

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA
(ON APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEAL OF QUEBEC)

BETWEEN:

**ENGLISH MONTREAL SCHOOL BOARD, MUBEENAH MUGAH, and PIETRO
MERCURI**

Appellants
(Respondents on Cross-Appeal)

- and -

**ATTORNEY GENERAL OF QUEBEC, JEAN-FRANÇOIS ROBERGE, in his official
capacity, SIMON JOLIN-BARRETTE, in his official capacity**

Respondents
(Appellants on Cross-Appeal)

- and -

**MOUVEMENT LAÏQUE QUÉBÉCOIS, and FRANÇOIS PARADIS, in his official
capacity**

Respondents

(Style of cause continued on next page)

**MEMORANDUM OF ARGUMENT OF THE PROPOSED INTERVENOR,
CANADIAN CONSTITUTION FOUNDATION**

(Pursuant to Rules 47, 55-59 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Canada)

BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP

Barristers & Solicitors
181 Bay Street, Suite 2100
Toronto, ON M5J 2T3
T: (416) 865-6935 / F: (416) 863-3275

George Avraam

E: george.avraam@bakermckenzie.com

Haadi Malik

E: haadi.malik@bakermckenzie.com

Anton Rizor

E: anton.rizor@bakermckenzie.com

**Counsel for the Proposed Intervener,
Canadian Constitution Foundation**

GOWLING WLG (CANADA) LLP

160 Elgin Street, Suite 2600
Ottawa, ON K1P 1C3
T: (613) 786-8699

Graham Ragan

E: graham.ragan@gowlingwlg.com

Catherine Ouellet

E: catherine.ouellet@gowlingwlg.com

**Agent for Counsel for the Proposed
Intervener, Canadian Constitution
Foundation**

(Style of cause continued)

AND BETWEEN:

WORLD SIKH ORGANIZATION OF CANADA and AMRIT KAUR

Appellants
(Respondents on Cross-Appeal)

- and -

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF QUEBEC

Respondent
(Appellant on Cross-Appeal)

AND BETWEEN

**ICHRAK NOUREL HAK, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CANADAN MUSLIMS (NCCM),
and CORPORATION OF THE CANADIAN CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION**

Appellants
(Respondents on Cross-Appeal)

- and -

**ATTORNEY GENERAL OF QUEBEC, JEAN-FRANÇOIS ROBERGE, in his official
capacity, SIMON JOLIN-BARRETTE, in his official capacity**

Respondents
(Appellants on Cross-Appeal)

- and -

**FRANÇOIS PARADIS, in his official capacity, MOUVEMENT LAÏQUE QUÉBÉCOIS,
and POUR LES DROITS DES FEMMES DU QUÉBEC**

Respondents

AND BETWEEN:

FÉDÉRATION AUTONOME DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT

Appellant
(Respondent on Cross-Appeal)

- and -

**ATTORNEY GENERAL OF QUEBEC, JEAN-FRANÇOIS ROBERGE, in his official
capacity, SIMON JOLIN-BARRETTE, in his official capacity**

Respondents
(Appellants on Cross-Appeal)

AND BETWEEN:

**ANDRÉA LAUZON, HAKIMA DADOUCHE, BOUCHERA CHELBI, AND LEGAL
COMMITTEE OF THE COALITION INCLUSION QUÉBÉC**

Appellants
(Respondents on Cross-Appeal)

- and -

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF QUEBEC

Respondent
(Appellant on Cross-Appeal)

AND BETWEEN:

LORD READING LAW SOCIETY

Appellant
(Respondent on Cross-Appeal)

- and -

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF QUEBEC

Respondent
(Appellant on Cross-Appeal)

- and -

**QUEBEC COMMUNITY GROUPS NETWORK, ICHRAK NOUREL HAK, NATIONAL
COUNCIL OF CANADIAN MUSLIMS (NCCM), CORPORATION OF THE CANADIAN
CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION, FÉDÉRATION AUTONOME DE
L'ENSEIGNEMENT, ANDRÉA LAUZON, HAKIMA DADOUCHE, BOUCHERA
CHELBI, LEGAL COMMITTEE OF THE COALITION INCLUSION QUÉBÉC,
CANADIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION, LORD READING LAW SOCIETY,
WORLD SIKH ORGANIZATION OF CANADA, AMRIT KAUR, PUBLIC SERVICE
ALLIANCE OF CANADA (PSAC), CHRISTIAN LEGAL FELLOWSHIP, QUEBEC
ENGLISH SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION, WOMEN'S LEGAL EDUCATION AND
ACTION FUND, POUR LES DROITS DES FEMMES DU QUÉBÉC, MOUVEMENT
LAÏQUE QUÉBÉCOIS, ENGLISH MONTREAL SCHOOL BOARD, MUBEENAH
MUGHAL, PIETRO MERCURI, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA, ATTORNEY
GENERAL OF ONTARIO, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW BRUNSWICK,
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MANITOBA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF BRITISH
COLUMBIA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SASKATCHEWAN, ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF ALBERTA**

Interveners

Table of Contents

PART I - OVERVIEW AND FACTS	1
A. Overview	1
B. The Proposed Intervener, Canadian Constitution Foundation	2
PART II - QUESTIONS IN ISSUE.....	3
PART III - ARGUMENT.....	3
A. The CCF Has An Interest in This Appeal.....	3
B. The CCF’s Unique Perspective Will Be Useful and Different	5
PART IV - SUBMISSIONS REGARDING COSTS	9
PART V - ORDER SOUGHT	9
PART VI - TABLE OF AUTHORITIES & LEGISLATIO.....	10

PART I - OVERVIEW AND FACTS

A. Overview

1. The Canadian Constitution Foundation (“CCF”) seeks leave to intervene in this appeal from the Court of Appeal of Quebec's decision in *Organisation mondiale sikhe du Canada c Procureur général du Québec*, [2024 QCCA 254](#).

2. The CCF is a national, non-partisan charity whose members are dedicated to defending the constitutional rights and freedoms of Canadians through education, communication, and advocacy.¹ In particular, the CCF recognizes the importance of the separation of powers to Canada’s democracy. The CCF also recognizes the importance of balancing legislative and judicial control when it comes to the interpretation of rights, including *Charter* rights, in Canada’s constitutional framework. At issue in this appeal is how the Court can balance these competing roles when the provincial legislature has invoked section 33 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

3. This appeal asks the Court, among other things, to determine the extent to which judges can award damages under section 24(1) of the *Charter* after the provincial legislature has invoked section 33. If granted leave to intervene, the CCF will provide an objective and balanced perspective, which will be different from those of the parties, yet central to this Court’s analysis. In particular, the CCF will submit that:

- (a) Section 33 allows Parliament or the provincial legislature to derogate from certain sections of the *Charter* for a five-year period;
- (b) An “appropriate and just” remedy under section 24(1) of the *Charter* must respect Canada’s constitutional framework, including section 33 and the separation of powers; and
- (c) Allowing courts to award damages under section 24(1) of the *Charter* once section 33 has been invoked would undermine the purpose of sections 33 and 24(1).

¹ Affidavit of Christine Van Geyn, affirmed May 14, 2025 (“**Van Geyn Affidavit**”), Motion Record of the Canadian Constitution Foundation (“**CCF Record**”), Tab 2, p. 28 at para 3.

4. The outcome of this appeal impacts all Canadians. As a national and non-partisan public interest organization with expertise in constitutional issues, the CCF has an established record of providing courts with valuable help in *Charter* cases. The CCF is uniquely positioned to assist in this appeal given its mission, mandate, and diverse base of supporters.

B. The Proposed Intervener, Canadian Constitution Foundation

5. The CCF is a national and non-partisan registered charity, dedicated to defending the constitutional rights and freedoms of Canadians. The CCF is supported by donations made by thousands of Canadians. Its supporters consist of a cross-section of Canadians and represent various occupations, interests, and viewpoints.²

6. Among other things, the CCF and its supporters envision a Canada in which every Canadian is treated equally by governments and is empowered to recognize, protect, and preserve their constitutional rights and liberties. The CCF and its supporters also aim to ensure that governments at all levels are held accountable to the *Constitution Act, 1982* and quasi-constitutional statutes when making and applying laws, regulations, and policies.³

7. The CCF often furthers its mandate through litigation. Whenever it participates in a case, the CCF promotes an approach that considers the text, purpose, and history of the Constitution and quasi-constitutional statutes while ensuring it remains neutral and independent from the interests of any particular group or litigant.⁴ The CCF has been involved in numerous constitutional cases with the help of its employees, board members, and volunteers.⁵

8. The CCF's involvement in litigation reflects its mandate to defend and promote the Constitution and the constitutional rights and freedoms of Canadians. To date, the CCF has intervened in a significant number of constitutional law cases before this Court.⁶ The CCF has also

² Van Geyn Affidavit, CCF Record, Tab 2, p. 28 at para 3.

³ Van Geyn Affidavit, CCF Record, Tab 2, p. 29 at para 10.

⁴ Van Geyn Affidavit, CCF Record, Tab 2, p. 29 at para 9.

⁵ Van Geyn Affidavit, CCF Record, Tab 2, p. 30 at para 12.

⁶ Van Geyn Affidavit, CCF Record, Tab 2, p. 30 at para 13.

been granted leave to intervene before other courts including various appellate courts.⁷ The CCF will continue to bring its expertise in constitutional issues to its submissions in this appeal.

PART II - QUESTIONS IN ISSUE

9. The CCF satisfies the test in Rule 57(2) of the *Rules of the Supreme Court of Canada*. The CCF has an interest in this appeal, and its submissions will be useful and different from those of the parties.⁸

PART III - ARGUMENT

A. The CCF Has An Interest in This Appeal

10. This Court has broad jurisdiction to determine whether a person or organization should be permitted to intervene. The requirement that a proposed intervener have an interest in the appeal is a flexible one. Any interest is sufficient, subject to the exercise of this Court's discretion.⁹

11. As set out in Christine Van Geyn's affidavit, the CCF has a real and demonstrated interest in this appeal as a public interest organization. The CCF's members represent a diverse section of Canadian society from various occupations, interests, and viewpoints, all of whom favour broad protections of *Charter* rights. The CCF also intends to bring a cross-sector perspective that is distinct from the position of either party, and it has the expertise and experience to assist the Court.

12. The issues in this appeal have implications well beyond the immediate parties. The genesis of this appeal is the Plaintiffs' challenge of the Quebec Legislature's use of section 33 in litigation seeking to declare certain provisions of the *Act respecting the laicity of the State*¹⁰ of no force and effect. Among other issues, the Appellants Andréa Lauzon, Hakima Dadouche, Bouchera Chelbi and the Comité Juridique de la Coalition Inclusion Québec argue that section 33 does not exclude the full range of remedies available to courts under section 24(1) and seek a declaratory remedy

⁷ Van Geyn Affidavit, CCF Record, Tab 2, p. 31 at para 14.

⁸ *Rules of the Supreme Court of Canada*, SOR/2002-156, Rule 57(2)(b); *Reference re Workers' Compensation Act*, 1983 (NFLD.) (Application to Intervene), [1989] 2 SCR 335 [*Workers' Compensation Reference*].

⁹ *Workers' Compensation Reference*, *ibid.*

¹⁰ *Act respecting the laicity of the State*, CQLR, c. L-0.3.

under section 24(1) of the *Charter* despite the Quebec Legislature’s declaration under section 33.¹¹ On this point, the Quebec Court of Appeal held that it would be “untenable to suggest that s. 24(1) of the *Canadian Charter* alone empowers courts to grant a remedy despite the use of s. 33...” and that there can be no remedy for a violation of sections 2 or 7 to 15 if the sections do not apply as a result of section 33.¹² The CCF takes no position on whether the Court can issue remedies such as declarations, but the CCF argues that, if the Court decides that remedies are available, the range of remedies cannot include *Charter* damages.

13. The availability of *Charter* damages once section 33 has been invoked is a vital matter to all Canadians, given that (a) Canadian taxpayers will ultimately be responsible for any potential damages awards and (b) Canadians elect the legislatures which may pass statutes invoking section 33. Broadly speaking, this matter raises issues of public interest and importance that the CCF proposes to intervene on: does invoking section 33 preclude granting damages under section 24(1) of the *Charter*? If the purpose of section 33 is to allow Parliament or the provincial legislature’s view of the content of rights to prevail for five years at a time, does awarding damages under section 24(1) of the *Charter* run contrary to that purpose? And if, as set out in section 24(1) of the *Charter*, courts can grant whatever remedies for *Charter* violations that they consider “appropriate and just”, would it be “appropriate and just” to award damages against Parliament or a provincial legislature where they have invoked section 33?

14. If granted leave to intervene, the CCF will approach these questions from the viewpoint of the many other Canadians, including its members and supporters, who seek to ensure that appropriate remedies remain available under section 24(1) while ensuring that Parliament’s and the provincial legislature’s powers to invoke section 33 are preserved. A core component of the CCF’s mandate is to address such issues, and this Court should grant the CCF leave to intervene so it may do so in this matter.

¹¹ Appeal Factum of Andréa Lauzon, Hakima Dadouche, Bouchera Chelbi and the Comité Juridique de la Coalition Inclusion Québec dated April 22, 2025, para 82.

¹² *Organisation mondiale sikhe du Canada c. Procureur général du Québec*, [2024 QCCA 254](#) at paras [360-362](#).

B. The CCF's Unique Perspective Will Be Useful and Different

15. An applicant can satisfy the requirement to make useful submissions from a different perspective if they, like the CCF, have a “history of involvement in the issue giving the applicant expertise which can shed fresh light or provide new information on the matter”.¹³ The CCF’s mandate includes defending constitutionally-protected rights and freedoms and maintaining Canada’s constitution, including preserving the content of *Charter* rights and remedies while respecting the separation of powers. The CCF proposes to draw upon its extensive experience in constitutional law matters to provide this Court with a distinct and independent perspective on the impact of judicial scrutiny on the legislative process and the appropriate threshold for awarding damages related to that process.

16. The CCF regularly intervenes on constitutional issues before the Supreme Court of Canada, including specifically on issues related to *Charter* remedies. This Court has previously granted the CCF intervenor status on issues concerning section 24(1) of the *Charter*. For example, in *Canada (Attorney General) v. Power*,¹⁴ the CCF submitted that *Charter* damages ought to be available for unconstitutional enactments in the rare circumstances of abuse of power, bad faith, or clear unconstitutionality.

17. The CCF’s proposed submissions, summarized below, do not raise any concerns that have traditionally led this Court to refuse intervention. The CCF does not intend to expand the issues under appeal beyond those raised by the parties, nor will it speak to the facts or merits of this case. The CCF’s participation will not cause prejudice to the parties.

(i) The Purpose of Section 33 is to Allow Parliament or a Provincial Legislature to Derogate from Certain Sections of the *Charter* for a Five-Year Period

18. Section 33 is an integral part of the *Charter* and is rooted in the principle of parliamentary sovereignty. The purpose of a *Charter* right can be found in the language of the provision and the meaning and purpose of specific rights and freedoms that it is associated with.¹⁵ Section 33(1)

¹³ *Workers’ Compensation Reference*, *supra* note 10.

¹⁴ *Canada (Attorney General) v. Power*, [2024 SCC 26](#) [*Power*].

¹⁵ *B. (R.) v. Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto*, [\[1995\] 1 SCR 315](#), at p. 338.

gives Parliament or the provincial legislature the power to derogate from certain provisions of the *Charter* by declaring that an Act or a provision operates notwithstanding section 2 and/or sections 7 to 15 of the *Charter*. As set out in sections 33(2) and 33(3), the Act or provision that Parliament or the provincial legislature declares to operate notwithstanding the *Charter* has “such operation as it would have but for the provision of this Charter referred to in the declaration” for a period of five years or less as specified by the declaration.

19. Read as a whole, the purpose of section 33 is to allow Parliament or the provincial legislature’s view of the content of rights to prevail for five years at a time. After five years, Parliament or the legislature can elect to re-enact the operation of section 33. Otherwise, the operation of section 33 ceases to have effect. The five-year expiry set out in section 33(3), referred to as the “sunset clause”, ensures that any government that relies on section 33 must face the electorate before it can be renewed.¹⁶ After five years, the notwithstanding clause will expire and the electorate will be able to consider the government’s use of the clause when it votes.¹⁷ For instance, every five years the Quebec Legislature renews the references to section 33 in five acts which are still in force today.¹⁸

20. When making a declaration under section 33, Parliament or the provincial legislature are only subject to requirements of form. In *Ford v. Quebec*, this Court engaged in a thorough review of the purpose of section 33 which must guide this Court’s review of section 33.¹⁹

¹⁶ *Working Families Coalition (Canada) Inc. v. Ontario (Attorney General)*, [2023 ONCA 139](#) at para [58](#) [*Working Families*], affirmed in *Ontario (Attorney General), v. Working Families Coalition (Canada) Inc.*, [2025 SCC 5](#).

¹⁷ *Working Families*, *ibid* at para [56](#), affirmed in *Ontario (Attorney General), v. Working Families Coalition (Canada) Inc.*, [2025 SCC 5](#).

¹⁸ See, for instance, *Act Respecting the Pension Plan of Certain Teachers*, CQLR, c. R-9.1, s. 62; *Act Respecting the Government and Public Employees Retirement Plan*, CQLR, c. R-10, s. 223.1; *Act Respecting the Teachers Pension Plan*, CQLR, c. R-11, s. 78.1; *Act Respecting the Civil Service Superannuation Plan*, C.R.L.Q., c. C-12, s. 114.1; *Act Respecting the Pension Plan of Management Personnel*, CQLR, c. R-12.1, s. 211.

¹⁹ *Ford v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, [\[1988\] 2 SCR 712](#) [*Ford*]; *Working Families*, *supra* note 18 at para [56](#), affirmed in *Ontario (Attorney General), v. Working Families Coalition (Canada) Inc.*, [2025 SCC 5](#).

(ii) An “Appropriate and Just” Remedy Under Section 24(1) Must Respect Canada’s Constitutional Framework

21. Under section 24(1), where the court finds a violation of a person’s *Charter* rights, the court may award whatever remedy it considers “appropriate and just in the circumstances”. In *Doucet-Boudreau v. Nova Scotia (Minister of Education)*, this Court set out the general considerations for what is considered an “appropriate and just” remedy under section 24(1) of the *Charter*.²⁰ In general terms, a “just and appropriate remedy” must:²¹

- (a) meaningfully vindicate the claimant's rights and freedoms;
- (b) employ means that are legitimate within the framework of our constitutional democracy;
- (c) be a judicial remedy which vindicates the right while invoking the function and powers of a court; and
- (d) be fair to the party against whom the order is made.

22. Among the requirements of an “appropriate and just” remedy is that the remedy employ means that are legitimate within the framework of Canada’s constitutional democracy, including the separation of functions among the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary.²²

23. This Court in *Vancouver (City) v. Ward* explained that a legitimate remedy within Canada’s constitutional framework will employ a means “well-recognized within our legal framework”.²³ Canada’s constitutional and legal framework operates in accordance with the Constitution, which enshrines the separation of powers and the *Charter*, which includes section 33. Thus, for a remedy, including damages, to be “appropriate and just” under section 24(1), it must respect the Constitution and the *Charter*, including the separation of powers and section 33.

²⁰ *Doucet-Boudreau v. Nova Scotia (Minister of Education)*, [2003 SCC 62](#) [*Doucet-Boudreau*].

²¹ *Doucet-Boudreau*, *ibid* at paras [55-58](#); *Vancouver (City) v. Ward*, [2010 SCC 27](#) [*Ward*] at para [20](#); *Power*, *supra* note 16 at para [40](#).

²² *Doucet-Boudreau*, *supra* note 22 at para [56](#).

²³ *Vancouver (City) v. Ward*, *supra* note 23 at para [21](#).

(iii) Empowering the Judiciary to Issue Damages Under Section 24(1) When Section 33 Has Been Invoked Would Undermine the Purpose of Sections 33 and 24(1)

24. Courts must not grant damages under section 24(1) when section 33 has been invoked because doing so would undermine the purposes of sections 33 and 24(1) and contravene the constitutional separation of powers.

25. As a basic rule, one part of the Constitution cannot be abrogated by another part of the Constitution,²⁴ which includes the *Charter*. Section 33, which allows legislative provisions to operate notwithstanding applicable *Charter* provisions, preserves the validity of statutes that may not be consistent with those rights.²⁵ Thus, invoking section 33 obviates any claim to damages under section 24(1).

26. An “appropriate and just” remedy, including damages, must also be legitimate within the framework of Canada’s constitutional democracy, which includes the separation of functions among the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary.²⁶ Simply put, in ordering damages under section 24(1), courts must not depart unnecessarily from their role in adjudicating disputes and granting remedies that address the matter of those disputes. Some authors have even gone so far as to argue that section 33 is an “attempt to immunize laws” against substantive judicial review to prevent the “undemocratic mischief” of judicial misinterpretation of *Charter* rights, and section 33 is therefore an integral part of the constitutional framework.²⁷ Awarding damages would have a chilling effect on Parliament and provincial legislatures by imposing a financial penalty if they exercise the power granted by section 33, defeating this provision's very purpose.

27. Put simply, Parliament’s and the provincial legislature’s abilities to enact legislation notwithstanding the *Charter* and the court’s duty to respect the separation of powers under the framework of Canada’s constitutional democracy both act as constitutional limits to court’s ability

²⁴ *Power*, *supra* note 16 at para [156](#); *Doucet-Boudreau*, *supra* note 28 at para [42](#); *New Brunswick Broadcasting Co. v. Nova Scotia (Speaker of the House of Assembly)*, [\[1993\] 1 SCR 319](#) at p. 373; *Reference re Bill 30, An Act to amend the Education Act (Ont.)*, [\[1987\] 1 SCR 1148](#) at para 60.

²⁵ Geoffrey Sigalet, “[Legislated Rights as Trumps: Why the Notwithstanding Clause Overrides Judicial Review](#)” [2024] 61 Osgoode Hall Law Journal at p. 72 [[Sigalet Article](#)].

²⁶ *Doucet-Boudreau*, *supra* note 22 at para [56](#).

²⁷ [Sigalet Article](#), *supra* note 27 at p. 86.

to award damages as a remedy under section 24(1). Judges should not be empowered to award damages under section 24(1) when Parliament or the provincial legislature has invoked section 33. This would have an unnecessary chilling effect on the legislature's ability to enact laws, and run contrary to the purpose of section 33 by allowing judges to operate outside the framework of Canada's constitutional democracy. This would not be "appropriate and just" under section 24(1).

PART IV - SUBMISSIONS REGARDING COSTS

28. The CCF will not seek costs in this matter and asks that no costs are awarded for or against it, whether in this motion or in the appeal if leave is granted.

PART V - ORDER SOUGHT

29. The CCF respectfully requests an Order granting it intervener status in these proceedings, including the right to file a factum of no more than 10 pages and the right to present oral argument of no more than 5 minutes.

ALL OF WHICH IS RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this May 20, 2025.



for:

George Avraam
Haadi Malik
Anton Rizor

Counsel for the Proposed Intervener,
Canadian Constitution Foundation

PART VI - TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Authorities (English)	Authorities (French)	Paragraph(s) Referenced in Memorandum of Argument
JURISPRUDENCE		
<i>B. (R.) v. Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto</i> , [1995] 1 SCR 315	<i>B. (R.) c. Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto</i> , 1995 CanLII 115 (CSC), [1995] 1 RCS 315	18
<i>Canada (Attorney General) v. Power</i> , 2024 SCC 26	<i>Canada (Procureur général) c. Power</i> , 2024 CSC 26	16, 21, 25
<i>Doucet-Boudreau v. Nova Scotia (Minister of Education)</i> , 2003 SCC 62	<i>Doucet-Boudreau c. Nouvelle-Écosse (Ministre de l'Éducation)</i> , 2003 CSC 62 (CanLII), [2003] 3 RCS 3	21-22, 25-26
<i>Ford v. Quebec (Attorney General)</i> , [1988] 2 SCR 712	<i>Ford c. Québec (Procureur général)</i> , 1988 CanLII 19 (CSC), [1988] 2 RCS 712	20
<i>New Brunswick Broadcasting Co. v. Nova Scotia (Speaker of the House of Assembly)</i> , [1993] 1 SCR 319	<i>New Brunswick Broadcasting Co. c. Nouvelle-Écosse (Président de l'Assemblée législative)</i> , 1993 CanLII 153 (CSC), [1993] 1 RCS 319	25
<i>Ontario (Attorney General), v. Working Families Coalition (Canada) Inc.</i> , 2023 ONCA 139 , aff'd 2025 SCC 5 .	<i>Ontario (Procureur général) c. Working Families Coalition (Canada) Inc.</i> , 2023 ONCA 139 [EN], aff'd 2025 CSC 5 [FR].	19 (ONCA) 19-20 (SCC)
<i>Reference re Bill 30, An Act to amend the Education Act (Ont.)</i> , [1987] 1 SCR 1148	<i>Renvoi relatif au projet de Loi 30, An Act to Amend the Education Act (Ont.)</i> , 1987 CanLII 65 (CSC), [1987] 1 RCS 1148	25
<i>Reference re Workers' Compensation Act, 1983 (NFLD.) (Application to Intervene)</i> , [1989] 2 SCR 335	<i>Workers' Compensation Act, 1983 (T.-N.) (Demande d'intervention)</i> , 1989 CanLII 23 (CSC), [1989] 2 RCS 335	9-10, 15
<i>Vancouver (City) v. Ward</i> , 2010 SCC 27	<i>Vancouver (Ville) c. Ward</i> , 2010 CSC 27 (CanLII), [2010] 2 RCS 28	21, 23

		19
LEGISLATION		
<i>Act respecting the laicity of the State</i> , CQLR, c. L-0.3	<i>Loi sur la laïcité de l'État</i> , RLRQ c L-0.3	12
<i>Rules of the Supreme Court of Canada</i> , S.O.R./2002-156, Rule 57(2)(b)	Règles de la Cour suprême du Canada (DORS/2002-156), R. 57(2)(b)	9
<i>Act Respecting the Civil Service Superannuation Plan</i> , C.R.L.Q., c. C-12, s. 114.1	<i>Loi sur le régime de retraite des fonctionnaires</i> , chapitre R-12, s. 114.1	19
<i>Act Respecting the Government and Public Employees Retirement Plan</i> , CQLR, c. R-10, s. 223.1	<i>Loi sur le régime de retraite du personnel employé du gouvernement et des organismes publics</i> , chapitre R-10, s. 223.1	19
<i>Act Respecting the Pension Plan of Certain Teachers</i> , CQLR, c. R-9.1, s. 62	<i>Loi sur le régime de retraite de certains enseignants</i> , chapitre R-9.1, s. 62	19
<i>Act Respecting the Pension Plan of Management Personnel</i> , CQLR, c. R-12.1, s. 211	<i>Loi sur le régime de retraite du personnel d'encadrement</i> , chapitre R-12.1, s. 211	19
<i>Act Respecting the Teachers Pension Plan</i> , CQLR, c. R-11, s. 78.1	<i>Loi sur le régime de retraite des enseignants</i> , chapitre R-11, s. 78.1	19
COMMENTARY		
Geoffrey Sigalet, " Legislated Rights as Trumps: Why the Notwithstanding Clause Overrides Judicial Review " [2024] 61 Osgoode Hall Law Journal	N/A	25-26