

**"Source: Department of Justice Canada, *Criminal law Review – Mental Disorder Project Discussion Paper*, September 1983. Reproduced with the permission of the Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 2007."**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|           |   | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------|---|-------------|
| Chapter 1 | INTRODUCTION  | 1           |
| Chapter 2 | PSYCHIATRIC REMANDS   | 13          |
|           | INTRODUCTION  | 15          |
| Issue 1   | For what purposes should "psychiatric remand" be sanctioned?  | 15          |
| Issue 2   | When should psychiatric remands be authorized?  | 19          |
| Issue 3   | Under what conditions should the remand take place?   | 21          |
| Issue 4   | Assuming that both custodial and non-custodial remands are authorized, on what basis should a choice between the two be made? | 21          |
| Issue 5   | What provision should be made with respect to the place to which persons may be remanded?                                     | 22          |
| Issue 6   | Should provision be made requiring notice of an application for psychiatric remand?   | 23          |
| Issue 7   | What should be the criteria for ordering a psychiatric remand?  | 23          |
| Issue 8   | What provision should be made with regard to consent for the purposes of psychiatric remand?                                  | 26          |
| Issue 9   | What provision should be made with regard to medical or other expert evidence in support of remand?                           | 27          |
| Issue 10  | Who should be permitted to seek the accused's remand?   | 29          |
| Issue 11  | What provisions should be made with regard to burden and standard of proof when the defence seeks remand?                     | 30          |
| Issue 12  | What provision should be made with regard to burden and standard of proof when the prosecution seeks remand?                  | 32          |

|                 |  | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------------|--|-------------|
| <b>Issue 13</b> | What should be authorized as far as the nature of the observation/examination/assessment is concerned?   | 33          |
| <b>Issue 14</b> | Assuming that examination/assessment is permitted, what provision should be made with regard to the persons authorized to conduct examination/assessment of the accused on remand? | 35          |
| <b>Issue 15</b> | Assuming that examination is permitted, what provision should be made with regard to the actual procedures that may be used?   | 37          |
| <b>Issue 16</b> | What provision should be made concerning the treatment of persons on remand?   | 38          |
| <b>Issue 17</b> | Assuming examination is permitted, what provision should be made with respect to the presence of counsel?  | 40          |
| <b>Issue 18</b> | Assuming examination is permitted, what provision (if any) should be made for the presence of a psychiatrist retained by the accused?  | 43          |
| <b>Issue 19</b> | What provision should be made with respect to the duration of remands?   | 44          |
| <b>Issue 20</b> | What provision should be made with respect to the number of remands allowed?   | 46          |
| <b>Issue 21</b> | What provision should be made with regard to the communication of psychiatric findings to the court following a "psychiatric remand?"  | 47          |
| <b>Issue 22</b> | What provision should be made with regard to the communication of findings to counsel following a "psychiatric remand?"  | 50          |
| <b>Issue 23</b> | What provision should be made with regard to the contents of mental status reports?  | 51          |
| <b>Issue 24</b> | What provision should be made with respect to informing the accused of the possible evidentiary consequences of psychiatric remand or examination in advance?                      | 52          |

|                  |  | <u>Page</u> |
|------------------|--|-------------|
| <b>Issue 25</b>  | What provision should be made regarding the consequences of the accused's failure to co-operate in examination?        | 53          |
| <b>Chapter 3</b> | <b>FITNESS TO STAND TRIAL</b>  | 57          |
|                  | <b>INTRODUCTION</b>  | 59          |
| <b>Issue 1</b>   | What provision should be made with respect to the test for fitness?  | 59          |
| <b>Issue 2</b>   | Who should be allowed to direct the issue of fitness to be tried?  | 63          |
| <b>Issue 3</b>   | Who should be permitted to raise the issue?  | 65          |
| <b>Issue 4</b>   | What provision should be made concerning notice prior to a trial of the issue of fitness?                              | 66          |
| <b>Issue 5</b>   | What provision should be made with respect to the grounds requiring the issue of fitness to be tried?                  | 67          |
| <b>Issue 6</b>   | What provision should be made with regard to the assignment of counsel?  | 70          |
| <b>Issue 7</b>   | What provision should be made with regard to the time at which trial of the issue should be directed?                  | 70          |
| <b>Issue 8</b>   | Who should try the fitness issue?  | 78          |
| <b>Issue 9</b>   | What provision should be made concerning the presence of the accused at the trial of a fitness issue?                  | 81          |
| <b>Issue 10</b>  | What provision should be made with respect to the amount of expert evidence (if any) required on the issue of fitness? | 82          |
| <b>Issue 11</b>  | What provision should be made with regard to burden of proof when the issue of fitness is raised at first instance?    | 85          |

|  | <u>Page</u>            |
|--|------------------------|
| <b>Issue 12</b> What provision should be made with regard to burden of proof when a person previously found unfit is returned for trial?   | 88                     |
| <b>Issue 13</b> What provision should be made with regard to standard of proof if and when the burden is on the defence to prove fitness?  | 90                     |
| <b>Issue 14</b> What provision should be made with regard to standard of proof if and when the burden is on the prosecution to prove fitness?  | 91                     |
| <b>Issue 15</b> What provision should be made with regard to standard of proof if and when the burden is on the defence to prove unfitness?  | 92                     |
| <b>Issue 16</b> What provision should be made with regard to the standard of proof if and when the burden is on the prosecution to prove unfitness?  | 93                     |
| <b>Chapter 4</b> <b>THE DEFENCE OF INSANITY</b>  | 95                     |
|  | <b>INTRODUCTION</b> 97 |
| <b>Issue 1</b> Should insanity ( <u>i.e.</u> , mental disorder in some form) be a separate defence in criminal law?  | 100                    |
| <b>Issue 2</b> Assuming there is to be a separate defence of insanity, what should the test for insanity be?   | 102                    |
| <b>Issue 3</b> Once insanity has been raised by the accused, should the accused be required to prove insanity, or should the prosecution be required to prove sanity? By what standard?      | 114                    |
| <b>Issue 4</b> Should the prosecution be allowed to lead evidence of the accused's insanity when the accused has not put his or her mental state in issue and does not want it put in issue? | 118                    |

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| <b>Issue 5</b> Assuming the prosecution is allowed to lead evidence of the accused's insanity, what standard of proof should the prosecution be required to satisfy?          | 122         |
| <b>Issue 6</b> Should psychiatric and psychological evidence be admissible in insanity cases?   | 123         |
| <b>Issue 7</b> What form of verdict should result from a finding of insanity?   | 130         |
| <b>Issue 8</b> Should the special verdict apply to both indictable and summary conviction offences?   | 137         |
| <b>Issue 9</b> Should provision be made for informing the jury of the consequences of an insanity verdict?  | 138         |
| <b>Issue 10</b> Assuming that the jury is to be told about the consequences of an insanity verdict, what provision should be made concerning the contents of the instruction? | 141         |
| <b>Issue 11</b> Assuming that the jury is to be told about the consequences of an insanity verdict, who should so instruct them?  | 142         |
| <b>Issue 12</b> Assuming that the jury may be told about the consequences of an insanity verdict, should a judicial instruction be mandatory or discretionary?                | 143         |
| <b>Chapter 5</b> <b>AUTOMATISM AND CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY</b>  | 145         |
| <b>INTRODUCTION</b>   | 147         |
| <b>Issue 1</b> Should automatism be a defence?  | 149         |
| <b>Issue 2</b> Assuming there is to be a defence of automatism in criminal law, how should it be defined?   | 150         |
| <b>Issue 3</b> Assuming there is to be a defence of automatism in criminal law, should the defence negate <u>actus reus</u> or <u>mens rea</u> , or both?                     | 151         |

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| <b>Issue 4</b> Assuming there is to be a defence of automatism in criminal law, what should be the relationship between that defence and the defence of insanity?   | 152         |
| <b>Issue 5</b> Assuming there is to be a defence of automatism in criminal law, what should be the relationship between it and the defence of intoxication?   | 155         |
| <b>Issue 6</b> Assuming there is to be a defence of automatism in criminal law, should that defence be available even where the state of automatism arose through the fault of the accused?               | 156         |
| <b>Issue 7</b> Assuming there is to be a defence of automatism in criminal law, what is the appropriate burden of proof to establish such a defence?  | 160         |
| <b>Issue 8</b> Assuming there is to be a defence of automatism in criminal law, what should be the result of a successful automatism defence?   | 160         |
| <b>Chapter 6 DISPOSITION AND CONTINUING REVIEW OF UNFIT AND INSANE ACCUSED PERSONS</b>  | 163         |
| <b>THE CRIMINAL COMMITMENT SYSTEM AS IT RELATES TO DISPOSITION</b>  | 165         |
| <b>INTRODUCTION</b>   | 165         |
| <b>Issue 1</b> Should provision be made in the <u>Criminal Code</u> for a system that allows for the rehabilitation of mentally disordered persons who have been found insane at the time of the offence? | 166         |
| <b>Issue 2</b> Should provision be made in the <u>Criminal Code</u> for a system that allows for the rehabilitation of mentally disordered persons who have been found unfit to stand trial?              | 168         |

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| <b>Issue 3</b> Assuming there is a separate system under the <u>Criminal Code</u> , should it apply to all insanity acquittees?                            | 170         |
| <b>Issue 4</b> Assuming there is a separate system under the <u>Criminal Code</u> , should it apply to all unfit accused persons?                          | 171         |
| <b>UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS RELATING TO A CRIMINAL COMMITMENT SYSTEM</b>   | 173         |
| <b>Issue 5</b> Should confinement of the insanity acquittee or unfit accused pending initial disposition be mandatory?                                     | 174         |
| <b>Issue 6</b> Assuming a range of options will be available for interim orders, what criteria should guide the court in selecting the appropriate option? | 178         |
| <b>Issue 7</b> How should the interim order decision be made?  | 179         |
| <b>INITIAL DISPOSITION</b>   | 180         |
| <b>Issue 8</b> What options should be available to the decision-maker on initial disposition?  | 180         |
| <b>Issue 9</b> What factors should be considered in deciding on initial disposition?   | 187         |
| <b>Issue 10</b> Who should make the initial disposition of insanity acquittees and unfit accused persons?  | 189         |
| <b>Issue 11</b> How many bodies should be involved in the initial disposition decision?  | 193         |
| <b>Issue 12</b> Should the decision-maker be required to hold a hearing prior to rendering a decision on initial disposition?                              | 194         |
| <b>Issue 13</b> Should the decision-making body be required to follow formalized procedures?   | 196         |
| <b>Issue 14</b> What provision should be made regarding procedural requirements relating to the initial disposition?                                       | 197         |

|                 | <u>Page</u>  |
|-----------------|--|
| <b>Issue 15</b> | What provision should be made regarding burden of proof at the interim order and/or initial disposition stage? 200   |
| <b>Issue 16</b> | Assuming there is to be a burden of proof at the interim order and/or initial disposition stage, what provision should be made with regard to the standard of proof? 202 |
| <b>Issue 17</b> | Should provisions be made for appeal from the initial disposition decision? 205  |
| <b>Issue 18</b> | Should the decision-maker be under a duty to render a decision regarding initial disposition within a specified period of time? 206                                      |
| <b>Issue 19</b> | What "investigative" powers should the decision-maker have? 208  |
| <b>REVIEWS</b>  | 208  |
|                 | <b>INTRODUCTION</b> 208  |
| <b>Issue 20</b> | Should there be periodic reviews of the initial disposition? 212   |
| <b>Issue 21</b> | Should periodic reviews be conducted by the same body that made the initial disposition decision? 213  |
| <b>Issue 22</b> | What body should conduct the review? 215   |
| <b>Issue 23</b> | Should more than one body be involved in the review process? 218   |
| <b>Issue 24</b> | Assuming the decision-maker on review is an administrative tribunal, how should the tribunal be established? 221   |
| <b>Issue 25</b> | Should the reviewing body be required to review all cases? 223   |
| <b>Issue 26</b> | What investigative powers should the reviewing body possess? 224   |

|                 |   | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------------|---|-------------|
| <b>Issue 27</b> | How frequently should periodic reviews be held?   | 228         |
|                 |   | 230         |
| <b>Issue 28</b> | What subsequent disposition options should be available to the reviewing body?  |             |
| <b>Issue 29</b> | What factors should be considered by the reviewing body in deciding on subsequent disposition?  | 233         |
| <b>Issue 30</b> | What factors should give rise to specific dispositions?   | 237         |
| <b>Issue 31</b> | What procedures should be followed by the reviewing body?   | 237         |
| <b>Issue 32</b> | Should there be parties to the review proceedings?  | 239         |
| <b>Issue 33</b> | If parties are designated, who should the parties be?   | 240         |
| <b>Issue 34</b> | Should the reviewing body be required to hold a hearing?  | 242         |
| <b>Issue 35</b> | Assuming a formal adversarial hearing is required, what procedural features should such hearing have?   | 245         |
| <b>Issue 36</b> | What provision should be made with regard to burden and standard of proof on review?  | 259         |
| <b>Issue 37</b> | What provision, if any, should be made concerning the maximum period for which an unfit accused person can be confined under the <u>Criminal Code</u> ? | 260         |
| <b>Issue 38</b> | What provision, if any, should be made with regard to the disposition of charges against an unfit accused?  | 262         |
| <b>Issue 39</b> | What provision, if any, should be made concerning the maximum period for which an insanity acquittee can be confined under the <u>Criminal Code</u> ?   | 265         |

|                  |   | <u>Page</u> |
|------------------|---|-------------|
| <b>Issue 40</b>  | What order should take precedence for "dual status" offenders, <u>i.e.</u> , persons under sentence and subject to a dispositional order as a result of having been found not guilty by reason of insanity or unfit to stand trial? | 265         |
| <b>Chapter 7</b> | <b>INTERPROVINCIAL TRANSFERS</b>  | 267         |
|                  | <b>INTRODUCTION</b>   | 269         |
| <b>Issue 1</b>   | What provision should be made with regard to the purposes for interprovincial transfers?  | 270         |
| <b>Issue 2</b>   | Should the consent of the receiving jurisdiction be required?   | 272         |
| <b>Issue 3</b>   | To what extent, if any, should the wishes of the prospective transferee be relevant?  | 273         |
| <b>Issue 4</b>   | What provision (if any) should be made regarding notice to an individual of any proposed transfer?  | 274         |
| <b>Issue 5</b>   | What provision (if any) should be made regarding the right to appeal or to challenge the transfer decision?   | 274         |
| <b>Issue 6</b>   | What should be the role of the sending and receiving provinces regarding subsequent decisions?  | 275         |
| <b>Issue 7</b>   | What provision, if any, should be made with regard to the return of transferees?  | 277         |
| <b>Issue 8</b>   | Should the cost of transfer and continued care and treatment be borne by the sending province or by the receiving province?   | 278         |
| <b>Issue 9</b>   | What provision should be made with regard to the return of an individual who has "eloped" from one province, and is apprehended in another province?  | 278         |

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| <b>Chapter 8 THE CONVICTED MENTALLY DISORDERED OFFENDER</b>   | 279         |
| <b>INTRODUCTION</b>   | 281         |
| <b>Issue 1</b> What provision should be made concerning the disposition of criminally responsible but mentally disordered offenders?                          | 283         |
| <b>Issue 2</b> What disposition should be made of an offender who has been sentenced to imprisonment and who is subsequently found to be mentally disordered? | 294         |
| <b>Issue 3</b> What provision should be made for periodic review of the detention of mentally disordered offenders transferred to mental health facilities?   | 302         |
| <b>Chapter 9 THE MENTALLY DISORDERED YOUNG OFFENDER</b>   | 305         |
| <b>INTRODUCTION</b>   | 307         |
| CURRENT STATUS OF JUVENILE JUSTICE LEGISLATION  | 307         |
| CURRENT PROVISIONS: THE JUVENILE DELINQUENTS ACT  | 308         |
| NEW PROVISIONS: THE YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT   | 310         |
| PHILOSOPHY OF THE YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT   | 312         |
| FUNDAMENTAL POLICY OPTIONS  | 317         |
| ISSUES  | 319         |
| CONCLUSION  | 321         |
| <b>APPENDICES</b>   | 323         |
| <b>APPENDIX I - References</b>  | 325         |
| Cases   | 326         |
| Books and Reports   | 328         |
| Articles and Papers   | 330         |

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| <b>APPENDIX II - Summary of American study</b>                                  | 333         |
| <b>APPENDIX III - Oregon Revised Statutes</b>                                   | 343         |
| <b>APPENDIX IV - Sections extracted from<br/>the <u>Criminal Code</u></b>       | 371         |
| <b>APPENDIX V - Sections extracted from<br/>the <u>Charter</u></b>              | 387         |
| <b>APPENDIX VI - Sections extracted from<br/>the <u>Young Offenders Act</u></b> | 389         |