

## Archived Content

Information identified as archived on the Web is for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It has not been altered or updated after the date of archiving. Web pages that are archived on the Web are not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards. As per the [Communications Policy of the Government of Canada](#), you can request alternate formats by [contacting us](#).

## Contenu archivé

L'information archivée sur le Web est disponible à des fins de consultation, de recherche ou de tenue de dossiers seulement. Elle n'a été ni modifiée ni mise à jour depuis sa date d'archivage. Les pages archivées sur le Web ne sont pas assujetties aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada. Conformément à la [Politique de communication du gouvernement du Canada](#), vous pouvez obtenir cette information dans un format de rechange en [communiquant avec nous](#).

Foreign Affairs and  
International Trade Canada

Department of Justice



Affaires étrangères et  
Commerce international Canada

Ministère de la Justice

125 Sussex Drive  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0G2

March 18, 2008

**Can 6**

By Email and Courier

Professor Juan Fernández-Armesto  
General Pardiñas, 102  
28006 Madrid, Spain  
jfa@jfarmesto.com

Professor Jean-Gabriel Castel  
833387 4<sup>th</sup> Line Mono, RR5  
Orangeville, Ontario  
Canada, L9W 2Z2  
jgcastel@sympatico.ca

John Christopher Thomas  
Suite 226-2211 West 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Vancouver, British Columbia  
Canada, V6K 4S2  
jcthomas@thomas.ca

**Re: Gallo v. Canada**

Dear Professor Fernández-Armesto and Members of the Tribunal,

This letter responds to the Tribunal's request for a post-hearing brief on certain issues and your correspondence A4 dated March 10, 2008. Canada replies in the order suggested by the Tribunal.

(a) *The Adams Mine Lake Act, 2004*

Canada understands that the Claimant is responding to question (a).

(b) *Place of Arbitration*

Canada does not agree to naming London, England as the place of arbitration. For the reasons explained in its submission, Canada considers that the factors set out in the *UNCITRAL Notes* for the determination of the place of arbitration clearly favour Toronto and that Toronto should be named the place of arbitration pursuant to NAFTA Article 1130.

During the Procedural Hearing the Claimant expressed its concern that section 5 of the *Adams Mine Lake Act, 2004* (“*AMLA*”) might be used to oppose a request made by the Claimant for the assistance of an Ontario court with document production or witness attendance in this NAFTA Chapter 11 arbitral proceeding. Canada remains of the view that section 5 of the *AMLA* is not applicable to such a situation and could not be used to oppose such a request for assistance. In the interests of advancing this matter, Canada agrees not to invoke section 5 of the *AMLA* to oppose a request for the assistance of an Ontario court with document production or attendance of a witness in this NAFTA Chapter 11 arbitration. Canada trusts that this fully addresses the concerns of the Claimant set out at page 11 of its written submission.

Obviously, Canada reserves the right to refer to all relevant provisions of the *AMLA* on an application under NAFTA Article 1136 to set aside an award, should such an application ever be made by either disputing party.

(c) *Place of Arbitration for Previous NAFTA Chapter 11 Arbitrations*

Canada has attached a chart to this letter that lists the place of arbitration for NAFTA Chapter 11 arbitrations to date. This chart is based on publicly available materials as of March 18, 2008. Canada has made the chart as comprehensive as possible to assist the Tribunal. This chart shows that the place of arbitration in four of the six NAFTA Chapter 11 proceedings brought against Canada has been within its territory.

(d) *Court Decisions Concerning Applications to Set Aside NAFTA Chapter 11 Awards*

Canada has attached a chart that lists the applications to set aside NAFTA Chapter 11 awards to date. This chart is based on publicly available materials as of March 18, 2008. Canada has made the chart as comprehensive as possible to assist the

Tribunal. Internet links to the set aside decisions have been included for ease of reference.

This chart shows that Canada has initiated only one set aside proceeding, in *S.D. Myers*. It follows that Canada has no “practice” of pleading before local courts that NAFTA awards should be set aside as the Claimant alleges at page 7 of its written submission. Moreover, the decisions of the Canadian courts reviewing the NAFTA Chapter 11 awards have all found that these awards are entitled to a high level of deference.

*(e) Retention of Confidential Information*

The Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario are each obligated to retain a complete copy of the record, including confidential information, to comply with their domestic statutory obligations. Respondent agrees to return or destroy any duplicate documents which contain the Claimant’s confidential information following the conclusion of any set aside proceeding or after the time to request a set aside proceeding under NAFTA Article 1136 has expired.

*(f) Revised Schedule*

Canada and the Claimant have reached agreement on a revised schedule, which is attached to this letter. With respect to the Claim and Defence, both disputing parties agree that the production of key documents is without prejudice to either disputing party later producing and relying upon relevant and material documents in the production phase or with its Memorials, and that neither disputing party will object to production of a document solely on the basis that it was not annexed to the Claim or Defence.

*(g) Tribunal Fees*

Canada agrees to pay the Tribunal US \$550 per hour. Canada understands the Claimant will reply to this point on its own behalf.

*(h) Other Issues*

The Tribunal raised two further drafting issues concerning the Confidentiality Order during the procedural hearing which Canada would like to address.

First, the Tribunal requested that Canada provide a list of the statutes and regulations that should be referred to in paragraph 10 of the Confidentiality Order. Canada can confirm that paragraph 10 should read:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Order, a request to the Government of Canada or the Government of Ontario for documents pursuant to the *Access to Information Act*, the *Privacy Act*, the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, and federal or provincial regulations thereto, including documents produced to Canada in these proceedings, shall be wholly governed by the relevant legislation.

In response to the Tribunal's comments on paragraph 14 of the Confidentiality Order, Canada would like to propose the following revisions:

Either disputing party may disclose documents to the public which do not contain confidential information or from which all confidential information has been redacted. Documents that are the subject of an objection under paragraph 8 of this Order may not be disclosed until the Tribunal has decided on the objection. For the purpose of this paragraph, documents include submissions, together with appendices and exhibits, correspondence, transcripts of hearings, any orders, rulings or awards, and other materials generated in this arbitration.

We trust this is satisfactory.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Meg Kinnear". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

Meg Kinnear  
Senior General Counsel and  
Director General  
Trade Law Bureau

cc. Chuck Gastle  
Murdoch Martyn  
Rizza Andrade