

Osgoode Hall Law Journal

Volume 30, Number 4 (Winter 1992)

Article 7

October 1992

[1985] S. C. R. Statistical Analysis

John H. Kim

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/ohlj Article

Citation Information

Kim, John H.. "[1985] S. C. R. Statistical Analysis." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 30.4 (1992) : 875-898. DOI: https://doi.org/10.60082/2817-5069.1706 https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/ohlj/vol30/iss4/7

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Osgoode Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Osgoode Hall Law Journal by an authorized editor of Osgoode Digital Commons.

[1985] S. C. R. Statistical Analysis

This article is available in Osgoode Hall Law Journal: https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/ohlj/vol30/iss4/7

[1985] S.C.R. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS®

GENERAL TABLES

I.	VOLUME OF WORK
II.	BREAKDOWN BY SOURCE 877
III.	SUBJECT MATTER OF LITIGATION
IV.	MAJORITY/DISSENT RATIO 885
v.	TYPE OF WORK 886
VI.	ACTION OF THE JUSTICES

CHARTER TABLES

VII.	SUCCESS RATE OF CHARTER CLAIMANTS	389
VIII.	OBJECT OF CHARTER LITIGATION	390
IX.	CHARTER LITIGATION BY SOURCE	891
X.	SUBJECT OF CHARTER LITIGATION	89 2
XI.	ACTION OF THE JUSTICES	894
XII.	VOTING BEHAVIOUR OF JUSTICES	895
XIII.	TYPE OF CHARTER CLAIMANTS	896
XIV.	MAJORITY/DISSENT RATIO	897
xv.	LEGAL RIGHTS AND SECTION 24(2)	898

-

© Copyright, 1992, Osgoode Hall Law Journal.

TOTAL	· · · · · ·	· · ·	
			Reported Ju
		Public	Private
84		73	16
		otions	Reported Mo
	Other	Refused	Granted
C	0	0	0
		Votions	Unreported N
	Other	Refused	Granted
469	24	343	102

TABLE I¹VOLUME OF WORK

¹ All data considered in this table derive from the [1985] Supreme Court Reports and the [1985] Bulletin of proceedings taken in the Supreme Court of Canada.

² The following cases have been included under both "Private" and "Public" categories but only once under "Total": Rosen v. R., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 83, ("Criminal" and "Trusts & Trustees"); British Columbia v. Tener, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 533, ("Expropriation" and "Real Property"); Deloitte Haskins and Sells Ltd. v. Workers' Compensation Board, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 785, ("Constitutional" and "Bankruptcy"); Lamb v. Lamb, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 851, ("Constitutional" and "Maintenance & Support"); and Vachon v. Canada (Employment and Immigration Commission), [1985] 2 S.C.R. 417, ("Bankruptcy" and "Unemployment").

³ Appellate decisions and references are included under this heading; motions are not. A decision involving one or more appeals (including cross-appeals) or references is considered to be one case for the purpose of this category. Procedural cases are classified according to their underlying subject matter. If a case is classified under both "Private" and "Public," it is entered under each of these headings, but only once under "Total."

		PRIVAT	· = 2		PUBLIC	•	Total From
	Affirmed		⊑~ d ³ Other ⁴	Affirmed		-	Source
Alberta	0	1	0	4	5	0	10
British Columbia	1	0	0	6	3	0	9
Manitoba	1	1	0	2	2	0	6
New Brunswick	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Newfoundland & Labrad	lor 0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Northwest Territories	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Nova Scotia	1	0	0	0	3	0	4
Ontario	5	2	0	14	3	2	23
Prince Edward Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quebec	3	1	0	7	7	1	17
Saskatchewan	0	1	0	2	0	0	3
Yukon Territory	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Court Martial Appeal Ct	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Board	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Court	0	1	0	4	4	0	8
TOTAL	11	7	0	39	28	3	82

TABLE II1BREAKDOWN BY SOURCE

¹ Only appellate decisions (including references on appeal from the decision of a lower court) are included in this table. Decisions may be classified under both "Private" and "Public" due to multiple subject matters. A decision involving one or more appeals (including cross-appeals) is entered once under "Affirmed," "Reversed," or "Other" unless the lower court was both affirmed and reversed, in which case the decision is entered once under two or more of "Affirmed," "Reversed," or "Other." A decision is entered once under "Total From Source" unless it involves multiple appeals having different origins. Procedural decisions are classified according to their underlying subject matter.

The following cases, Reference Re Section 23 of the Manitoba Act, 1870, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 721 and Order: Manitoba Language Rights, [1985] 2 S.C.R. 347, are original references and are not included in this table.

² The following cases have been included under both "Private" and "Public" categories but only once under "Total From Source": Rosen v. R, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 83; British Columbia v. Tener, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 533; Deloitte Haskins and Sells Ltd. v. Workers' Compensation Board, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 785; Lamb v. Lamb, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 851; and Vachon v. Canada (Employment and Immigration Commission), [1985] 2 S.C.R. 417.

878

³ In the following cases, the court affirmed in part and reversed in part the decision of the lower court: *V.K. Mason Construction Ltd.* v. *Bank of Nova Scotia*, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 271, ("Ontario - Public") (two appeals were joined: the appeal of the Bank of Nova Scotia was dismissed, the cross-appeal of V.K. Mason Construction Ltd. was allowed, and the appeal of V.K. Mason Construction Ltd. was dismissed); and *Rousseau* v. *R.*, [1985] 2 S.C.R. 38, ("Quebec") (the appeal by Rousseau was allowed and the appeal by the Crown was dismissed).

⁴ The following cases have been classified as "Other": Rosen v. R., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 83, (the appeal was allowed in part); Montreal (City of) v. Arcade Amusements Inc., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 368, (two appeals were joined: one appeal was dismissed and the other was allowed in part); and Krug v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 255, (the appeal was allowed in part).

1992]

TABLE III¹ SUBJECT MATTER OF LITIGATION²

This table indicates, first, the breakdown by subject matter of the reported cases; second, the number of cases decided by a given majority/dissent ratio within a given subject matter; and third, the number of "Appellate" cases in which the Supreme Court affirmed, reversed, or took other action with respect to the decision of the court immediately below.

	Number of Cases Reported	Majority Dissent Ratio		Reversed	Other
ORIGINAL JURISDICTION					
References	2	1-7:0 1-5:0			1 ³ 1 ⁴
Reported Motions APPELLATE (a) PRIVATE (Common Law & Civil Li (i) Adminstration & Succession Dependent's Relief Devolution Executors & Administrators Wills (ii) Commercial Accounts Agency & Partnership	aw)				
Assignments Bankruptcy Banks & Banking Bills & Notes Companies	3	2-7:0 1-6:0	1 0	1 1	0 0
Debtor & Creditor Guarantees & Sureties	3	1-7:0 3-6:0 ⁵ 1-3:2	1 2 1	0 1 0	0 0 0
Insurance Interest Sale of Goods (iii) <i>Family Law</i> Adoption	1	3-6:0 ⁵	0	0	1
Child Welfare, Custody & Acc Divorce	ess 1	1-6:0	1	0	0

		Number of Cases Reported	Majority/ Dissent Ratio	Affirmed	Reversed	Other
	Judicial Separation Maintenance & Support Matrimonial Property Family Law - Other	1 1	1-7:0 1-6:3	1 0	0 1	0 0
(iv)	Intellectual Property Copyrights Industrial Designs Patents Trademarks Intellectual Property - Other					
(v)	Land Hypothecs & Mortgages Landlord & Tenant Construction & Mechanics' Lie					
(vi)	Real Property <i>Torts</i> Assault & Battery Bailment Conspiracy & Intimidation Conversion & Detinue False Imprisonment Libel & Slander	2	2-7:0	2	0	0
	Negligence Nuisance Occupiers' Liability Trespass Vicarious Liability	2	1-7:0 3-6:0 ⁵	1 0	0 0	0 1
(vii)	Other Associations Barristers & Solicitors Charities Choses in Action Conflict of Laws					
	Damages Maritime, Admiralty & Shipping Master & Servant Natural Resources Pensions	1 9	1-4:0	1	0	0
	Privilege Trusts & Trustees Unjust Enrichment & Restitution	1 on	1-7:0	0	0	16

.

			Number of Cases Reported	Majority/ Dissent Ratio	Affirmed	Reversed	Other
(b)	F I F I M II F III S III S III S III S III M	ATE (Civil Law) Preliminary Title Persons & Moral Persons Marriage, Separation & Divorc Property Dismemberments of Property Succession & Liberalities Dbligations Proof Sale, Exchange & Lease Mandate, Partnerships & Sure Pledges, Privileges & Hypothe	1 tyships	1-7:0	1	0	0
	III M IV C	Registration & Prescription Ainor Nominate Contracts Commercial Law & Insurance Civil Law - Other	1	1-6:0 1-7:0	0 1	1 0	0
(c)	PUBL		3	1-7:0	0	1	0
		nistrative Boards	5	2-5:0 4-7:0 1-6:0	2 2 0	0 2 1	0 0 0
	Asses Certio Charte		18	2-9:0 2-8:0 1-6:2 3-7:0 1-6:1	2 0 1 2 0	0 2 0 1	0 0 0 1 ⁷ 0
	Civil F	Rights	4	3-6:0 1-9:0 1-7:0 1-5:2 1-5:0	1 1 0 1	2 0 1 0	0 0 0 0
	Comb Comn	ines nunications					
	Const	itutional	6	1-7:0 1-6:1 3-6:0 1-5:0	1 0 1 1	0 1 1 0	0 0 1 ⁸ 0

OSGOODE HALL LAW JOURNAL

[VOL. 30 NO. 4

		Number of Cases Reported	Majority/ Dissent Ratio		Reversed	Other
	Criminal	28	1-9:0	1	0	0
			1-5:4	0	1	0
			1-6:2	1	0	0
			23-7:06	14	7	26,7
			1-4:3	1	0	0
			1-6:0	0	1	0
			1-5:0	1	0	0
	Crown & Sovereign Immunity	1	1-7:2	0	1	0
	Elections					
	Environmental		4 7.0		0	•
	Expropriation	1	1-7:0	1	0	0
	Extradition	` a	0 7.0		~	•
	Habeas Corpus	3	3-7:0	1	2	0
	Human Rights Immigration	1	1-6:0	0	1	0
	International	1	1-0:0	U	1	U
	Judicial Review					
	Labour	5	1-9:0	1	0	0
	Labour	5	3-7:0	2	1	0
			1-6:0	0	1	Ő
	Mandamus	2	1-6:0	1	0	ŏ
	Mandanus	2	1-5:0	0	1	ŏ
	Municipal & Planning	3	1-7:0	õ	1	ŏ
	indinoipal a Flainning	Ũ	1-6:0	õ	0	18
			1-5:0	õ	1	0
	Prohibition Public Utilities Securities		1 0.0	Ū	·	U
	Statutory Interpretation	2	1-9:0	1	0	0
			1-6:0	0	1	0
	Taxation	3	1-7:0	1	0	0
			1-4:3	0	1	0
			1-6:0	0	1	0
	Transportation					
	Unemployment	1	1-7:0	0	1	0
(d)	PROCEDURAL					
	Appeal	7	6-7:0 ⁶	1	5	0
			1-6:0	0	1	Ō
			1-5:0	1	0	Ō

.

•

	Number of Cases Reported	Majority/ Dissent Ratio	Affirmed R	eversed	Other
Costs					
Declaratory Action					
Evidence	9	3-9:0	3	0	0
		5-7:0	3	2	0
		1-6:1	0	1	0
Injunctions	2	2-6:0	0	2	0
Jurisdictions	10	1-9:0	1	0	0
		8-7:0	5	3	0
		1-6:0	1	0	0
Limitation Period	1	1-5:0	0	1	0
Procedural - Other					
Procedure	3	1-7:0	1	0	0
		1-6:0	1	0	0
		1-5:0	0	1	0
Res Judicata	1	1-5:4	0	1	0
Standing					

¹ A decision involving one or more appeals (including cross-appeals), motions, or references is considered to be one case for the purposes of this table unless the results differ with respect to affirmation or reversal, or the vote or composition of majority or minority varies among the appeals, motions, or references.

Multiple entries are made if a case involves more than one subject matter of importance. Appeals from decisions on references brought before lower courts are classified according to subject matter under "Appellate."

² The following cases have been included under two or more categories: Aetna Financial Services Ltd. v. Feigelman, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 2, ("Injunction" and "Appeal"); Rosen v. R, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 83, ("Criminal" and "Trusts & Trustees"); Skoke-Graham v. R., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 106, ("Criminal," "Constitutional," and "Statutory Interpretation"); Singh v. Canada (Minister of Employment and Immigration), [1985] 1 S.C.R. 177, ("Charter" and "Immigration"); V.K. Mason Construction Ltd. v. Bank of Nova Scotia, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 271, ("Contract," "Negligence," and "Interest"); R. v. Big M Drug Mart Ltd., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 295, ("Charter" and "Constitutional"); Plantation Indoor Plants Ltd. v. Alberta (A.G.), [1985] 1 S.C.R. 366, ("Charter" and "Injunction"); Montreal (City of) v. Arcade Amusements Inc., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 368, ("Municipal" and "Constitutional"); Staranchuk v. R., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 439, ("Charter" and "Evidence"); Operation Dismantle Inc. v. R, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 441, ("Charter," "Jurisdictions," and "Procedure"); Towne Cinema Theatres Ltd. v. R., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 494, ("Criminal" and "Evidence"); British Columbia v. Tener, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 533, ("Expropriation" and "Real Property"); Bell v. R., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 594, ("Evidence" and "Jurisdictions"); Syndicat des professeurs du collège de Lévis-Lauzon v. C.E.G.E.P. de Lévis-Lauzon, [1985] 1S.C.R. 596, ("Labour" and "Administrative Boards"); R. v. Therens, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 613, ("Charter" and "Criminal"); Deloitte Haskins and Sells Ltd. v. Workers' Compensation Board, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 785, ("Constitutional" and "Bankruptcy"); Grdic v. R., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 810,

("Criminal" and "Res Judicata"); Lamb v. Lamb, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 851, ("Constitutional" and "Maintenance & Support"); Rousseau v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 38, ("Criminal" and "Appeal"); Fraternité des policiers de la Communauté urbaine de Montréal Inc. v. Communauté urbaine de Montréal, [1985] 2 S.C.R. 74, ("Labour" and "Administrative Boards"); R. v. Jewitt, [1985] 2 S.C.R. 128, ("Criminal," "Jurisdictions," and "Appeal"); Winnipeg School Division No. 1 v. Craton, [1985] 2 S.C.R. 150, ("Civil Rights" and "Statutory Interpretation"); Oakwood Development Ltd. v. St. François Xavier (Rural Municipality of), [1985] 2 S.C.R. 164, ("Mandamus" and "Municipal & Planning"); Libman v. R., [1985] 2S.C.R. 178, ("Criminal" and "Jurisdictions"); Fanjoy v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 233, ("Criminal" and "Appeal"); Spencer v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 278, ("Evidence" and "Charter"); Dick v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 309, ("Aboriginal Rights," "Constitutional," and "Appeal"); Jack v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 332, ("Aboriginal Rights," "Civil Rights," and "Criminal"); Dubois v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 350, ("Charter" and "Evidence"); Vachon v. Canada (Employment and Immigration Commission), [1985] 2 S.C.R. 417, ("Bankruptcy" and "Unemployment"); Grabowski v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 434, ("Criminal" and "Evidence"); John v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 476, ("Appeal," "Criminal," and "Evidence"); Reference Re Section 94(2) of the Motor Vehicle Act. R.S.B.C. 1979, [1985] 2 S.C.R. 486, ("Criminal" and "Charter"); Schuldt v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 592, ("Appeal" and "Criminal"); R. v. Miller, [1985] 2 S.C.R. 613, ("Habeas Corpus," "Jurisdictions," and "Evidence"); Cardinal v. Director of Kent Institution, [1985] 2 S.C.R. 643, ("Administrative Boards," "Habeas Corpus," and "Jurisdictions"); Morin v. National Special Handling Unit Review Committee, [1985] 2 S.C.R. 662, ("Habeas Corpus" and "Jurisdictions"); and Valente v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 673, ("Charter" and "Jurisdictions").

³ In Reference Re Section 23 of the Manitoba Act, 1870, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 721, the Court answered four constitutional questions.

⁴ In Order: Manitoba Language Rights, [1985] 2 S.C.R. 347, the Court made an order to give effect to a consent agreement pursuant to Reference Re Section 23 of the Manitoba Act, 1870, ibid.

⁵ In V.K. Mason Construction Ltd. v. Bank of Nova Scotia, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 271, two appeals were joined: the appeal of the Bank of Nova Scotia was dismissed, the cross-appeal of V.K. Mason Construction Ltd. was allowed, and the appeal of V.K. Mason was dismissed.

⁶ In Rosen v. R., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 83, the appeal was allowed in part.

⁷ In Krug v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 255, the appeal was allowed in part.

⁸ In Montreal (City of) v. Arcade Amusements Inc., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 368, two appeals were joined: one appeal was dismissed and the other was allowed in part.

⁹ In Rousseau v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 38, the appeal by Rousseau was allowed and the appeal by the Crown was dismissed.

 TABLE IV1

 MAJORITY/DISSENT RATIO

Total Nu	umber of Cases Rep	orted	84
Unanim	ous Decisions	•••••	74
Split De	cisions		10
9:0 6	8:0 2	7:0 47	6:0 12
8:1 0	7:1 0	6:1 2	5:1 0
7:2 1	6:2 1	5:2 1	4:2 0
6:3 1	5:3 0	4:3 2	3:3 0
5:4 1	4:4 0		
5:0 6	4:0 1	3:0 0	1:0 0
4:1 0	3:1 0	2:1 0	
3:2 1	2:2 0		

¹ Both "Original Jurisdiction" and "Appellate" decisions are included in this table. A decision involving one or more appeals (including cross-appeals), motions, or references is considered to be one case for the purposes of this table unless the composition of majority and minority varies among the appeals, motions, or references. If the ratios differ, they will be included in this table but not in the "Total Number of Cases Reported." Dissenting judgments include dissents in part.

.

•	Common Law	Civil Law	Constitutional	Criminal	Other Public Law	Reported Motions
Beetz	10	3	17	22	28	0
Chouinard	11	2	17	24	25	0
Dickson	13	2	20	27	25	0
Estey	11	1	15	16	24	0
La Forest	4	1	4	8	8	0
Lamer	8	3	16	24	23	0
Le Dain	4	3	10	21	16	0
McIntyre	12	1	20	26	29	0
Wilson	12	3	18	23	26	0

TABLE V¹ TYPE OF WORK

¹ Both "Original Jurisdiction" and "Appellate" decisions are included in this table. A decision involving one or more appeals (including cross-appeals), motions, or references is considered to be one case for the purposes of this table. Procedural cases and references are classifed according to their underlying subject matter. Cases involving multiple subject matters may be classified under one or more of "Common Law," "Civil Law," "Constitutional," "Criminal," or "Other Public Law."

ACTION OF THE JUSTICES **TABLE VI**

This table indicates, first, the number of cases on which a justice sat; second, the number of cases in which a justice wrote the dissenting judgment of anther justice in two cases. Further, he participated in fourteen unattributed judgments of "The Чe a judgment (whether "Majority" or "Dissent"); and third, the number of cases in which a justice did not write a judgment and judgments and no dissenting judgments. He concurred with the majority judgment of another justice forty-eight times and with concurred with the judgment of another justice. For example, Beetz J. sat on seventy-one cases and wrote seven majority Court," and concurred with the majority judgment of Chouinard J. eight times, Dickson C.J. eleven times, and so on. concurred with the dissenting judgments of Dickson C.J. and Wilson J. once each

Concurrences with Another Justice	Beetz Chouinard Dickson Eatey Lamer Lamer	8 11 8 2 6 5 5 0 0 5 1	5 5 13 8 4 7 0 1 0 0 0 0	40 00 00 00 00 00
	The The ncurrences Court	48 2	50 11 2	41 15
	Number of Cases Judgments Concurrences	20	80	ΰά
	Numbe	-	ard 71 onity sent	ority 77 sent
		Beetz Majority Dissent	Chouinard Majority Dissent	Dickson Majority Dissent

1992]

OSGOODE HALL LAW JOURNAL

					Concu	Irrence	s with	Concurrences with Another Justice	r Justic	9			
	Number of Cases	Judgments	Judgments Concurrences	The Court	zteea	Chouinard	Dickson	Estey	La Forest	Lamer	· nisG eJ	McIntyre	nosliW
Estey Majority Dissent	58	ወል	35 0	12	70	40	ဖဝ		-0	40	оù	90	00
La Forest Majonity Dissent	28	Ω 	13 0	თ	00	-0	r0	00		-0	00	00	00
Lamer Majonity Dissent	20	00	44 4	12	00	90	4-		80		90	 ∞	ب دی
Le Dain Majonity Dissent	55	~-	34 0	13	00	90	60	80	80	r0		ыO	-0
McIntyre Majority Dissent	11	ជ័ល	47 1	14	90	ыO	5 0	o	40	90	90 ,		6 ۲
Wilson Majority Dissent	73	ដូល	42	14	m 0	40	ño	40	4-	ωO	40	-+ α	

In John v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 476, Dickson C.J. and Beetz, Chouinard, Le Dain, and McIntyre JJ. concurred with both Lamer and Estey JJ.

TABLE VII¹ SUCCESS RATE OF CHARTER CLAIMANTS²

-	Number	Per cent
Charter Claimant Wins	8	66.7
Charter Claimant Loses	3	25.0
Other ³	1	8.3
Total	12	100.0

1 "Claimant Wins" includes cases in which both the *Charter* claim and the disposition are successful. "Claimant Loses" includes cases in which both the *Charter* claim and the disposition are unsuccessful. "Other" includes cases in which the claimant wins the *Charter* argument but loses the disposition on other grounds, or the claimant loses the *Charter* argument but wins on other grounds.

² Staranchuk v. R., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 439, has not been included in the tables because the *Charter* was not applied or considered in the judgment.

³ In Krug v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 255, the claimant won in part but not on the basis of the Charter.

		Number	Per cent	Success Rate (%)
Legislation:1	Federal	4	33.3	75
	Provincial	1	8.3	100
	Territorial			
	Municipal			•
Administrative	Decisions			
	Rules			
Conduct or De of Public Off		7	58.3	57
Common Law	_			

 TABLE VIII

 OBJECT OF CHARTER LITIGATION

1 "Legislation" includes subordinate legislation, orders in council, and regulations. If the legislation expressly or by necessary implication authorizes the limitation of the *Charter* right or freedom, it will fall under "Legislation." If the legislation confers a broad discretion, it will be classified as an "Administrative Decision" or "Administrative Rule."

TABLE IX CHARTER LITIGATION BY SOURCE

Source	# of Cases	% of Cases		er Decisio Reversed			Claima Loses	
Alberta	4	33.3	1	1	21	4		
British Columbia	1	8.3	1			1		
Manitoba								
New Brunswick								
Newfoundland	1	8.3		1		1		
Nova Scotia								
Ontario	3	25.0	2		12		2	12
P.E.I.								
Quebec								
Saskatchewan	1	8.3	1			1		
N.W.T. and Yukon				-				
Federal Court	2	16.7	1	1		1	1	
Federal Reference								
Total	12	100.0	6	3	3	8	3	1

¹ In Rahn v. R., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 659 and *Dubois* v. R., [1985] 2 S.C.R. 350, new trials were ordered.

² In Krug. v. R., supra Table VII ([1985] S.C.R. Charter Tables), note 3, the lower decision was reversed in part and affirmed in part.

-

Section	# of Cases		laimant Loses (Other	Righ Freed Limited	iom	Saves	ction 1 Doesn't Save C	
2. Fundamental Freedoms									
(a) Conscience	2	2			2			2	
Religion	2	2			2			2	
(b) Thought, Belief & opinion,									
Expression, Press & other									
(c) Peaceful assembly									
(d) Association s. 2 SUBTOTAL	2	2			•			•	
3 5. Democratic Rights	2	2			2			2	
6. Mobility Rights									
Legal Rights									
7. General (non-distinguished)									
Life	1		1			1			
Liberty	3	1	2		1	2		1	
Security of person	4	2	2		2	2		2	
Principles of fund. justice	1			1		1		_	
s. 7 SUBTOTAL	5	2	2	1	2	3		2	
8. Search or seizure									
9. Detention or imprisonment									
10. Arrest or Detention									
(a) Informed promptly of reaso	ns								
(b) Retain & instruct counsel	3	3			3				
(c) Habeas corpus									
11. Criminal & Penal Matters									
(a) Informed of offence									
(b) Tried within reasonable tim	е								
(c) Compelled to be a witness						_			
(d) Presumption of innocence,	1		1			1			
Fair public hearing,									
Independent impartial tribu						4			
s. 11(d) SUBTOTAL (e) Reasonable bail	1		1			1			
(f) Trial by jury									
(g) Time of act or omission									
(9) time of act of offission									

TABLE X¹ SUBJECT OF CHARTER LITIGATION

.

1992]

Section	# of Cases	Claimant Wins Loses Other	Right or Freedom Limited Not Ltd	Section 1 Saves Doesn't Limit Save Other
(h) Double jeopardy				
(i) Benefit of lesser punishme	nt			
12. Treatment or Punishment				
13. Self-incrimination	1	1	1	
14. Interpreter				
15. Equality Rights				
(1) Race				
National or ethnic origin				
Colour				
Religion				
Sex				
Age				
Mental or physical disability	y			
Aboriginal peoples				
Other				
s. 15(1) SUBTOTAL				
(2) Affirmative action				
16 22. Official Languages				
23. Minority Language				
Educational Rights				
24(1) Enforcement	1	1	1	
(2) Exclusion of Evidence				
25. Aboriginal Rights				
26. Other Rights & Freedoms				
27. Multicultural heritage				
28. Rights guaranteed equally				
29. Rights respecting schools				
30. Application to Territories				
31. Legislative powers	1	1	1	
32. Application of <i>Charter</i>33. Exception	I	i	i	

¹ The categories of analysis in this table are as follows: the number of times a particular section or subsection was considered; the number of cases in which the claimant wins or loses; the number of cases decided otherwise; the number of decisions in which the *Charter* right or freedom was found to be limited or not limited; and the number of decisions in which the limit was saved or not saved by section 1, or was decided on another basis.

894

ACTION OF THE JUSTICES **TABLE XI**

				-		-	Concurrences with Another Justice	Lence	es with	א Anol	her Jı	Istice			
Justice	# of Cases	Judç Vritte Court	Judgments Written for the Court Maj Diss	Judgments Co-Written Concurrences for the with the Court Maj Diss Court Maj Diss	Concı w Court	Concurrences with the Court Maj Diss	ztəəB	Chouinard	Dickson	Estey	La Forest	ramer	Le Dain	McIntyre	nosliW
													:		
Beetz	6		÷	N	2	4			÷				-	-	
Chouinard	÷			5	ო	9			2		2	2	-	-	
Dickson ^I	12		N	0	ო	ы					2	ო	2	÷	
Estey	6		2	0	0	ო	-		-		-	-	-		
La Forest	01	-	-												
Lamer	42		ი	ଷ	ო	4			N		2		-		
Le Dain	7	-		ଷ		ო					-	2			
McIntyre	12	-	1	0	2	4	-	2			ณ		-		
Wilson	11		4	2	2	ო				-	2	* ***		*	

¹ In R. v. Therens, [1985] 1 S.C.R. 613, Dickson C.J. wrote a brief judgment concurring with both Le Dain J. (in finding a limit on the section 10(b) right and finding that section 1 did not apply in this case) and Lamer J. (in excluding the evidence under section 24(2)). Since Dickson C.J. did not qualify his concurrence but repeated the reasons delivered by Le Dain and Lamer JJ, he has been noted twice under "Concurrences with Another Justice" and not under "Judgments Written."

	Majo Judgment	rity Concurs	Mino Judgment		Support	Section 1
	For	With	For	With	For	lit ave
Justice	Claimant Gov't Other	Claimant Gov't Other	Claimant Gov't Other	Claimant Gov't Other	Claimant Gov't Other	Saves Limit Doesn't Save Other
Beetz ²	2 1	42			621	3
Chouinard	2	531			731	2
Dickson	31	521			831	4
Estey	31	122			4 3 2	
La Forest	11				11	
Lamer	5	331			831	4
Le Dain	21	21	1		4 3	1
McIntyre	4	132	2		552	3
Wilson	51	311			821	4

TABLE XII^I VOTING BEHAVIOUR OF JUSTICES

1 "Support for Claimant" is the sum of those judgments and concurences decided in favour of the claimant's *Charter* argument, regardless of the disposition. "Support for Government" is the sum of those judgments and concurrences decided in favour of the government's *Charter* arguments, regardless of the disposition. "Section 1" notes the number of times a justice pronounces on section 1 for each constitutional issue. Therefore, a case can be counted twice if there are multiple issues.

² In Singh v. Canada (Minister of Employment and Immigration), [1985] 1 S.C.R. 177, Beetz, Estey, and McIntyre JJ. decided the case using the *Bill of Rights* and not the *Charter*. For these Justices, this case has been noted under "Support For Other."

TABLE XIII
TYPE OF CHARTER CLAIMANTS

			Cla	aima	ant			tervene			
	# of Case	% of s Cases	Wins	Loses	Other	# of	Cl'nt	For 6 # of Cases	Gov't	# of	Both Cl'nt Wins
Business											
Corporation	s 2	17	2					1			
Individuals	8	67	5	2	1	1	1	2	1		
Interest											
Groups ¹	1	8		1							
Unions ¹	1	8		1							
Other ²	1	8	1							1	1

1 R. v. Operation Dismantle Inc., [1985] 1 S.C.R. 441, has been included under both "Unions" and "Interest Groups."

² In *Reference Re Section 94(2) Motor Vehicle Act, R.S.B.C. 1979*, [1985] 2 S.C.R. 486, the constitutional reference was introduced by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of British Columbia.

٠

TABLE XIVMAJORITY/DISSENT RATIO

	animous Decisions it Decisions		
9:0	8:0 2	7:0 3	6:0 4
8:1	0 7:1 0	6:1 1	5:1 0
7:2) 6:2 1	5:2 0	4:2 0
6:3	5:3 0	4:3 0	3:3 0
5:4 (9 4:4 0		
5:0 (0 4:0 0	3:0 0	1:0 0
4:1	0 3:1 0	2:1 0	
3:2	0 2:2 0		

Claimant -----— Section 24(2) – Wins Loses Other # of 24(2) Evidence Evidence Legal Rights Cases Used Excluded Admitted Other 7. General (non-distinguished) Life 1 1 Liberty 3 1 2 Security of person 4 2 2 Principles of fund. justice 1 0 8. Search or Seizure 9. Detention or Imprisonment 10. Arrest or Detention (a) Informed promptly of reasons (b) Retain & instruct counsel 3 3 3 З (c) Habeas corpus 11. Criminal & Penal Matters (a) Informed of offence (b) Tried within reasonable time (c) Compelled to be a witness (d) Presumption of innocence, 1 1 Fair public hearing, Independent impartial tribunal (e) Reasonable bail (f) Trial by jury (g) Time of act or omission (h) Double jeopardy (i) Benefit of lesser punishment 12. Treatment or Punishment 13. Self-incrimination 1 1 14. Interpreter

TABLE XV LEGAL RIGHTS AND SECTION 24(2)