conspiracy".