

Osgoode Hall Law Journal

Volume 6, Number 1 (October 1968)

Article 3

October 1968

[1967] S. C. R. Statistical Analysis

Rene Mastin

Harvey Strosberg

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

Citation Information

Mastin, Rene and Strosberg, Harvey. "[1967] S. C. R. Statistical Analysis." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 6.1 (1968): 87-91.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.60082/2817-5069.2377

https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/ohlj/vol6/iss1/3

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.

[1967] S. C. R. Statistical Analysis	

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF [1967] S.C.R.*

TABLES

- I. Subject Matter of Litigation
- II. Provincial Breakdown
- III. Action of Individual Judges
 Type of Work
- IV. Cases and Majority Ratio
- V. Action of the Justices

TARLE I	SHRIECT	MATTER	OF	T.TTTCATTON

	Cases orted	Exchequer Court of App Affirmed Rev	eal	No. of Judges Sitting
Original Juris.				
Habeas Corpus				
References	1	1		1.8;1
Appellate				
(a) Private (i) Administration & Succession Devolution Executors & Administrators Wills	2	2		2.5;0
(ii) Commercial Accounts Agency Assignments				
Banks & Banking Bankruptey	1 1	1 1		1.5;0 1.5;0
Contracts	4	3	1	4.5;0
Debtor & Creditor Interest	2	2		2.5;0
PartnershipsSale of Goods	2	2		2.5;0
SubrogationSuretyship	1	1		1.5;0
(iii) Domestic Relations Adoption				

^{*} Statistics compiled by Rene Mastin and Harvey Strosberg, II year students at Osgoode Hall Law School.

	I	No. of Cases Reported	Exchequer Court of Affirmed	Appeal	No. of Judges Sitting
(iv)	Industrial Property Copyrights	 3	1	2	3.5;0
(v)	Land Landlord and Tenant Mechanics Liens Mortgages Real Property	1	1		1.5;0
(vi)	Natural Resources Mines & MineralsPetroleum & Natural G		1		1.5;0
(vii)	Tort Libel & Slander Negligence		1	1 4	1.4;0 2.5;0 2.4;1 1.3;2
	Occupier's Liability	******			·
(viii)	Other Animals		1 1 2		1.5;0 1.5;0 2.5;0
(b) P	ublic Administrative Boards CertiorariCombines				
	Constitutional	3	1	2	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 1.7;0\\ 2.4;1 \end{array} \right.$
	Criminal Law		7	4	10.5;0 1.5;0
	Habeas CorpusImmigration	*****	1		1.3;0
	Mandamus Municipal Corporations		2 1	3	2.5;0
	ProhibitionPublic Utilities	******	4	J	3.3;2 1.5;0
	Taxation	10	5	5	$\begin{cases} 8.5:0\\ 1.4:1 \end{cases}$
	Expropriation	4	1	3	1.3;2 3.5;0 1.3;2

	No. of Cases Reported	Exchequer Court or Court of Appeal Affirmed Reversed	No. of Judges Sitting
PROCEDURAL			
Appeal	••••••		
Costs			
Declaratory Action			
Evidence			
Injunction			
Judgments & Orders			
Jurisdiction			
Procedure	1	1	1.4;1

KEY

As an example of how this table operates look to the criminal classification

and note:

(1) 11 criminal cases reported.

(2) The Courts of Appeal were affirmed 7 times and reversed 4 times.

(3) One case was decided by a 3 to 0 majority, ten cases by a 5 to 0 majority.

TABLE II PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN

	Rep	orted	
	Public	Private	Total
Newfoundland			
Nova Scotia			
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND			
New Brunswick			
QUEBEC	1	1	2
ONTARIO	8	6	14
MANITOBA	$\frac{2}{2}$	3	5
Saskatchewan	2		Ž
Alberta	1	6	7
British Columbia	9	6	15
YUKON			
NORTH WEST TERRITORIES			
EXCHEQUER COURT	13	5	18
FEDERAL BOARDS			
ORIGINAL			
_		==	
TOTAL	36	27	63

TABLE III ACTION OF INDIVIDUAL JUDGES

	Majority				Disser	nt	
	J*	Č	T	J	C	${f T}$	Total
Taschereau	0	21	21	3	0	3	24
Cartwright	9	23	32	2	0	2	34
Fauteux	5	22	27	0	0	0	27
Abbott	6	21	27	1	3	4	31
Martland	7	38	45	3	0	3	48
Judson	15	22	37	3	2	5	42
Ritchie	12	33	45	0	0	0	45
Hall	10	17	27	0	3	3	30
Spence	6	39	45	2	0	2	47

J—Leading judgment or leading dissenting judgment. C—Concurred. T—Total.

^{* —}In a few cases, 2 or more judges gave leading opinions.

TYPE	OF	WORK

	Common Law	Civil Law	Criminal Law	Con- stitutional Law	Other Public Law
Taschereau Cartwright Fauteux Abbott Martland Judson Ritchie Hall Spence	14 6 11 15 12 15	4 1 4 2 0 1 1 3	10 4 9 5 8 7 9 7 5	1 2 1 1 2 2 2	17 14 5 8 19 20 16 13 18

TABLE IV	CASES	AND.	TAT A	JORITY	PATTO

		er of Cas decisions					
9×0		7×0	2	5 x 0	48	3 x 0	1
8 x 1	1			4×1	7	2×0	
				3×2	7		

TABLE V	TABLE V ACTION OF THE JUSTICES								
Taschereau	Spence	Hall	Ritchie	Judson	Martland	Abbott	Fauteux	Cartwright	Taschereau
Taschereau MO C DO C	1	3	4	6	1	2	3	1	3
Cartwright MO C DO C	3	3	5	7	3	1	0	9 2	0
Fauteux MO C DO C	0	3	6	4	1	4	5	5	0
Abbott MO C DO C	2	3	4	3 1	2	6 1	3	5 1 1	0
Martland MO C DO C	4	8	10	6	7 3	3	1	6	

	Spence	Hall	Ritchie	Judson	Martland	Abbott	Fauteux	Cartwright	Taschereau
Judson MO C DO C	1	5	2	15 3	6 3	0	3 .	5. 2	
Ritchie MO C DO C	5	6	12	7	5	3	2	4	
Hall MO C DO C		9 1	3	5	2	1 2	1	4	
Spence MO C DO C	6	5	7	12	4	2	4	6	

KEY

M-Majority

D-Dissent

O-Wrote Judgment

C-Concurred

As an example of how this table works look to Hall J. and one sees:

- (1) He delivered 9 majority judgments.
- (2) He concurred with Abbott J. once but wrote a substantial separate opinion.
- (3) He did not concur in any judgments delivered by Spence J. but did concur in 3 judgments of Ritchie J. etc.
- (4) He (dissented once) delivered one dissenting opinion.
- (5) He concurred in 3 dissenting opinions of Martland J.