

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Preface to the Fourteenth Edition</i>	v
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi

Chapter 1. INTRODUCTION

1. SOURCES	1
(a) Common Law (Judge-made Law)	1
(i) Offence definition	1
<i>R. v. Sedley</i>	1
<i>Frey v. Fedoruk</i>	2
<i>The Criminal Code</i>	4
(ii) Doctrine of precedent	6
<i>R. v. Henry</i>	6
(b) Statute	10
(i) General principles of statutory interpretation	10
<i>Application under S. 83.28 of the Criminal Code, Re</i>	10
<i>R. v. Clark</i>	11
(ii) Bilingual interpretation	17
(iii) Strict construction	17
<i>R. v. Goulis</i>	18
<i>R. v. Paré</i>	19
<i>R. v. Mac</i>	22
(iv) Limits on the value of codification	23
(v) Truths of criminology	26
<i>Doob and Webster, Sentence Severity and Crime: Accepting the Null Hypothesis</i>	30
(c) Division of Powers under the Constitution Act 1867	34
<i>The Constitution Act, 1867</i>	34
<i>Reference re Firearms Act (Canada)</i>	35
(d) Charter of Rights and Freedoms	45
(i) Purposive approach	47
<i>Hunter v. Southam Inc.</i>	47
(ii) Section 7 and principles of fundamental justice	48
<i>Canadian Foundation for Children, Youth and the Law v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	49
<i>Bedford v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	59
<i>R. v. Safarzadeh-Markhali</i>	69
(iii) Oakes test for section 1	72
<i>R. v. Oakes</i>	72
<i>R. v. J. (K.R.)</i>	74
<i>Bedford v. Canada (Attorney General)</i>	79
2. PROCEDURAL OVERVIEW	81
(a) Procedural Classification of Offences	81

	(i) <i>Offences triable only on indictment</i>	81
	(ii) <i>Summary conviction offences</i>	82
	(iii) <i>Crown election offences (dual, hybrid)</i>	83
(b)	Presumption of Innocence	84
	(i) <i>Common law</i>	85
	<i>Woolmington v. D.P.P.</i>	85
	<i>Allen, Legal Duties and Other Essays in Jurisprudence</i>	91
	(ii) <i>Reasonable doubt</i>	92
	<i>R. v. Lifchus</i>	92
	<i>R. v. Starr</i>	94
	<i>R. v. S. (J.H.)</i>	96
	<i>R. v. Mullins-Johnson</i>	100
	(iii) <i>Section 11(d) of the Charter</i>	102
	<i>R. v. Oakes</i>	103
	<i>R. v. Downey</i>	108
	<i>Coughlan, Doubt Mountain and the Presumption of Innocence</i>	109
3.	ROLE OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN CANADIAN SOCIETY	112
	(a) Victims' Rights	112
	<i>Victims' Bill of Rights</i>	113
	(b) Scope	115
	Canadian Committee on Corrections, <i>Towards Unity: Criminal Justice and Corrections (Ouimet Report)</i>	115
	Law Reform Commission of Canada, <i>Report: Our Criminal Law</i>	116
	Adult Criminal Court Statistics, 2014/2015	116
	Indigenous Overrepresentation in the Criminal Justice System	117
	<i>R. v. Malmo-Levine</i>	118
	<i>R. v. Labaye</i>	125
	<i>R. v. Kouri</i>	125
4.	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF JUDGES AND LAWYERS ...	134
	(a) The Adversary System	134
	Coughlan, <i>The "Adversary System": Rhetoric or Reality?</i>	136
	Menkel-Meadow, <i>Portia in a Different Voice</i>	140
	Wilson, <i>Will Women Judges Really Make a Difference?</i>	145
	Law Reform Commission of Canada, <i>Aboriginal Peoples and Criminal Justice</i>	149
	Ross, <i>Dancing With a Ghost</i>	151
	Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, <i>Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future</i>	154
	<i>R. v. R.D.S.</i>	155
	(b) Ethical Obligations of Crown and Defence Counsel	162
	C.B.A., <i>Code of Professional Conduct</i>	163
	Cory, <i>The Inquiry Regarding Thomas Sophonow</i>	165

Luban, <i>The Adversary System Excuse</i>	167
Hazard, <i>Ethics in the Practice of Law</i>	169
Greenspan and Jonas, <i>The Case for the Defence</i>	170

Chapter 2. THE ACT REQUIREMENT (ACTUS REUS)

1. INTRODUCTION	177
Howard, <i>Criminal Law</i>	177
Stephen, <i>A History of the Criminal Law of England</i>	178
2. COMMISSION OF AN UNLAWFUL ACT	180
(a) Causing Disturbance in Public Place	180
<i>R. v. Lohnes</i>	180
(b) Vicarious Liability	187
<i>R. v. Burt</i>	187
(c) Possession Offences	192
<i>Marshall v. R.</i>	192
<i>R. v. Terrence</i>	196
<i>R. v. Morelli</i>	199
<i>R. v. Pham</i>	203
<i>R. v. Chalk</i>	210
(d) Consent Making Act Lawful	213
<i>R. v. Jobidon</i>	214
<i>R. v. Moquin</i>	227
<i>R. v. Cuerrier</i>	231
<i>R. v. Mabior</i>	237
<i>R. v. Hutchinson</i>	248
(e) De Minimis Non Curat Lex	253
<i>R. v. Kubassek</i>	253
3. OMISSIONS —LEGAL DUTIES TO ACT	258
(a) Moral and Legal Duties	258
<i>Buch v. Amory Mortgage Co.</i>	258
Ryan, <i>Criminal Responsibility for Omissions</i>	259
<i>Quebec Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms</i>	260
<i>French Penal Code</i>	261
(b) What is an Omission?	261
Holmes, <i>The Common Law</i>	261
<i>Fagan v. Commissioner of Metropolitan Police</i>	262
(c) How Do Legal Duties Arise?	265
<i>R. v. Miller</i>	265
<i>Moore v. R.</i>	268
<i>R. v. Thornton (Ont. C.A.)</i>	276
<i>Thornton v. R. (S.C.C.)</i>	280
<i>R. v. Browne</i>	280
<i>R. v. Peterson</i>	283

4.	VOLUNTARINESS	297
	(a) Defining Conduct That Is Not “Voluntary”	297
	<i>R. v. King</i>	297
	<i>Rabey v. R.</i>	297
	<i>R. v. Parks</i>	298
	<i>R. v. Stone</i>	298
	Cobb, <i>Foundations of Neuropsychiatry</i>	299
	(b) Why Have a Voluntary Requirement for the Actus Reus?	299
	Hart, <i>Acts of Will and Responsibility</i>	299
	Patient, <i>Some Remarks about the Element of Voluntariness in</i> <i>Offences of Absolute Liability</i>	301
	Holmes, <i>The Common Law</i>	302
	Packer, <i>The Limits of the Criminal Sanction</i>	302
	(c) Examples Not Associated with Mental Disorder	303
	<i>R. v. Lucki</i>	303
	<i>R. v. Wolfe</i>	304
	<i>R. v. Swaby</i>	305
	<i>R. v. Ryan</i>	307
	<i>Kilbride v. Lake</i>	309
5.	ACTING THROUGH INNOCENT AGENT	313
	<i>R. v. Michael</i>	313
6.	CAUSATION	315
	(a) Criminal Code	315
	<i>B.C. Electric Railway v. Loach</i>	316
	(b) Common Law	316
	<i>Smithers v. R.</i>	316
	<i>R. v. Harbottle</i>	323
	<i>R. v. Nette</i>	326
	<i>R. v. Talbot</i>	334
	(c) Charter	335
	<i>R. v. F. (D.L.)</i>	335
	(d) Cases of Intervening Cause	339
	<i>R. v. Smith</i>	339
	<i>R. v. Blaue</i>	342
	<i>The Queen v. Singapore</i>	345
	<i>R. v. Maybin</i>	347

Chapter 3. THE FAULT REQUIREMENT (MENS REA OR NEGLIGENCE)

1.	INTRODUCTION	359
	Stephen, <i>A History of the Criminal Law of England</i>	359
	Gilbert, <i>The Mikado</i>	360
	Mueller, <i>On Common Law Mens Rea</i>	360
	Williams, <i>Criminal Law: The General Part</i>	360

2.	SUBJECTIVE/OBJECTIVE DISTINCTION	361
	<i>R. v. Hundal</i>	362
	<i>R. v. Théroux</i>	363
	<i>R. v. Mulligan</i>	364
	<i>R. v. Ortt</i>	365
	<i>R. v. Walle</i>	366
3.	FAULT FOR PUBLIC WELFARE (REGULATORY) OFFENCES	367
	(a) Common Law	367
	<i>Beaver v. R.</i>	367
	<i>R. v. City of Sault Ste. Marie</i>	374
	<i>R. v. Wholesale Travel Group Inc</i>	383
	<i>R. v. Chapin</i>	391
	(b) Charter Standards	397
	Reference re. Section 94(2) of the Motor Vehicle Act (B.C.)	
	398
	<i>R. v. Wholesale Travel Group Inc</i>	406
	<i>R. v. Transport Robert, R. v. William Cameron Trucking</i>	413
	(c) Summary	421
	<i>R. v. Beauchamp</i>	422
4.	FAULT FOR CRIMES	424
	(a) Murder and the Charter	424
	(i) Murder under ss. 229(a)(i) and (ii)	424
	<i>Simpson v. R.</i>	424
	<i>R. v. Edelenbos</i>	427
	(ii) Constructive murder: ss. 229(c) and 230	431
	<i>Vaillancourt v. R.</i>	431
	<i>R. v. Martineau</i>	441
	<i>R. v. Shand</i>	453
	(iii) First degree murder: s. 231	460
	<i>R. v. Smith</i>	460
	<i>R. v. Nygaard and Schimmens</i>	465
	<i>R. v. Collins</i>	468
	<i>R. v. Arkell</i>	470
	(b) Subjective Awareness Guaranteed by Charter for Few Crimes	471
5.	THREE TYPES OF FAULT FOR CRIMES SINCE CREIGHTON	473
	(a) Crimes Requiring Subjective Awareness	473
	(i) Common law presumption	473
	<i>R. v. H. (A.D.)</i>	474
	(ii) Motive	478
	(iii) Desire/Purpose	480
	<i>R. v. Hibbert</i>	480
	(iv) Intention or knowledge	484
	<i>R. v. Buzzanga and Durocher</i>	485

	<i>R. v. Théroux</i>	494
	<i>R. v. Boulanger</i>	497
	(v) Recklessness or wilful blindness	499
	<i>Sansregret v. R.</i>	500
	<i>R. v. Briscoe</i>	504
	<i>R. v. Lagace</i>	505
	<i>R. v. Blondin</i>	506
(b)	Crimes of Objective Fault	509
	(i) Criminal negligence: s. 219	510
	<i>O'Grady v. Sparling</i>	510
	<i>R. v. Tutton and Tutton</i>	511
	<i>Waite v. R.</i>	523
	<i>R. v. Anderson</i>	524
	(ii) Marked departure test	528
	<i>R. v. Hundal</i>	528
	<i>R. v. Creighton</i>	532
	<i>R. v. Beatty</i>	541
	<i>R. v. F. (J.)</i>	553
(c)	Crimes Based on Predicate Offences	555
	<i>R. v. DeSousa</i>	556
	<i>R. v. Creighton</i>	564
	<i>R. v. Krushel</i>	573
6.	NORMATIVE THEORIES	579
	Fletcher, <i>Re-thinking Criminal Law</i>	579
	Fletcher, <i>The Theory of Criminal Negligence</i>	579
	Stalker, <i>Can George Fletcher Help Solve the Problem of Criminal Negligence?</i>	580
	Weiler, <i>R. v. Kundeus: The Saga of Two Ships Passing in the Night</i>	581
	Cairns Way, <i>The Charter, the Supreme Court and the Invisible Politics of Fault</i>	581
	Pickard and Goldman, <i>Dimensions of Criminal Law</i>	582
7.	GENERAL REVIEW QUESTIONS	582
 Chapter 4. RAPE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT		
1.	RAPE LAWS IN CONTEXT	589
	(a) Prior Sexual History	592
	(b) Doctrine of Recent Complaint	593
	(c) Corroboration	593
	Young, <i>When Titans Clash</i>	595
2.	DEFINITION OF THE CRIME OF RAPE	597
	<i>Criminal Code</i>	597
	<i>Pappajohn v. R.</i>	597
	Weiner, <i>Shifting the Communication Burden</i>	610

	<i>Sansregret v. R.</i>	611
	Manson, <i>Annotation</i>	619
3.	CRIMES OF SEXUAL ASSAULT (1983)	621
	House of Commons Debates	621
	<i>R. v. Chase</i>	622
	<i>R. v. Bulmer</i>	628
	<i>R. v. Davis</i>	633
	Estrich, <i>Teaching Rape Law</i>	636
	<i>R. v. Seaboyer; R. v. Gayme</i>	638
4.	PARLIAMENT'S RESPONSE TO SEABOYER (1992)	657
	(a) Rape Shield	657
	<i>Criminal Code</i> , s. 276	657
	<i>R. v. Darrach</i> (S.C.C.)	658
	(b) Consent	665
	<i>Criminal Code</i> , s. 273.1	665
	(c) Mistaken Belief in Consent	666
	<i>Criminal Code</i> , s. 273.2	666
	<i>R. v. Ewanchuk</i>	666
	<i>R. v. Cornejo</i>	681
	<i>R. v. A. (J.)</i>	689
	<i>R. v. Barton</i>	705
	Two Views on the Acquittal of Jian Ghomeshi	711
	Benedet, <i>Ghomeshi: Telling the Whole Truth Might Not Have</i> <i>Changed the Result</i>	711
	Stuart, <i>Ghomeshi: Dangers in Overreacting to this High-</i> <i>Profile Acquittal</i>	713
5.	CHARTER ARGUMENTS	715
	<i>R. v. Darrach</i> (Ont. C.A.)	717
6.	OTHER SUBSTANTIVE OPTIONS	721
	McKinnon, <i>Feminism, Marxism and the State: Towards</i> <i>Feminist Jurisprudence</i>	722
	Roiphe, <i>Rape Hype Betrays Feminism</i>	722

Chapter 5. MISTAKE

1.	MISTAKE OF FACT	725
	(a) General Principles	725
	(b) Charter Standards	725
	<i>R. v. Hess; R. v. Nguyen</i>	726
	(c) As to Nature of Offence	738
	<i>R. v. Ladue</i>	739
	<i>R. v. Kundeus</i>	741

2. MISTAKE OF LAW	747
(a) Policy Considerations	747
Holmes, <i>The Common Law</i>	748
Ryu and Silving, <i>Error Juris: A Comparative Study</i>	748
<i>R. v. Esop</i>	750
<i>R. v. Campbell and Mlynarchuk</i>	750
(b) Distinguishing Mistake of Law and Fact	756
<i>R. v. Prue, R. v. Baril</i>	756
<i>R. v. MacDonald</i>	760
(c) Colour of Right for Property Offences	762
<i>R. v. Dorosh</i>	763
(d) Officially Induced Error of Law	769
<i>Lévis (City) v. Tétreault</i>	769

Chapter 6. INCAPACITY

1. AGE	777
2. INSANITY (MENTAL DISORDER)	778
(a) Psychiatric Classification: Limited Truths	778
<i>Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders</i>	779
Szasz, <i>Psychiatry, Ethics and Criminal Law</i>	781
(b) Mental Disorder under Criminal Code	783
<i>U.S. v. Freeman</i>	784
<i>Cooper v. R.</i>	789
<i>Kjeldsen v. R.</i>	798
<i>R. v. Abbey</i>	799
<i>R. v. Chaulk</i>	802
<i>R. v. Campione</i>	803
(c) Mental Disorder Negating Mens Rea	806
3. AUTOMATISM	806
<i>R. v. Rabey (Ont. C.A.)</i>	806
<i>Rabey v. R. (S.C.C.)</i>	812
<i>R. v. Parks</i>	822
<i>R. v. Stone</i>	833
<i>R. v. Luedecke</i>	843
<i>R. v. Bouchard-Lebrun</i>	855
<i>R. v. Fontaine</i>	861
Premenstrual Syndrome	864
4. INTOXICATION	867
(a) Common Law	867
Beck and Parker, <i>The Intoxicated Offender</i>	867
<i>R. v. Bernard</i>	870
(b) Charter Standards	892
<i>R. v. Daviault</i>	892

Bill C-72	905
<i>R. v. Daley</i>	908
<i>R. v. Bouchard-Lebrun</i>	910
<i>R. v. Tatton</i>	913
Coughlan, <i>Bringing Clarity to the General/Specific Intent Distinction: R. v. Tatton</i>	919

Chapter 7. JUSTIFICATIONS AND EXCUSES

1. WHY ALLOW COMMON LAW DEFENCES?	927
Stephen, <i>The Nineteenth Century</i>	927
2. AIR OF REALITY FOR DEFENCES	929
<i>R. v. Cinous</i>	929
3. DEFENCE OF PERSON	933
New 2013 <i>Criminal Code</i> s. 34	933
<i>R. v. Lavallee</i>	935
<i>R. v. Malott</i>	945
<i>R. v. Cormier</i>	949
4. DEFENCE OF PROPERTY	957
New 2013 <i>Criminal Code</i> s. 35	957
<i>R. v. Cormier</i>	958
5. NECESSITY	959
<i>R. v. Dudley and Stevens</i>	959
<i>Perka v. R.</i>	963
<i>R. v. Latimer</i>	974
6. DURESS	986
(a) Section 17 and Common Law	986
<i>R. v. Carker (No. 2)</i>	986
<i>R. v. Paquette</i>	988
<i>R. v. Hibbert</i>	993
(b) Charter Standard of Moral Involuntariness	997
<i>R. v. Ruzic</i>	997
<i>R. v. Ryan</i>	1008
7. PARTIAL DEFENCES TO MURDER	1022
(a) Provocation	1022
<i>R. v. Hill</i>	1022
<i>R. v. Parent</i>	1032
<i>R. v. Tran</i>	1033
(b) Voluntary Intoxication	1050
(c) Cumulative Effect on Intent (rolled up charge)	1050
<i>R. v. Nealy</i>	1050

8. GENERAL REVIEW QUESTIONS	1054
9. ENTRAPMENT	1056
<i>R. v. Mack</i>	1056
<i>R. v. Barnes</i>	1066

Chapter 8. PARTIES TO A CRIME

1. CO-PRINCIPALS	1079
<i>R. v. Ball</i>	1079
2. AIDING AND ABETTING	1082
<i>Dunlop and Sylvester v. R.</i>	1082
<i>R. v. Laurencelle</i>	1089
<i>R. v. Briscoe</i>	1093
<i>R. v. Logan</i>	1096
<i>R. v. Gauthier</i>	1101
3. COUNSELLING	1103
4. ACCESSORY AFTER FACT	1104
<i>R. v. Duong</i>	1104
5. GENERAL REVIEW QUESTION	1108

Chapter 9. INCOMPLETE CRIMES

1. ATTEMPTS	1111
<i>R. v. Ancio</i>	1111
<i>R. v. Sorrell and Bondett</i>	1118
<i>R. v. Deutsch</i>	1124
<i>United States v. Dynar</i>	1130
2. CONSPIRACY	1135
<i>R. v. Celebrity Enterprises Ltd. (No. 2)</i>	1135
<i>R. v. Gralawicz</i>	1137
<i>R. v. Innocente</i>	1145
3. LIABILITY FOR OFFENCE NOT COMMITTED	1149
<i>R. c. Déry</i>	1149
<i>R. v. Hamilton</i>	1153

**Chapter 10. GROUP RESPONSIBILITY: CORPORATIONS,
CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS AND
TERRORIST GROUPS**

1.	CORPORATIONS	1167
	(a) Common Law	1167
	<i>Canadian Dredge and Dock Co. v. R.</i>	1167
	(b) Criminal Code Provisions for Organizations (2003)	1171
2.	CRIMINAL ORGANIZATIONS	1172
	(a) Biker Violence	1173
	(b) Participation in Criminal Organization (Gangsterism) (1997)	1173
	(c) Fiasco of Manitoba Warriors Trial	1176
	(d) Widening Gangsterism Laws (2001)	1177
3.	TERRORIST GROUPS	1181
	(a) 9/11 Attacks	1181
	(b) Definition of Terrorism	1182
	(c) Broad New Offences	1184
	(d) Three-Year Review	1186

Chapter 11. SENTENCING

1.	PRINCIPLES OF SENTENCING	1189
	<i>R. v. C.A.M.</i>	1189
2.	SENTENCING REFORM: REDUCED USE OF INCARCERATION	1193
	<i>R. v. Priest</i>	1193
	<i>R. v. Gladue</i>	1198
	Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, <i>Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future</i>	1201
	<i>R. v. Nur</i>	1204
	<i>R.v. Lloyd</i>	1205
3.	TOOLS OF SENTENCING	1207
	Discharges	1207
	Fines	1209
	Probation	1209
	Restitution	1211
	Community Service	1213
	Intermittent Sentence	1213
	Recognizance to Keep the Peace	1213
	Imprisonment	1214
	Conditional Sentences	1214
	<i>R. v. Proulx</i>	1214
	<i>Table of Cases</i>	1219