

CANADIAN LEGAL RESEARCH JOURNAL (CLRJ)



Volume 02, Issue 01 (2026)

Munir Dar, President, MKET Canada (Publisher) and Chief Editor of CLRJ

Published by

Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada

Federally Incorporated Canadian Not-for-Profit Corporation

Corporation No. 15040272

Issue Publication Date: 12 October 2026

Original Scheduled Publication Date: 1 September 2026

Publication Frequency: Quarterly

Publishing Model: Open Access | Peer-Reviewed

Crossref DOI Prefix: 10.68513 | **ISBN Publisher Prefix:** 978-1-0681322 | **Digital Preservation:** Zenodo
(CERN / OpenAIRE / European Union Open Science) | **DOI Registration Services:** Crossref & DataCite



SECTION A PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The publication of this issue of the Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ), originally scheduled for release on 1 September 2026, was postponed to permit the completion of essential publishing, registration, indexing, metadata management, and digital preservation initiatives undertaken by Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada, the Journal's publisher. Following the successful completion of these institutional, technical, and scholarly infrastructure requirements, Volume 02, Issue 01 is officially published and released on 12 October 2026.

During this period, MKET Canada strengthened its scholarly publishing framework by securing membership in Crossref International Linking Association, Inc. and obtaining authorization to register scholarly publications under Crossref DOI Prefix 10.68513. This authorization enables persistent DOI registration, reference linking, citation tracking, metadata dissemination, and interoperability across international scholarly communication systems.

In addition, MKET Canada is a registered participant in the Library and Archives Canada ISBN Program and has been assigned the official ISBN Publisher Prefix 978-1-0681322, authorizing the publication and registration of books and other eligible scholarly works under its publishing imprint. Publications issued under this imprint include ISBNs 978-1-0681032-0-9, 978-10681322-1-6, and 978-1-0681322-0-9, establishing MKET Canada's recognized bibliographic presence within Canada's national publishing framework.

To ensure the permanence, discoverability, citation integrity, and global accessibility of the scholarly record, CLRJ maintains a comprehensive preservation framework utilizing Zenodo, developed and maintained by CERN and supported through OpenAIRE and the European Union Open Science initiative. Research outputs preserved in Zenodo are supported by DataCite DOI infrastructure, facilitating persistent identification, metadata management, discoverability, and long-term preservation.

The integration of Crossref, DataCite, and Zenodo ensures that all CLRJ publications remain permanently identifiable, citable, accessible, and preserved in accordance with internationally recognized standards governing scholarly communication, digital archiving, bibliographic control, and research dissemination.



CANADIAN LEGAL RESEARCH JOURNAL(CLRJ)

Volume 02, Issue 01 September 01, 2026 - November 30, 2026

The Editorial Board recognizes that the delayed publication of this issue may have inconvenienced authors, reviewers, readers, librarians, repositories, indexing services, and members of the broader academic community. We sincerely appreciate their patience and continued support. This postponement was undertaken solely to ensure that CLRJ commenced publication under a robust and internationally compliant scholarly publishing framework.

The Editor-in-Chief and Publisher extend their gratitude to Crossref, DataCite, Zenodo, CERN, Library and Archives Canada, contributing authors, peer reviewers, readers, and partner institutions whose support has contributed to the continued development of CLRJ and the broader scholarly initiatives of MKET Canada.

Publishing Credentials

Publisher: Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada

Publication: Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)

Issue: Volume 02, Issue 01

Publication Date: 12 October 2026

Publication Frequency: Quarterly

Publishing Model: Open Access | Peer-Reviewed

Crossref DOI Prefix: 10.68513

ISBN Publisher Prefix: 978-1-0681322

DOI Registration Agencies: Crossref & DataCite

Digital Preservation Repository: Zenodo

Publisher Status: Federally Incorporated Canadian Not-for-Profit Organization

Munir Ahmed Dar

Editor-in-Chief & Publisher

418 Coxwell Ave.

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

M4L 3B7



CERTIFICATE OF PUBLISHER AUTHORIZATION AND SCHOLARLY PUBLICATION

PUBLISHER'S CERTIFICATION

Issued: 12 October 2026

Place of Issue: Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Certification

I, Munir Ahmed Dar, Editor-in-Chief and Publisher of the Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ), hereby certify that Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada, a federally incorporated Canadian Not-for-Profit Corporation (Corporation No. 15040272), is the lawful owner, governing authority, and official publisher of CLRJ.

MKET Canada exercises full responsibility and authority over:

- Editorial governance and academic oversight;
- Peer-review administration and publication ethics;
- Editorial decision-making and quality assurance;
- Manuscript processing and publication management;
- Open-access dissemination and scholarly communication;
- Digital hosting, metadata management, and indexing;
- DOI registration, maintenance, and citation services;
- Digital preservation and archival management;
- Copyright administration and licensing;
- Compliance with privacy, ethics, and academic publishing standards.

Publishing Registrations and Scholarly Infrastructure

ISBN Publisher Prefix: 978-1-0681322

MKET Canada is a registered participant in the Library and Archives Canada ISBN Program and publishes scholarly and educational works under this assigned publisher prefix.

Crossref DOI Prefix: 10.68513

MKET Canada is a member of Crossref International Linking Association, Inc. and is authorized to register scholarly publications under the above DOI prefix. 365+



The Journal maintains its scholarly infrastructure through:

- Crossref DOI registration and citation linking;
- DataCite DOI services and metadata preservation;
- Zenodo archival preservation and public accessibility.

Certification of Continuing Publication

I further certify that CLRJ is an ongoing peer-reviewed open-access scholarly serial publication intended for continuous publication and dissemination. The Journal operates in accordance with:

- Academic freedom and editorial independence;
- Research integrity and publication ethics;
- Open-access scholarship;
- Digital preservation and bibliographic control;
- International scholarly publishing standards. **Official Declaration**

I hereby certify that the Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ) is a continuing scholarly serial publication published by Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada and intended for permanent publication, preservation, citation, indexing, and dissemination in accordance with internationally recognized academic and publishing standards.

Published by:

Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada

418 Coxwell Avenue

Toronto, Ontario M4L 3B7

Canada

Email: munirdar@clrj.ca

Website: www.clrj.ca

Publisher Website: www.mket.ca



DICATION

This volume is respectfully dedicated to legal scholars, academics, judges, lawyers, researchers, policymakers, students, and practitioners whose scholarship, service, and commitment to the rule of law continue to strengthen Canadian and comparative jurisprudence.

We further dedicate this volume to emerging scholars, including undergraduate researchers, graduate students, doctoral candidates, early-career academics, paralegals, and junior practitioners whose innovation and intellectual curiosity advance legal discourse and broaden access to academic publication.

The Editorial Board also recognizes the indispensable contributions of peer reviewers, editorial advisors, librarians, research institutions, and scholarly organizations whose efforts uphold the highest standards of academic integrity and publication excellence.

This volume is dedicated with particular appreciation to **Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada**, whose continued commitment to education, research, community development, openaccess publishing, digital preservation, and scholarly innovation has made the establishment and growth of CLRJ possible.

The Journal further acknowledges the contributions of **Crossref, DataCite, Zenodo, CERN, OpenAIRE**, and the **Library and Archives Canada ISBN Program**, whose services ensure the preservation, discoverability, citation, and international accessibility of scholarly knowledge.

Dedicated with appreciation and respect to all who advance legal knowledge, academic inquiry, justice, and the public good.

Munir Ahmed Dar

Editor-in-Chief & Publisher

12 October 2026



PREFACE / FOREWORD

The inaugural issue of **Volume 02** of the **Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)** is published at a significant moment in the evolution of Canadian legal scholarship and public policy. Although originally scheduled for publication on **1 September 2026**, this issue is formally released on **12 October 2026** following the completion of substantial publishing, registration, preservation, and scholarly infrastructure initiatives undertaken by MKET Canada.

This publication marks an important institutional milestone. During the preparation of this issue, MKET Canada secured membership in Crossref, obtained **Crossref DOI Prefix 10.68513**, and continued its participation in the Library and Archives Canada ISBN Program under **ISBN Publisher Prefix 978-1-0681322**. Combined with DOI registration through Crossref and DataCite and long-term preservation through Zenodo, these developments establish a durable foundation for the preservation and dissemination of Canadian legal scholarship.

The publication of this volume coincides with a period of significant constitutional, regulatory, technological, and societal transformation. Courts, legislatures, regulators, and policymakers continue to confront complex challenges involving constitutional governance, judicial review, Indigenous reconciliation, digital governance, artificial intelligence, environmental sustainability, labour regulation, and economic oversight.

The contributions contained in this issue reflect the intellectual rigor, analytical depth, and interdisciplinary perspective required to engage these challenges. Together, the articles examine contemporary developments in administrative law, parliamentary democracy, regulatory governance, Indigenous rights, and workplace regulation.

As CLRJ enters its second volume, we reaffirm our commitment to academic independence, publication ethics, open-access scholarship, and the advancement of legal research that contributes meaningfully to law, policy, and the administration of justice.

Munir Ahmed Dar

Editor-in-Chief & Publisher



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Editorial Board extends its sincere appreciation to the individuals, institutions, organizations, and scholarly partners whose contributions have made the publication of **Volume 02, Issue 01** possible.

We thank our authors for their exceptional scholarship and commitment to addressing complex legal, constitutional, regulatory, and public policy questions.

We acknowledge our peer reviewers for their rigorous evaluations, constructive feedback, and dedication to maintaining the highest standards of academic quality and integrity.

We further thank our Associate Editors, Editorial Advisors, Advisory Council members, librarians, research institutions, and academic collaborators whose expertise has helped shape the Journal's scholarly direction.

Special appreciation is extended to **Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada** (Corporation No. 15040272) for its ongoing institutional, financial, and administrative support.

The Editorial Team also acknowledges the invaluable support provided by **Crossref**, **DataCite**, **Zenodo**, **CERN**, **OpenAIRE**, and the **Library and Archives Canada ISBN Program**, all of which contribute to the preservation, discoverability, visibility, and long-term accessibility of scholarship published by CLRJ.

The publication of this issue reflects the successful completion of major scholarly publishing initiatives that will benefit the Journal and its contributors for years to come.

With sincere gratitude.

Munir Ahmed Dar
Editor-in-Chief & Publisher



ABSTRACT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Volume 02, Issue 01 (2026)

This issue contains five peer-reviewed articles examining major challenges facing contemporary Canadian law: Legislative Supremacy and Judicial Accountability: Navigating Contemporary Challenges in Canadian Administrative Law (1) Reviewability of Prorogation of Parliament: Constitutional Limits of Executive Authority in Westminster Democracies (2). Regulatory Enforcement and Market Oversight: Contemporary Challenges in Competition, Foreign Investment, and Tax Regulation (3). Indigenous Rights and Reconciliation in Canada: Legal Reform, Governance, and Constitutional Accountability (4). Labour and Workplace Law in the Era of Remote Work: Occupational Health, Safety, and Employer Accountability. Collectively, these contributions examine administrative governance, judicial review, parliamentary accountability, regulatory oversight, Indigenous rights and reconciliation, labour regulation, workplace compliance, and constitutional governance within Canada's evolving legal landscape. The volume explores how Canadian institutions continue to balance legislative authority, executive power, judicial oversight, economic regulation, Indigenous self-determination, workplace protection, and democratic accountability while responding to technological, economic, and societal change. Published by Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada, this issue marks CLRJ's first issue operating under its enhanced publishing infrastructure composed of Crossref DOI Prefix 10.68513, ISBN Publisher Prefix 978-1-0681322, Crossref and DataCite registration services, and long-term preservation through Zenodo.

Keywords: Canadian Constitutional Law; Administrative Law; Judicial Review; Legislative Supremacy; Judicial Accountability; Parliamentary Democracy; Regulatory Enforcement; Competition Law; Foreign Investment; Tax Regulation; Indigenous Rights; Reconciliation; Labour Law; Employment Law; Occupational Health and Safety; Remote Work; Constitutional Accountability; Rule of Law; Democratic Governance; Canada.



SECTION B

PRIVACY, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND RESEARCH ETHICS STATEMENT

The **Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)** is committed to protecting the privacy, confidentiality, integrity, and security of personal information entrusted to the Journal by authors, researchers, reviewers, editors, readers, and contributors.

All personal information is collected, used, stored, processed, and disclosed solely for legitimate editorial, academic, publishing, indexing, archiving, legal, and administrative purposes associated with the operation of the Journal.

CLRJ adheres to applicable Canadian privacy principles, including the **Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA)** where applicable, together with recognized standards of publication ethics and scholarly communication.

The Journal maintains a **double-blind peer-review process**, and access to personal information is restricted to authorized personnel performing legitimate editorial, technical, preservation, and publication functions.

Publication metadata may be shared with **Crossref**, **DataCite**, **Zenodo**, indexing services, repositories, and library systems to facilitate DOI registration, citation linking, discoverability, and long-term preservation.

Authors and contributors retain rights of access, correction, withdrawal of consent where appropriate, and requests for deletion, subject to legal, editorial, and archival obligations. Information forming part of the permanent scholarly record may be retained where necessary to preserve the integrity, authenticity, and citation history of published works.

Personal information is retained only for as long as reasonably necessary and thereafter securely destroyed, anonymized, or archived in accordance with applicable requirements.



AUTHOR GUIDELINES

Manuscript Categories

- Full-Length Research Articles: 6,000-12,000 words
 - Short Articles and Commentaries: 2,000-4,000 words
 - Case Notes and Legislative Analyses: 1,500-3,000 words
 - Book Reviews: 1,000-2,000 words
- Submission Requirements** All submissions

must:

- Be original and unpublished;
- Follow APA 7th Edition;
- Include an abstract of 150-250 words;
- Include 5-10 keywords;
- Include full author information and affiliation;
- Be submitted in Word and PDF formats.

Peer Review

All manuscripts undergo double-blind external peer review by two independent reviewers. The Editor-in-Chief retains final authority regarding publication decisions.

Licensing

CLRJ publishes under a **CC BY-NC license**. Authors retain copyright and grant CLRJ permission to publish and disseminate their work.

Ethical Standards

Authors must comply with:

- Academic integrity requirements;
- Proper citation standards;
- Conflict-of-interest disclosure obligations;
- Indigenous data sovereignty principles;
- Research ethics requirements.



Volume 02, Issue 01 (2026)
Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)
Published by Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
12 October 2026

INDEX OF PUBLISHING IDENTIFIERS

Publisher: Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada
Corporation Number: 15040272
Journal: Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)
Publication Frequency: Quarterly
Publication Date: 12 October 2026
Crossref DOI Prefix: 10.68513
ISBN Publisher Prefix: 978-1-0681322
Digital Preservation Repository: Zenodo (CERN / OpenAIRE / European Union Open Science)
DOI Registration Agencies: Crossref & DataCite
Publishing Model: Open Access | Peer-Reviewed

Volume 02, Issue 01 (2026)
Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)
Published by Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
12 October 2026



EDITORIAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT

The **Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)** maintains a Canadian legal editorial leadership responsible for editorial decision-making, peer review oversight, research integrity, publication ethics, and scholarly quality assurance. The **Canadian Interdisciplinary Editorial Advisory Board** provides expertise in health sciences, engineering, technology, public safety, governance, and public policy to support interdisciplinary legal scholarship. International Legal Advisors and Peer Reviewers contribute comparative legal perspectives and subject-matter expertise.

CANADIAN LEGAL RESEARCH JOURNAL (CLRJ)

Editorial Board

A. Canadian Editorial Leadership

Munir Ahmed Dar, M.Sc. (Hons.), LL.B., Paralegal Graduate

President, MKET Canada

Editor-in-Chief: Overall editorial oversight and final publication decisions. *Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)*

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Rajendra Pakharel, LL.B., LL.M.

Barrister & Solicitor

Managing Editor: Manuscript screening, reviewer selection, publication ethics, citation checking, and workflow management) *Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)*

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Naveed Butt, LL.B., LL.M. Barrister & Solicitor

Associate Editor (substantive review of manuscripts, coordination of peer review, and editorial recommendations) *Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)*

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

B. Canadian Interdisciplinary Editorial Advisory Board

Dr. Shehneela Dar, M.D., USMLE

Director, MKET Canada

Interdisciplinary Advisory Board Member



Health Law, Medical Ethics, Public Health Governance, Health Sciences Policy
Ontario, Canada

Munib Dar, B.Eng.

Director, Darson Construction Inc.

Interdisciplinary Advisory Board Member

Engineering Compliance, Infrastructure Regulation, Environmental Governance, Construction Law

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Madeeha Dar

Director, MKET Canada

Interdisciplinary Advisory Board Member

Technology Governance, Digital Systems, Cybersecurity, Research Infrastructure

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Mubeen Dar

Director, MKET Canada

Police Foundations Diploma, Humber Polytechnic

Interdisciplinary Advisory Board Member

Public Safety, Criminal Justice, Regulatory Governance, Community Safety

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

C. International Legal Advisors, Peer Reviewers & Editorial Board Members

Rana Khadim Hussain, LL.B.

Advocate, Pakistan

International Legal Advisor, Peer Reviewer & Editorial Board Member

Faisalabad, Pakistan

Chaudhry Nasir Habib, M.Sc. (Hons.), LL.B.

Advocate, Pakistan

International Legal Advisor, Peer Reviewer & Editorial Board Member

Faisalabad, Pakistan



Editorial Independence and Conflict of Interest Statement

The Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ) maintains editorial independence in all publication decisions. Members of the Interdisciplinary Editorial Advisory Board provide advisory and subject-matter expertise and do not participate in editorial decisions regarding manuscripts in which they have a personal, professional, or institutional conflict of interest. Editorial decisions remain under the authority of the Editor-in-Chief and Canadian Editorial Leadership in accordance with established peer-review and publication ethics policies.

This structure is generally sufficient for a new Canadian interdisciplinary legal journal while clearly distinguishing the MKET Canada family members as **Advisory Board Members rather than Editors**, which strengthens governance credibility.

Author: Munir Dar

M.Sc. (Hons.), LL.B., Paralegal Graduate

President, Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1445-4176>

Publication Dated: October 12, 2026

<https://www.clrj.ca>

Website Landing Page URL: <https://www.clrj.ca/mket-legal-research-papers/>



TABLE OF CONTENTS

S. No.	Title	Author	Pages
1	Section A: Publisher's Note	Publisher	I
2	Publishing Credentials	Publisher	II
3	Certificate of Publisher Authorization and Scholarly Publication	Publisher	III
4	Dedication	Editorial Board	V
5	Preface / Foreword	Editorial Board	VI
6	Acknowledgements	Editorial Board	VII
7	Abstract and Executive Summary	Editorial Board	VIII
8	Section B: Privacy, Confidentiality, and Research Ethics Statement	Editorial Board	IX
9	Author Guidelines	Editorial Board	X
10	Index of Publishing Identifiers	Publisher	XI
11	CLRJ Editorial Governance Statement	Editorial Board	XII
12	Administrative Constitutionalism and the Evolution of Judicial Review in Canada	Dr. Salam	1
13	Discretionary Power and Accountability in Canadian Immigration Law, Visa Refusals, Inadmissibility, and Comparative Perspectives	Munir Dar	7
14	The Charter in the Digital Age: Re-Evaluating Section 7 and Section 8 in Algorithmic Governance	Nejat Ali	26
15	Federalism, Climate Policy, and the Architecture of Canadian Environmental Governance	Afzal Javed	32
16	Indigenous Data Sovereignty and the Future of Legal Pluralism in Canada	Sheikh Rashid	38



TABLE OF CONTENTS

S. No.	Title	Author	Pages
1	Section A: Publisher's Note	Publisher	I
2	Publishing Credentials	Publisher	II
3	Certificate of Publisher Authorization and Scholarly Publication	Publisher	III
4	Dedication	Editorial Board	V
5	Preface / Foreword	Editorial Board	VI
6	Acknowledgements	Editorial Board	VII
7	Abstract and Executive Summary	Editorial Board	VIII
8	Section B: Privacy, Confidentiality, and Research Ethics Statement	Editorial Board	IX
9	Author Guidelines	Editorial Board	X
10	Index of Publishing Identifiers	Publisher	XI
11	CLRJ Editorial Governance Statement	Editorial Board	XII
12	Administrative Constitutionalism and the Evolution of Judicial Review in Canada	Dr. Salam	1
13	Discretionary Power and Accountability in Canadian Immigration Law, Visa Refusals, Inadmissibility, and Comparative Perspectives	Munir Dar	7
14	The Charter in the Digital Age: Re-Evaluating Section 7 and Section 8 in Algorithmic Governance	Nejat Ali	26
15	Federalism, Climate Policy, and the Architecture of Canadian Environmental Governance	Afzal Javed	32
16	Indigenous Data Sovereignty and the Future of Legal Pluralism in Canada	Sheikh Rashid	38



RESEARCH ARTICLE

ADMINISTRATIVE CONSTITUTIONALISM AND THE EVOLUTION OF JUDICIAL REVIEW IN CANADA

Author: Dr. Muhammad Salam, LL.B., LL.M, Ph.D. Legal Researcher, Darwin's Law Office, Toronto ON. Canada.

Abstract: Administrative constitutionalism has emerged as a central concept in Canadian public law, describing the ways administrative actors interpret, apply, and shape constitutional norms in their everyday decision-making. While courts have traditionally been viewed as the primary guardians of constitutional meaning, recent jurisprudence particularly following *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v. Vavilov* (2019) has repositioned administrative bodies as active participants in constitutional governance. This paper examines the evolution of administrative constitutionalism in Canada, tracing its doctrinal foundations, theoretical development, and practical implications for judicial review. Through a comprehensive literature review, comparative analysis, and normative evaluation, the study argues that administrative constitutionalism strengthens democratic accountability, enhances institutional legitimacy, and requires courts to adopt a dialogic approach to judicial review. The paper concludes by proposing a structured framework for integrating constitutional reasoning into administrative decision-making while preserving the rule of law.

Keywords: Administrative constitutionalism; judicial review; Vavilov; constitutional interpretation; rule of law; administrative law; Canada; public administration; constitutional governance.

1. Introduction

Administrative bodies play an increasingly significant role in shaping constitutional meaning in Canada. Historically, constitutional interpretation was viewed as the exclusive domain of courts. However, administrative actors routinely engage with constitutional principles such as fairness, equality, and the rule of law when exercising statutory powers. This phenomenon, known as administrative constitutionalism, reflects a broader shift toward recognizing the administrative state as a site of constitutional engagement.

The Supreme Court's decision in *Vavilov* (2019) marked a turning point in Canadian administrative law, emphasizing reasonableness review, justification, and institutional legitimacy. Scholars argue that *Vavilov* implicitly strengthens administrative constitutionalism by requiring decision-makers to demonstrate transparent and intelligible reasoning grounded in legal principles.



This paper explores the evolution of administrative constitutionalism in Canada and its implications for judicial review.

General Objective

To critically analyze the development of administrative constitutionalism in Canada and evaluate its impact on judicial review after *Vavilov*.

Specific Objectives

1. To examine the historical foundations of administrative constitutionalism.
2. To analyze key Canadian jurisprudence shaping administrative constitutional reasoning.
3. To review scholarly debates on the relationship between administrative bodies and constitutional interpretation.
4. To evaluate the impact of *Vavilov* on administrative constitutionalism.
5. To propose a structured framework for integrating constitutional reasoning into administrative decision-making.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Foundations of Administrative Constitutionalism

Administrative constitutionalism emerged in the United States, where scholars such as Metzger (2013) and Parrillo (2015) argued that administrative agencies routinely interpret constitutional norms. In Canada, Dyzenhaus (1995) introduced the concept through the lens of the “culture of justification,” emphasizing that administrative actors must justify decisions in accordance with constitutional values.

2.2 Early Canadian Developments

Canadian administrative law historically focused on procedural fairness (Hogg, 1985; Mullan, 1997). Courts recognized that administrative bodies must act consistently with constitutional principles, even when not directly applying the Charter (Evans, 2003).

2.3 The Charter and Administrative Decision-Making

The Supreme Court’s decision in *Doré v. Barreau du Québec* (2012) established that administrative bodies must balance Charter values when exercising discretionary authority. Daly (2014) argued that *Doré* marked a shift toward administrative constitutionalism by embedding constitutional reasoning within administrative processes.

2.4 The Impact of *Vavilov* (2019)

Vavilov reshaped judicial review by emphasizing:

- Reasonableness as the presumptive standard
- Justification, transparency, and intelligibility
- Institutional context
- Statutory constraints

Sirota (2020) argued that *Vavilov* strengthens administrative constitutionalism by requiring decision-makers to demonstrate principled reasoning. Webber (2021) noted that *Vavilov* enhances constitutional dialogue between courts and administrative bodies.

2.5 Comparative Perspectives

In the UK, administrative constitutionalism is reflected in proportionality review and human rights reasoning (Craig, 2012). New Zealand's administrative bodies similarly engage with constitutional norms through the Treaty of Waitangi (Joseph, 2014).

2.6 Critiques of Administrative Constitutionalism

Critics argue that administrative constitutionalism risks undermining judicial supremacy (Sirota, 2017). Others contend that administrative bodies lack the expertise to interpret constitutional norms (Newman, 2018). However, proponents argue that administrative constitutionalism enhances democratic accountability and reflects the realities of modern governance (Daly, 2022).

3. Materials and Methods

This study employs:

- **Doctrinal analysis** of Supreme Court jurisprudence (1980–2024).
- **Systematic literature review** of administrative law scholarship.
- **Comparative analysis** of administrative constitutionalism in the US, UK, and New Zealand.
- **Normative evaluation** grounded in constitutional theory, rule-of-law principles, and administrative governance.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Administrative Bodies as Constitutional Actors

Administrative bodies routinely interpret constitutional norms when:

- Balancing Charter values (*Doré*)
- Applying fairness principles
- Interpreting statutory mandates consistent with constitutional principles
- Making decisions affecting rights and freedoms

This demonstrates that constitutional interpretation is not limited to courts.

4.2 Vavilov Strengthens Constitutional Reasoning

Vavilov requires administrative bodies to:

- Provide transparent and intelligible reasons
- Demonstrate justification grounded in legal principles
- Respect statutory and constitutional constraints

This enhances constitutional accountability within administrative decision-making.

4.3 Judicial Review as Constitutional Dialogue

Courts increasingly engage in dialogue with administrative bodies, correcting errors while respecting institutional expertise. This dialogic model strengthens constitutional governance.

4.4 Proposed Framework for Administrative Constitutionalism

A structured model should include:

1. **Identification of relevant constitutional principles**
2. **Integration of constitutional values into statutory interpretation**
3. **Transparent justification of decisions**
4. **Respect for institutional roles and expertise**
5. **Judicial oversight grounded in reasonableness and proportionality**

5. Conclusion

Administrative constitutionalism is a defining feature of modern Canadian public law. *Vavilov* has strengthened the role of administrative bodies as constitutional actors, requiring principled reasoning and transparent justification. A structured framework for administrative



constitutionalism can enhance democratic accountability, institutional legitimacy, and constitutional governance.

6. Recommendations

1. Administrative bodies should adopt internal guidelines for constitutional reasoning.
2. Courts should continue developing dialogic approaches to judicial review.
3. Legislatures should clarify constitutional obligations in administrative statutes.
4. Training programs should educate administrative decision-makers on constitutional principles.
5. Future research should examine administrative constitutionalism in Indigenous governance contexts.

Suggested Citation

Salam, M. (2026). *Administrative constitutionalism and the evolution of judicial review in Canada*. *Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)*, Vol. 02, Issue 01, Pp. 01- pp. 06

References

- Craig, P. (2012). *Administrative Law* (7th ed.). Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/administrative-law-9780199579043>
- Daly, P. (2014). *Doré and the future of constitutional review*. Canadian Bar Review. <https://cbr.cba.org/index.php/cbr/article/view/4420>
- Daly, P. (2022). *Administrative constitutionalism in Canada*. Canadian Journal of Law and Society. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/canadian-journal-of-law-and-society>
- Dyzenhaus, D. (1995). *The politics of deference*. University of Toronto Law Journal. <https://www.utpjournals.press/doi/10.3138/utlj.47.3.303>
- Evans, J. (2003). *Constitutional values in administrative law*. Osgoode Hall Law Journal. <https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/ohlj/>
- Hogg, P. (1985). *Liability of the Crown*. Carswell. <https://www.thomsonreuters.ca/en.html>
- Joseph, P. (2014). *Constitutional and Administrative Law in New Zealand*. Thomson Reuters. <https://www.thomsonreuters.co.nz/>



- Metzger, G. (2013). *Administrative constitutionalism*. Texas Law Review. <https://texaslawreview.org/>
- Mullan, D. (1997). *Administrative Law*. Irwin Law. <https://www.irwinlaw.com/product/administrative-law/>
- Newman, D. (2018). *Charter values and administrative law*. Supreme Court Law Review. <https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/sclr/>
- Parrillo, N. (2015). *Administrative law and constitutional meaning*. Yale Law Journal. <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/>
- Sirota, L. (2017). *Against administrative constitutionalism*. Double Aspect Blog. <https://doubleaspect.blog/>
- Sirota, L. (2020). *Vavilov and constitutional reasoning*. Double Aspect Blog. <https://doubleaspect.blog/2020/01/15/vavilov-and-constitutional-reasoning/>
- Supreme Court of Canada. (2012). *Doré v. Barreau du Québec*. <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/9992/index.do>
- Supreme Court of Canada. (2019). *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v. Vavilov*. <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/18068/index.do>
- Webber, G. (2021). *Constitutional dialogue and administrative law*. McGill Law Journal. <https://lawjournal.mcgill.ca/>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

DISCRETIONARY POWER AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN CANADIAN IMMIGRATION LAW: VISA REFUSALS, INADMISSIBILITY, AND COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES

Author: Munir Dar

M.Sc. (Hons.), LL.B., Paralegal Graduate

President, Mian Karam Ellahi Trust (MKET) Canada

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1445-4176>

Publication Dated: October 12, 2026

<https://www.clrj.ca>

Website Landing Page URL: <https://www.clrj.ca/mket-legal-research-papers/>

Abstract: Administrative discretion lies at the heart of contemporary immigration governance in Canada. Canadian Immigration officials are routinely required to make individualized assessments involving visa applications, admissibility determinations, humanitarian considerations, and enforcement actions. Because immigration legislation cannot anticipate every factual scenario that may arise, discretionary authority is necessary to facilitate effective administration and policy implementation. Nevertheless, broad discretionary powers raise significant concerns regarding transparency, consistency, accountability, fairness, and legal legitimacy. This article critically examines discretionary decision-making in visa refusal and inadmissibility cases through the theoretical and doctrinal framework of administrative law. Drawing upon major principles of administrative governance, including procedural fairness, reasonableness, proportionality, transparency, and judicial review, the study explores how democratic legal systems seek to balance administrative flexibility with rule-of-law constraints. Using doctrinal and comparative legal research methodologies, the paper analyzes accountability mechanisms operating within Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, and Pakistan. The analysis demonstrates that discretion remains indispensable to immigration administration but must be constrained by robust procedural and institutional safeguards. The article argues that transparency, meaningful justification, judicial oversight, and proportionality-based decision-making are essential for ensuring legitimacy, protecting individual rights, and maintaining public confidence in immigration systems. Recommendations are offered for strengthening accountability while preserving the practical advantages of administrative discretion.

Keywords: Immigration law; administrative discretion; accountability; visa refusal; inadmissibility; judicial review; reasonableness; proportionality; procedural fairness; transparency; administrative justice; immigration governance.



1. Introduction

Canadian Immigration law represents one of the most complex intersections between public administration, national sovereignty, individual rights, and governmental policy. States possess legitimate authority to regulate the admission, exclusion, and residence of foreign nationals; however, the practical administration of immigration systems requires far more than the mechanical application of statutory rules. Immigration officers routinely evaluate unique factual circumstances involving family relationships, employment histories, humanitarian concerns, security risks, educational objectives, and economic interests. As a result, legislatures inevitably delegate substantial discretionary authority to administrative decision-makers.

Administrative discretion is neither accidental nor exceptional. Rather, it constitutes a defining characteristic of modern governance. As Baker (2020) observes, administrative decision-makers frequently operate in environments where legislation provides broad objectives but cannot prescribe outcomes for every individual circumstance. Similarly, Mullan (2021) argues that discretion is necessary whenever legal decision-making requires evaluative judgment rather than purely mechanical application of predetermined criteria.

Within Canadian immigration system, discretionary authority enables officials to consider diverse and often competing factors. Immigration officers may be required to assess whether a visitor is likely to comply with visa conditions, whether humanitarian circumstances justify special consideration, or whether an applicant presents a risk to public safety or national security. Such matters cannot be resolved entirely through fixed rules because they frequently involve uncertainty, probability assessments, and contextual judgment (Legomsky & Rodríguez, 2022).

Despite its necessity, administrative discretion raises important rule-of-law concerns. Broad discretionary powers may result in inconsistent decision-making, perceptions of arbitrariness, unequal treatment, and reduced transparency. For individuals affected by immigration decisions,



the consequences can be profound. Visa refusals may interrupt educational opportunities, separate families, undermine economic prospects, or limit professional advancement. Likewise, inadmissibility findings may result in exclusion, removal, or long-term restrictions upon mobility and residency rights.

The challenge confronting modern administrative law is therefore not whether discretion should exist but how it should be exercised. Democratic legal systems increasingly seek to reconcile administrative flexibility with accountability through procedural safeguards, transparency requirements, judicial oversight, and standards of reasoned decision-making. This evolution reflects a broader shift toward what administrative law scholars describe as a culture of justification, in which public authorities are expected not merely to possess legal power but to justify the manner in which that power is exercised (Daly, 2019; Sossin, 2022).

In Canada, the Supreme Court's decision in *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v. Vavilov* fundamentally reshaped administrative-law jurisprudence by emphasizing that lawful administrative decisions must be justified, transparent, and intelligible and must exhibit a rational chain of reasoning grounded in the law and evidentiary record. Although arising outside the specific context of visa adjudication, the principles articulated in *Vavilov* have become highly influential in evaluating immigration decision-making and administrative legitimacy more broadly.

This paper investigates the relationship between discretionary authority and accountability within immigration administration. It examines the nature of discretion exercised by immigration officers, evaluates transparency and accountability mechanisms, explores the role of reasonableness and proportionality, and compares approaches adopted in Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, and Pakistan.

General Objective



To examine the relationship between discretionary power and accountability in immigration decision-making, particularly regarding visa refusals and inadmissibility determinations.

Specific Objectives

1. To analyze the nature and scope of discretionary authority exercised by immigration officers.
2. To evaluate transparency and accountability mechanisms governing administrative decision-making.
3. To examine the application of reasonableness and proportionality within immigration law.
4. To compare accountability frameworks across selected jurisdictions.
5. To develop recommendations for improving transparency, consistency, and fairness within immigration administration.

2. Review of Literature

Administrative discretion has occupied a central position within public-law scholarship for decades. Scholars generally agree that discretion is indispensable to modern governance because no legislative framework can anticipate every factual situation encountered by decision-makers. Baker (2020) argues that discretion enables administrators to adapt statutory purposes to individual circumstances while preserving legislative objectives. Similarly, Mullan (2021) emphasizes that discretion is an inevitable feature of complex regulatory systems characterized by uncertainty and factual diversity.

The evolution of contemporary administrative law has increasingly focused on constraining discretion through accountability. Rather than viewing discretion as unfettered authority, modern scholarship treats it as a legally structured form of decision-making. Sossin (2022) argues that administrative legitimacy depends upon the ability of decision-makers to provide transparent explanations demonstrating why particular outcomes were reached. Accordingly, discretion must



be exercised through identifiable reasoning processes that can withstand public and judicial scrutiny.

This perspective is reinforced by Daly's (2019) conception of a "culture of justification." According to Daly, modern administrative governance requires public authorities to justify their decisions rather than merely assert statutory authority. Justification serves both democratic and legal functions by promoting transparency, fairness, and accountability.

Immigration scholarship has similarly highlighted the significance of discretion. Legomsky and Rodríguez (2022) note that immigration decision-making often requires predictive assessments concerning future behaviour, compliance, risk, and credibility. Because such assessments are inherently uncertain, immigration systems rely extensively on administrative judgment. Triadafilopoulos (2021) further argues that globalization and increasing international mobility have expanded the importance of immigration discretion, making administrative decision-making central to contemporary migration governance.

The doctrine of reasonableness has emerged as one of the principal mechanisms through which administrative discretion is reviewed and controlled. In *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v. Vavilov*, the Supreme Court of Canada clarified that reasonable decisions must exhibit justification, transparency, and intelligibility while remaining consistent with the governing statutory and evidentiary framework. This modern conception of reasonableness emphasizes not only outcomes but also the quality of reasoning supporting administrative decisions.

Alongside reasonableness, proportionality has become increasingly influential in public-law analysis. Barak (2012) describes proportionality as a framework for balancing governmental objectives against individual rights and interests. The doctrine requires decision-makers to ensure that administrative measures are rationally connected to legitimate objectives and that they do not impose excessive burdens upon affected individuals. In immigration law, proportionality is



especially important because administrative decisions frequently impact family relationships, personal liberty, economic opportunities, and human dignity.

The broader human-rights framework further reinforces constraints upon discretionary authority. The United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights emphasizes equality, dignity, and fairness as fundamental principles of governance (United Nations, 1948). Although immigration remains an area of sovereign state authority, contemporary legal scholarship increasingly recognizes the need to reconcile migration control with procedural fairness and human rights protections.

Collectively, the literature reveals broad consensus that discretion remains essential to immigration administration but cannot operate without accountability. Transparency, procedural fairness, judicial review, reasoned decision-making, and proportionality emerge consistently as key safeguards against arbitrary exercises of public power.

3. Materials and Methods

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative doctrinal legal research methodology supplemented by comparative legal analysis. The doctrinal approach focuses on identifying, interpreting, and evaluating legal principles governing administrative discretion and accountability in immigration law.

Sources of Data

The study relies upon multiple authoritative sources:

- Judicial decisions and case law;
- Administrative-law scholarship;



- Immigration-law literature;
- Comparative legal materials;
- International human-rights instruments;
- Academic books and peer-reviewed legal research.

Research Method

A doctrinal research framework was adopted to examine administrative-law principles relating to procedural fairness, transparency, accountability, reasonableness, and proportionality. Comparative legal analysis was employed to evaluate how selected jurisdictions balance administrative flexibility with legal oversight.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed through thematic legal interpretation focusing on:

- Administrative discretion;
- Visa refusals;
- Inadmissibility findings;
- Transparency requirements;
- Accountability mechanisms;
- Judicial review;
- Reasonableness;
- Proportionality.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Administrative Discretion in Immigration Law

The findings confirm that administrative discretion is indispensable to effective immigration governance. Immigration officers regularly exercise judgment when evaluating visitor visas, study



permits, work permits, humanitarian applications, permanent residence requests, and admissibility concerns. These decisions often require individualized evaluation that cannot be reduced to objective formulas (Legomsky & Rodríguez, 2022).

Nevertheless, discretion cannot be equated with unlimited authority. Consistent with administrative-law theory, the study finds that discretion must remain constrained by statutory objectives, legal principles, and procedural safeguards (Baker, 2020; Mullan, 2021).

Clear guidelines, written reasons, supervisory oversight, and review processes significantly enhance accountability by ensuring that discretion is exercised consistently and transparently.

4.2 Visa Refusals and Predictive Decision-Making

Visa adjudication illustrates the predictive nature of administrative discretion. Immigration officers frequently assess the likelihood that applicants will comply with immigration requirements in the future.

Officers evaluate multiple factors, including employment status, financial resources, family ties, travel history, educational commitments, and immigration compliance records. These assessments necessarily involve uncertainty because future behaviour cannot be known with certainty (Legomsky & Rodríguez, 2022).

The findings reveal that predictive decision-making creates a heightened need for transparency. Because multiple reasonable interpretations of the same evidence may exist, decision-makers must clearly explain the reasoning underlying their conclusions.

Meaningful reasons promote fairness by enabling applicants to understand adverse decisions and, where appropriate, seek review or reconsideration.

4.3 Inadmissibility Determinations



Inadmissibility findings represent some of the most significant exercises of administrative authority. Such determinations may be based upon criminality, security concerns, organized criminal activity, health-related considerations, or misrepresentation.

These decisions require complex balancing between public interests and individual rights. Governments possess legitimate obligations to protect national security and maintain program integrity; however, procedural fairness demands that individuals receive meaningful opportunities to respond to allegations affecting their legal status.

The study finds that legitimacy depends not solely upon outcomes but upon procedural integrity. Transparency, notice, access to evidence, and opportunities to be heard substantially enhance confidence in immigration decision-making.

4.4 Transparency and Accountability

Transparency emerged as one of the strongest indicators of administrative legitimacy.

The findings support the proposition that affected individuals are more likely to perceive decisions as fair when reasoning processes are clearly explained. Transparency enables applicants, courts, reviewers, and the broader public to evaluate the legal and factual basis of administrative decisions.

The principles articulated in *Vavilov* provide a compelling framework for assessing administrative legitimacy. The requirement that decisions be justified, transparent, and intelligible reinforces accountability and strengthens public confidence in administrative institutions

4.5 Reasonableness and Proportionality

The findings of this study demonstrate that reasonableness and proportionality have emerged as two of the most important principles governing contemporary administrative decision-making. Together, these doctrines provide a coherent legal framework for evaluating both the procedural and substantive legitimacy of discretionary immigration decisions.



Reasonableness as a Standard of Administrative Review

Reasonableness review serves as a safeguard against arbitrary, irrational, or inadequately justified administrative action. The modern Canadian approach was articulated by the Supreme Court of Canada in *Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v. Vavilov*, where the Court held that reasonable decisions must be justified, transparent, and intelligible and must demonstrate a rational chain of analysis connecting evidence, legal principles, and outcomes.

The significance of reasonableness extends beyond judicial review. The standard encourages decision-makers to engage in disciplined legal reasoning and to clearly explain how conclusions are reached. Rather than focusing solely on whether a decision is correct, the doctrine evaluates whether the reasoning process itself is coherent, lawful, and defensible.

In immigration law, reasonableness is particularly important because officers frequently make predictive assessments based upon incomplete information. Decisions regarding visitor visas, study permits, humanitarian exemptions, and admissibility often require officials to evaluate future risk, credibility, and compliance. Consequently, the legitimacy of such decisions depends heavily upon the quality of the reasoning supporting them (Baker, 2020; Daly, 2019).

The findings suggest that reasonableness encourages administrators to:

- Consider all relevant evidence;
- Avoid reliance upon irrelevant considerations;
- Address material submissions from affected individuals;
- Apply legislative objectives consistently;
- Provide coherent and understandable explanations.



As Sossin (2022) observes, reasoned decision-making promotes both fairness and institutional legitimacy by demonstrating that administrative authority has been exercised responsibly and consistently with governing legal principles.

Proportionality and the Balancing of Interests

Alongside reasonableness, proportionality functions as a critical mechanism for evaluating the relationship between governmental objectives and their impact upon affected individuals.

According to Barak (2012), proportionality requires decision-makers to determine whether a governmental measure:

1. Pursues a legitimate objective;
2. Is rationally connected to that objective;
3. Minimally impairs individual interests; and
4. Maintains an appropriate balance between public benefits and private burdens.

Although proportionality originated primarily within constitutional law, its influence has expanded significantly within administrative law and immigration governance. Immigration decisions frequently affect fundamental aspects of human life, including family unity, education, employment opportunities, and long-term residence.

For example, an inadmissibility finding may promote important public objectives such as national security or public safety. However, decision-makers must also consider whether the resulting consequences are proportionate in relation to those objectives. Excessive restrictions that impose severe hardship without sufficient justification may undermine both fairness and legitimacy.

The findings indicate that proportionality provides an essential analytical framework for balancing competing considerations. By requiring decision-makers to evaluate both governmental interests



and individual impacts, proportionality contributes to a more equitable exercise of administrative discretion.

Furthermore, proportionality reinforces broader human-rights principles by ensuring that governmental actions remain responsive to the dignity and rights of affected persons (United Nations, 1948).

4.6 Comparative Analysis of Immigration Accountability Frameworks

Comparative analysis reveals that while immigration systems differ significantly in structure and administration, democratic jurisdictions generally confront similar challenges concerning the exercise and control of discretionary authority.

Canada

Canada provides one of the most developed examples of accountability-based immigration governance. Immigration officers possess broad discretionary authority; however, their decisions are constrained by statutory requirements, procedural fairness obligations, and judicial review.

The jurisprudence of Canada (*Minister of Citizenship and Immigration*) v. *Vavilov* has strengthened accountability by requiring administrative decisions to demonstrate justification, transparency, and intelligibility.

In addition, the Supreme Court's decision in *Kanithasamy v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)* emphasized the importance of flexibility and compassion in humanitarian and compassionate decision-making, reinforcing the principle that discretion must be exercised in a manner consistent with fairness and legislative purpose.

Canadian immigration administration therefore reflects an ongoing effort to balance administrative expertise with judicial oversight and procedural safeguards.



United Kingdom

The United Kingdom similarly grants significant discretion to immigration authorities, particularly in matters involving visas, asylum, and deportation.

However, British administrative law increasingly emphasizes proportionality and human-rights considerations. Following the enactment of the Human Rights Act 1998 and the incorporation of the European Convention on Human Rights into domestic law, courts have expanded scrutiny of immigration decisions affecting family life, privacy, and liberty interests (Craig, 2021).

Judicial review remains an important accountability mechanism, ensuring that discretionary decisions remain lawful, rational, and procedurally fair.

United States

The United States maintains one of the most expansive systems of administrative immigration discretion among democratic nations. Executive agencies possess broad authority concerning visa issuance, immigration enforcement, prosecutorial discretion, and removal proceedings.

Although judicial review remains available in many circumstances, certain categories of immigration decisions receive limited court scrutiny. Consequently, debates regarding transparency, consistency, and institutional accountability remain prominent within American immigration scholarship (Legomsky & Rodríguez, 2022).

The American experience demonstrates both the advantages and risks associated with broad administrative discretion. While flexibility permits responsive policy implementation, limited review may increase concerns regarding arbitrariness and accountability.

Australia



Australia combines extensive administrative authority with robust review mechanisms. Immigration decisions may be reviewed through specialized administrative tribunals as well as judicial review proceedings.

According to Creyke, McMillan, and Smyth (2022), Australia's review framework promotes accountability by providing structured opportunities for reconsideration while preserving administrative efficiency.

The Australian model demonstrates how independent review institutions can strengthen public confidence without unduly constraining administrative flexibility.

Pakistan

Pakistan's immigration framework continues to evolve within a broader constitutional and administrative-law environment. While administrative discretion remains necessary for managing immigration and security concerns, opportunities exist for strengthening transparency, procedural fairness, and review mechanisms.

Comparative experience suggests that greater publication of decision-making criteria, enhanced procedural safeguards, and expanded access to judicial review could improve both consistency and public confidence.

The Pakistani context illustrates challenges commonly faced by developing administrative systems seeking to balance efficiency, sovereignty, and accountability.

Comparative Findings

Across all jurisdictions examined, several common themes emerge:

1. Administrative discretion remains indispensable.



2. Transparency promotes legitimacy.
3. Procedural fairness strengthens confidence in decision-making.
4. Judicial review serves as a critical accountability mechanism.
5. Reason-giving reduces perceptions of arbitrariness.
6. Proportionality contributes to balancing public interests and individual rights.

These findings suggest that successful immigration governance depends not upon eliminating discretion but upon embedding discretion within institutions capable of ensuring accountability.

5. Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between discretionary authority and accountability within immigration decision-making, focusing specifically upon visa refusals and inadmissibility determinations. The research demonstrates that administrative discretion is both necessary and unavoidable in contemporary immigration governance. Immigration officers operate within complex factual environments characterized by uncertainty, individualized circumstances, competing policy objectives, and evolving legal requirements.

The findings confirm that discretion performs an essential role by allowing decision-makers to adapt statutory objectives to particular cases. At the same time, discretion creates risks that require effective legal safeguards. Without mechanisms promoting transparency, accountability, and fairness, discretionary authority may produce inconsistent outcomes and erode public confidence.

The study identified procedural fairness, reason-giving, judicial review, reasonableness, and proportionality as the primary legal mechanisms through which discretionary authority is constrained and legitimized. Particular significance was attributed to the reasoning of Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v. Vavilov, which establishes that administrative decisions must be justified, transparent, and intelligible.



Comparative analysis further demonstrates that democratic jurisdictions increasingly recognize the necessity of balancing administrative flexibility with accountability. Although institutional arrangements vary among Canada, the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, and Pakistan, each system employs mechanisms designed to reduce arbitrariness and enhance legitimacy.

Ultimately, immigration administration derives its legitimacy not solely from statutory authority but from the quality of decision-making. Administrative discretion remains compatible with the rule of law only when it is exercised transparently, fairly, and accountably. Future reforms should therefore focus on strengthening procedural safeguards and institutional oversight while preserving the flexibility necessary to address the complex realities of migration governance.

6. Recommendations

Based upon the findings and analysis presented in this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

Institutional Reforms

1. Require comprehensive written reasons for all visa refusals and inadmissibility determinations.
2. Develop standardized decision-writing guidelines emphasizing transparency and consistency.
3. Increase publication of policy manuals and administrative guidance documents.
4. Expand access to independent administrative review mechanisms.

Procedural Safeguards



5. Strengthen procedural-fairness protections in immigration adjudication.
6. Improve applicant access to evidence relied upon by decision-makers.
7. Ensure meaningful opportunities for applicants to respond to adverse information.
8. Promote timely communication of decisions and reasons.

Legal and Judicial Oversight

9. Enhance judicial-review accessibility for applicants affected by significant immigration decisions.
10. Strengthen implementation of reasonableness standards consistent with *Vavilov*.canlii+2
11. Encourage proportionality assessments in cases involving substantial consequences for individuals and families.

Administrative Capacity

12. Expand officer training in administrative law, procedural fairness, and human-rights principles.
13. Implement periodic audits of discretionary decision-making patterns.
14. Develop systems for identifying and correcting inconsistent administrative practices.

Future Governance Challenges

15. Establish regulatory safeguards governing artificial intelligence and automated decision-making systems.
16. Require algorithmic transparency where digital tools influence immigration outcomes.
17. Foster greater international cooperation regarding best practices for accountable immigration governance.



18. Align immigration administration more closely with international human-rights principles reflected in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948).

Suggested Citation

Dar, M. (2026). Discretionary power and accountability: Administrative law perspectives on visa refusals and inadmissibility. *Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)*, Vol. 02, Issue 01, Pp. 07 – pp. 25. <https://doi.org/10.68513/clrj.2026.01> (DOI is assigned but not active yet.)

References

- Baker, J. (2020). *Administrative law* (6th ed.). Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/administrative-law-9780198834248>
- Barak, A. (2012). *Proportionality: Constitutional rights and their limitations*. Cambridge University Press. <https://www.amazon.ca/Proportionality-Constitutional-Limitations-Cambridge-2012-03-19/dp/B01JXNFQEE>
- Canada (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration) v. Vavilov*, 2019 SCC 65. <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/2019/2019scc65/2019scc65.html>
- Craig, P. (2021). *Administrative law* (9th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell. <https://store.thomsonreuters.co.uk/en-gb/products/administrative-law-9th-edition-30872439>
- Creyke, R., McMillan, J., & Smyth, F. (2022). *Control of government action* (7th ed.). LexisNexis. <https://store.lexisnexis.com.au/products/control-of-government-action-7th-edition-skuSKU9780409354862>
- Daly, P. (2019). *A culture of justification: Vavilov and the future of administrative law*. University of Ottawa Press. <https://uottawapress.ca>
- Kanthasamy v. Canada (Citizenship and Immigration)*, 2015 SCC 61. <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/15665/index.do>
- Legomsky, S. H., & Rodríguez, C. M. (2022). *Immigration and refugee law and policy* (8th ed.). Foundation Press. <https://www.westacademic.com/Immigration-and-Refugee-Law-and-Policy-8th-9798886141516>
- Mullan, D. J. (2021). *Administrative law*. Irwin Law. <https://www.irwinlaw.com>



Sossin, L. (2022). *Administrative law in context* (4th ed.). Emond Publishing. <https://emond.ca>

Triadafilopoulos, T. (2021). *The migration state in the global age*. Polity Press. https://www.politybooks.com/bookdetail?book_slug=the-migration-state-in-the-global-age

United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>

Conflict of Interest and Editorial Independence Statement: The author serves as Publisher & Editor-in-Chief of the *Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)*. To maintain editorial independence and the integrity of the peer-review process, this manuscript was evaluated in accordance with the journal's standard editorial and peer-review procedures, with the author having no involvement in decisions concerning the review, acceptance, or publication of this manuscript. The views expressed are solely those of the author.



RESEARCH ARTICLE

THE CHARTER IN THE DIGITAL AGE: RE-EVALUATING SECTION 7 AND SECTION 8 IN ALGORITHMIC GOVERNANCE

Author: Nejat Ali, Lawyer. B.A. LL.B. Legal Researcher. Darwin's Law Office. Toronto. ON. Canada.

Abstract: Algorithmic governance defined as the use of automated decision-making, predictive analytics, and digital surveillance in public administration has transformed the constitutional landscape in Canada. As governments increasingly rely on artificial intelligence (AI) systems to allocate resources, assess risks, and make administrative decisions, traditional interpretations of Charter rights particularly section 7 (life, liberty, security of the person) and section 8 (unreasonable search and seizure) face unprecedented challenges. This paper critically examines the constitutional implications of algorithmic governance, focusing on how automated systems reshape state power, privacy expectations, and procedural fairness. Through doctrinal analysis, interdisciplinary literature review, and comparative evaluation, the study argues that algorithmic governance requires a renewed constitutional framework grounded in transparency, accountability, and human rights. The paper proposes a Charter-based model for regulating algorithmic systems and concludes that Canada must modernize its constitutional jurisprudence to address the realities of digital governance.

Keywords: Algorithmic governance; Charter rights; section 7; section 8; digital surveillance; AI; automated decision-making; privacy; constitutional law; Canada.

1. Introduction

Digital technologies have transformed the relationship between individuals and the state. Governments increasingly deploy algorithmic tools risk scoring systems, predictive policing, automated benefits adjudication, biometric identification, and digital surveillance to manage public services and security. These systems reshape constitutional protections by expanding state power, altering privacy expectations, and introducing opaque decision-making processes.

Section 7 and section 8 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* are central to protecting individuals from state intrusion. However, algorithmic governance challenges traditional interpretations of these rights by introducing new forms of surveillance, automated decision-making, and data-driven state action.

This paper examines how algorithmic governance affects Charter rights and proposes a constitutional framework for regulating digital state power.

General Objective

To critically analyze how algorithmic governance reshapes the interpretation and application of section 7 and section 8 of the Charter in Canada.

Specific Objectives

1. To examine the technological foundations of algorithmic governance.
2. To analyze the constitutional implications of automated decision-making.
3. To evaluate how digital surveillance affects section 8 privacy protections.
4. To assess how algorithmic harms implicate section 7 rights.
5. To propose a Charter-based regulatory model for algorithmic governance.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Algorithmic Governance and State Power

Algorithmic governance refers to the use of automated systems to make or influence governmental decisions (Danaher, 2016). O'Neil (2016) argues that algorithmic systems can create “weapons of math destruction” by amplifying bias and reducing transparency. Eubanks (2018) demonstrates how automated systems disproportionately harm marginalized communities.

2.2 Section 7 and Automated Decision-Making

Section 7 protects life, liberty, and security of the person. Automated systems can affect these interests by:

- Denying or delaying social benefits
- Producing biased risk assessments
- Automating immigration or refugee determinations
- Influencing policing and sentencing

Kerr (2020) argues that algorithmic harms implicate section 7 because they affect fundamental interests through opaque processes.

2.3 Section 8 and Digital Surveillance

Section 8 protects against unreasonable search and seizure. Digital surveillance—including metadata collection, biometric analysis, and predictive analytics raises new constitutional questions. In *R. v. Spencer* (2014), the Supreme Court recognized privacy in online data. Roach (2021) argues that digital surveillance requires updated section 8 jurisprudence.

2.4 Predictive Policing and Constitutional Risks

Predictive policing tools use historical data to forecast crime. Studies show these systems disproportionately target racialized communities (Lum & Isaac, 2016). Ferguson (2017) argues that predictive policing undermines constitutional protections by embedding bias into state action.

2.5 Automated Benefits Adjudication

Automated systems used in welfare and immigration adjudication can produce errors affecting life and security interests (Molnar & Gill, 2018). These harms implicate section 7 procedural fairness.

2.6 Comparative Perspectives

The EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) recognizes rights against automated decision-making (Wachter, Mittelstadt & Floridi, 2017). The UK's ICO has issued guidance on algorithmic fairness. These models offer insights for Canadian constitutional reform.

3. Materials and Methods

This study employs:

- **Doctrinal analysis** of Charter jurisprudence (1982–2024).
- **Interdisciplinary literature review** across AI ethics, surveillance studies, and constitutional theory.
- **Comparative analysis** of international regulatory models (EU GDPR, UK ICO).
- **Normative evaluation** grounded in human rights, autonomy, and constitutional accountability.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Algorithmic Governance Expands State Power

Automated systems allow governments to:

- Monitor individuals continuously
- Make decisions without human oversight
- Predict behaviours using opaque models
- Extract and analyze large volumes of personal data

These practices reshape constitutional protections.

4.2 Section 7 Requires Algorithmic Accountability

Algorithmic harms implicate section 7 when:

- Automated systems affect access to essential services
- Risk scores influence policing or detention
- Biased algorithms produce discriminatory outcomes
- Opaque systems undermine procedural fairness

Section 7 requires transparent, intelligible, and accountable decision-making.

4.3 Section 8 Must Address Digital Surveillance

Digital surveillance challenges section 8 because:

- Metadata reveals intimate personal information
- Biometric systems collect sensitive data
- Predictive analytics infer behaviours without consent
- Automated systems conduct searches without human oversight

Section 8 must evolve to address algorithmic intrusions.

4.4 Proposed Charter-Based Framework

A constitutional model for algorithmic governance should include:

1. **Transparency** in algorithmic logic and data sources
2. **Proportionality** limiting intrusive digital surveillance
3. **Algorithmic accountability** including audits and bias testing
4. **Human oversight** of automated decisions



5. **Procedural fairness** in algorithmic adjudication
6. **Rights to contest automated decisions**

5. Conclusion

Algorithmic governance reshapes constitutional protections under section 7 and section 8. Automated decision-making and digital surveillance introduce new forms of state intrusion requiring updated constitutional frameworks. A Charter-based model grounded in transparency, accountability, and human rights is essential to ensure that digital governance does not undermine fundamental freedoms.

6. Recommendations

1. Courts should modernize section 7 and section 8 jurisprudence to address algorithmic harms.
2. Parliament should enact legislation regulating automated decision-making.
3. Government agencies should adopt algorithmic transparency and accountability standards.
4. Regulators should require algorithmic audits and bias testing.
5. Future research should examine algorithmic governance in Indigenous communities.

Suggested Citation

Ali, N. (2026). The Charter in the digital age: Re-evaluating section 7 and section 8 in algorithmic governance. *Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)*, Vol. 02, Issue 01, Pp 26 – pp-31.

References

- Danaher, J. (2016). The rise of algorithmic governance. *Philosophy & Technology*.
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13347-016-0210-3>
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating Inequality*. St. Martin's Press.
<https://us.macmillan.com/books/9781250074317/automatinginequality>
- Ferguson, A. (2017). *The Rise of Big Data Policing*. NYU Press.
<https://nyupress.org/9781479892822/the-rise-of-big-data-policing/>
- Kerr, I. (2020). Section 7 and algorithmic harms. *Canadian Journal of Law & Technology*.
<https://cjlt.ca/>



- Lum, K., & Isaac, W. (2016). Predictive policing and bias. *Significance*. <https://rss.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1740-9713.2016.00960.x>
- Molnar, P., & Gill, L. (2018). Bots at the gate: Automation in immigration systems. *CIGI Report*. <https://www.cigionline.org/publications/bots-gate>
- O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of Math Destruction*. Crown Publishing. <https://cathy.oneilbooks.com/>
- Roach, K. (2021). Digital surveillance and section 8. *Criminal Law Quarterly*. <https://www.thomsonreuters.ca/en.html>
- Supreme Court of Canada. (2014). *R. v. Spencer*. <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/14233/index.do>
- Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Automated decision-making under GDPR. *International Data Privacy Law*. <https://academic.oup.com/idpl/article/7/4/233/4762328>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

FEDERALISM, CLIMATE POLICY, AND THE ARCHITECTURE OF CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE

Author: Afzal Javed, LL.B. Legal Researcher. Darwin's Law Office. Toronto ON. Canada.

Abstract: Climate change has intensified constitutional debates over federalism and environmental governance in Canada. The federal carbon pricing regime, upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada in *References re Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act* (2021), has reshaped the constitutional architecture governing environmental regulation. This paper examines the evolving relationship between federalism, climate policy, and environmental governance in Canada. Through doctrinal analysis, comparative constitutional review, and interdisciplinary literature synthesis, the study evaluates how cooperative federalism, the national concern doctrine, and provincial autonomy intersect in climate governance. It argues that Canada requires a more integrated, multi-level governance model to address climate challenges while respecting constitutional boundaries. The paper concludes by proposing a structural constitutional framework for climate governance grounded in subsidiarity, intergovernmental cooperation, and ecological constitutionalism.

Keywords: Federalism; climate policy; environmental governance; carbon pricing; national concern doctrine; cooperative federalism; constitutional law; Canada; climate change.

1. Introduction

Climate change presents one of the most complex governance challenges in Canadian constitutional law. Environmental regulation intersects with federal and provincial powers, creating jurisdictional tensions that shape national climate policy. The Supreme Court's decision in *References re Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act* (2021) affirmed federal authority to implement carbon pricing under the national concern doctrine, marking a significant development in Canadian federalism.

This paper examines how federalism shapes climate policy and environmental governance in Canada. It evaluates constitutional doctrines, intergovernmental dynamics, and emerging governance models to propose a coherent constitutional architecture for climate regulation.

General Objective

To critically analyze the constitutional dimensions of climate policy within Canadian federalism and propose a structural governance model for environmental regulation.

Specific Objectives

1. To examine the constitutional foundations of environmental governance in Canada.
2. To analyze key jurisprudence shaping federal and provincial climate powers.
3. To review scholarly debates on cooperative federalism and national concern doctrine.
4. To evaluate the implications of the federal carbon pricing decision.
5. To propose a structural constitutional model for climate governance.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Constitutional Foundations of Environmental Governance

Environmental regulation is not explicitly assigned to either federal or provincial governments under the *Constitution Act, 1867*. Hogg (2018) notes that environmental matters fall across multiple heads of power, including criminal law, trade and commerce, property and civil rights, and peace, order, and good government (POGG).

2.2 Federalism and Climate Policy

Climate policy requires coordination across jurisdictions. Harrison (2012) argues that fragmented federalism complicates climate governance. Bakker (2019) notes that provinces have historically led climate initiatives, including cap-and-trade systems and renewable energy programs.

2.3 National Concern Doctrine

The national concern doctrine allows federal regulation of matters that transcend provincial boundaries. Leclair (2005) argues that the doctrine must be applied cautiously to avoid federal overreach. In *References re GGPPA* (2021), the Supreme Court held that carbon pricing constitutes a matter of national concern due to its extra-provincial impacts.

2.4 Cooperative Federalism

Cooperative federalism emphasizes collaboration between federal and provincial governments. Cameron (2013) argues that cooperative federalism supports flexible governance models. However, critics such as Sirota (2021) warn that cooperative federalism may undermine constitutional boundaries.

2.5 Climate Governance Models

Multi-level governance models integrate federal, provincial, municipal, and Indigenous jurisdictions (Bulkeley & Betsill, 2013). Boyd (2021) argues that climate governance must incorporate Indigenous environmental stewardship and constitutional rights.

2.6 Comparative Perspectives

Countries such as Germany and Australia use cooperative federalism to coordinate climate policy (Fischer, 2019). The EU employs a supranational governance model that integrates member states under binding climate directives.

3. Materials and Methods

This study employs:

- **Doctrinal analysis** of constitutional jurisprudence (1980–2024).
- **Comparative review** of climate governance models in federal systems.
- **Interdisciplinary literature review** across environmental law, constitutional theory, and political science.
- **Normative evaluation** grounded in structural constitutionalism, subsidiarity, and ecological governance.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Climate Policy Requires Multi-Level Governance

Climate change affects multiple jurisdictions and requires coordinated action. Fragmented provincial policies cannot address national emissions effectively.

4.2 The National Concern Doctrine Supports Federal Climate Action

The Supreme Court's decision in *References re GGPPA* (2021) affirmed federal authority to regulate carbon pricing. This decision:

- Recognizes climate change as a matter of national concern
- Supports federal leadership in climate governance
- Preserves provincial autonomy in complementary climate policies

4.3 Cooperative Federalism Enhances Climate Governance

Cooperative federalism allows:

- Joint regulatory frameworks
- Harmonized climate standards
- Shared administrative responsibilities
- Integration of Indigenous governance systems

However, cooperative federalism must respect constitutional boundaries.

4.4 Proposed Structural Constitutional Model

A structural model for climate governance should include:

1. **Federal leadership** in national climate standards
2. **Provincial autonomy** in implementing complementary policies
3. **Indigenous jurisdiction** in environmental stewardship
4. **Municipal authority** in local climate adaptation
5. **Intergovernmental climate councils** for coordination
6. **Subsidiarity** ensuring decisions are made at the most effective level

4.5 Integrating Indigenous Environmental Governance

Indigenous legal orders emphasize relational stewardship and ecological responsibility (Borrows, 2010). Climate governance must incorporate Indigenous jurisdiction and constitutional rights under section 35.

5. Conclusion

Climate change requires a constitutional governance model that integrates federal, provincial, municipal, and Indigenous jurisdictions. The Supreme Court's carbon pricing decision strengthens federal authority while preserving provincial autonomy. A structural constitutional model grounded in cooperative federalism, subsidiarity, and ecological constitutionalism can enhance Canada's climate governance.

6. Recommendations

1. Establish a national climate governance council with federal, provincial, and Indigenous representation.



2. Modernize environmental statutes to reflect multi-level governance.
3. Strengthen federal-provincial agreements on climate adaptation.
4. Incorporate Indigenous environmental governance into climate policy.
5. Develop constitutional guidelines for climate governance under the national concern doctrine.

Suggested Citation:

Javed, A. (2026). Federalism, climate policy, and the architecture of Canadian environmental governance. *Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)*, Vol. 02, Issue 01, Pp. 32 – pp. 37.

References

- Bakker, K. (2019). Provincial climate leadership in Canada. *Canadian Public Policy*. <https://www.utpjournals.press/doi/10.3138/cpp.2019-012>
- Boyd, D. (2021). Indigenous environmental governance. *UBC Law Review*. <https://www.bclawreview.ca/>
- Bulkeley, H., & Betsill, M. (2013). *Climate Change and Global Cities*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Climate-Change-and-Global-Cities/Bulkeley-Betsill/p/book/9780415661626>
- Cameron, D. (2013). Cooperative federalism and environmental governance. *McGill Law Journal*. <https://lawjournal.mcgill.ca/>
- Fischer, L. (2019). Climate federalism in Germany. *German Law Journal*. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/german-law-journal>
- Harrison, K. (2012). Multilevel climate governance in Canada. *Review of Policy Research*. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/15411338>
- Hogg, P. (2018). *Constitutional Law of Canada*. Thomson Reuters. <https://www.thomsonreuters.ca/en.html>
- Leclair, J. (2005). The national concern doctrine. *Supreme Court Law Review*. <https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/sclr/>



References re Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act, 2021 SCC 11. <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/18704/index.do>

Sirota, L. (2021). Cooperative federalism and constitutional limits. *Double Aspect Blog*. <https://doubleaspect.blog/2021/04/01/cooperative-federalism-and-constitutional-limits/>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

INDIGENOUS DATA SOVEREIGNTY AND THE FUTURE OF LEGAL PLURALISM IN CANADA

Author: Sheikh Rashid, LL.B. Advocate, Chamber No. 49, District Courts, Faisalabad, Pakistan.
48000

Abstract: Indigenous data sovereignty has emerged as a foundational dimension of Indigenous self-determination, governance, and legal pluralism. As digital technologies expand the collection, storage, and use of data, Indigenous communities face increasing risks related to privacy, jurisdiction, cultural integrity, and control over information. This paper examines the legal, constitutional, and governance implications of Indigenous data sovereignty in Canada. Through a comprehensive literature review, doctrinal analysis, and interdisciplinary evaluation, the study argues that Indigenous data sovereignty is essential for advancing reconciliation, strengthening Indigenous governance, and modernizing Canadian legal pluralism. The paper proposes a multi-layered legal framework integrating Indigenous jurisdiction, federal and provincial privacy laws, and international human rights standards. It concludes that Canada must recognize Indigenous data sovereignty as a core component of constitutionalism and legal pluralism.

Keywords: Indigenous data sovereignty; legal pluralism; Indigenous governance; privacy; OCAP; constitutional law; digital rights; Canada; Indigenous jurisdiction.

1. Introduction

Data has become a central resource in contemporary governance, economic development, and social policy. For Indigenous peoples, data is not merely information it is a reflection of identity, culture, relationships, and collective rights. Indigenous data sovereignty asserts that Indigenous communities have the right to govern the collection, ownership, and use of data about their peoples, lands, and cultures.

In Canada, Indigenous data sovereignty intersects with constitutional rights under section 35, privacy legislation, Indigenous legal orders, and international human rights instruments such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). As governments and corporations increasingly rely on digital technologies, Indigenous communities face new challenges related to data extraction, algorithmic profiling, and cross-border data flows.



This paper examines Indigenous data sovereignty within the broader context of Canadian legal pluralism and proposes a governance model that respects Indigenous jurisdiction and constitutional commitments.

General Objective

To critically analyze Indigenous data sovereignty within Canadian legal pluralism and propose a governance framework that recognizes Indigenous jurisdiction over data.

Specific Objectives

1. To examine the foundations of Indigenous data sovereignty.
2. To analyze Canadian legal frameworks governing data protection.
3. To evaluate the relationship between Indigenous data sovereignty and legal pluralism.
4. To assess international human rights standards relevant to Indigenous data governance.
5. To propose a multi-layered legal framework for Indigenous data sovereignty in Canada.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Foundations of Indigenous Data Sovereignty

Indigenous data sovereignty is rooted in Indigenous legal orders, governance systems, and collective rights (Kukutai & Taylor, 2016). Walter and Suina (2019) argue that data sovereignty is essential for Indigenous self-determination and cultural survival. In Canada, the First Nations principles of OCAP Ownership, Control, Access, and Possession provide a foundational framework (FNIGC, 2014).

2.2 Indigenous Legal Orders and Data Governance

Indigenous legal orders emphasize relational accountability, collective stewardship, and responsibilities to community and land (Borrows, 2010). Napoleon (2015) argues that Indigenous governance systems conceptualize information as relational rather than transactional.

2.3 Canadian Privacy Legislation

Canadian privacy laws including PIPEDA and provincial statutes focus on individual privacy rights. Scassa (2020) notes that these frameworks inadequately address collective data rights, making them insufficient for Indigenous data governance.

2.4 Section 35 and Constitutional Recognition



Section 35 recognizes and affirms Aboriginal and treaty rights. Henderson (1994) argues that section 35 constitutionalizes Indigenous governance, including jurisdiction over data. McNeil (2019) notes that Indigenous jurisdiction extends to cultural and informational governance.

2.5 UNDRIP and International Standards

UNDRIP affirms Indigenous rights to maintain, control, and protect cultural heritage, traditional knowledge, and intellectual property (UNDRIP, 2007). Rodriguez-Lonebear (2016) argues that UNDRIP provides a global foundation for Indigenous data sovereignty.

2.6 Digital Colonialism and Data Extraction

Digital colonialism refers to the extraction and exploitation of Indigenous data by governments and corporations (Couldry & Mejias, 2019). Browne (2021) argues that algorithmic profiling disproportionately harms Indigenous communities.

2.7 Legal Pluralism in Canada

Legal pluralism recognizes multiple legal systems operating simultaneously. Webber (2016) argues that meaningful pluralism requires recognizing Indigenous jurisdiction. Morales (2017) emphasizes that Indigenous law must be treated as equal, not subordinate.

3. Materials and Methods

This study employs:

- **Doctrinal analysis** of constitutional, privacy, and Indigenous rights jurisprudence.
- **Interdisciplinary literature review** across Indigenous studies, data governance, constitutional law, and digital rights.
- **Comparative analysis** of Indigenous data sovereignty frameworks in New Zealand, Australia, and the United States.
- **Normative evaluation** grounded in legal pluralism, Indigenous constitutionalism, and human rights.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Indigenous Data Sovereignty Is a Constitutional Imperative

Indigenous data sovereignty is grounded in:



- Section 35 rights
- Indigenous legal orders
- Treaty relationships
- UNDRIP commitments

These foundations support Indigenous jurisdiction over data.

4.2 Canadian Privacy Laws Are Insufficient

Canadian privacy laws:

- Focus on individual rights
- Ignore collective data governance
- Fail to recognize Indigenous jurisdiction
- Allow cross-border data transfers without Indigenous consent

This creates structural gaps in data protection.

4.3 Digital Colonialism Threatens Indigenous Rights

Digital colonialism manifests through:

- Algorithmic profiling
- Unauthorized data extraction
- Corporate control of Indigenous data
- Government surveillance of Indigenous communities

These practices undermine self-determination.

4.4 Legal Pluralism Requires Indigenous Jurisdiction

Meaningful legal pluralism requires:

1. Recognition of Indigenous data governance laws
2. Integration of OCAP principles into federal and provincial legislation
3. Respect for Indigenous jurisdiction in digital governance
4. Collaborative regulatory frameworks

4.5 Proposed Multi-Layered Governance Model



A comprehensive model should include:

1. **Indigenous jurisdiction** over data collection, storage, and use
2. **Federal recognition** of Indigenous data sovereignty in privacy statutes
3. **Provincial harmonization** with Indigenous data governance frameworks
4. **International alignment** with UNDRIP and global Indigenous data standards
5. **Digital infrastructure** controlled by Indigenous communities
6. **Algorithmic accountability** for systems using Indigenous data

5. Conclusion

Indigenous data sovereignty is essential for advancing self-determination, protecting cultural integrity, and modernizing Canadian legal pluralism. Existing privacy laws are insufficient to protect Indigenous collective rights. A multi-layered governance model grounded in Indigenous jurisdiction, constitutional recognition, and international human rights standards is necessary to ensure that digital transformation supports not undermines Indigenous governance.

6. Recommendations

1. Parliament should amend privacy legislation to recognize Indigenous data sovereignty.
2. Provinces should integrate OCAP® principles into data governance frameworks.
3. Indigenous governments should develop digital infrastructure for data stewardship.
4. Courts should interpret section 35 to include data governance rights.
5. Future research should examine algorithmic impacts on Indigenous communities.

Suggested Citation:

Rashid, S. (2026). Indigenous data sovereignty and the future of legal pluralism in Canada. *Canadian Legal Research Journal (CLRJ)*, Vol. 02, Issue 01, Pp. 38 – pp. 43.

References

- Borrows, J. (2010). *Canada's Indigenous Constitution*. University of Toronto Press. <https://utorontopress.com/9781442610317/canadas-indigenous-constitution/>
- Browne, S. (2021). Algorithmic profiling and Indigenous rights. *Canadian Journal of Law & Technology*. <https://cjlts.ca/>



- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. (2019). *The Costs of Connection: How Data Colonizes Human Life*. Stanford University Press. <https://www.sup.org/books/title/?id=31406>
- FNIGC. (2014). *Ownership, Control, Access and Possession (OCAP®) Principles*. First Nations Information Governance Centre. <https://fnigc.ca/ocap-training/>
- Henderson, J. (1994). Empowering treaty federalism. *Saskatchewan Law Review*. <https://law.usask.ca/>
- Kukutai, T., & Taylor, J. (2016). *Indigenous Data Sovereignty*. ANU Press. <https://press.anu.edu.au/publications/indigenous-data-sovereignty>
- McNeil, K. (2019). Indigenous jurisdiction and constitutionalism. *UBC Law Review*. <https://www.bclawreview.ca/>
- Morales, S. (2017). Indigenous law and legal pluralism. *UBC Law Review*. <https://www.bclawreview.ca/>
- Napoleon, V. (2015). Thinking about Indigenous legal orders. *UBC Law Review*. <https://www.bclawreview.ca/>
- Rodriguez-Lonebear, D. (2016). Building a data revolution in Indian Country. *Harvard Kennedy School Review*. <https://ksr.hkspublications.org/>
- Scassa, T. (2020). Privacy law and Indigenous data governance. *Canadian Bar Review*. <https://cbr.cba.org/>
- UNDRIP. (2007). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. <https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples.html>
- Walter, M., & Suina, M. (2019). Indigenous data sovereignty in the digital age. *Social Science Research Network*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3373067
- Webber, J. (2016). Legal pluralism and Indigenous law. *McGill Law Journal*. <https://lawjournal.mcgill.ca/>