

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

# STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

## **CRIMINAL COURT SYSTEM**

(Chapter 3, 2019 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR  
GENERAL OF ONTARIO, Volume 3)

1<sup>st</sup> Session, 43<sup>rd</sup> Parliament  
2 Charles III

ISBN 978-1-4868-7447-7 (Print)  
ISBN 978-1-4868-7445-3 [English] (PDF)  
ISBN 978-1-4868-7446-0 [French] (PDF)  
ISBN 978-1-4868-7443-9 [English] (HTML)  
ISBN 978-1-4868-7444-6 [French] (HTML)

Legislative  
Assembly  
of Ontario



Assemblée  
législative  
de l'Ontario

The Honourable Ted Arnott, MPP  
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly

Sir,

Your Standing Committee on Public Accounts has the honour to present its Report and commends it to the House.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Tom Rakocevic".

Tom Rakocevic, MPP  
Chair of the Committee

Queen's Park  
November 2023



STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS  
MEMBERSHIP LIST

1<sup>st</sup> Session, 43<sup>rd</sup> Parliament

TOM RAKOCEVIC  
Chair

DONNA SKELLY  
Vice-Chair

WILL BOUMA

FRANCE GÉLINAS

RICK BYERS

LOGAN KANAPATHI

LUCILLE COLLARD

\*TODD J. MCCARTHY

STEPHEN CRAWFORD

LAURA SMITH  
Thornhill

RUDY CUZZETTO

LISE VAUGEOIS

\*TODD J. MCCARTHY was no longer a Member of the Committee from  
September 26, 2023.

KRISTYN WONG-TAM regularly served as a substitute member of the  
Committee.

---

TANZIMA KHAN  
Clerk of the Committee

LAUREN WARNER  
Research Officer



**CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION	1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	1
BACKGROUND	1
Delays and R. v. Jordan	2
2019 AUDIT SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES	2
ISSUES RAISED IN THE AUDIT AND BEFORE THE COMMITTEE	2
Number of Criminal Cases Awaiting Disposition	3
Digitization and the Disclosure of Evidence	4
Prioritizing Cases and Protecting Victims of Crime	5
Monitoring and Data Collection	6
Tracking Cases Vulnerable to Being Stayed	6
Tracking Reasons for Withdrawal of Charges	6
Systems and Data Collection	7
Reducing Delays and Backlogs	8
Justice Centres	8
Pre-charge Consultation	8
Diversion	9
Bail	10
Time Needed for Bail Decision	10
Bail Reform	10
Mental Health and Drug Treatment Courts	11
CONSOLIDATED LIST OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS	13



## INTRODUCTION

On March 20, 2023, the Standing Committee on Public Accounts held public hearings on the value-for-money audit of the Criminal Court System (*2019 Annual Report* of the Office of the Auditor General of Ontario), overseen by the Ministry of the Attorney General.

The Committee welcomes the Auditor's 2019 findings and recommendations and now presents its own findings, views, and recommendations. The Committee requests that the Ministry provide the Clerk of the Committee with written responses to the recommendations within 120 calendar days of the tabling of this report with the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, unless otherwise specified.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Committee extends its appreciation to officials from the Ministry of the Attorney General. The Committee also acknowledges the assistance provided by the Office of the Auditor General, the Clerk of the Committee, and Legislative Research. The Committee also extends its appreciation to the Chief Justices of the Superior Court of Justice and the Ontario Court of Justice.

## BACKGROUND

Ontario's criminal justice system operates largely under the *Criminal Code*, federal legislation that sets out the substantive criminal law and procedure that applies in courts across the country. The Code is supplemented by other federal and provincial statutes.

In Ontario, provincial Crown attorneys for the Criminal Law Division of the Ministry of the Attorney General (the Ministry) are agents of the Attorney General and prosecute offences under the Code and provincial statutes.

Most criminal matters are heard in the Ontario Court of Justice (Ontario Court). However, certain serious charges (such as murder and drug trafficking) are tried in the Superior Court of Justice (Superior Court).

Although members of the judiciary work with the Ministry to administer the justice system, the judiciary itself is a separate and independent branch of government. Under the *Courts of Justice Act*, regional senior judges and their delegates (under the direction and supervision of the Chief Justices) are responsible for preparing trial lists. They are also responsible for assigning cases and other judicial duties to individual judges, determining judges' workloads, determining sitting schedules and locations, and assigning courtrooms.

Court staff employed by the Court Services Division of the Ministry of the Attorney General are responsible for providing administrative support to Ontario's courts.

## **Delays and R. v. Jordan**

The 2019 audit identified a growing backlog of cases awaiting disposition in Ontario's criminal courts. This is a concern because the right to trial in a reasonable time is constitutionally protected by s. 11(b) of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (the *Charter*).

In the 2016 decision of *R. v. Jordan*, the Supreme Court of Canada set out a new framework for determining whether this right has been breached. In essence, the court held that if a case is not disposed of within 18 months in Ontario Court, or 30 months in Superior Court, the court will presume that the delay is unreasonable (i.e., a breach of the *Charter* right to trial in a reasonable time) unless the Crown attorney can prove otherwise. Delays attributable to the defence and exceptional circumstances are deducted out of the presumptive ceilings. The remedy for such a breach is a stay of proceedings (i.e., a discontinuance of proceedings against the accused).

Following the *Jordan* decision, between July 2016 and August 2019, 191 provincially prosecuted cases were stayed on account of unreasonable delay.

## **2019 AUDIT SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES**

The audit objective was "to assess whether the Ministry of the Attorney General (Ministry) had effective systems and procedures in place to:

- utilize Ministry resources for courts efficiently and in a cost-effective way;
- support the resolution of criminal law matters on a timely basis, with consistent delivery of court services across the province, in accordance with applicable legislation and best practices; and
- measure and publicly report periodically on the results and effective delivery of court services contributing to a timely, fair and accessible justice system."

The audit was conducted primarily at the Ministry and seven selected courthouses from January to August 2019.

## **ISSUES RAISED IN THE AUDIT AND BEFORE THE COMMITTEE**

The Committee heard that despite the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Ministry has made significant strides in addressing many of the Auditor's recommendations. The pandemic placed tremendous pressure on the justice system. The courts were closed to in-person matters for months, and when they reopened, there were limitations on how many people could attend and what types of proceedings could be heard. According to the Ministry, this resulted in a substantial backlog of active pending criminal cases.

To help address the backlog and prevent cases from being stayed for unreasonable delay, the Ministry moved forward with virtual and digital solutions. The Committee heard that since the 2019 audit, investments were made in modernizing court operations, including \$65 million spent on video technology and other initiatives, such as the Criminal Justice Digital Design initiative (outlined further below).

The Ministry also took steps to reduce the number of cases in the system and prioritize the prosecution of the most serious offences. On August 14, 2020, the Attorney General issued a temporary COVID-19 recovery directive, which required prosecutors to review all existing and new prosecutions and to consider all available and appropriate sanctions to resolve cases as early as possible.

In addition, the government invested \$72 million over two years in the Criminal Case Backlog Reduction Strategy. Measures taken to support this work included:

- updating the COVID-19 recovery directive for prosecutors;
- expanding the ability of Crown prosecutors to assess bail positions more quickly;
- increasing the capacity of Ontario's Victim/Witness Assistance Program; and
- creating a system of regional virtual resolution teams (Crown attorneys and non-legal staff who work to resolve less serious cases).

### **Number of Criminal Cases Awaiting Disposition**

The Committee asked about the current status of the criminal case backlog. At the time of 2019 audit, the Auditor reported that between 2014/15 and 2018/19:

- the number of criminal cases pending disposition increased by 27% to about 114,000 cases; and
- the average number of days needed to dispose of a criminal case increased by 9% (from 133 to 145 days).

The Ministry stated that it continues to see ripple effects from the pandemic but that it has made strides in addressing the (pandemic-related) backlog. In particular, there were 21,000 fewer active pending criminal cases in the Ontario Court at the end of December 2022 than there were at the height of the pandemic in December 2020.

The Committee heard that the current extent of the backlog varies considerably by region. Some regions have been very effective in clearing their backlogs, and others have more challenges. However, the rate of cases being stayed for unreasonable delay has remained relatively constant (both before and during the pandemic), at about 0.03% of cases. Further, the Ministry has not lost any homicides to stays for unreasonable delay to date.

## Committee Recommendation

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts recommends that:

1. The Ministry of the Attorney General provide annual updated data to the Committee on the current number of criminal cases awaiting disposition, the average number of days needed to dispose of a criminal case, and how they were disposed.

## Digitization and the Disclosure of Evidence

The Committee asked about how the criminal court system changed to rely less on paper and more on digital systems during the pandemic. The Ministry said that it has worked to create an in-house digital system, known as Criminal Justice Digital Design (CJDD).

The aim of the CJDD initiative is to “modernize the criminal justice sector from beginning to end.” The Ministry collaborated with the Ministry of the Solicitor General (SOLGEN) and other justice sector partners to ensure that information, documentation, and evidence in criminal cases could be shared digitally and online where appropriate.

The Committee heard that an important element of CJDD is its ability to allow for digital disclosure of the evidence. At the time of the 2019 audit, the Auditor noted that the Ministry and police services lacked formally agreed upon roles and responsibilities for disclosure of evidence, and that delays in Crown attorneys receiving disclosure from police contribute to case backlogs. (The Crown has a duty to disclose all relevant evidence to the accused, which derives from the accused person’s right to make full answer and defence.)

CJDD will allow police services to manage, store, and share investigative and evidentiary digital files with the Crown using a consistent set of tools and standards. According to the Ministry, CJDD “will improve timely flow of disclosure” from police to the Crown, and from the Crown to the defence.

The Ministry said that one of its biggest challenges in meeting the *Jordan*-timelines is delays in the disclosure process (i.e., the time it takes for evidence to go from the police to the Crown, be reviewed, and then go on to defence counsel). The process takes much longer now due to the proliferation of electronic evidence such as cell phone videos and content from body-worn cameras. Significant resources are required to review and process all this evidence. While CJDD does not address the amount of human time it takes to go through such evidence, it does give the Ministry the technical capacity to move digital media from the police to the Crown, and from the Crown to the defence efficiently.

Since 2016, the Ministry has been working with police and SOLGEN to create a Framework Memorandum of Understanding (FMOU) to identify clear roles and responsibilities in the disclosure process. At the time of the 2019 audit, the Auditor recommended that the Ministry work with SOLGEN to clearly define the roles and responsibilities of police services and Crown attorneys in the process, and revise the FMOU to incorporate those roles and responsibilities.

However, to date, only 27 of Ontario's 47 police services have signed onto the FMOU. The Committee learned that the Ministry is working with SOLGEN to strategize on how to secure commitment from police services to the FMOU.

### **Committee Recommendations**

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts recommends that:

2. The Ministry of the Attorney General continue to engage with the Ministry of the Solicitor General and police services to secure commitment from all police services to sign on to the disclosure Framework Memorandum of Understanding (FMOU).
3. The Ministry of the Attorney General work with the Ministry of the Solicitor General to provide a list to the Committee of the police services that have and have not signed the Framework Memorandum of Understanding (FMOU) and the reasons why some police services may be unable to sign the FMOU.
4. The Ministry of the Attorney General identify the resources required to go through electronic evidence and how Ontario compares to other jurisdictions.

### **Prioritizing Cases and Protecting Victims of Crime**

Part of the Ministry's COVID-19 backlog reduction strategy involves identifying and prioritizing cases that should be resolved quickly and efficiently. At the time of the 2019 audit, the Auditor noted that administration of justice offences – such as failure to comply with bail conditions and failure to appear in court – were increasingly consuming resources. From a prosecutor's point of view, these offences are considered minor and non-complex but take up significant resources.

The Committee asked how cases are prioritized to ensure that vulnerable victims are protected. The Ministry said that the cases that are prioritized for quick resolution (e.g., through diversion out of the criminal justice system) are those that are lower severity and do not involve or impact victims directly. The direction given by the Ministry to Crown attorneys was to target these types of cases for resolution where such an approach would be consistent with public safety.

Another aspect of the backlog reduction strategy involves dedicating resources to the prosecution of serious cases. For instance, some of the Ministry's backlog reduction resources were allocated to specialized teams of Crown attorneys to support the prosecution of homicide cases. Similarly, the Ministry allocated staff to enhanced major case preparation and prosecution, and enhanced litigation support for serious cases.

In addition, the Case Impact Management Model (CIMM) system is now available to help track Crown resources and determine where resources should be allocated. CIMM is a "case-weighted scientific data modelling tool" that assists the Ministry in assessing the impact of case loads and case complexity on prosecution workload.

CIMM allows for weighted assessments of the workload implications of case volume for Crown attorneys. Some types of cases, such as cases of serious violence, require tremendous resources to prosecute. CIMM allows the Ministry to weigh the need for resources based on the particular kinds of cases in Crown offices. For example, if an office has a number of homicides in its caseload, Crown attorneys may need to be reallocated to that region because homicide cases take a disproportionately high number of resources to prosecute.

## **Monitoring and Data Collection**

### *Tracking Cases Vulnerable to Being Stayed*

One of the Auditor's 2019 recommendations was that the Ministry monitor all cases that have been pending disposition for more than eight months by court location and region and analyze the reasons for the delay to proactively manage the progress of criminal cases through the court system.

The Committee heard that the Ministry has been working to leverage available resources to track cases that are vulnerable to being stayed. In particular, the Ministry has added an eight-month flag to SCOPE (the Crown's electronic case management tool), which alerts Crown attorneys to the need to prioritize a file. SCOPE now has several colour-coded flags that make it very clear to Crown attorneys which cases are vulnerable to being stayed so that they can take steps to address the matter.

SCOPE reports can also be pulled by Crown managers to assess *Jordan* vulnerability on an office level, a regional level, and a provincial level so that they can reallocate resources as necessary to address those risks. The Ministry also noted that SCOPE can produce a list of cases that have been pending disposition for more than eight months by court location and region.

In 2019, the Auditor also recommended that the Ministry capture all reasons for cases being stayed by judges. The Committee learned that SCOPE was enhanced in August 2022 to allow Crown attorneys, in the event of a stay, to record the specific reasons for it. However, the Ministry advised that the only way to capture *all* the reasons for a stay would be to manually review the justice's written reasons and a transcript or audio recording of the proceedings. The Ministry said that the effort and cost associated with such a review would not provide value for money.

The Committee asked whether any cases have been stayed involving violent repeat offenders. The Ministry said that it could not confirm whether there have been any such stays. However, the Ministry noted that decisions on stays for unreasonable delay are published by the courts and publicly available. The Ministry also noted that when cases are stayed for disclosure problems the case is brought to the attention of the Crown attorney, the regional director, and the office of the chief prosecutor. The Ministry then takes steps to work with the senior command of the relevant police service to address the issue.

### *Tracking Reasons for Withdrawal of Charges*

The Committee asked about the Ministry's progress on addressing the Auditor's recommendation that the Ministry collect certain data on cases where charges are withdrawn by the prosecution.

The Ministry said that it is taking steps to record and analyze the reasons for withdrawal of charges, and to reduce the number of cases that unnecessarily end in withdrawals. The Committee also heard that the Ministry tracks the reasons for trial collapse (that is, when charges are withdrawn on the day of the preliminary inquiry or trial). Every time a trial collapses, the Crown attorney is required to fill out a form that explains the reasons for collapse. The Ministry can then track trial collapse rates in individual offices and regions.

The Ministry explained that this work is important because trial collapses have the potential to create inefficiencies in the justice system. For example, if a matter collapses on the day of trial, the court might not have other work on its docket to fill the court day, and the court day may not be utilized to its full potential.

The Ministry also explained that there are many reasons that a trial may collapse: a witness may not show up to court on the assigned date for trial or may recant their evidence. Alternatively, the accused or their counsel may reveal new evidence that satisfies the Crown that there is a viable defence or that prosecution is no longer in the public interest.

#### *Systems and Data Collection*

The Committee asked about the Auditor's overall conclusion that the Ministry "does not have effective systems and procedures in place to know if its resources are being used or allocated efficiently and in a cost-efficient way to support timely disposition of criminal cases."

The Ministry responded that things have changed since the time of the audit. The Ministry now has CIMM in place, which allows it to measure workflow in offices across the province. In conjunction with SCOPE, the Ministry said it has the resources now.

The Committee also asked about the Ministry's capacity to monitor and collect data about the court system and delays. The Ministry noted that a case-management system is being put in place for both the Ontario Court and the Superior Court, which will give the Ministry better data about scheduling and court operations.

The Committee heard that there are some limitations on how the Ministry can use data that is owned by the courts. Further, there are certain statutory requirements that prohibit the Ministry from releasing certain data. However, the Ontario Court publishes data annually that the Ministry aggregates for them, and whenever the Ministry has asked them to release data, a request has never been refused and the court generally agrees to share data when requested by the Ministry.

## **Committee Recommendation**

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts recommends that:

5. The Ministry of the Attorney General report to the Committee on the timing and the implementation of the case management system for the Ontario Court of Justice and the Superior Court of Justice.

## **Reducing Delays and Backlogs**

### *Justice Centres*

The Committee heard that there are different approaches to address delays and backlogs in the courts; in addition to speeding up the court process, steps can be taken to reduce the number of cases coming into the system. The Committee heard that justice centres are one way to help achieve this goal.

Ontario currently has four justice centres: one in Kenora, one in London, and two in Toronto. Justice centres involve less serious cases and bring together support workers to help get at the root causes of an accused person's involvement in the criminal justice system.

For example, the Downtown East Justice Centre in Toronto is focused on the needs of people in the downtown core who may be suffering from mental health issues, addiction, poverty, and housing insecurity. This population has a disproportionately high rate of re-offending while on bail, which is often connected to mental health and/or addiction issues.

The Downtown East Justice Centre is meant to address this phenomenon by providing community programming to at-risk individuals. Justice centres can support the stability of people while on bail with regular judicial intervention in their cases, and regular intervention through community programming to address mental health and addiction issues.

The Committee heard that preliminary data from the Downtown East Justice Centre shows that it has been successful in reducing recidivism. The Centre has been in operation since 2021 and data shows that in the 12 months after an accused person's first appearance at the Centre, they incur on average 2.8 fewer criminal cases than they did in the preceding 12 months. Further, over 90% of individuals who come through the Centre demonstrate some level of reduction in recidivism.

### *Pre-charge Consultation*

The Committee heard that the Ministry is consulting with SOLGEN about the merits of moving to a "pre-charge" Crown consultation model. However, the Ministry said that it would be critical to have both the police and the Ministry agree on whether and how this matter goes forward.

Currently, Ontario is a “post-charge” consultation jurisdiction, meaning that the Crown generally reviews the charge only after it is laid. If the charge does not meet the Crown’s screening threshold for prosecution (e.g., due to insufficient evidence or because prosecution would not be in the public interest), the Crown would withdraw the charge. If disclosure is not complete, the Crown would wait for the disclosure to be provided to withdraw the charge.

In a pre-charge consultation model, prior to the laying of charges, the police are required to consult with a Crown attorney, who would review the proposed charge based on the Crown’s screening threshold. If the charge does not meet the Crown’s threshold for prosecution, then the Crown would recommend that the police not lay the charge. The Crown may also request that disclosure be complete or substantially complete prior to the laying of the charge, so that the charge can be properly screened.

According to the Ministry, moving to a pre-charge consultation model would help ensure that court time is not spent waiting for disclosure to be completed. In addition, because the *Jordan* timelines do not include time before a charge is laid, the production of disclosure prior to charge reduces the risk that disclosure delays could contribute to a section 11(b) breach and a stay of proceedings. The Ministry also said that pre-charge consultation could decrease the number of unnecessary charges entering the system by ensuring that only prosecutable charges are laid. In turn, more resources would be available for the prosecution of serious offences.

The Ministry shared some data with the Committee on charge withdrawal rates in post-charge and pre-charge consultation jurisdictions. From 2017 to 2021, in pre-charge consultation jurisdictions (British Columbia, New Brunswick, and Quebec), the average rate of withdrawn and stayed cases ranged from about 9% in Quebec to 31% in British Columbia. In post-charge consultation jurisdictions (Ontario, Nova Scotia, and Saskatchewan), the rate of withdrawn and stayed cases was higher, ranging from 37.5% in Saskatchewan to 48% in Ontario. The Ministry said that this data suggests a potential inefficiency that could be addressed through pre-charge consultation.

#### *Diversion*

The Committee also heard that there are other mechanisms for keeping low-level cases out of the criminal justice system. For instance, for a minor theft case, the Crown might choose to terminate the prosecution by diverting the offender to a community program that would address the offence at issue. This approach is known as post-charge diversion.

Recently, the Ministry has also worked with several police services to develop a program of pre-charge police diversion. Approximately 15 police services across the province have signed on to a version of the program, which allows police to decide not to lay a charge and instead send the accused to a diversion program.

## Committee Recommendations

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts recommends that:

6. The Ministry of the Attorney General continue working with the Ministry of the Solicitor General and police services to explore the potential benefits of moving to a system of pre-charge consultation and report back to the Committee on its findings.
7. The Ministry of the Attorney General explore the potential for more justice centres and report its findings to the Committee.

## Bail

### *Time Needed for Bail Decision*

The 2019 audit found that the average number of days needed to reach a bail decision had increased since 2014/15. To help reduce the number of days needed to arrive at a bail outcome, the Auditor recommended, among other things, that the Ministry evaluate some of its initiatives to increase speed and certainty in the bail process, such as its bail vettor program (see below). The Auditor also recommended that the Ministry work with the judiciary to expand the use of teleconferencing and videoconferencing and discuss the possibility of expanding court operating hours for bail hearings.

A bail vettor is an experienced prosecutor who takes an active role in the operation of bail court by collaborating with defence counsel, the police, community partners, and other justice participants to prepare the Crown's position on bail. The Committee learned that the Bail Vettor Performance Monitoring Report was updated and completed in the spring of 2021. In July 2022, the Ministry increased the number of bail vettors across from province from 11 to 33.

According to the Ministry, bail vettors "can reduce the average number of days needed to arrive at a bail outcome, streamline the bail process, and facilitate early resolutions." In turn, this creates capacity in the system, reducing the need to expand court operating hours. However, the Ministry has been working with the Ontario Court to evaluate whether expanding court operating hours for bail hearings will reduce the average number of days needed to arrive at a bail outcome.

The Committee also learned that due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Ontario Court implemented new virtual processes. SOLGEN has reported that video conferencing was used for 97% of in-custody court appearances as of early May 2021, mainly due to the widespread adoption of remote appearances during the pandemic.

### *Bail Reform*

The Committee also asked whether the Ministry is seeing more violent offenders getting bail. The Ministry responded that the available statistics are not conclusive, although there have been some high-profile cases of crimes committed by persons on bail. The Ministry noted that it would like to see a change to the federal *Criminal Code* that would place the onus on persons

---

accused of committing a crime using a gun or involving intimate partner violence, or who are repeat violent offenders, to prove that they should be released on bail (rather than the Crown having to prove that they should not be released).

### **Committee Recommendations**

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts recommends that:

8. The Ministry of the Attorney General monitor the expansion of the bail vettor program and its impact on the amount of time it takes to reach a bail outcome.
9. The Ministry of the Attorney General continue working with the Ontario Court to evaluate whether expanding court operating hours for bail hearings will reduce the average number of days in arriving at a bail outcome.

### **Mental Health and Drug Treatment Courts**

The Committee heard that there are approximately 40 mental health, drug treatment, and combined mental health/drug treatment courts across the province. They operate in various jurisdictions, including throughout northern Ontario. However, they do not all operate the same way. Sometimes they will operate one day a week, sometimes half a day a week, depending on the need.

The 2019 audit found that a lack of a specific mandate, standardized procedures and goals, and data limited the potential benefits of mental health courts. In particular, the audit found that mental health courts lack specific goals and measurable outcomes, and there was a lack of data on the number of individuals and cases that go through mental health courts.

The Ministry said that there are two challenges related to tracking outcomes of the mental health and drug treatment courts. The first challenge is that some data is owned by the court. The Ministry stated that the development of performance outcomes for these courts would have to be led by the judiciary.

In addition, the existing systems do not permit the Ministry to track the number of offenders who go through mental health and/or drug treatment courts. However, the Ministry is hopeful that as it migrates to the new case management systems there may be opportunities to enhance the tracking of these cases.

The Ministry also noted that mental health and drug treatment courts do not operate in isolation; as noted earlier, Ontario also has four justice centres, some of which are designed to address mental health issues. For instance, the justice centre in London is designed to meet the needs of young adults, many of whom suffer from mental health issues and lack of educational, employment, and training opportunities.

**Committee Recommendations**

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts recommends that:

10. The Ministry of the Attorney General continue working with the judiciary and other stakeholders to encourage the adoption of performance indicators for mental health courts.
11. The Ministry of the Attorney General work to enhance the tracking of cases through mental health and drug treatment courts as it migrates to the new case management system and report back to the Committee.

---

## CONSOLIDATED LIST OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts recommends that:

1. The Ministry of the Attorney General provide annual updated data to the Committee on the current number of criminal cases awaiting disposition, the average number of days needed to dispose of a criminal case, and how they were disposed.
2. The Ministry of the Attorney General continue to engage with the Ministry of the Solicitor General and police services to secure commitment from all police services to sign on to the disclosure Framework Memorandum of Understanding (FMOU).
3. The Ministry of the Attorney General work with the Ministry of the Solicitor General to provide a list to the Committee of the police services that have and have not signed the Framework Memorandum of Understanding (FMOU) and the reasons why some police services may be unable to sign the FMOU.
4. The Ministry of the Attorney General identify the resources required to go through electronic evidence and how Ontario compares to other jurisdictions.
5. The Ministry of the Attorney General report to the Committee on the timing and the implementation of the case management system for the Ontario Court of Justice and the Superior Court of Justice.
6. The Ministry of the Attorney General continue working with the Ministry of the Solicitor General and police services to explore the potential benefits of moving to a system of pre-charge consultation and report back to the Committee on its findings.
7. The Ministry of the Attorney General explore the potential for more justice centres and report its findings to the Committee.
8. The Ministry of the Attorney General monitor the expansion of the bail vettor program and its impact on the amount of time it takes to reach a bail outcome.
9. The Ministry of the Attorney General continue working with the Ontario Court to evaluate whether expanding court operating hours for bail hearings will reduce the average number of days in arriving at a bail outcome.
10. The Ministry of the Attorney General continue working with the judiciary and other stakeholders to encourage the adoption of performance indicators for mental health courts.
11. The Ministry of the Attorney General work to enhance the tracking of cases through mental health and drug treatment courts as it migrates to the new case management system and report back to the Committee.

