



April 3, 2012

Via email: [banc@sen.parl.gc.ca](mailto:banc@sen.parl.gc.ca)

The Honourable Irving Gerstein  
Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce  
The Senate of Canada  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0A4

Dear Senator Gerstein:

**Re: Review of the *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act***

The Canadian Bar Association (CBA) appreciates the opportunity to contribute to the Senate Committee's current review of the *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act* (PCMLTFA). The CBA is a national association of over 37,000 lawyers, law students, notaries and law teachers, and our mandate includes improvements in the law and the administration of justice.

The CBA has been involved in the development of proceeds of crime legislation since it was first considered in Canada, and has frequently commented on proposed legislative and regulatory changes, in particular as those changes impact the legal profession. As the national professional association for lawyers, the CBA supports the federal government's efforts to combat money laundering. We stress that those efforts must occur in the context of protecting the fundamental individual rights and freedoms of all Canadians, and in compliance with Canadian constitutional requirements. Our most recent public statements in this area are attached.

While provisions in the PCMLTFA concerning the legal profession are in force, they are currently inoperative as a result of court rulings and related injunctions. Even though the regime does not now apply to the legal profession, the most recent ruling is under appeal. The CBA is participating in the Senate Committee's review to explain the issues at stake and to share what the legal profession has done ... and will continue to do ... to address the important interests involved.

The CBA stresses that:

- Canada's courts have long recognized that an independent Bar is fundamental to the rule of law and the fair and proper administration of justice. The importance of an independent Bar and respect for solicitor-client privilege are at the foundation of Canada's justice system. This is not changed because of the legitimacy of the government objective.
- To the extent that any law or regulation requires lawyers to monitor and collect information about their clients for state purposes unrelated to the lawyer's retainer, the duty of loyalty owed

by lawyers to their clients is undermined, and the independence of the Bar significantly weakened. Compelling a lawyer to become an agent of the state by providing access to confidential or privileged client information is antithetical to our duty to our clients, and would undermine the fair and proper administration of justice. We want to preserve what has worked well to protect Canada's freedoms and the administration of justice — all clients' right to speak to their lawyers in the confidence that what they say will go no further.

- Lawyers have demonstrated their willingness to aid the government to fight money laundering, but it is critical that the proper approach remain within the sphere of self-regulation.
- Law societies across Canada have already introduced strict requirements on client due diligence and cash transactions. Law society requirements provide a high standard of diligence and disclosure, and compliance with these requirements is rigorously monitored and audited by law societies across Canada. Measures put in place by the law societies are more than adequate to include lawyers in the fight against money laundering, and, importantly, they can occur while upholding core constitutional values.
- Suggestions that lawyers are a weak link in the fight against money laundering, and either knowingly or innocently participate in money laundering activities schemes are mistaken. The overwhelming majority of lawyers in Canada adhere to the highest legal and ethical standards. Like all citizens, lawyers are bound by the *Criminal Code* and other statutes, and any errant lawyers are rightly exposed to criminal prosecution for a violation of the law, including the prohibition against money laundering. Again, lawyers are also subject to demanding professional codes of conduct and all other law society requirements.
- Canadian democracy rests in part on effective law and regulatory enforcement and its related intelligence gathering. However, "intelligence gathering is potentially more insidious to individual rights and freedoms than other types of policing, and more difficult to hold accountable."<sup>1</sup> Strong controls on the sharing of information are necessary to ensure it remains subject to the protections guaranteed under Canadian privacy legislation and the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.
- The disclosure provisions in the PCMLTFA as they relate to registered charities should be reviewed, to address deficiencies in the existing collection and use of information against registered charities, and to ensure adherence with principles of procedural fairness, natural justice and due process.

We appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the Senate Committee's review, and urge very serious consideration of this legislation. For our part, the CBA will continue to contribute to the federal government's efforts to combat money laundering and terrorist financing, while also ensuring that the rule of law and the rights of Canadians are preserved.

Yours truly,

*(original signed by Trinda L. Ernst)*

Trinda L. Ernst, Q.C.

encl.

---

<sup>1</sup> Submission on the *Three Year Review of the Anti-Terrorism Act* (Ottawa: CBA, 2005) at v.



March 8, 2012

Via email: [fcs-scf@fin.gc.ca](mailto:fcs-scf@fin.gc.ca)

Leah Anderson  
Director, Financial Sector Division  
Department of Finance  
L'Esplanade Laurier  
20th Floor, East Tower  
140 O'Connor Street  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0G5

Dear Ms. Anderson:

**Re: *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act (PCMLTFA)***

The Canadian Bar Association (CBA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the consultation paper, *Strengthening Canada's Anti-Money Laundering and Anti-Terrorist Financing Regime* (the Consultation Paper). The CBA is a national association of over 37,000 lawyers, law students, notaries and law teachers, and our mandate includes improvements in the law and the administration of justice.

The CBA has been involved in the development of proceeds of crime legislation since it was first considered in Canada, and has frequently commented on proposed legislative and regulatory changes, in particular as those changes impact the legal profession. As the national professional association for lawyers, the CBA strives to assist the federal government in crafting laws that are as effective and fair as possible, while protecting the rule of law and the rights of all Canadians. We support the federal government's efforts to combat money laundering, but stress that those efforts must occur in the context of protecting fundamental individual rights and freedoms of all Canadians and must comply with Canadian constitutional requirements.

The Consultation Paper states that Canada's regime is among the top of Financial Action Task Force (FATF) members in terms of compliance with the FATF standards. In spite of this, it proposes expanding the present legislation with broad and vague proposals said to be aimed at enhancing public safety in Canada and around the world and safeguarding the integrity of Canada's financial system. As the CBA has previously cautioned, effective anti-terrorism and money laundering legislation must be precise, as imprecision only "opens the door to subjective interpretation and arbitrary application of the law, which can too readily lead to abuses, discrimination and persecution rather than protection of national security interests."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Submission on the Three Year Review of the *Anti-Terrorism Act* (Ottawa: CBA, 2005) at 9.

The CBA's detailed comments follow the key headings in the Consultation Paper. While provisions in the *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act* (PCMLTFA) concerning the legal profession are in force, they are currently inoperative as a result of court rulings and related injunctions.<sup>2</sup> The Consultation Paper correctly indicates that the ruling is currently under appeal. Since 1998, the CBA has steadfastly maintained that the proper approach to dealing with concerns about money laundering in the context of the legal profession must be through self-regulation. Given the CBA's extensive commentary on this issue over many years, we offer our comments on the current proposals in spite of the fact that they do not currently apply to the legal profession.

## 1. Strengthening Customer Due Diligence Standards

Customer due diligence (CDD) standards are a key element of Canada's anti-money laundering and anti-terrorist financing (AML/ATF) regime. The CBA recognizes that some proposals in the Consultation Paper would relax obligations previously placed on reporting entities (i.e., proposals 1.2 and 1.8). We are encouraged to see the federal government responding to stakeholder concerns by making at least some of the reporting requirements less, rather than more, onerous.

However, other proposals would require reporting entities to monitor more closely and report on their clients' affairs, under the threat of greater penalty if found to be non-compliant. Most lawyers and Quebec notaries are not generally involved in the day to day affairs of their clients<sup>3</sup>, and do not have access to much of the information required for this monitoring and reporting, in particular to the extent those requirements deal with persons other than our clients. In addition, law societies across Canada have already introduced strict requirements on client due diligence and cash transactions, and those bodies monitor and audit to ensure compliance by the profession.

If lawyers and Quebec notaries were ever included in the regime, the proposals in this section would have a serious negative impact on the solicitor-client relationship. To the extent that lawyers are required to monitor and collect information about their clients for state purposes unrelated to the lawyer's retainer, the duty of loyalty owed by lawyers to their clients is undermined, and the independence of the Bar significantly weakened.

### Proposal 1.5

The Consultation Paper proposes amending the definition of "politically exposed foreign person" to include close associates of that person. Proposal 1.5 is too vague to permit a detailed response, and the CBA believes that further consideration should be given to this proposal. Reporting entities require clear instructions to determine if a client is, or is not a politically exposed foreign person. The term "close associate" is also subjective, and could expose reporting entities to unwitting violations of the PCMLTFA. We encourage the government either to define the term more precisely or consider adopting a definition from another area of Canadian law, with more precise meaning either in statute or as a result of a history of case law.

---

<sup>2</sup> See, *Law Society of B.C. v. A.G. Canada*, 2001 BCSC 1593 and *Federation of Law Societies v. A.G. Canada*, 2011 BCSC 1270. In the most recent litigation, the BC Supreme Court again held that the *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act* and *Regulations* do not apply to lawyers, Quebec notaries and law firms. In the unlikely event that this situation changes as a result of Canada's appeal of that decision, the CBA would express serious objections about the extent to which the proposed amendments would again interfere with the solicitor-client relationship.

<sup>3</sup> This observation does not hold true, however, for lawyers acting as in-house counsel. The proposals would raise distinct concerns in that regard.

### **Proposal 1.9**

The Consultation Paper proposes amending the PCMLTFA to specify that any document used as proof of the existence of a corporation must be no more than one year old. In the interests of greater certainty, we recommend that provision be made for delivery of a certificate of corporate status or functionally equivalent document issued by a competent authority under whose laws the corporation exists within one year of the subject transaction. These documents are routinely used by solicitors in Canada in granting opinions on corporate subsistence.

## **2. Closing the Gaps**

Enhancements to the current regime must be examined recognizing that they address an unquantifiable threat, both domestically and internationally. To date, there is no empirical evidence on the extent of terrorist financing in Canada.

This position is supported by the final report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Investigation of the Bombing of Air India Flight 182, *Air India Flight 182: A Canadian Tragedy*. Commissioner Justice Major indicated that no witness felt it possible to estimate the dollar value of terrorist financing activity, whether in Canada or globally, and at least one RCMP witness suggested that the amounts reported by FINTRAC to be connected to terrorist financing “seemed high in light of the RCMP’s own observations.” As such, Commissioner Major observed that anti-terrorist financing measures “must seek to contain an activity of unknown value.”

Given this uncertainty, we urge caution regarding the breadth of application of these proposals.

### **Proposal 2.6**

Proposal 2.6 would require a reporting entity to report relevant cash transactions from an agent – information not currently caught under the *Act* and Regulations. This would significantly expand the scope of what must be reported. While the legal profession is not currently impacted by the proposals, any expansion would be a serious concern should that situation change in future.

## **3. Improving Compliance, Monitoring and Enforcement**

### **Proposal 3.3**

On the issue of compliance of reporting entities, proposal 3.3 would add an enforcement mechanism for non-compliant entities. At present, a fine can be issued for non-compliance. This proposal would allow continuing fines for continuing non-compliance on the same issue. We believe that making the punishment for non-compliance harsher, while simultaneously making the burden on reporting entities more onerous, is a step in the wrong direction. We urge the federal government to reconsider this proposal.

Again, most lawyers and Quebec notaries are not intimately involved in the day to day activities of their clients, and so would not generally have the information sought under the report. To the extent that we do have the information, disclosing it would often result in an adverse impact on the solicitor-client relationship. We note that lawyers acting as in-house counsel are often intimately aware of the day-to-day activities of their clients. Should these rules ever apply to those lawyers, it would have a fundamental impact on their role.

### **Proposal 3.4**

The Consultation Paper proposes to require reporting entities to keep track of all reasonable measures they take under the *Act* and Regulations. This too would impose a significant new burden on reporting entities. Not only would they be expected to monitor client activities, but they would also be required to keep track of that monitoring, in certain circumstances. In addition, the term “reasonable” in this context might be inadequately precise.

Law society requirements provide a high standard of diligence and disclosure, and compliance with these requirements is monitored and audited by law societies across Canada.

## **4. Strengthening Information Sharing in the Regime**

Canadian democracy rests in part on effective law and regulatory enforcement and its related intelligence gathering. However, as the CBA has cautioned, “intelligence gathering is potentially more insidious to individual rights and freedoms than other types of policing, and more difficult to hold accountable.”<sup>4</sup> In that regard, we must consider the foreseeable and unforeseeable consequences of strengthening information sharing with a view to ensuring the rights of Canadians are respected and protected.

### **Proposal 4.1**

The federal government is considering an expansion of the current list of designated information that FINTRAC may be required to disclose to law enforcement and intelligence agencies to include:

- an individual’s gender and occupation;
- the grounds for suspicion developed by international partner Financial Intelligence Units;
- information contained in the narrative section of cross-border seizure reports;
- a description of the actions taken by reporting entities when making a suspicious transaction report; and
- information setting out the “reasonable grounds to suspect” that FINTRAC has determined would enable it to make a disclosure.

The CBA remains concerned that information gathered and analyzed by FINTRAC will not necessarily be tested for accuracy or reliability before it is employed by law enforcement and regulatory agencies, particularly the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA). Although there is a recognized efficiency in avoiding duplicated analysis of information obtained under the PCMLTFA (a recommendation of Commissioner Major in the Air India Report), there remains a benefit to each intelligence, law and regulatory enforcement agency exposing the information to its own specialized lens. Failure to test information for accuracy or reliability may result in compounding errors, resulting in a serious negative impact on individuals and entities in Canada.

The CBA believes that strong controls on the sharing of information are necessary to ensure it remains subject to the protections guaranteed under Canadian privacy legislation and the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Supra*, note 1 at v.

#### Proposal 4.4

The Consultation Paper proposes to review and clarify the conditions under which FINTRAC discloses to the CRA information related to registered charities to facilitate its ability to provide proactive disclosures.

The CRA Charities Directorate is tasked with ensuring compliance with the *Income Tax Act* by registered charities and determining whether entities qualify for registration. The *Anti-Terrorism Act*, which included amendments to the PCMLTFA, exposes charities in Canada to a new layer of scrutiny, with issues of terrorist financing incorporated into the CRA's auditing of the organizations. Prior to 2001, there were no specific terrorist financing offences in Canadian law and incidents were dealt with under existing criminal law. With the 2001 reforms, charities are susceptible to criminal charges for facilitating terrorist activities or supporting terrorist groups; deregistration for suspected involvement in terrorist activities, with the charity losing its charitable status and its directors exposed to personal liability; and surveillance of its financial activities, potentially leading to allegations of terrorist financing.

In our view, the deregistration process for registered charities lacks procedural safeguards and infringes principles of natural justice and due process, as:

- no knowledge or intent is required;<sup>5</sup>
- the law is retroactive;<sup>6</sup>
- normal rules for admissibility of evidence do not apply;<sup>7</sup>
- the burden of proof is shifted to the charity to prove its innocence, even where it may not know the full case against it;<sup>8</sup> and
- due diligence is not a defence.<sup>9</sup>

Further, failure by CRA to provide comprehensive made-in-Canada guidelines for complying with anti-terrorism legislation has resulted in compliance being a moving target for Canadian charities. CBA members report anecdotally an uneven enforcement against charities, with smaller, ethnically identified charities carrying out programs in conflict zones facing deregistration on the basis of questionable allegations of terrorist financing at a far greater rate than the larger established charities carrying out the same or similar programs in the same conflict zones.

In light of these problems, the CBA is concerned with proposals to enhance disclosure of information related to registered charities, whether by FINTRAC or CBSA. We are particularly concerned about sharing that information with administrative departments who regulate the charities, and are in a position to affect their status and very existence. The Consultation Paper quotes the Air India Report, which suggested that FINTRAC's lack of authority to disclose more than designated information, including its own analysis, negatively impacts the quality and timely use of the disclosure. However, Commissioner Major referred to disclosures to law enforcement agencies in that regard, not regulatory agencies. Timeliness of disclosure to CRA and duplicated analysis of information cannot reasonably be

---

<sup>5</sup> See, *Charities Registration (Security Information) Act*, para. 4. Although not explicitly stated, there is no requirement for knowledge or intent to be demonstrated.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 4(a) and (b).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, paras. 6(e), (f), (g).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 6(h).

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* The *Act* does not provide defences.

cited as issues relating to CRA's role in detecting and deterring money laundering and terrorist financing, when its ultimate tool against threats is merely deregistration or failure to register an organization as a charity.

The CBA encourages the federal government to review the disclosure provisions in the PCMLTFA as they relate to registered charities with stakeholders, to address deficiencies in the existing collection and use of information against registered charities, and to ensure adherence with principles of procedural fairness, natural justice and due process.

## 5. Countermeasures

We have no comments on these proposals.

## 6. Other Proposals

The legislation currently requires reporting entities to report suspicious transactions. The *Act* states that a suspicious transaction is any financial transaction that occurs or is attempted in the course of a reporting entity's activities that gives rise to a suspicion of money laundering or terrorist financing.

### Proposal 6.1

Proposal 6.1 would expand the definition of a suspicious transaction to any financial transaction that occurs or is attempted, *including an activity undertaken for the purpose of a financial transaction*, in the course of a reporting entity's activities, that gives rise to a suspicion of money laundering or terrorist financing.

The effect would be to require even more information from reporting entities about their clients. Again, while the legislation does not now apply to lawyers and Quebec notaries, the more information a lawyer could be required to obtain from a client and then report to the federal government, the greater the damage to the solicitor-client relationship. Subjecting lawyers and Quebec notaries to the suspicious transaction reporting requirements in future would raise significant constitutional concerns of the type already addressed by the BC Supreme Court in the original stay application regarding the regime's application to the legal profession.<sup>10</sup> It would essentially require lawyers to spy on their clients for state purposes. Further, the definition of what constitutes a "suspicious transaction" as proposed is so vague that reporting entities would be placed in the untenable position of facing jeopardy for failing to comply with an ill-defined standard. This would offend principles of fundamental justice under section 7 of the *Charter*.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposals, and encourage serious consideration of the comments provided. The CBA continues to contribute to the federal government's efforts to combat money laundering and terrorist financing, while also ensuring that the rule of law and the rights of Canadians are preserved.

Yours truly,

*(original signed by Trinda L. Ernst)*

Trinda L. Ernst, Q.C.

---

<sup>10</sup> *Supra*, note 2.





December 16, 2011

Via email: fcs-scf@fin.gc.ca

Leah Anderson  
Director, Financial Sector Division  
Department of Finance  
140 O'Connor Street  
Ottawa, ON K1A 0G5

Dear Ms. Anderson:

**RE: Proposed Amendments to the *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Regulations* on Ascertaining Identity**

The Canadian Bar Association (CBA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on proposed amendments to the *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Regulations* on Ascertaining Identity (the Proposed Amendments), published by Finance Canada on November 7, 2011. The CBA is a national association of over 37,000 lawyers, notaries, law students and law teachers, and our mandate includes improvements in the law and the administration of justice.

The CBA has been involved in the development of the proceeds of crime legislation since it was first considered in Canada. We have frequently commented on legislative and regulatory changes, and specifically on their application to the legal profession.<sup>1</sup> Throughout our involvement, the CBA has been guided by a commitment to protect and maintain the independence of the Bar and respect for solicitor-client privilege, both of which are at the foundation of the Canadian justice system. We support the government's efforts to combat money laundering, and have continually stressed that those efforts must occur within the context of, and with respect for, these core constitutional principles. This is for the benefit of all Canadians, and for the integrity of the justice system and the rule of law. These basic principles again guide our comments on the Proposed Amendments.

The legal profession has demonstrated its commitment to combating money laundering and terrorist financing activities through contributions to law reform, efforts to educate and inform members of the profession, and various initiatives implemented by provincial and territorial law societies. For

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example: Letter to Senator Grafstein, Bill C-25, *Proceeds of Crime (money laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act* amendments (Ottawa: CBA, 2006); Letter to Minister of Justice Toews, *Proceeds of Crime and the Legal Profession* (Ottawa: CBA, 2006); Letter to Richard Lalonde, *Proceeds of Crime Regulations 2000* (Ottawa: CBA, 2001); Submission on Bill C-22, *Proceeds of Crime (money laundering) Act* (Ottawa: CBA, 2000); Letter to Senator Kolber, Bill C-22, *Proceeds of Crime (money laundering) Act* (Ottawa: CBA, 2000); Submission on Discussion and Policy Paper on Bill C-89 (Ottawa: CBA, 1991); Submission on Bill C-9, *An Act to Facilitate Combating the Laundering of Proceeds of Crime* (Ottawa: CBA, 1991).

example, law societies adopted the model rule on cash transactions developed by the Federation of Law Societies of Canada (FLSC), prohibiting lawyers and Quebec notaries from accepting large amounts of cash from clients. In light of this proactive step, the government exempted lawyers and Quebec notaries from the cash transaction reporting requirements of the legislation.

The FLSC developed a second model rule dealing with client identification and verification requirements (model rule on client identification) to again address the government's concerns as reflected in the Proposed Amendments. However, the government did not accept that model rule as sufficient, and included the legal profession in regulations on the subject. This decision led to reopening earlier litigation from 2002, which had resulted in the courts declaring the reporting requirements of the *Act* to be unconstitutional. The CBA has steadfastly maintained that the proper approach to dealing with concerns about money laundering in the context of the legal profession must be through self-regulation.

In the most recent litigation, as with previous judicial decisions, the BC Supreme Court again<sup>2</sup> held that the *Proceeds of Crime (Money Laundering) and Terrorist Financing Act* and *Regulations* do not apply to lawyers, Quebec notaries and law firms. In the unlikely event that this situation changes as a result of Canada's appeal of that decision, the CBA would express serious objections to the extent to which the Proposed Amendments would again interfere with the solicitor-client relationship. Given the CBA's extensive commentary on this issue over many years, we offer our comments on the current proposals in spite of the fact that they do not apply to the legal profession.

The Proposed Amendments are extremely broad in scope, and extensive in their approach. They would require professionals and other entities subject to the legislation to function as government watchdogs over the business activities of their clients.

While the legislation now requires reporting entities to carry out certain reporting and due diligence activities in respect of prescribed transactions, under Proposal 1.1, those obligations would be extended to encompass the totality of the reporting entity's "business relationship" with its customers. This will, in effect, require reporting entities to engage in continuous monitoring of their clients and their clients' activities. This is both impractical and highly intrusive.

Currently, reporting entities are required to undertake client due diligence (CDD) measures (i.e. client identification and verification measures) for certain prescribed transactions. The proposed amendments (Proposal 2.1) would extend that obligation to all transactions, whether prescribed or not, if the transaction gives rise to a suspicion of money laundering or terrorist financing. The obligations will be further extended to any attempted suspicious transactions, whether or not the transaction is completed (Proposal 2.2). Again, if ever applied to lawyers and Quebec notaries, these proposed provisions would compel those professionals to spy on their clients, which would run contrary to the essence of the solicitor-client relationship. For this reason, any attempt to apply the proposed provisions to lawyers and Quebec notaries would be unconstitutional and would be vigorously opposed by the CBA.

Under Proposal 3.1, it would be mandatory for reporting entities to obtain information about the beneficial ownership of customers that are corporations, entities or trusts. In many instances, this information will not be available and cannot be compelled. Proposals 3.2 and 3.3 would require a reporting entity to engage in ongoing monitoring of all aspects of its business relationship with its customers. This is impractical and highly intrusive for reporting entities. If applied to lawyers and Quebec notaries, it would again intrude on the solicitor-client relationship, and thus render the provision unconstitutional.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Federation of Law Societies of Canada vs. AG Canada*, 2011 BCSC 1270.

We question how professionals and businesses are expected to comply with these onerous obligations. In particular, the requirement for ongoing monitoring of the business relationship will be very difficult, particularly if the client is a foreign entity. It does not appear that consideration has been given to how these provisions would work (or not work) in reality. While the Proposed Amendments suggest they would offer “help” to business people in complying with their obligations to the government, simply enacting regulations demanding onerous or unworkable efforts by non-governmental actors to achieve government objectives is not equivalent to providing help in meeting those demands. As a matter of both law and sound public policy, the government should not oblige citizens to act as substitute law enforcement officials, subject to penalties for non-compliance.

In closing, we note that courts have long recognized that an independent Bar is fundamental to the fair and proper administration of justice. The importance of an independent Bar to the rule of law and to Canada’s constitutional democracy is not changed because of the legitimacy of the government objective. We trust our comments will be helpful. The CBA continues to be pleased to contribute to the government’s efforts to combat money laundering, while ensuring that the rule of law is preserved, and lawyers and Quebec notaries are able to fulfill their primary duty to their clients.

Yours truly,

*(original signed by Trinda L. Ernst)*

Trinda L. Ernst, Q.C.