

# **Justices of the Peace Review Council**

**IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING UNDER SECTION 11.1 OF  
THE *JUSTICES OF THE PEACE ACT*, R.S.O. 1990, c. J.4, AS  
AMENDED,**

**Concerning Three Complaints about the Conduct of  
Justice of the Peace Julie Lauzon**

**Before:** The Honourable Justice Feroza Bhabha, Chair  
His Worship Thomas Stinson, Justice of the Peace Member  
Ms. Margot Blight, Lawyer Member

## **APPENDICES TO THE REASONS FOR DECISION**

**Counsel:**

Mr. Ian Smith and Mr. Andrew Guaglio  
Presenting Counsel

Mr. Lawrence Greenspon and Mr. Graham Bebbington  
Counsel for Her Worship

Mr. Scott Rollwagen and Ms. Margaret Robbins  
Counsel for the Interveners, the Association of Justices of the Peace of Ontario

Ms. Savitri Gordian and Mr. Mark Crow  
Counsel for the Attorney General of Ontario, Constitutional Law Branch

## **Appendix "A"**

### **History of the Proceedings**

# Appendix “A”

## HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDINGS

- [1] In April 2017, a complaints committee of the Justices of the Peace Review Council (“the JPRC”) received letters of complaint about the conduct of Justice of the Peace Julie Lauzon from:
- a. Mr. James Cornish, Assistant Deputy Attorney General, Criminal Law Division, Ministry of the Attorney General;
  - b. Mr. Brian Saunders, Director of Public Prosecutions, on behalf of the Public Prosecution Service of Canada; and
  - c. Ms. Kate Matthews, President of the Ontario Crown Attorneys’ Association, on behalf of the Ontario Crown Attorneys’ Association.
- [2] Following its investigation, the complaints committee ordered that the three (3) complaints be referred to a Hearing Panel of the Review Council, for a formal hearing under section 11.1 of the *Justices of the Peace Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. J.4, as amended (“the Act”).
- [3] Her Worship Lauzon came before this Hearing Panel in June 2018. A Notice of Hearing was filed on June 22, 2018 (Exhibit 1 on the hearing.)
- [4] The allegations contained in the Notice of Hearing can be summarized as follows:
- Her Worship failed to uphold the integrity, impartiality and independence of the judiciary when she inappropriately used the power and prestige of her judicial office to make out-of-court statements in the media in an opinion piece entitled, “When Bail Courts Don’t Follow the Law” published in the National Post on March 15, 2016 in which she made disparaging comments and allegations of misconduct against Crown counsel and members of the judiciary, without regard for their personal reputations. Her Worship made inappropriate comments in court that could be perceived as inconsistent with the integrity, impartiality and independence expected of the judiciary.
- [5] On June 22, 2018, Presenting Counsel and counsel for Her Worship requested that the Panel order a pre-hearing conference before setting hearing dates, in order to narrow the issues. The Panel so ordered, and a pre-hearing conference was conducted on July 18, 2018. The matter was adjourned to August 8, 2018 to schedule hearing dates.

### *Pre-Hearing Motions and Applications*

- [6] On August 1, 2018, the Association for Justices of the Peace (“AJPO”) filed a motion for leave to intervene in the hearing. AJPO sought to provide legal submissions on three issues:
- a. Whether and to what extent any sanction of Justice of the Peace Lauzon could interference with the independence of the justice of the peace bench;
  - b. Whether and to what extent principles of freedom of expression enshrined in paragraph 2(b) of the *Charter* apply to judicial officers when making public statements about matters relevant to the administration of justice; and
  - c. How any freedom to make public statements on matters affecting the administration of justice should be reconciled with the independence of the justice of the peace bench and the responsibility of all participants in the justice system to protect and refrain from interfering with that independence.
- [7] On August 7, 2018, a second pre-hearing conference was conducted.
- [8] On August 8, 2018, the parties appeared before the Hearing Panel to schedule further dates. The Panel set October 30, 2018 for the hearing of AJPO’s motion and scheduled dates in November 2018 and January 2019 for evidence and submissions.
- [9] Prior to the next appearance, on October 18, 2018, Her Worship filed a Notice of Constitutional Question (“NCQ”). The NCQ sought guidance from the Panel on:
- a. Whether and to what extent Her Worship should be protected and insulated from the external influence of the Attorney General for Ontario and/or the Attorney General for Canada, that could potentially be seen to undermine her ability to adjudicate impartially.
  - b. Whether principles of freedom of expression in s. 2(b) of the *Charter* apply to Her Worship when making public statements about matters relevant to the administration of justice, and if so, would sanctions by the JPRC violate that freedom, and is such a violation a reasonable limit prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society; and
  - c. If such freedoms apply and any limits are not justified, is Her Worship entitled to a remedy pursuant to s. 24(1) of the *Charter*.

- [10] In response to the NCQ, on October 22, 2018, Presenting Counsel filed a motion for an Adjournment and Directions.
- [11] The parties appeared before the Hearing Panel on October 30, 2018 to address both Presenting Counsel's motion for an Adjournment and Directions and AJPO's motion for intervenor status. Presenting Counsel submitted that he had not been served with an application record or factum in respect of the NCQ, and that evidence could not be called in the hearing until Her Worship filed materials and the Attorneys General confirmed their respective positions.
- [12] The Hearing Panel granted Presenting Counsel's motion, vacated the November hearing dates and set a timetable for the service and filing of materials on the NCQ. The Panel also confirmed that the NCQ would be argued after all evidence had been called in the hearing.
- [13] Presenting Counsel further advised the Panel of his decision not to proceed on two of the allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing arising from comments allegedly made by Her Worship in bail court. Presenting Counsel indicated that after considering all the circumstances and changes in the law, he had concluded that there was no reasonable prospect of a finding of judicial misconduct on those allegations.
- [14] With respect to AJPO's intervenor motion, the Hearing Panel heard submissions from counsel for AJPO, counsel for Her Worship and Presenting Counsel. Her Worship consented to the motion. Presenting Counsel did not oppose the motion but requested that limitations be imposed on AJPO's participation.
- [15] The Hearing Panel granted AJPO leave to intervene in the hearing with the terms and conditions sought by Presenting Counsel, including that AJPO must not seek to add to the factual record, dispute the proven facts, adduce further evidence, or raise new issues, and must make reasonable efforts not to duplicate submissions made by the parties.
- [16] The Panel ordered the parties to return on December 12, 2018 to schedule further hearing dates.

*Replacement of Justice of the Peace Member on the Hearing Panel*

- [17] At this point in the proceeding, (then) Regional Senior Justice of the Peace Warren Ralph was the justice of the peace member appointed to the Hearing Panel.
- [18] Unfortunately, His Worship Ralph's term as Regional Senior Justice of the Peace and as a member of the JPRC was set to expire on February 20, 2019. Following the expiry of his term, His Worship Ralph had travel plans outside the country for an

extended period; he was therefore unable to remain on the Hearing Panel to render a decision pursuant to section 4.3 of the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*.

- [19] Accordingly, in order to ensure that the hearing could continue in a timely manner, the Chief Justice of the Ontario Court of Justice appointed Regional Senior Justice Thomas Stinson to replace His Worship Ralph as the justice of the peace member on the Hearing Panel.

*Intervention by Attorney General of Ontario; Interim Publication Ban*

- [20] On December 12, 2018, counsel for the Attorney General of Ontario, Mr. Mark Crow, appeared and informed the Panel that the Ministry would be intervening on the NCQ as it pertained to the ability of Attorneys General to make a complaint about a sitting justice of the peace.
- [21] Presenting Counsel made a motion for an interim publication ban on the names of the judicial officers and lawyers referred to in the materials filed by Her Worship on the NCQ. Presenting Counsel argued that a publication ban was necessary to prevent prejudice to the reputational interests of persons named in the NCQ who were not parties to the hearing, and whose conduct had been criticized by Her Worship. Her Worship consented to the interim publication ban.
- [22] Pursuant to Rule 16.11(3)(g) of the JPRC Procedures Document, this Panel granted the publication ban on an interim basis.
- [23] The hearing was scheduled to continue on January 14 and 15 and February 15, 2019.

*Removal from Record of Mr. Lamb and Adjournment*

- [24] On January 14, 2019, counsel for Her Worship, Mr. Dominic Lamb, filed a motion for an order removing himself as counsel of record and for an adjournment of the hearing. Mr. Lamb advised the Panel that there had been an irreparable breakdown in the solicitor-client relationship, and that Her Worship required a reasonable adjournment in order to retain new counsel.
- [25] Neither Presenting Counsel nor counsel for the interveners took a position on the motion.
- [26] This Panel granted Mr. Lamb's motion to remove himself from the record and, regrettably, an adjournment of the hearing.
- [27] The timetable set to file materials on the NCQ and the January 15, 2019 hearing date was vacated. The Panel reserved February 15, 2019 for the matter to be

spoken to, for new hearing dates to be scheduled, and for a new timetable to be set for filing materials.

- [28] Her Worship subsequently retained Mr. Lawrence Greenspon as her new counsel.
- [29] At the February 15, 2019 appearance, the Panel ordered a further prehearing conference at the request of Presenting Counsel and counsel for Her Worship. On March 22, 2019, the parties attended a pre-hearing conference. On March 27, 2019, the Hearing Panel convened a teleconference with the parties and further dates were scheduled.
- [30] A motion on the admissibility of seven affidavits that Her Worship sought to file on the NCQ was scheduled to be argued on July 17, 2019. On July 12, 2019, Presenting Counsel and counsel for Her Worship reached an agreement that the affidavits could be admitted into evidence, subject to argument as to their relevance and weight. Accordingly, the Hearing Panel converted the July 17, 2019 attendance into a teleconference, wherein counsel confirmed their agreement on the record.

*Motion for Continuing Publication Ban*

- [31] On September 16, 2019, Presenting Counsel sought a permanent order continuing the publication ban in respect of the names (and job titles) of specified individuals referred to in the materials filed by Her Worship on the NCQ *and* in the *viva voce* evidence to be taken at the hearing.
- [32] Presenting Counsel took the position that such individuals were participants in the justice system whose conduct had been criticized by Her Worship. As non-parties, they were not in a position to respond or defend themselves. Presenting Counsel submitted that their professional reputations and those of their respective offices were at risk should the publication ban not continue.
- [33] On September 16, 2019, Presenting Counsel sought a permanent order continuing the publication ban in respect of the names (and job titles) of specified individuals referred to in the materials filed by Her Worship on the NCQ *and* in the *viva voce* evidence to be taken at the hearing.
- [34] Presenting Counsel took the position that such individuals were participants in the justice system whose conduct had been criticized by Her Worship. As non-parties, they were not in a position to respond or defend themselves. Presenting Counsel submitted that their professional reputations and those of their respective offices were at risk should the publication ban not continue.
- [35] Counsel for Her Worship consented to the order sought and requested that the scope of the ban be expanded to include the two allegations in the Notice of Hearing that

Presenting Counsel was no longer pursuing. Presenting Counsel opposed Mr. Greenspon's request, submitting that these allegations were made public in 2018 when the Notice of Hearing was filed and have been in the public domain for some time.

[36] On September 17, 2019, this Panel denied Presenting Counsel's motion for a continuing publication ban. In doing so, this Panel also denied Her Worship's request for an expanded publication ban over the allegations that are not before this Panel. The interim publication ban was lifted and is no longer in force. Counsel for Her Worship consented to the order sought and requested that the scope of the ban be expanded to include the two allegations in the Notice of Hearing that Presenting Counsel was no longer pursuing. Presenting Counsel opposed Mr. Greenspon's request, submitting that these allegations were made public in 2018 when the Notice of Hearing was filed and have been in the public domain for some time.

[37] On September 17, 2019, this Panel denied Presenting Counsel's motion for a continuing publication ban. In doing so, this Panel also denied Her Worship's request for an expanded publication ban over the allegations that are not before this Panel. The interim publication ban was lifted and is no longer in force.

#### *Evidence and Submissions*

[38] Evidence and submissions were scheduled to proceed on the following dates: September 12, 16, 17, 18 and October 9 and 15, 2019.

[39] On September 12, 2019, Presenting Counsel made an opening statement and advised the Panel that he was not in a position to call any witnesses that day because one of his witnesses, Ms. Vikki Bair, had become "unavailable" and would not be called and the remaining witness, Ms. Kate Matthews, was out of the country. On consent of Mr. Greenspon, Presenting Counsel proposed that Her Worship call her witnesses first, and that Ms. Matthews be called at the October 9, 2019 hearing date.

[40] Between September 16 and 18, 2019, counsel for Her Worship called evidence from Justice of the Peace Pearson, Justice of the Peace Roffey, Justice of the Peace Coopersmith, Justice of the Peace Forster and Her Worship Lauzon. These witnesses were cross-examined by Presenting Counsel.

[41] On October 9, 2019, Presenting Counsel called evidence from former President of the Crown Attorneys' Association, Ms. Kate Matthews. Following this testimony, on October 10 and 11, 2019, counsel made submissions on the evidence and on the Constitutional law issues.



[42] Evidence and submissions concluded on October 15, 2019. The Panel reserved its decision. Two days, May 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020 were scheduled for a disposition hearing in the event of a finding(s) of judicial misconduct. If there was no finding of misconduct, the dates would be vacated.

[43] In March 2020, Counsel for Her Worship, Mr. Greenspon, advised that a conflict had arisen for him in relation to the dates previously scheduled. As a result, with the consent of Presenting Counsel, the Panel, in consultation with counsel, selected new dates to be used for a disposition hearing if there was a finding(s) of judicial misconduct. Those dates are: July 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> 2020.

## **Appendix “B”**

**The Article – online version (Exhibit “3”, Tab 2)**

# NATIONAL POST

NEWS • FULL COMMENT • SPORTS • CULTURE • LIFE • MORE • DR!

**BONUS TAG EVENT** 2010 BUICK ENCORE UP TO \$5,500 CASH PURCHASE CREDIT

ON SELECT NEW BUICK MODELS IN STOCK THE LONGEST LIMITED-TERM LEASE OF \$29,665



JUSTICES OF THE PEACE REVIEW COUNCIL  
 COPY OF EXHIBIT 3 - Tab 2  
 In the matter of a hearing into a complaint against  
 Justice of the Peace JULIE LAUZON  
 Date Sept 18/19 AM Bouchard  
 Asst. / Registrar

## Julie Lauzon: When bail courts don't follow the law

A justice of the peace in Ottawa's main bail court explains how Canada's bail system is broken.



fololla

National

NATIONAL POST

March 14, 2016  
3:42 PM EDT

Last Updated  
March 15, 2016  
2:00 PM EDT

Filed under  
Full Comment

Comment

Facebook

Twitter

Reddit

Two successive reports have revealed just how broken Canada's bail system is. As a justice of the peace sitting in Ottawa's main bail court, this unfortunately comes as little surprise.

In this country, accused people are legally presumed innocent and those who are held while awaiting trial are not to be denied reasonable bail without just cause. At their first court appearance, detainees are paraded in front of a camera in the basement of this courthouse, in handcuffs and shackles, where they speak to a JP via video link. Legally, they are supposed to be asked whether they wish to appear by video, or if they prefer an in-person appearance, yet this is generally not done.

Some will be remanded to another date, given the nature and severity of the charges. Others, for whom the prosecutor does not seek further detention, are released. The Criminal Code of Canada clearly states that unless the

ePaper Email

More

FOR YOU

Melania Trump's not-so hidden jacket message caused a meltdown. But who was it for?

Legal fight over summer jobs attestation grows as religious, business groups file new challenges

prosecutor shows why certain conditions are necessary, the JP is to release the person with a simple undertaking, or promise, he or she will return for their next court appearance.

It is at this point the law goes out the window, and cynicism and bullying kick in. Here in Ottawa, generally speaking, the JP will be told that the person is being released, and provided the list of conditions that have already been typed into the system.

Pity the JP who dares ask for a justification of those conditions. It is the JP's legal responsibility to ensure that the conditions placed on a person's bail are reasonable, lawful and appropriate. This is also reflected in the fact that the JP and the accused sign the release document; not the prosecutor; or the accused's lawyer. Without sufficient justification for these conditions, individuals are to be released without them.

Some counsels are of the view that because conditions are consented to by the accused and the prosecutor, they should be accepted by the court, in the same way joint submissions on sentencing are. That would be fine, were it not for two monumental differences between bail and sentencing.

First of all, the person is presumed innocent at the bail stage. He or she has not yet been convicted of a crime and may actually be innocent of any wrongdoing. Secondly, after being found guilty, negotiations on sentencing occur on a level playing field, with both parties possessing the same powers. That is not the case with bail. The prosecutor is the only one who can consent to a release. If the accused does not accept the prosecutor's conditions, he or she will not be released and may have to wait any number of days for their bail hearing.

The fact is that people will agree to just about anything to regain their freedom and go back home to their families and daily routines. I have seen alcoholics and drug addicts accept a condition of abstinence. If only it were that easy. I have seen homeless people promise \$1,000 to the court. If they breach that condition, they are basically agreeing to pay that money. It should come as no surprise that they simply don't have it. I have also seen men cry because, in order to be freed, they agreed not to see their children, on account of allegations made by the mother, of which the children played no part.

Ottawa's main bailout court, and many others throughout the country, have devolved into dysfunctional and punitive bodies.

As a result of my interpretation of bail law, I have, in recent years, had a prosecutor turn his back to the court and tell all the defence lawyers that all deals were off the table as long as I was presiding. More recently, I had a prosecutor scream at me and basically throw a temper tantrum after I questioned certain conditions. I have also had a prosecutor ask that I recuse myself from all bail hearings, given my interpretation of bail law.

Hello reldo1 5

LATEST COMMENT

Christie Blatchford: Jury wasn't about criminal record of intruder killed by Ontario homeowner

Watch John Ivison: Collateral damage from U.S. tariffs has arrived in Canada

Barbara Kay: UBC had a #Me? bloodletting. It was a disaster for everyone

John Robson: It's easy to hate Trump's border plan. It's hard to suggest a better one

ePaper

Between forced, rushed video appearances, a lack of respect for the JP bench and the absence of the rule of law in this court, I can no longer call it a court of law. It is a disgrace. I am there to administer justice. It is not my job as a JP to sign off on release documents that are unlawful.

As judicial officers, we are supposed to know the law and apply it according to our legal interpretation. We expect and accept that if one or both parties disagree with the court's decision, they have the right to appeal. It thus comes as a shock when prosecutors attempt to wrestle jurisdiction from the court, through a variety of unacceptable tactics, rather than exercise their right of appeal.

Bail is not an opportunity or an invitation to fix people and to address all their issues with a myriad of conditions. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Criminal Code of Canada lay out the legal rights and responsibilities when someone is charged with an offence. Unfortunately, Ottawa's main bail court, and others, have devolved into dysfunctional and punitive bodies, devoid of the rule of law.

National Post

0 Comments  
Share your thoughts

FULL COMMENT



Christie Blatchford: Jury wasn't told about criminal record of intruder killed by Ontario homeowner



Barbara Kay: UBC had a #MeToo bloodletting. It was a disaster for everyone



Andrew Coyne: Equalization program merits reform, but side is eager for debate



Watch John Ivison: Collateral damage from U.S. tariffs has already arrived in Canada



John Robson: It's easy to hate Trump's border plan. It's hard to suggest a better one



If Canada cares about the law, it has to answer China's ocean aggression

Show More

TOP STORIES



## **Appendix “C”**

**The Article – print version (Exhibit “3”, Tab 3)**

A JUSTICE OF THE PEACE IN OTTAWA'S  
 MAIN BAIL COURT EXPLAINS HOW  
 CANADA'S BAIL SYSTEM IS BROKEN

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE IN OTTAWA'S MAIN BAIL COURT EXPLAINS HOW CANADA'S BAIL SYSTEM IS BROKEN  
 EXHIBIT 3 - Tab 3  
 JULY 19 2009  
 Date Sept 18/19 JMR

# When courts don't follow the law

JULIE LAUZON

Two successive reports have revealed just how broken Canada's bail system is. As a justice of the peace serving in Ottawa's main bail court, this unfortunately comes as little surprise.

In this country, accused people are legally presumed innocent and those who are held while awaiting trial are not supposed to be denied bail without just cause. At their first court appearance, detainees are paraded in front of a camera in the basement of the courthouse in handcuffs and shackles, where they speak to a JP via video link. Legally, they are supposed to be asked whether they wish to appear by video, or if they prefer an in-person appearance, yet this is generally not done.

Some will be remanded to another date, given the nature and severity of the charges. Others, for whom the prosecutor does not seek further detention, are released. The Criminal Code of Canada clearly states that unless the prosecutor shows why certain conditions are necessary, the JP is to release the person with a simple undertaking, or promise, he or she will return for their next court appearance.

It is at this point the law goes out the window, and cynicism and bullying kick in. Here in Ottawa, generally speaking, the JP will be told that the person is being released, with the list of conditions that have already been typed into the system.

Why the JP who dares ask for a justification of those conditions, it is the JP's legal responsibility to ensure that the conditions placed on a person's bail are reasonable, lawful and appropriate. This is reflected in the fact that the JP and the accused sign the release document, not the prosecutor, or the accused's lawyer. If the prosecutor can't meet this test, the offending conditions are supposed to be waived.

Some counsels are of the view

that because conditions are consented to by the accused and the prosecutor, they should be accepted by the court, in the same way joint submissions on sentencing are. That would be fine, were it not for two monumental differences between bail and sentencing.

First of all, the person is presumed innocent at the bail stage. He or she has not yet been convicted of a crime and may actually be innocent of any wrongdoing. Secondly, after being found guilty, negotiations on sentencing occur on a level playing field, with both parties possessing the same powers. That is not the case with bail. The prosecutor is the only one who can consent to a release. If the accused does not accept the prosecutor's conditions, he or she will not be released and

made by the mother, of which the children played no part.

As a result of my interpretation of bail law, I have, in recent years, had a prosecutor turn his back to the court and tell all the defence lawyers that all deals were off the table as long as I was presiding. More recently, I had a prosecutor scream at me and basically throw a temper tantrum after I questioned certain conditions, and I have had a prosecutor ask that I recuse myself from all bail hearings, given my interpretation of bail law.

Between forced, rushed video appearances, a lack of respect for the JP bench and the absence of the rule of law in my court, I can no longer call it a court of law. It is a disgrace. I am there to administer justice. It is not my job as a JP to sign off on release documents that are unlawful.

The JP bench is regularly criticized because its members are not required to be lawyers, I suggest that this actually suits some parties. It may lead to less argument from the bench. As judicial officers, we are supposed to know the law, apply it according our legal interpretation and expect that if one or both parties disagree with the court's decision, they have the right to appeal. It thus comes as a shock when prosecutors attempt to wrestle jurisdiction from the court, through a variety of unacceptable tactics, rather than exercise their right of appeal.

Bail is not an opportunity or an invitation to fix people and to address all their issues with a myriad of conditions. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Criminal Code of Canada lay out the legal rights and responsibilities when someone is charged with an offence. The courts should be the first ones to recognize this and follow the law. Unfortunately, my court, and many others throughout the country, have devolved into dysfunctional and punitive bodies, which are devoid of the rule of law.

National Post

Julie Lauzon is a justice of the peace in Ottawa.

MY COURT, AND  
 MANY OTHERS  
 THROUGHOUT  
 THE COUNTRY,  
 HAVE DEVOLVED  
 INTO  
 DYSFUNCTIONAL  
 AND PUNITIVE  
 BODIES.

may have to wait any number of days for their bail hearing.

The fact is that people will agree to just about anything to regain their freedom and go back home to their families and daily routines. I have seen alcoholics and drug addicts accept a condition of abstinence. If only it were that easy. I have seen homeless people promise \$1,000 to the court. If they breach that condition, they are basically agreeing to pay that money. It should come as no surprise that they simply don't have it. I have also seen men cry because, in order to be freed, they agreed not to see their children, on account of allegations

address in Regg... anniversary of... edict sketched ou... ment that to act e... to God, and that... erolon in the serv... was contrary to r... lecture was greet... throughout the... world, but after... eruption the let... met with a respa... logical engage... ing Islamic schol... argument, frame... edict in terms of... reason, had him... because it did no... address the shar... stoiles of the g... mic faiths.

We now have an excellent biblical from Rabbi Jonat perhaps the lea... ish scholar of h... tion. Formerly o... of the Commie... Rabbi Sacks is i... this week, speak... his new book, No... Name: Confront... gious Violence, I... the most import... since 9/11, and I... ed to be in con... with Rabbi Sacks... the Glen Gould... Tuesday night.

Sacks places t... religious conflict... ling rivalries of... fires sacred to J... tians and Musl... foundational a... tional accounts... conflict, frequen... conflict, not betw... but in the host... family.

"The Hebrew... talk about sibil... Sacks writes, "... could not be m... forcefully. The fir... act, Cain and Al... to the first mu... does seem to ha... ites. There does... a zero-sumness... stories. It is no ac... Jews, Christians... lms read these... way they did."

That God cho... He chooses is... it appears that... chooses one br... rejects the oth... chosen, Ishmae... Jacob chosen, j... ected; Joseph... his brothers rej... chosen therefor... reject the reject

eral... an... the... om... n... ma... in... hey... I to... the... gov... d to... le's... le's... ppy... rid... ing... me, ... has... ont... des... t of... no... con... the... t by... to... tur... olit... up... ding... a al... their... im... ing... now... nists... good... com... and... each... urse, ... omic... public... coming... in... that a... venoy... ction... using... ho is... study... here's... conho... seful... duate... a eco... u hear... s are... don't... ion to... that's... n... mics... L.

## **Appendix “D”**

**The comparison of the versions (Exhibit “11”)**



Date Sept 18/19M Boudreau  
Asst. / Registrar

## DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRINT AND ONLINE ARTICLES

Online	Print	Difference
"When <b>bail</b> courts don't follow the law"	"When courts don't follow the law"	Word removed.
"As a justice of the peace <b>sitting</b> in Ottawa's main bail court..."	"As a justice of the peace <b>servng</b> in Ottawa's main bail court..."	Word changed.
"In this country, accused people are legally presumed innocent and those who are held while awaiting trial are not to be denied reasonable bail without just cause."	"In this country, accused people are legally presumed innocent and those who are held while awaiting trial are not <b>supposed</b> to be denied reasonable bail without just cause."	Word added.
"At their first court appearance, detainees are paraded in front of a camera in the basement of <b>this</b> courthouse, in handcuffs and shackles..."	"At their first court appearance, detainees are paraded in front of a camera in the basement of <b>the</b> courthouse in handcuffs and shackles..."	Word changed; comma removed.
"Here in Ottawa, generally speaking, the JP will be told that the person is being released, <b>and provided</b> the list of conditions that have already been typed into the system."	"Here in Ottawa, generally speaking, the JP will be told that the person is being released, <b>with</b> the list of conditions that have already been typed into the system."	Words changed.
"This is <b>also</b> reflected in the fact that the JP and the accused sign the release document..."	"This is reflected in the fact that the JP and the accused sign the release document..."	Word removed.
"Without sufficient justification for these conditions, individuals are to be released without them."	"If the prosecutor can't meet this test, the offending conditions are supposed to be waived."	Sentence changed.
"He or <b>she</b> has not yet been convicted of a crime and may actually be innocent of any wrongdoing."	"He or <b>so</b> [sic] has not yet been convicted of a crime and may actually be innocent of any wrongdoing."	Word changed.
"Ottawa's main bailout court, and many others throughout the country, have devolved into dysfunctional and punitive bodies."	This sentence is missing in the same location as the first instance in the online article.	Sentence missing.
"More recently, I had a prosecutor scream at me and basically throw a temper tantrum after I questioned certain conditions. I	"More recently, I had a prosecutor scream at me and basically throw a temper tantrum after I questioned certain conditions, <b>and</b>	Sentences joined; word removed.

have <b>also</b> had a prosecutor ask that I recuse myself from all bail hearings, given my interpretation of bail law."	I have had a prosecutor ask that I recuse myself from all bail hearings, given my interpretation of bail law."	
"Between forced, rushed video appearances, a lack of respect for the JP bench and the absence of the rule of law in <b>this</b> court, I can no longer call it a court of law."	"Between forced, rushed video appearances, a lack of respect for the JP bench and the absence of the rule of law in <b>my</b> court, I can no longer call it a court of law."	Word changed.
These sentences are not present in the online article.	"The JP bench is regularly criticized because its members are not required to be lawyers. I suggest that this actually suits some parties."	Sentences added.
"As judicial officers, we are supposed to know the law <b>and</b> apply it according to our legal interpretation. <b>We</b> expect <b>and</b> <b>accept</b> that if one or both parties disagree with the court's decision, they have the right to appeal."	"As judicial officers, we are supposed to know the law, apply it according to our legal interpretation <b>and</b> expect that if one or both parties disagree with the court's decision, they have the right to appeal."	Words changed; words removed; sentences joined.
This sentence is not present in the online article.	"The courts should be the first ones to recognize this and follow the law."	Sentence added.
"Unfortunately, <b>Ottawa's main bailout</b> court, and others, have devolved into dysfunctional and punitive bodies, devoid of the rule of law."	"Unfortunately, <b>my</b> court, and <b>many</b> others <b>throughout the country</b> , have devolved into dysfunctional and punitive bodies, <b>which are</b> devoid of the rule of law."	Words changed; words added.