



October 1974

[1972] S. C. R. Statistical Analysis

Jennifer K. Bankier

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

Article

Citation Information

Bankier, Jennifer K.. "[1972] S. C. R. Statistical Analysis." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 12.2 (1974) : 411-419.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60082/2817-5069.2241>

<https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/ohlj/vol12/iss2/7>

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.

[1972] S. C. R. Statistical Analysis

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF [1972] S.C.R.*

TABLES

1. Subject Matter of Litigation
2. Volume of Work
3. Provincial Breakdown
4. Action of Individual Judges
Type of Work
5. Cases and Majority Ratio
6. Action of the Justices

*Statistics compiled by Jennifer K. Bankier, B.A. (Toronto), a member of the 1974 graduating class, Osgoode Hall Law School.

TABLE I
SUBJECT MATTER OF LITIGATION

	Exchequer Court or Court of Appeal			No. of Judges Sitting
	No. of Cases Reported*	Affirmed*	Reversed*	
ORIGINAL JURISDICTION				
References				
Reported Motions	3			2.4x1 1.3x2
APPELLATE				
(a) PRIVATE				
(i) <i>Administration and Succession</i>				
Devolution				
Executors & Administrators				
Wills	2	1	1	2.5x0
(ii) <i>Commercial</i>				
Accounts				
Agency	1		1	1.5x0
Assignments				
Banks and Banking	2	2		1.5x0
Bills & Notes	1		1	1.4x1
Bankruptcy				
Companies				
Contract	2	2		2.5x0
Debtor & Creditor	1	1		1.5x0
Insurance	2	1	1	1.5x0 1.3x2
Interest				
Partnership	1		1	1.5x0
Sale of Goods	1	1	1	1.4x1
Subrogation				
(iii) <i>Domestic Relations</i>				
Adoption				
Annulment				
Breach of Promise				
Child Welfare				
Divorce				
Judicial Separation				
Support	1	1		1.3x2
(iv) <i>Industrial Property</i>				
Copyrights	1	1	1	1.5x0
Industrial Designs				
Patents	2	2	1	2.5x0
Trademarks				

	No. of Cases Reported*	Exchequer Court or Court of Appeal Affirmed*	Reversed*	No. of Judges Sitting
(v) <i>Land</i>				
Landlord & Tenant				
Mechanics Liens	1	1		1.4x1
Mortgages	1	1		1.5x0
Real Property	3	1	2	2.5x0 1.3x2
(vi) <i>Natural Resources</i>	2	1	1	1.5x0 1.3x2
(vii) <i>Torts</i>				
Assault & Battery				
Bailment				
Libel & Slander				
Negligence	11	6	5	6.5x0 1.4x1 4.3x2
Nuisance				
Occupier's Liability				
Vicarious Liability	2	1	1	2.5x0
(viii) <i>Other</i>				
Animals				
Associations				
Charities				
Choses in Action				
Conflicts				
Damages				
Privileges				
Shipping	1		1	1.5x0
Trusts	1		1	1.5x0
(b) PUBLIC				
Administrative Boards				
Certiorari	1		1	1.9x0
Civil Rights	3	2	1	2.9x0 1.6x3
Constitutional	2	1	1	2.9x0
Criminal	7	3	4	3.9x0 1.6x3 2.5x0 1.4x1
Crown & Sovereign Immunity				
Habeas Corpus				

	No. of Cases Reported*	Exchequer Court or Court of Appeal		No. of Judges Sitting
		Affirmed*	Reversed*	
Immigration	4	1	3	1.9x0 1.5x0 2.3x2
Labour	1	1		1.5x0
Mandamus				
Prohibition				
Public Utilities	1		1	1.5x4
Taxation	6	5	1	5.5x0 1.3x2
Expropriation	5		5	1.5x0 3.4x1 1.3x2
Elections				
Municipal Law	3		3	1.7x0 1.5x0 1.4x1

PROCEDURAL

Appeal	1	1		1.5x0
Costs				
Declaratory Action				
Evidence				
Injunction	1		1	1.5x4
Limitation Period	2		2	2.5x0
Jurisdiction	1		1	1.5x4
Procedure				

KEY

As an example of how this table operates look to the taxation classification and note:

- (1) Six Tax cases reported.
- (2) The lower courts were affirmed 5 times and reversed once.
- (3) Five cases were decided by a 5 to 0 majority, and one case 3 to 2.

*Multiple entries have been made where a case contained more than one subject matter of importance. Four cases were entered twice within the "PUBLIC" heading while one case was entered once under "PUBLIC" and once under "PROCEDURAL". One case was entered three times, i.e. once under "PUBLIC" and twice under "PROCEDURAL".

Three other cases were entered twice under a single subject matter because the results of appeal and cross-appeal were different with regard to affirmation and reversal.

Where one decision was handed down to cover two appeals or motions they are treated as one case.

TABLE II

VOLUME OF WORK

Reported Judgments ¹			TOTAL
Public	Private		
30	40		70
Reported Motions ¹			
Allowed	Dismissed	Other	
2	2	0	3
Unreported Judgments			
Allowed	Dismissed	Other ²	
3	44	3	50
Unreported Motions ³			
Allowed	Dismissed	Other ⁴	
51	112	3	161

¹ Where one judgment covers two appeals or motions one entry has been made except where the results of the appeals or motions are contradictory, in which case they are listed under both "Allowed" and "Dismissed" but only once under "Total". See, for example, *Hretchka v. A.G. B.C.*, [1972] S.C.R. 119.

² There was one unreported judgment where a new trial was ordered and two where the appeal was quashed and leave to appeal was refused.

³ All figures under this heading are derived from the [1972] *Bulletin of Proceedings Taken in the Supreme Court of Canada* because the entries in the [1972] S.C.R. are highly incomplete. It should be noted that motions entered under this heading may be reported in subsequent volumes of the Supreme Court Reports. For example, the three motions entered under "Reported Motions" in this table were heard in 1971 but were reported in the [1972] S.C.R.

Since the purpose of this table is to measure volume of work only one entry is made where two motions are argued on the same date by the same lawyers before the same judges (e.g. *Merck & Co. Inc. v. Sherman & Ulster Ltd.* and *Merck & Co. Ltd. v. S. & U. Co. Ltd.* are entered as one dismissal only), except where one of the simultaneous motions is affirmed and the other denied, in which case the rule in footnote one applies. Note the change from last year when such cases were entered twice under "Total".

When the same appeal gives rise to multiple motions that are heard by different judges the result of each motion is entered separately. An example is *Syndicat des Employés de Bureau de l'Hydro Québec v. Proc. Gen. de Québec* where the motion for leave to appeal was originally heard by a panel of three judges who referred it to the full court for decision, thus giving rise to one entry under "Other" and one under "Dismissed".

⁴ "Other" covers one motion where it was ruled that leave to appeal was not required, a second motion which was referred to the full court, and a third one which was withdrawn.

TABLE III

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN

	<u>PUBLIC</u>			<u>PRIVATE</u>			<u>TOTAL*</u>
	A	R	O	A	R	O	
Newfoundland	0	0		0	0		0
Nova Scotia	0	0		0	2		2
Prince Edward Island	0	0		0	0		0
New Brunswick	1	1		0	0		2
Quebec	2	2		7	2		13
Ontario	3	8		9	6		26
Manitoba	0	1		1	0		2
Saskatchewan	0	0		0	2		2
Alberta	0	2		2	3		7
British Columbia	2	2		2	2		8
Yukon	0	0		0	0		0
North West Territories	0	0		0	0		0
Exchequer Court	3	1		2	2		8
Federal Boards	1	2		0	0		3
Original			2			1	3
TOTAL	12	18	2	23	20	1	76

*Three private law decisions (Quebec, British Columbia, and Exchequer Court) were entered twice because the lower court was both affirmed and reversed in a case involving a cross appeal. One purely procedural case was entered under Quebec — public — affirmed and another under Alberta — private — reversed because the underlying subject matter was public and private respectively.

TABLE IV

ACTION OF INDIVIDUAL JUDGES

	<u>Majority</u>			<u>Dissent</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>
	J*	C	T	J*	C	T	
Fauteux	7	14	21	0	0	0	21
Abbott	7	23	30	1	2	3	33
Martland	13	30	43	1	2	3	46
Judson	7	38	45	2	4	6	51
Ritchie	14	32	46	2	2	4	50
Hall	11	38	49	2	3	5	54
Spence	6	42	48	4	1	5	53
Pigeon	7	28	35	6	2	8	43
Laskin	18	20	38	8	2	10	48

J—Judgment, either majority or dissenting

C—Concurred

T—Total

*In some cases more than one judge gave an opinion. "The leading judgment" terminology previously used in this table has been abandoned because of its vagueness and all reported judgments are now entered under "J".

TYPE OF WORK*

	<u>Common Law**</u>	<u>Civil Law**</u>	<u>Criminal***</u>	<u>Constitutional***</u>	<u>Other Public Law***</u>
Fauteux	0	8	6	2	8
Abbott	4	9	6	2	15
Martland	21	5	6	2	15
Judson	23	3	6	2	20
Ritchie	24	4	7	2	16
Hall	25	6	5	2	19
Spence	25	1	6	2	22
Pigeon	12	8	5	2	19
Laskin	26	1	4	5	18

*Procedural decisions are classified according to their underlying subject matter. For example, *Ace Holdings v. Montreal Catholic School Board*, [1972] S.C.R. 268, was classified in Table 1 as a procedural case. Since the procedural issue arose in an expropriation case, the appeal was entered under "Other Public" in this table.

**"Common Law" includes equity. Private cases based upon federal or provincial statutes are classified as common or civil law depending upon their province of origin.

***Three cases were entered twice in this table because their multiple subject matter made them fall into two categories. For example, *Curr v. The Queen*, [1972] S.C.R. 889 is both a civil rights and a criminal law appeal, and is classified under both "Criminal" and "Other Public".

TABLE V

CASES AND MAJORITY RATIO

Total Number of Cases Reported				73
Unanimous Decisions				47
Split Decisions				26
9x0.....6	7x0.....1	5x0.....40	3x0.....0	
8x1.....0	6x1.....0	4x1.....11	2x1.....0	
7x2.....0	5x2.....0	3x2.....13		
6x3.....1	4x3.....0			
5x4.....1				

TABLE VI
ACTION OF THE JUSTICES*

	Fauteux	Abbott	Martland	Judson	Ritchie	Hall	Spence	Pigeon	Laskin
Fauteux									
MO	7								
C		6	1	0	3	0	2	1	2
DO	0								
C		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Abbott									
MO		7							
C	5		6	2	3	1	1	2	3
DO		1							
C	0		0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Martland									
MO			13						
C	3	3		5	6	4	4	1	4
DO			1						
C	0	1		0	1	0	0	0	0
Judson									
MO				7					
C	2	3	12		7	5	3	2	5
DO				2					
C	0	1	0		0	1	0	1	1
Ritchie									
MO					14				
C	4	1	6	6		6	4	1	4
DO					2				
C	0	1	0	0		0	1	0	0
Hall									
MO						11			
C	3	3	5	3	7		3	3	13
DO						2			
C	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	3
Spence									
MO							6		
C	0	1	7	4	9	8		3	10
DO							4		
C	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	1

	Fauteux	Abbott	Martland	Judson	Ritchie	Hall	Spence	Pigeon	Laskin
Pigeon									
MO								7	
C	2	5	1	3	5	4	3		5
DO								6	
C	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1
Laskin									
MO									18
C	0	1	7	1	2	8	1	0	
DO									8
C	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	

KEY

M—Majority

D—Dissent

O—Wrote Judgment

C—Concurred

As an example of how this table works, look to Judson and observe:

- (1) He delivered 7 majority judgments.
- (2) He concurred with Fauteux 2 times, Abbott 3 times, Martland 12 times, etc.
- (3) He wrote 2 dissenting judgments, and concurred once each with the dissenting judgments of Abbott, Hall, Pigeon and Laskin.

*The totals in this table are sometimes not in accord with those in Table IV because of different rules of classification reflecting the different purposes of the tables. In Table III a particular judge was only entered once for any given case. For example, if a judge concurred with more than one majority judgment (as Fauteux did in *Quebec Telephone v. Bell Telephone*, [1972] S.C.R. 182) he would be entered once under "C" in Table IV while in this table two concurrences would be indicated. (Pigeon and Laskin).

Where a judge in an opinion indicates approval of another judgment without officially adopting it as his own this is not treated as a concurrence.

