

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Preface to Fourteenth Edition</i>	iii
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1. THE ADVERSARY SYSTEM.....	1
(a) Not a Scientific Inquiry	1
(b) Truth and Justice: Competing Goals?	3
<i>Imperial Oil v. Jacques</i>	5
Lisa Dufraimont, Evidence Law and the Jury	8
(c) The Role of the Trial Judge	10
<i>R. v. Samaniego</i>	10
<i>R. v. John</i>	13
<i>R. v. Lawes</i>	15
<i>R. v. Chouhan</i>	18
(d) The Role of Lawyers	21
<i>R. v. Felderhof</i>	22
<i>Groia v. Law Society of Upper Canada</i>	24
2. SOURCES	28
<i>R. v. Salituro</i>	28
3. CONTEXT MATTERS.....	31
(a) Relaxing the Rules of Evidence.....	31
<i>Québec v. Bombardier Inc.</i>	31
<i>Nassiah v. Peel Regional Police</i>	33
(b) Aboriginal Rights and Indigenous Traditions.....	37
<i>Delgamuukw v. British Columbia</i>	38
<i>Mitchell v. M.N.R.</i>	39
<i>Ignace v. B.C. A.G.</i>	41
Chapter 2 BURDENS OF PROOF	43
1. TERMINOLOGY	43
2. ALLOCATING AND MEASURING BURDENS OF PROOF	45
(a) Allocation of Burdens.....	45
(i) Civil Cases.....	46
<i>Fontaine v. Insurance Corp. of British Columbia</i>	46
<i>Peart v. Peel Regional Police Service</i>	48
(ii) Criminal Cases	52
Expediency	53
Facts Peculiarly Within Knowledge of Accused	55

(b) Measure of Burden of Persuasion	55
(i) Balance of Probabilities Standard for Civil Cases.....	55
<i>F.H. v. McDougall</i>	56
(ii) Reasonable Doubt Standard for Criminal Cases	63
<i>R. v. Lifchus</i>	63
<i>R. v. Starr</i>	65
(iii) Choosing Between Competing Versions	66
<i>R. v. W. (D.)</i>	67
<i>R. v. S. (J.H.)</i>	67
<i>R. v. Nyznik</i>	72
<i>R. v. Theriault</i>	74
(iv) Considering Individual Pieces of Evidence	76
<i>R. v. Morin</i>	76
(v) Direct and Circumstantial Evidence	79
<i>R. v. Munoz</i>	79
<i>R. v. Calnen</i>	84
<i>R. v. White</i>	85
<i>R. v. Angelis</i>	93
<i>R. v. Jack</i>	96
<i>R. v. Hanemaayer</i>	100
(vi) <i>Hodge's Case</i>	105
<i>R. v. Villaroman</i>	106
(vii) Preliminary Findings of Fact	117
<i>R. v. Evans</i>	117
<i>R. v. Arp</i>	117
(viii) Presumption of Innocence and the <i>Charter</i>	118
<i>R. v. Oakes</i>	118
<i>R. v. Whyte</i>	118
<i>R. v. Chaulk</i>	118
(c) Measure of Evidential Burden.....	121
(i) Criminal Cases	121
<i>U.S.A. v. Shephard</i>	122
<i>R. v. Arcuri</i>	122
PROBLEM	126
Lisa Dufraimont, <i>R. v. Hay</i>	127
<i>R. v. Cinous</i>	130
(ii) Civil Cases.....	134
<i>Hryniak v. Mauldin</i>	134
<i>FL Receivables Trust v. Cobrand Foods Ltd.</i>	139
 Chapter 3 RELEVANCE AND DISCRETION TO EXCLUDE	143
1. RELEVANCE.....	143
(a) Tests.....	143
<i>Morris v. R.</i>	145
<i>R. v. Schneider</i>	148
(b) Materiality.....	158

(c) Multiple Relevance	158
(d) Relevance and Social Context	159
<i>R. v. Lavallee</i>	160
<i>R. v. Ellis</i>	161
<i>R. v. S. (R.D.)</i>	162
2. DISCRETION AND LAW OF EVIDENCE	172
(a) Introduction	172
(b) Discretion to Exclude	174
(i) Discretion to Exclude Read In to a Statute under the <i>Charter</i>	175
<i>Corbett v. R.</i>	175
<i>R. v. Potvin</i>	181
(ii) Balancing Probative Value and Prejudicial Effect	183
<i>R. v. Seaboyer</i>	183
<i>R. v. Grant (2015)</i>	185
<i>R. v. Hart</i>	190
<i>R. v. Mills</i>	193
<i>R. v. King</i>	196
<i>Anderson v. Maple Ridge (District)</i>	197
(iii) Assessing Trial Fairness	201
<i>R. v. Harner</i>	201
(iv) Bringing Administration of Justice into Disrepute (<i>Charter</i> , s. 24(2))	207
<i>R. v. Grant (2009)</i>	208
<i>R. v. Harrison</i>	208
<i>R. v. McGuffie</i>	209
<i>R. v. Paterson</i>	209
<i>R. v. Le</i>	210
<i>R. v. Beaver</i>	210
<i>R. v. McColman</i>	210
PROBLEMS	212
<i>Chapter 4 EXCLUSIONARY CANONS</i>	217
A. Character Evidence	217
1. HABIT	217
<i>Belknap v. Meakes</i>	218
<i>R. v. Watson</i>	219
<i>Devgan v. College of Physicians & Surgeons (Ontario)</i>	222
<i>R. v. B. (L.)</i>	224
2. CHARACTER OR DISPOSITION	225
(a) Admissible as Directly Relevant to Material Issue	225
<i>R. v. Johnson</i>	226
<i>R. v. Brissard</i>	227
(b) Underlying Assumptions Grounding Character Evidence	232
<i>R. v. Clarke</i>	232

(c) Character of Parties in Civil Cases.....	233
<i>Rawdah v. Evans</i>	234
<i>Plester v. Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Co.</i>	235
(d) Character of Accused in Criminal Cases	236
(i) Good Character Evidence	236
<i>R. v. Profit</i> (Ont. C.A.).....	236
<i>R. v. Profit</i> (S.C.C.)	238
(ii) Bad Character Evidence.....	238
<i>R. v. Handy</i>	239
(iii) When Does an Accused Put His Character in Issue?.....	241
<i>R. v. P. (N.A.)</i>	243
<i>R. v. A. (W.A.)</i>	245
(iv) How Character May be Proved	246
<i>R. v. Levasseur</i>	248
<i>R. v. Brown</i>	250
(v) Warnings to Jury	252
PROBLEMS.....	252
(e) Similar Facts	253
(i) Need for Connection Between Previous Acts and Accused	255
(ii) How are Similar Facts Relevant?	255
<i>R. v. Arp</i>	255
<i>R. v. Handy</i>	260
<i>R. v. Blake</i>	271
<i>R. v. Titmus</i>	273
<i>R. v. Shearing</i>	274
PROBLEMS.....	279
(iii) Civil Cases.....	281
<i>Johnson v. Bugera</i>	281
<i>S. (R.C.M.) v. K. (G.M.)</i>	283
PROBLEM	285
(f) Character of Third Party/Co-Accused.....	285
<i>R. v. Khan</i>	287
(g) Character of Victim	290
(i) Self-defence.....	290
(ii) Sexual Assault	292
<i>Charter of Rights</i>	292
<i>R. v. Seaboyer</i>	292
New Legislation — Bill C-49 and Bill C-51.....	303
<i>R. v. Darrach</i>	306
<i>R. v. A.</i>	309
<i>R. v. Barton</i>	310
<i>R. v. Goldfinch</i>	321
<i>R. v. R.V.</i>	339
<i>R. v. Ghomeshi</i>	343

Myths and Stereotypes in Sexual Offence Cases	345
<i>R. v. Kruk</i>	346
PROBLEMS	359
B. Hearsay	362
1. THE RULE	362
(a) History	362
(b) Reason for Rule	365
(c) Identifying Hearsay	367
<i>R. v. Khelawon</i>	370
<i>R. v. Baldree</i>	372
PROBLEMS	379
(d) Principled Approach to Hearsay	380
<i>R. v. Khan</i>	382
<i>R. v. B. (K.G.)</i>	387
<i>R. v. Devine</i>	396
<i>R. v. Khelawon</i>	397
<i>R. v. Bradshaw</i>	411
<i>R. v. Blackman</i>	418
<i>R. v. Baldree</i>	421
<i>R. v. Furey</i>	423
PROBLEMS	423
(e) Establishing Necessity	425
<i>R. v. Smith</i>	425
<i>R. v. Parrott</i>	426
PROBLEM	431
<i>Dodge v. Kaneff Homes Inc.</i>	432
2. EXCEPTIONS	435
(a) Admissions	436
(i) Generally	436
<i>R. v. Schneider</i>	436
<i>R. v. Phillips</i>	438
<i>R. v. Streu</i>	440
(ii) Confessions	443
(iii) Implied Admissions	443
<i>R. v. Scott</i>	443
(iv) Statements Authorized by Party	447
<i>R. v. Strand Electric Ltd.</i>	447
(v) Statements of Person with Common Purpose	448
<i>R. v. Mapara</i>	449
(b) Exceptions where Declarant or Testimony Unavailable	455
(i) Declarations Against Interest	455
<i>R. v. Demeter</i>	456
<i>R. v. Lucier</i>	457
(ii) Dying Declarations	458
<i>R. v. Aziga</i>	459

(iii) Declarations in Course of Duty	462
General.....	462
<i>R. v. Larsen</i>	463
Business Records	465
<i>R. v. Martin</i>	467
<i>R. v. L. (C.)</i>	470
(iv) Former Testimony	473
<i>R. v. Potvin</i>	474
PROBLEM	477
(c) Exceptions Not Dependent on Availability of Declarant.....	477
(i) Declarations as to Physical Sensation	477
(ii) Declarations as to Mental or Emotional State	478
<i>R. v. Starr</i>	480
(iii) Spontaneous Statements (Excited Utterances)	483
<i>R. v. Bedingfield</i>	484
<i>R. v. Clark</i>	485
<i>R. v. Shea</i>	487
<i>R. v. Brown</i>	489
PROBLEM	492
C. Voluntary Confession Rule.....	493
1. PERSONS IN AUTHORITY.....	493
<i>R. v. Hodgson</i>	493
2. MODERN APPROACH IN <i>R. v. OICKLE</i>	502
<i>R. v. Oickle</i>	502
<i>R. v. Tessier</i>	516
3. THE PRE-TRIAL RIGHT TO SILENCE AND INTERROGATION.....	520
<i>R. v. Hebert</i>	520
<i>R. v. Singh</i>	522
4. CONFESSIONS IN UNDERCOVER OPERATIONS.....	535
<i>R. v. Hart</i>	535
<i>R. v. Mack</i>	555
PROBLEMS.....	558
5. VIDEOTAPING OF INTERROGATIONS	561
Should Confessions be Videotaped?	561
<i>R. v. Moore-McFarlane</i>	561
<i>R. v. Wilson</i>	564
6. MIXED INCULPATORY AND EXCULPATORY STATEMENTS.....	566
<i>R. v. Rojas</i>	566
D. Opinion Evidence and Experts	568
1. OPINION RULE	568
<i>Graat v. R.</i>	569
<i>R. v. B. (H.)</i>	573
2. EXPERT EVIDENCE.....	578

(a) Tests.....	579
<i>White Burgess Langille Inman v. Abbott and Haliburton Co.</i> ..	581
<i>R. v. Abbey</i>	595
<i>R. v. J. (J.-L.)</i>	606
<i>R. v. Trochym</i>	608
<i>R. v. Sekhon</i>	612
<i>R. v. Bingley</i>	615
<i>Moore v. Getahun</i>	622
(b) Examples of Judicial Resistance to Experts	629
(i) Identification	629
<i>R. v. McIntosh</i>	629
<i>R. v. Dimitrov</i>	634
(ii) Testimony of Children	635
<i>R. v. Marquard</i>	635
<i>R. v. D. (D.)</i>	637
<i>R. v. Talbot</i>	645
(iii) Memory.....	648
<i>R. v. Perlett</i>	648
<i>R. v. T.W.S.</i>	651
<i>R. v. Horswill</i>	651
(iv) False Confessions	652
<i>R. v. Osmar</i>	652
<i>R. v. Phillion</i>	654
<i>R. v. Pearce</i>	655
PROBLEM	657
3. EXAMINING EXPERT	657
(a) Hypothetical Questions.....	657
(b) Use of Textbooks	659
<i>R. v. Marquard</i>	659
4. EXCHANGE OF EXPERTS' REPORTS	661
<i>Criminal Code</i>	661
<i>Westerhof v. Gee Estate</i>	663
E. Privilege	666
1. PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS.....	666
(a) Introduction	666
<i>R. v. Gruenke</i>	666
(b) Solicitor-Client Privilege	670
(i) Generally.....	670
<i>Descôteaux v. Mierzewski</i>	671
<i>Canada (Privacy Commissioner) v. Blood Tribe</i>	
<i>Department of Health</i>	677
<i>R. v. Olusaga</i>	679
<i>Goodis v. Ontario (Ministry of Correctional</i>	
<i>Services)</i>	680
<i>Blank v. Canada (Minister of Justice)</i>	682

(ii)	Exceptions	689
	Inadvertent Disclosure	689
	<i>Airst v. Airst</i>	689
	Public Safety — Future Harm Exception	692
	<i>Smith v. Jones</i>	692
	Innocence at Stake Exception	698
	<i>R. v. McClure</i>	698
	Legal Advice About Police Legality	703
	<i>R. v. Shirose and Campbell</i>	703
	The Common Interest Exception	706
	<i>Pritchard v. Ontario (Human Rights Commission)</i>	706
(c)	Marital Communications	708
	<i>R. v. Nero</i>	709
	<i>R. v. Zylstra</i>	713
(d)	Privilege for Without Prejudice Communications	714
	<i>Sable Offshore Energy Inc v. Ameron International Corporation</i>	714
2.	PUBLIC INTEREST IMMUNITY	718
	(a) Statutory Provisions	718
	(b) Identity of Informers	720
	<i>R. v. Durham Regional Crime Stoppers Inc.</i>	720
3.	CASE-BY-CASE PRIVILEGE	725
	<i>Slavutych v. Baker</i>	725
	<i>Denis v. Côté</i>	727
	<i>M. (A.) v. Ryan</i>	728
4.	BALANCING CHARTER VALUES	735
	<i>R. v. Mills</i>	739
	<i>R. v. McNeil</i>	751
	Bill C-51	752
	<i>R. v. J.J.</i>	752
	<i>Chapter 5 MECHANICS OF PROOF</i>	769
A.	Matters Not Requiring Proof	769
1.	FORMAL ADMISSIONS OF FACT	769
	<i>R. v. Falconer</i>	769
	<i>R. v. Lo</i>	773
2.	JUDICIAL NOTICE	776
	(a) Introduction	776
	(b) The Modern Approach	777
	<i>R. v. Spence</i>	777
	<i>Moge v. Moge</i>	785
	<i>Cronk v. Canadian General Insurance Co.</i>	789
	<i>R. v. Le</i>	792
	<i>R. v. Morris</i>	798
	<i>CTV Television v. The Queen</i>	799

<i>R. v. Hernandez-Lopez</i>	802
PROBLEMS.....	806
B. Real Evidence	808
1. AUTHENTICATION	808
<i>R. v. Nikolovski</i>	810
<i>R. v. Andalib-Goortani</i>	815
2. DOCUMENTS	822
3. BEST EVIDENCE RULE.....	823
<i>R. v. Cotroni</i>	824
4. ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS	826
<i>Canada Evidence Act</i> , ss. 31.1-31.8	826
<i>R. v. Martin</i>	827
5. DEMONSTRATIVE EVIDENCE	837
<i>R. v. MacDonald</i>	837
<i>R. v. Pan</i>	843
<i>R. v. Collins</i>	844
6. VIEWS.....	846
C. Witnesses	848
1. COMPETENCE AND COMPELLABILITY	848
(a) Introduction	848
(b) Oath	848
<i>R. v. Kalevar</i>	850
<i>R. v. J. (T.R.)</i>	853
(c) Age.....	855
<i>R. v. W. (R.)</i>	856
Nick Bala et al., Bill C-2: A New Law for Canada's Child Witnesses	859
<i>R. v. Levogiannis</i>	869
<i>R. v. L. (D.O.)</i>	872
<i>R. v. F. (C.)</i>	873
(d) Mental Capacity	876
<i>Canada Evidence Act</i> , s. 16.....	876
<i>R. v. I. (D.)</i>	878
<i>R. v. Parrott</i>	883
<i>R. v. Doncel</i>	885
(e) Interest	886
Evidence Acts	888
(f) Spousal Competence and Compellability.....	889
(g) Compellability of Accused	889
(i) History of Privilege Against Self-incrimination.....	889
(ii) <i>Canada Evidence Act</i>	891
(iii) Sections 11(c) and 13 of the <i>Charter</i>	893
<i>R. v. Henry</i>	893
<i>R. v. Nedelcu</i>	895
PROBLEMS.....	901

	<i>Knutson v. Registered Nurses Assn. (Sask.)</i>	901
(iv)	Pre-trial Right to Silence: <i>Charter</i> , s. 7.....	902
(v)	Principle Against Self-incrimination: <i>Charter</i> , s. 7	902
(vi)	No Adverse Inference from Pre-trial Silence.....	906
	<i>R. v. Turcotte</i>	906
(vii)	No Adverse Inference from Trial Silence.....	912
	<i>R. v. Noble</i>	913
(viii)	Comments on Accused's Failure to Testify	919
	<i>R. v. Prokofiew</i>	920
2.	MANNER OF QUESTIONING.....	925
(a)	Leading Questions	926
	<i>R. v. Rose</i>	929
(b)	Refreshing Memory/Past Recollection Recorded	933
	<i>R. v. Wilks</i>	933
	<i>R. v. B. (K.G.)</i>	939
	<i>R. v. Mattis</i>	940
	PROBLEMS.....	943
(c)	Adoption.....	944
	<i>R. v. McCarroll</i>	944
(d)	Cross-examination	946
	<i>R. v. Lyttle</i>	948
	<i>R. v. R. (A.J.)</i>	952
	<i>R. v. Osolin</i>	956
	<i>R. v. Mills</i>	958
	<i>R. v. Shearing</i>	958
	<i>R. v. Schmaltz</i>	959
(e)	Duty to Cross-examine (Rule in <i>Browne v. Dunn</i>)	966
	<i>R. v. McNeill</i>	966
	<i>Curley v. Taaffe</i>	970
(f)	Collateral Facts Rule.....	974
	<i>R. v. R. (D.)</i>	975
	<i>R. v. D.S.</i>	976
	<i>Landmark v. Vehicle Leasing</i>	978
	<i>R. v. MacIsaac</i>	979
	PROBLEMS.....	983
3.	IMPEACHMENT	984
(a)	Prior Inconsistent Statements.....	984
	<i>Canada Evidence Act</i> , ss. 10, 11.....	985
(i)	Impeaching One's Own Witness	986
	<i>Anderson v. Flying Saucer Drive-in Ltd.</i>	987
	<i>R. v. Malik</i>	989
	<i>R. v. Osae</i>	992
(ii)	<i>Canada Evidence Act</i> , s. 9(1)	994
	<i>R. v. Figliola</i>	994
(iii)	<i>Canada Evidence Act</i> , s. 9(2)	997
	<i>R. v. Milgaard</i>	997

	<i>R. v. Dupuis</i>	999
PROBLEM		1005
(b) Bias		1005
<i>R. v. Ghorvei</i>		1007
(i) Motives of Accused and Complainants		1009
<i>R. v. Gerrard</i>		1009
<i>R. v. D.S.</i>		1011
<i>R. v. Ellard</i>		1011
<i>R. v. Laboucan</i>		1012
(c) Character of Witness		1018
(i) Extrinsic Evidence		1018
<i>R. v. Clarke</i>		1018
(ii) Evidence Elicited on Cross-examination		1020
(iii) Accused as Witness		1021
<i>Canada Evidence Act</i> , s. 12		1022
<i>R. v. Underwood</i>		1023
<i>R. v. King</i>		1025
<i>Ontario Evidence Act</i> , s. 22		1031
<i>Hutton v. Way</i>		1031
(d) Incapacity of Witness		1033
4. SUPPORTING OR REHABILITATING CREDIBILITY		1034
(a) General Rule Prohibiting		1034
<i>R. v. Béland</i>		1034
<i>R. v. Tash</i>		1041
(b) Exceptions		1044
(i) To Rebut Allegation of Recent Fabrication		1044
<i>R. v. Stirling</i>		1044
<i>R. v. Ellard</i>		1047
(ii) Prior Identification		1049
<i>R. v. Tat</i>		1049
(iii) Part of Narrative		1050
<i>R. v. Dinardo</i>		1050
<i>R. v. Gill</i>		1052
(iv) Exculpatory Arrest Statement		1056
<i>R. v. Edgar</i>		1056
(v) Recent Complaint		1061
5. Demeanour as Guide to Credibility		1063
<i>R. v. Norman</i>		1064
<i>R. v. S. (N.)</i>		1066
<i>R. v. Santhosh</i>		1072
6. CORROBORATION		1075
<i>Vetrovec v. R.</i>		1075
<i>R. v. Khela</i>		1078
<i>R. v. Brooks</i>		1082
<i>Table of Cases</i>		1087