Judith Parisien
Direct +1 613 696 6858
jparisien@fasken.com

January 5, 2016

BY EMAIL

Roger Bilodeau, Q.C.
Registrar
Supreme Court of Canada
301 Wellington Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 0J1

Dear Registrar:

Re: Mounted Police Association of Ontario et al. v. Canada
**   (Attorney General) et al.**
**   Court File No: 34948**

We are writing to advise that our client, the Mounted Police Members' Legal Fund
("Legal Fund"), has no objection to the sur-reply delivered by the Association des
Membres de la Police Montée du Québec ("AMPMQ") on January 4, 2016.

In addition, we are taking this opportunity to request directions respecting sur-reply from
our client. In the reply of the Attorney General of Canada ("AGC") to the Legal Fund
dated December 23, 2015 (which we did not receive until December 30, 2015), the AGC
submits that the Legal Fund is not entitled to make submissions or adduce evidence in
response to the AGC's motion under Rules 52 and 76. The AGC asks the Court to
"wholly disregard" the Legal Fund's responding motion record. This is obviously of great
concern to the Legal Fund since its acceptance would result in the Court not receiving
submissions and evidence concerning the impact of the AGC's motion on about 17,000
members of the RCMP (i.e. the vast majority of RCMP members) who are also Legal
Fund members.

Since the Rules are silent on the issue of sur-replies to motions under Rules 52 and 76,
the Legal Fund respectfully requests directions as to whether it can be permitted to file a
brief sur-reply of no more than two (2) pages concerning the Legal Fund's status to
participate in the instant motion. If the answer is affirmative, then the Legal Fund will

deliver the aforementioned sur-reply forthwith. To the extent necessary, we rely on Rule 3(2) for this request.

Yours truly,

FASKEN MARTINEAU DuMOULIN LLP

Judith Parisien for: John D.R. Craig and Christopher D. Pigott

JP/ml

cc: All parties/interveners