

**IN THE MATTER OF PART XX.1 (Mental Disorder) OF THE CRIMINAL CODE  
R.S.C. 1985 c. C-46, as amended 1991, c. 43**

**AND**

**THE BRITISH COLUMBIA REVIEW BOARD**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

**ROBERT ALLAN MITCHELL**

**REASONS FOR DISPOSITION**

**HELD AT: Forensic Psychiatric Institute  
Port Coquitlam, BC  
February 7, 2001**

**BEFORE:                   CHAIRPERSON:   B. Walter  
MEMBERS:                Dr. H. Parfitt, psychiatrist  
                                  K. Lehal**

**APPEARANCES:   ACCUSED/PATIENT: Robert Allan Mitchell  
                          ACCUSED/PATIENT COUNSEL: M. Smith  
                          HOSPITAL/CLINIC: M. Shieh D. Carew M. Acheson  
                          ATTORNEY GENERAL: T. Ochitwa  
                          COUNSEL - MAG LEGAL SERVICES BRANCH: J. Loenen  
                          MINISTRY FOR CHILDREN & FAMILIES: P. Grant**

1        **1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

2        On February 1, 2001 the BC Review Board (BCRB) convened a “mandatory” hearing,  
3        pursuant to S.672.81(2)(a) C.C., to review its disposition in the matter of Robert A.  
4        Mitchell (accused) made on October 16, 2000. That disposition ordered, inter alia,  
5        that as of November 16, 2000, Mr. Mitchell be discharged from the Forensic  
6        Psychiatric Institute (FPI) to reside at the “South Surrey Residence”: Ex. 119.

7  
8        On November 16, 2000 the BCRB received notification pursuant to S.672.56 C.C. that  
9        “hospital unable to discharge patient to South Surrey Residence as ordered in  
10       patient’s most recent Review Board disposition”: Ex. 20.

11  
12       Mr. Mitchell remains detained at FPI at the time of this hearing. His ongoing detention  
13       is in contravention of the discharge afforded him under his current disposition,  
14       occasioning this hearing.

15  
16       Mr. Mitchell’s social, criminal, psychiatric and clinical history have all been described in  
17       detail over the course of his (at least 15) previous hearings before the Review Board.  
18       This panel adopts the findings and conclusions contained in the Review Board’s  
19       previous reasons for disposition; in particular Exhibits 44, 98, and 119. Some of this  
20       documented history is brought forward for the reader’s benefit in these reasons.

21  
22       The following passages are taken from Reasons for Disposition at Ex. 44:

23                    Mr. Mitchell’s psycho-social and clinical history is outlined in excellent detail  
24                    in Exhibit 44, the Reasons for Disposition of a hearing held on September  
25                    21, 1995:

1  
2 Mr. Mitchell has had mental disorder since childhood. He has suffered  
3 seizures since a very early age, and in his third or fourth year was  
4 diagnosed as suffering from temporal lobe epilepsy. He still takes drugs to  
5 lessen the risk of grand mal seizures. He also suffers from an intellectual  
6 deficiency, having a borderline range of intellectual functioning, falling within  
7 the 4<sup>th</sup> percentile. In school he reached perhaps a Grade III or IV level. At  
8 age 15 he was admitted to psychiatric ward at Cranbrook because his  
9 mother had difficulty controlling him – he would fly into rages and destroy  
10 things. It is alleged that he also displayed inappropriate sexual behaviour  
11 with a four year-old girl and animals. (See Psychological Assessment by  
12 Kelly Reid, MA Psych, working under the supervision of Dr. Hans Veiel,  
13 October 22, 1992).

14  
15 The above Psychological Assessment also indicates that to that date Mr.  
16 Mitchell had had three admissions to the Forensic Psychiatric Institute  
17 (“FPI”), all for assault. In the index offence, Mr. Mitchell was found to have  
18 thrown a knife at someone in a continuous care home of which he was a  
19 resident. He was found not guilty by reason of insanity and ordered into  
20 strict custody to await the pleasure of the Lieutenant Governor. On January  
21 28, 1993, when brought under the new mental disorder provisions, he was  
22 given a discharge subject to conditions (Exhibit 20).”

23  
24 Initially following his admission to FPI Mr. Mitchell demonstrated some  
25 progress under medication, programs and counseling, including the benefit  
26 of a “one-to-one” worker to support his reintegration. In April 1994 he was  
27 transferred to reside in cottage accommodations on the Riverview hospital  
28 grounds.

29  
30 Prior to his February 16, 1995 review hearing Dr. Riar indicated that:

31  
32 “Mr. Mitchell’s condition was very stable. He caused no major management  
33 difficulties. He was very cooperative, polite, reactive and tolerable. His  
34 speech was good, his thinking concrete and his mood and affect appropriate  
35 (albeit a little silly sometimes). He displayed no hallucinations, delusions or  
36 suicidal or homicidal ideations. His attention and concentration were fair.  
37 His ability to judge certain social situations was poor and his insight to his  
38 situation was limited. He still remained passive aggressive and failed to  
39 accept responsibilities for his actions, tending instead to blame others. His  
40 diagnosis was

41 Axis I – Organic Personality Disorder due to Epilepsy + sexually  
42 inappropriate behaviour

43 Axis II - Borderline Mental Retardation

44 Axis III – Epilepsy: [Ex. 27]

45  
46  
47 Dr. Riar reported that Mr. Mitchell was taking public transport  
48 unaccompanied to attend Vancouver Community College to learn about  
49 human sexuality, and this experience was also helping his socializing skills.  
50 Dr. Riar added that despite this general improvement, Mr. Mitchell still had a  
51 tendency to decompensate quickly and to regress, and he need structure,  
52 supervision and guidance in his life: [Ex. 44].”

53  
54 “In mid 1995 Mr. Mitchell was the object of allegations of sexual impropriety  
55 resulting in the loss of his privileges including community access. Further  
56 allegations that he had submitted a false expense claim and non-  
57 compliance with house rules at the cottages resulted in a transfer to the  
58 more restrictive environment of R2-N. Mr. Mitchell tended to blame others  
59 for these things.  
60

1 A further summary of events and progress is found at [Ex. 44], p.p 2-3:  
2

3 In a Progress Report dated July 27, 1995, Dr. Simon Hearn, Psychologist,  
4 wrote that it was hard to be optimistic concerning Mr. Mitchell's future ability  
5 to control prosocial behaviour in sexual and other areas for the long-term.  
6 Dr. Hearn added that he may have reached a ceiling on how much he can  
7 improve (exhibit 36). In preparation for the July 31 hearing of the Review  
8 Board, Dr. Riar wrote to Dr. D. Eaves, July 28, 1995 (exhibit 37) that since  
9 the last Review Board hearing he had not noticed any improvement in Mr.  
10 Mitchell's behaviour. "In fact", he said, "his behaviour had deteriorated at  
11 times." However, in assessing risk, Dr. Riar said that Mr. Mitchell was able  
12 to control his behaviour and act appropriately whenever properly supervised  
13 and instructed. On July 31, the Review Board extended the conditional  
14 discharge, granting a right of unescorted access to the community subject to  
15 the authority of the Director, Adult Forensic Psychiatric Services ("the  
16 Director") to set rules of supervision for such access.  
17

18 In the middle of August three further events occurred that led once again to  
19 withdrawal of privileges. On August 13, Mr. Mitchell was sitting with his girl  
20 friend in a public area of the hospital, in front of a window, with his penis out.  
21 He was seen by a staff member who confronted him about it. At first, he  
22 denied the allegation categorically, calling the staff member an "f....g liar",  
23 along with some racial slurs. However, his girl friend is alleged to have  
24 acknowledged that the allegation was true, and that Mr. Mitchell had indeed  
25 asked her to fellate him. Later, Mr. Mitchell is reported to have admitted to a  
26 staff member that it happened, but he refused to discuss it in a formal  
27 setting. The second incident occurred on August 14, when he persistently  
28 rang a buzzer on a hallway door, and when told that this was inappropriate  
29 conduct he became argumentative, refusing to talk it out, adding that he had  
30 "the right to remain silent". On August 16, he was reminded that use of his  
31 own cup to get ice from the ice-machine was prohibited on sanitary grounds,  
32 and he became argumentative and agitated (exhibit 41).  
33

34 In response to his apparent disregard for the rules, the treatment team  
35 decided to place him on a strict behaviour modification program. All his  
36 privileges were withdrawn, and he was told that they would be restored if his  
37 behaviour remained appropriate: (see letter of September 18, 1995, from  
38 Dr. K. Riar to Dr. D. Eaves, exhibit 42).  
39

40 As of December 15, 1995 Mr. Mitchell's privileges were withheld after it was  
41 alleged that he was soliciting sexual partners for a mentally handicapped  
42 woman (his "girlfriend").  
43

44 In anticipation of his June 26, 1996 hearing a significant body of new  
45 disposition information was generated.  
46

47 Dr. Simon Hearn, psychologist provided an update to his earlier (1995)  
48 assessment:  
49 He has always generated unusual amounts of attention at FPI, for instance,  
50 has a one-to-one worker when no other patient has, and weekly sessions  
51 with a psychologist where few others have.  
52

53 Since 1995 the patient has transgressed behaviourally a number of times in  
54 serious ways. These incidents have entailed crossing sexual boundaries  
55 with women without consent, crossing sexual boundaries with consent but in  
56 public places, or conning staff. The team, through individual members and  
57 as a group, has explored how best to understand and ameliorate Mr.  
58 Mitchell's behaviour.  
59

1 What has become apparent ins that his worldview and behaviour are  
2 unvaryingly egocentric, and that asking him to understand and use abstract  
3 principles, such as taking into account the other person's point of view, will  
4 not work, because such notions are beyond his intellectual capacity and out  
5 of his character. Mr. Mitchell is an unfortunate mixture of entrenched  
6 antisocial attitudes and intellectual limitation. He lacks abstract reasoning  
7 ability, and taking another person's point of view requires that ability.  
8

9 Mr. Mitchell's behaviour did improve notably over his initial few years at FPI,  
10 and that raised expectations. Some team members now suspect he has  
11 reaching a ceiling of capacity.  
12

13 While the patient can parrot statements of understanding principles such as  
14 those learned from human relationships courses he took at Douglas  
15 College, such attitudes are not internalized. For him, all situations are still  
16 about naïve self-interest, and actions are defined in terms of punishment  
17 and reward.  
18

19 Mr. Mitchell's capacity for relationships and bonding with others is entirely  
20 limited. He was attached to Mike Best, his on-to-one worker, because Mike  
21 was a supportive and relatively undemanding companion. However, the  
22 concepts of trust, commitment, loyalty, or wanting the best for others, are  
23 not in Mr. Mitchell's repertoire. Not only do his intellectual limitations stop  
24 him from experiencing empathy, but his abusive, painful past seems to have  
25 taught him not to expect anything from anyone else and to look out for  
26 number one in every case. If he gives, there is an attached expectation of  
27 something in return. Among FPI patients, he is know as one of those who  
28 live by the "con code:" life in the Institute is a struggle between staff and  
29 patients; rules are to be worked around where possible; never tell, always  
30 deny; every one for himself. Mr. Mitchell has no close friends in the patient  
31 population: [Ex. 50].  
32

33 With what appears to have become an insightful and prescient statement,  
34 Dr. Hearn states:  
35 "Essentially, the Institute's 'dialogue' with Mitchell is about control and  
36 Power": [Ex. 50, p.4].  
37

38 Dr. Hearn's report also indicates that Mr. Mitchell had consented to  
39 treatment with Androcur to lower his libido: [Ex. 50 p.6]. Mr. Mitchell  
40 withdrew his consent to such anti-androgen treatment May 31, 1996.  
41

42 In the overview spanning 7 months Ms. Richardson, the accused's CMC  
43 stated:  
44

45 Over the last year the treatment team has attempted to accelerate his  
46 activity in the community including ten months of community college  
47 courses for the mentally handicapped. He has continued with a one-to-one  
48 worker for well over 2.5 years to assist him to understand expectations of  
49 community living and appropriate social behaviour. He has one-to-one  
50 counseling and group counseling since the summer of 1995 and is on a  
51 fairly strict behaviour modification program. Although there have been  
52 periods where Robbie's behaviour has been acceptable for periods at a  
53 time. The behaviour can just as quickly deteriorate into argumentative,  
54 defiant, egocentric behaviour. He has been involved in sexually  
55 inappropriate behaviour which may have included the fact that he charge  
56 co-patients for the services of his girlfriend: [Ex. 51].  
57

58 On October 1, 1996 Dr. Wanis assumed responsibility as Mr. Mitchell's  
59 assigned, supervising psychiatrist. Dr. Wanis considered Mr. Mitchell a high  
60 risk as:

1  
2 "There has not been any outstanding changes in his thinking or  
3 behaviourally pattern. He continues to show minimal insight as to what  
4 brought him into the hospital and he has a distinctive ability of displacing  
5 blame onto others. His response to medication has been minimal. Hence,  
6 overall, Mr. Mitchell presents a high risk of reoffending": [Ex. 55].  
7

8  
9 During the period June 1996 to May 1997 the following incidents were  
10 documented [Ex. 56]:

- 11 • August 30, 1996: bothering a female patient for 2 weeks asking for  
12 sex.
- 13 • October 7, 1996: verbal aggression toward staff; he apologized.
- 14 • November 1996: refusal to take direction from vocational  
15 supervisor.
- 16 • November 23, 1996: inappropriate behaviour on an S.E.O.
- 17 • December 2, 1996: observed with female patients' head between  
18 his knees.
- 19 • December 28, 1996: female visitor observed fondling Mr. Mitchell's  
20 genitals; accused taken to sideroom.
- 21 • January 17, 1997: verbal threats to one-to-one worker.
- 22 • January 21, 1997: observed kissing female patient  
23

24 On June 23, the BCRB encouraged high level Inter-ministry discussions of  
25 Robert Mitchell's housing needs.  
26

27 In September 1997 Robert Mitchell was found out-of-bounds and engaged  
28 in sexual relations with a female co-patient.  
29

30 In November 1997 Mr. Mitchell's treatment team approached Ministry of  
31 Social Services to discuss a 24 hour supervised community placement.  
32 Funding for such an opportunity was to be pursued at management levels  
33 between FPI, the Ministry of Health (MOH), and the Ministry of Children and  
34 Families (MCF).  
35

36 Mr. Mitchell was introduced to staff from South Surrey residence a possible  
37 placement, but refused to visit the facility or accept his need for 24 hour  
38 supervision: [Ex. 68]. This facility would consider housing Mr. Mitchell at  
39 \$300.00 per day: [Ex. 70].  
40

41 Subsequently Ministry of Children and Families rejected Mr. Mitchell for its  
42 S.P.M.H./C.L.S. mandate: [Ex. 69].  
43

44 On February 4, 1998 the BCRB convened a hearing to receive further  
45 evidence relevant to the inter-ministerial or "systemic" issues which posed  
46 barriers to funding an appropriately supervised out-patient program for Mr.  
47 Mitchell. The following is an excerpt of the reasons for the Board's  
48 custodial disposition:  
49

50 On November 26, 1997, the Regional Operating Officer, East Kootenay  
51 Region of the Ministry of Children and Families wrote to Mr. Westell, a  
52 social worker at FPI that Mr. Mitchell was not eligible for Ministry of Children  
53 and Families services. According to Mr. Phillips, the Ministry of Children  
54 and Families' Child Family and Community Service Policy Manual defines  
55 adults with a mental handicap as those assessed at or below and IQ of 70.  
56

57 As Mr. Mitchell had been assessed at an IQ of 72, he was deemed ineligible  
58 for Services to Persons with Mental Handicaps (SPMH) and accordingly:  
59 "We have no ability, nor is it within our mandate, to provide the type of  
60 service and supervision that he requires..." [Exhibit 69].

1  
2 Mr. M. Quinn, FPI Director, attended the hearing to provide an update on  
3 the progress of negotiations with respect to service funding for Mr. Mitchell.  
4 We were told that senior management of the Ministries of Health and  
5 Children and Families had met to discuss revising the existing protocol  
6 between the Ministries in relation to funding responsibilities. Agreement in  
7 principle, has been achieved to raise the SPMH IQ limit for eligibility to 75.  
8 Pending finalization of this agreement, the Ministry of Children and Families  
9 has approved interim funding for 3 FPI inpatients, including Mr. Mitchell,  
10 who meet the new criterion for eligibility.

11  
12 However, this acceptance of responsibility for funding translates in practical  
13 terms to a commitment of only \$96.00 per day. Previously submitted  
14 disposition information [Exhibits 69 & 70] indicate that appropriate  
15 programming for the accused would cost \$300 per day. The question of  
16 responsibility for this shortfall remains unresolved.

17  
18 We were then told that no concrete, comprehensive community based  
19 care/treatment plan for Mr. Mitchell had in fact been developed and that  
20 therefore, it was not possible to ascertain its final cost. Moreover, we were  
21 told that the resource proposed in Exhibit 70 would not be available to  
22 accommodate Mr. Mitchell until the end of February. In conclusion, we were  
23 left with the message that despite the adjournment, and although Ministry of  
24 Health's Adult Mental Health Services would be expected to contribute to  
25 Mr. Mitchell's service plan neither the services for the funds were in place  
26 on the day of the hearing.

27  
28 Dr. Wanis, Mr. Mitchell's supervising psychiatrist attended to provide  
29 information with respect to the level of risk which Mr. Mitchell might pose to  
30 the safety of the public.

31  
32 Dr. Wanis' opinion is that the accused would remain a high risk (80-100%  
33 likelihood of re-offending) even with 1 to 1 supervision. He believes that  
34 level of risk is unlikely to abate or respond to intervention given the organic  
35 basis for Mr. Mitchell's affliction.

36  
37 He acknowledges that the accused is not now nor had he been psychotic,  
38 but rather that his overall mental condition or his diagnostic issues in  
39 combination, as well as his "predatorial" nature render him a possible  
40 public threat.

41  
42 Dr. Wanis defines "mental condition" as a broader constellation of psycho-  
43 social elements, including organic factors, than the narrow legal concept of  
44 "mental disorder".

45  
46 In coming to his assessment of Mr. Mitchell's risk, Dr. Wanis cited a number  
47 of HCR 20 factors.

48  
49 In summary, Dr. Wanis would be reluctant to discharge Mr. Mitchell under  
50 any service plan beyond an institutional setting.

51  
52 On Mr. Mitchell's behalf, Mr. Arbogast argues that insofar as the accused's  
53 "mental condition" is deemed to be permanent/constant, the BCRB ought to  
54 place greater emphasis upon the companion elements of s.672.54. He also  
55 argues on the basis of the Chambers decision that despite the treatment  
56 team's pessimistic view of the accused level of "clinical" risk, the BCRB  
57 ought to focus its attention on risk of "criminal" behaviour. No evidence was  
58 rendered which would assist us in separating these two notions: [Ex. 74].

59  
60 In conclusion the Board maintained the status quo:

1 Under the circumstances, it appears that notwithstanding the issues of  
2 funding and despite the arrangement of a second hearing, no plan for this  
3 accused exists. Clearly, the high level of case management, coordination,  
4 assessment, service brokerage and negotiation required by the accused's  
5 unique configuration of needs, has not occurred despite the hiatus of 1 ½  
6 months.

7  
8 Whether this is due to the lack of consensus amongst the treatment team or  
9 the unresolved allocation of funding responsibility is unclear and perhaps  
10 ultimately secondary.

11  
12 What is clear is that this accused, like any other is entitled to a full  
13 exploration of program options which have some likelihood of meeting the  
14 competing considerations dictated by Parliament under s.672.54. Failing  
15 such a fulsome exploration, the accused's current disposition is tantamount  
16 to a life sentence.

17  
18 In the face of the Director's strong views as to Mr. Mitchell's potential threat  
19 to public safety and in the absence of any alternative at this time, we have  
20 no choice but to continue Mr. Mitchell's custodial situation.

21  
22 We are however concerned that custodial dispositions do not become Mr.  
23 Mitchell's fate by default and consequently, this disposition is further review  
24 able by April 30, 1998.

25  
26 We trust that on or before that date, the BCRB can be provided with a clear  
27 position and plan for Mr. Mitchell's future, in lieu of the need to continue this  
28 rather wasteful pattern of having to marshal the extensive clinical, legal and  
29 BCRB resources required to conduct proceedings which result in  
30 inconclusive dispositions: [Ex. 74].

31  
32 On April 28, 1998 the existing order was extended for a further period of two  
33 months at the request of Mike Quinn, Director, Adult Forensic Psychiatric  
34 Services (AFPS):

35 I write to report that discussions are still ongoing between the Ministries of  
36 Health and Children & Families with reference to the above patient. I have  
37 received financial support for three patients, who come within the category  
38 of MCF, and am awaiting a decision with respect to the remaining three  
39 patients, making a total of six patients.

40  
41 In discussions with the proprietor of the home in Surrey, they would need a  
42 minimum of 4/5 residents to 'open' the house.

43  
44 I will continue with discussions to hopefully bring this issue to closure, and  
45 would request that the present order be allowed to continue: [Ex. 75].

46  
47 Clearly the Director appeared to hold out hope of establishing/achieving a  
48 suitable discharge program for Mr. Mitchell.

49  
50 On May 29, 1998 a new hearing was convened resulting in a reserved  
51 decision. Following evidence and submissions the Board awarded yet  
52 another disposition of custody, essentially by "default":

53  
54 All parties agree that Mr. Mitchell does not need to reside in a hospital  
55 setting, and he could function in the community if there were available an  
56 appropriate community facility that would provide the kind of structure and  
57 supervision that he requires in order to ensure public safety. In the absence  
58 of this, the default position is a custodial disposition in a hospital: Brockville  
59 Psychiatric Hospital v. McGillis (Ont. C.A., Oct. 4, 1996).  
60



1 Like previous panels of the Review Board, the members of this panel are  
2 very concerned that the effect of the shortage of supervised community  
3 placements in British Columbia is to prevent many mentally disordered  
4 accused, like Mr. Mitchell, from being granted the least onerous and least  
5 restrictive appropriate disposition on the basis of the considerations set out  
6 in sec. 672.54. The Review Board therefore urges the ministries and  
7 agencies involved to redouble their efforts to resolve this systemic  
8 inadequacy as soon as possible. The Board is sure that development of  
9 appropriate community resources would be welcomed not only by those  
10 persons detained in FPI primarily for security reasons, but also by the  
11 administration and staff of FPI who could then concentrate more attention  
12 on those patients who really need hospital care.

13  
14 The Review Board also noted that unless a suitably supervised placement  
15 can be found, it is likely that Mr. Mitchell will remain in custody at FPI for the  
16 rest of his life. This is because the psychiatric assessment that he is a  
17 sexual predator, preying upon intellectually challenged females, is likely to  
18 stay with him as he is incapable of learning abstraction such as the need to  
19 respect other people's rights and feelings. The Board believes that given  
20 the extremely serious consequences of concluding that he is a high risk  
21 sexual predator, Mr. Mitchell is entitled to an independent psychiatric  
22 assessment of his level of risk, preferably by someone who is  
23 knowledgeable regarding supervised residential facilities for the mentally  
24 disordered and who carry the diagnosis of Axis I Organic personality  
25 disorder and Axis II Borderline mental retardation significant anti-social  
26 personality traits. The Board stresses that this does not indicate any lack of  
27 confidence in the expertise of Dr. Wanis, but rather a recognition of the  
28 patient's right to a second opinion. Accordingly, the Review Board has  
29 provided its disposition for another hearing to take place before November  
30 30, 1998, to review Mr. Mitchell's case once again, and to receive the  
31 assessment prepared by the independent psychiatrist: [Ex. 82].

32  
33 A further hearing was scheduled for November 12, 1998. In the interim Mr.  
34 Mitchell's former one-to-one worker, M. Best was "encouraged to submit a  
35 written proposal" to Mr. Mitchell's treatment team regarding his capacity to  
36 provide a 24 hour supervised, structured and staffed residential  
37 environment: Ex 83.

38  
39 Mr. Mitchell was offered a trial of Sertraline to decrease his sexual drive  
40 which he refused: [Ex. 84].

41  
42 On October 8, 1998 a female Riverview patient reported an offer of money  
43 for sex from Mr. Mitchell.

44  
45 In addition an independent psychological assessment by Dr. Peter Johnson  
46 was submitted by Mr. Mitchell's counsel. Dr. Johnson's assessments  
47 provides, inter alia:

48  
49 Given that Mr. Mitchell has spent so many years living at FPI, there can be  
50 little doubt that the environment has significantly influenced his behaviour.  
51 From his point of view, it is largely an environment of mentally-ill patients,  
52 secure buildings, and a complex system of rules. Relationships with trained  
53 staff are transitory. Staff change shifts and wards, and doctors are only  
54 available for a few hours a week. Supportive friendships between patients  
55 are unusual. Clearly, the negative environment factors outweigh the positive  
56 influences in this man's life.

57  
58 Mr. Mitchell has been criticized for having adopted the "con" lifestyle, i.e. not  
59 trusting staff or other patients and trying to manipulate the system in order  
60 to meet his own needs. From his point of view, this appears to be a method

1 of dealing with a hostile environment. In spite of staff's promises and their  
2 best intentions, he is still confined in FPI. He now seems to lack the level of  
3 trust of professional staff which might bring about positive changes in his  
4 status. Further lengthy confinement at FPI is unlikely to improve this man's  
5 behaviour: [Ex. 86]."  
6

7 "The Board imposed a further disposition of custody for 6 months noting Mr.  
8 Mitchell's progress.  
9

10 In preparation for Mr. Mitchell's next hearing scheduled for May 4, 1999 Dr.  
11 Wanis indicated that Mr. Best's "proposal" to provide residential care would  
12 be critically reviewed contingent upon funding commitments: [Ex. 89]. The  
13 "Best proposal" is at [Ex. 91]. In April the MCF and MOH executed a  
14 protocol agreement respecting collaboration in discharge planning for  
15 developmentally disabled adults from FPI: [Ex. 92]. In reviewing the  
16 document at its May 4 hearing the Review Board remarked:  
17 "Now the Treatment Team in conjunction with MCF social worker Gordon  
18 Towers should be able to move forward to identify a suitable placement.  
19 Mr. Quinn believes that Robert Mitchell's name is near the top of the list of  
20 those persons needing specialized placement facilities:" [Ex. 93].  
21

22 The Board ordered a further period of custody in the hope that either the  
23 "Best proposal" or another suitable placement would be identified by  
24 September 1999.  
25

26 Ministry for Children and Families was designated a party to the  
27 proceedings pursuant to S.672.5(4)C.C."  
28

## 29 **2.0 RECENT PROCEDURAL/HEARING HISTORY**

30 On October 25, 1999 an early hearing was convened to allow the Board to review  
31 anticipated discharge program proposals; to learn about the extent of MCF  
32 Community Living Services (CLS) participation in providing and funding services for  
33 Mr. Mitchell pursuant to the "protocol" [Ex. 92]; to learn of the outcome of any visit  
34 leaves enjoyed by Mr. Mitchell since May 1999.  
35

36 The evidence addressed at that hearing and considered by the Review  
37 Board consisted of the following:

- 38 • MCF is currently funding Mr. Mitchell's one-to-one worker at a cost  
39 of \$25,000 per annum.
- 40 • Gordon Towers is the assigned CLS social worker in the East  
41 Kootenay region. He has explored both the "Best" and South  
42 Surrey proposals.
- 43 • Given Mr. Mitchell's constellation of needs and challenges a  
44 placement opportunity might be more likely to develop in the lower  
45 mainland.

- MCF does not see Forensic Services' role of safeguarding public safety as part of its mandate or expertise.

For AFPS Mr. Shieh, CMC provided an updated progress report citing occasions when the accused's behaviour has brought about suspension and reinstatement of privileges. On June 23, 1999 the accused was transferred to Elm Unit for increased supervision due to an escalation of verbally abusive and threatening behaviours directed at female staff.

On July 22, 1999 it was reported that Mr. Mitchell had threatened his one-to-one worker to the point where Dr. Wanis later told the hearing he was considering removing this benefit from his patient. Mr. Mitchell later apologized though it is difficult in the context to consider the incident described as anything amounting to a threat of violence or to imagine it inspiring fear in the recipient, although it has resulted in the loss of the accused privileges as well as having raised the potential for his transfer to the most secure unit at FPI.

Mr. Shieh summarizes his patient's behaviours over time:

Mr. Mitchell's behaviour appears to have been escalating and deteriorating since May of this year, resulting in his transfer to Elm House and suspension of privileges.

He continues to lack insight, refuses to accept responsibility for his behaviour and instead projects blame onto others. Recently, he has been more demanding, argumentative and verbally aggressive with nursing staff and his 1-1 worker, threatening to report them or speak to his lawyer when given directions or when confronted about his inappropriate behaviour: [Ex. 74].

Dr. Wanis' evidence is that he continues to consider Mr. Mitchell as a high risk to re-offend and not suitable for community placement. He believes the level or risk posed by Mr. Mitchell is currently so unmanageable as to obviate even a consideration of a community program. Dr. Wanis gave as grounds for his assessment Mr. Mitchell's impulsive behaviour, his brain damage, and borderline retardation, his need for structure, his consistent historic "acting out behaviour" and lack of insight.

Dr. Wanis was not able or willing to couch his patient's risk in the context of likelihood of violence. He stated that this was not the threshold or criteria by which FPI assesses risk. Rather he interprets Mr. Mitchell's non-cooperation as indicative of his inability to function outside FPI or in a "Mini-FPI" with 24 hour supervision, locked doors at night and professional and one-to-one staffing during the day.

On the other hand it is Dr. Wanis' view that his patient has essentially exhausted the benefits of the programs and services which have been provided to him at FPI.

On behalf of Mr. Mitchell the Board heard from Mr. Best who had submitted the proposal to accommodate Mr. Mitchell in the community: [Ex. 91] and 97.

Despite the apparent earlier trajectory of case planning for the accused as well as the evidence noted in the Reasons at Exhibit 93, the proposal remains unassessed and not responded to. No visit leaves have occurred: [Ex. 98]."

1 After the conclusion of this hearing the Review Board stated:

2 We have no evidence before us of recent overt physical violence or serious  
3 aggression, beyond persistent, unpleasant, inappropriate, annoying, testing,  
4 even anti-social behaviour. We also know that the accused has exhausted  
5 the services of FPI to the point where at this time much of his behaviour is  
6 likely dictated, by or reactive to his environment.  
7

8 This state of affairs was foreshadowed by Dr. Hearn in 1996 at Exhibit 50  
9 and reflected by Dr. Johnson at [Ex. 87]. It also emerged clearly in the  
10 course of this hearing.  
11

12 It is our unanimous opinion that the level of public threat posed by Mr.  
13 Mitchell is manageable and ought to be managed in a sufficiently  
14 supervised, structured and equipped community program model. It is our  
15 belief that there are two potential settings which currently or with altogether  
16 reasonable modifications or adaptations could accommodate and manage  
17 Mr. Mitchell. We therefore propose to delay the implementation of this  
18 disposition until December 1, 1999.  
19

20 We also strongly believe that it is important to attempt to reintegrate Mr.  
21 Mitchell now, before his current circumstances become the fulfillment of the  
22 potentially prophetic statement found in [Ex. 74] supra:  
23 What is clear is that this accused, like any other is entitled to a full  
24 exploration of program options which have some likelihood of meeting the  
25 competing considerations dictated by Parliament under s.672.54. Failing  
26 such a fulsome exploration, the accused's current disposition is tantamount  
27 to a life sentence: [Ex. 98].  
28

29 On December 4, 1999 the Review Board received a "postdated" notice stating that as  
30 of December 8, 1999, Mr. Mitchell's liberties were being restricted by his non  
31 discharge, "due to recent assaultive behaviour on a Health care worker on November  
32 17, 1999.": Ex. 99.  
33

34 The assaultive incident referred to resulted in a charge of assault (S.266 CCC)  
35 brought on January 13, 2000.: Ex. 100. The allegation consisted of the following:  
36

37 "...Mitchell had a verbal argument with a staff member... the victim  
38 Ramsay...was to escort Mitchell to solitary confinement...just as they were  
39 entering the confinement room (the victim) advised Mitchell "walkman" is not  
40 permitted in the room".  
41

42 The "victim" attempted to take the "walkman from Mitchell who" turned  
43 around and punched (the victim) with his closed right fist...one time...in the  
44 upper facial area." [Ex. 100].  
45

1 This incident constituted the first act of violence by the accused in his (then) 9 years at  
2 FPI: Ex. 103. He was ultimately acquitted on the charge of assault.

3

4 On February 28, 2000 a mandatory hearing was convened pursuant to S.672.81(2)(a).

5 At that hearing previously identified residential options remained unassessed. The

6 Board ordered a further short period of custody:

7 "Our disposition will extend for a period of four months to be reviewed on or  
8 before June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2000. It will contain directions that M.C.F., in consultation  
9 or partnership with F.P.I., undertake a thorough review and assessment of  
10 both the "Best" proposal and the South Surrey Residence with a view to  
11 determining and informing the Board of their suitability to house and  
12 supervise Mr. Mitchell, including where or why those programs may be  
13 deficient in that regard.": [Ex. 103].  
14

15 A hearing planned for June 12, 2000 was postponed to July 28, 2000 at the request of

16 counsel for the accused in order to obtain an independent psychiatric assessment.

17

## 18 **2.1 THE HEARING OF JULY 28, 2000 AND ITS CONTINUATION**

19

20 Prior to this hearing counsel for accused filed Notice of Constitutional Question:

21 asserting:

22 1. "The Applicant/ Accused has been detained in custody at the  
23 Forensic Psychiatric Institute following a verdict of not guilty on  
24 account of insanity rendered on January 21, 1991 on charges of  
25 assault with a weapon and aggravated assault.

26  
27 2. Since at lease June 23, 1997, the Review Board has repeatedly  
28 indicated that the Applicant/Accused would be eligible for a  
29 conditional discharge if a suitable community placement were  
30 located and adequate funding secured.

31  
32 3. Since at least June 23, 1997, the Review Board has encouraged  
33 the Forensic Psychiatric Institute to pursue discharge planning for  
34 the Applicant/Accused and, in particular, to negotiate funding  
35 arrangements for a community placement with other government  
36 agencies, including the Ministry of Health and the Ministry for  
37 Children and Families.

38  
39 4. The Government of British Columbia as represented by the forensic  
40 Psychiatric Institute and the Ministry of Children and Families, have  
41 failed adequately to pursue discharge planning for the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
  
15  
  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
  
29  
  
30  
  
31  
32  
33  
  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

Applicant/Accused and, in particular, have failed to conclude funding arrangements for a community placement for the Applicant/Accused.

- 5. Having regard to the factors set out in s.6762.54 of the Criminal Code, the continued detention of the Applicant/Accused at the Forensic Psychiatric Institute is not the least onerous and least restrictive disposition to the Applicant/Accused.
- 6. The ongoing detention of the Applicant/Accused at the forensic Psychiatric Institute infringes his rights under sections 7, 9 and 12 of the Charter and entitles him to seek relief under s.24(1) of the Charter.” Ex. 106.

This necessitated the involvement of counsel of behalf of the AGBC who argued that:

- (a) “The Review Board did not have jurisdiction as it is not a court of competent jurisdiction for the purposes of Section 24(1)of the Charter;
- (b) Alternatively, the applicant has not established that his rights have been infrindged pursuant to sections 7, 9, 12 or of the Charter; and
- (c) In the further alternative, any such infringement is saved under section one.

The MCF took no position as to disposition but argued:

“if the order of the Review Board was to be a Conditional Discharge with a provision for funding or a direction to reside at a specific facility, then Ms. St. Clair took the position that such an order would be tantamount to a payment order and beyond the jurisdiction of the Review Board.”

AFPS and Crown Counsel both supported a custodial disposition.

It bears mentioning that all parties (including the accused) before the Board were in agreement that an absolute discharge ought not to be ordered: Ex. 119.

The hearing which commenced on July 28, 2000 could not be completed in one day. Written interrogatories, answers and closing submissions with authorities were directed. The Board considered this additional evidence and material on October 16 and made its disposition of discharge subject to conditions to take effect November 16, 2000.

1 Given the progress of this case, the evidence considered by the Board as summarized  
2 in its Reasons for Disposition [Ex. 119] is once again summarized below:

3  
4 **“EVIDENCE OF THE DIRECTOR ADULT FORENSIC PSYCHIATRIC**  
5 **SERVICES**

6  
7 Two reports were tendered; a report dated July 4, 2000 from Dr. Wanis at  
8 Exhibit 108; and a report dated July 5, 2000 from Mr. Shieh at Exhibit 109.  
9 In addition, these individuals appeared at the hearing.

10  
11 Evidence of Dr. Wanis’

12  
13 In his report dated July 4, 2000 Dr. Wanis makes the following comments on  
14 the issues of risk and placement. After reciting earlier reports of Dr.  
15 Lohrasbe and Dr. Riar, Dr. Wanis concludes that:

16  
17 “Mr. Mitchell remains a high risk to re-offend. His aggression started at an  
18 early age, it does have an organic basis to it, and has not responded to  
19 psychological or medication treatment. He continues to rationalize and  
20 displace blame, hence revealing poor insight as to his acting out behaviors.  
21 This presents a significant problem in his management and his future  
22 placement.

23 I recommend that Mr. Mitchell be detained in custody at the Forensic  
24 Psychiatric Institute. It is the opinion of the treatment team that he is not  
25 currently suitable for any structured placement in the community... He has a  
26 one-to-one worker, Dan, who has been escorting him to programs.  
27 Depending on Dan's degree of comfort and perception, as well as the  
28 clinical opinion of risk by the treatment team, we will continue to increase  
29 Mr. Mitchell's privileges and allow him access into the community. He  
30 appears to be doing well on A2 and this is due to the structure and  
31 supervision provided there.

32  
33 At the hearing, Dr. Wanis elaborated further on his opinion, as follows:

34  
35 ***Risk:***

36  
37 Violent Behavior

38  
39 Dr. Wanis conceded that aside from the index offence and the November  
40 1999 assault, (of which Mr. Mitchell was acquitted), there has been no other  
41 assaultive or violent acting out behavior by Mr. Mitchell. In fact, Dr. Wanis  
42 agreed that in a recent altercation between Mr. Mitchell and a co-patient, on  
43 June 9, 2000, in which Mr. Mitchell was the victim that Mr. Mitchell did not  
44 retaliate. Nevertheless, Dr. Wanis emphasized that absence of violence on  
45 part of Mr. Mitchell was because of Mr. Mitchell’s placement in a secure  
46 custodial facility. Dr. Wanis maintained that Mr. Mitchell was a high risk to  
47 re-offend.

48  
49 “Sexual Predator”

50  
51 Part of Dr. Wanis’ risk assessment was based on his categorization of Mr.  
52 Mitchell as a “sexual predator”. When asked exactly what he meant by this  
53 phrase, Dr. Wanis responded that “Mr. Mitchell knows the weaknesses of  
54 other people and tends to exploit women with mental retardation.”  
55

1 As for specific examples of inappropriate sexual behavior Dr. Wanis testified  
2 that aside from an incident which occurred before 1997, when Mr. Mitchell  
3 tried to solicit prostitution, that there was no other incidents. In fact, Dr.  
4 Wanis conceded that this incident was five years ago, November 30, 1995  
5 (Exhibit 51, p.3).  
6

7 However, Dr. Wanis pointed out that last year Mr. Mitchell was found in  
8 possession of pornographic material, supplied to him by a visitor. Dr. Wanis  
9 explained, that this was one of the reasons for canceling Mr. Mitchell's  
10 Internet privileges, there were concerns that "he could use the Internet to  
11 entice women and children in cyberspace." But Dr. Wanis agreed that the  
12 actual reason for terminating Mr. Mitchell's internet usage was the hospital's  
13 understanding that Mr. Mitchell was misrepresenting himself to musical  
14 artists in order to solicit free CDs.  
15

16 Dr. Wanis insisted that Mr. Mitchell has the "antennas for vulnerable people"  
17 and that the reason there have been no recent incidents of sexually  
18 inappropriate behavior is, again, because Mr. Mitchell is in a custodial ward  
19 and subjected to strict supervision.  
20

### 21 ***Discharge into the Community***

22 Dr. Wanis emphasized that the hospital had no plan to discharge Mr.  
23 Mitchell at this time. Dr. Wanis maintained that the purpose of keeping Mr.  
24 Mitchell in FPI is to cascade him into the community. He repeated a number  
25 of times that the hospital wants Mr. Mitchell to model after Dan Campbell,  
26 the one-to-one worker. Dr. Wanis further stated that in his opinion he  
27 believes that Mr. Mitchell still does have room to move within FPI.  
28

29 Dr. Wanis was of the opinion that Mr. Mitchell can improve his impulsivity,  
30 despite his concession that extensive psychological treatment in this regard  
31 has already been tried in the past and failed. Dr. Wanis explained that  
32 despite the past failure that currently Mr. Mitchell is on a low dose of  
33 Triazodon, a drug used to curve impulsivity, and that if that dosage is  
34 increased there is room to improve in this area.  
35

36 Dr. Wanis agreed that Mr. Mitchell has already been in the hospital for 10  
37 years, that he has not been granted unescorted day leaves since 1995, that  
38 his escorted privileges were suspended in July of 1999, and that there is the  
39 risk of institutionalization. Nevertheless, Dr. Wanis advocated for the  
40 cascading approach. Dr. Wanis stated that if the hospital observes a period  
41 of stability they would move Mr. Mitchell to the Elm unit and then to the  
42 Dogwood unit, less secure facilities within the hospital. Dr. Wanis explained  
43 that if Mr. Mitchell does well at those levels his outings into the community  
44 would be increased with his one-to-one worker, and if that goes well, then  
45 community placement would be considered. He was adamant that without  
46 this cascading through the system community placement was not a  
47 possibility.  
48

### 49 **Evidence of the Accused**

50 Mr. Mitchell:

51 Mr. Mitchell testified at the hearing as follows on the issues of risk and  
52 placement:  
53

#### 54 ***Risk***

#### 55 Violent Behavior



1  
2 Mr. Mitchell testified that the allegation of hitting a health care worker in  
3 November of 1999 was a result of self-defense. Mr. Mitchell explained that  
4 he had been placed in a chokehold and was trying to free himself. He  
5 further testified that he was acquitted of this matter when it was tried in  
6 court.  
7

8  
9 “Sexual Predator”

10  
11 As to the evidence that he had been found in possession of pornographic  
12 material Mr. Mitchell explained that he was told that he could have this type  
13 of material if he kept it locked up and if the female staff would not take  
14 offence. He stated that the Director, a Mr. McGuiness, had told him this.  
15

16  
17 As to his Internet usage Mr. Mitchell testified that he was trying to create his  
18 own music newsletter to be distributed in the community. He explained that  
19 he had a few friends in musical bands and he communicated with them on  
20 the Internet asking them to send him their CD’s for his review. Mr. Mitchell  
21 said that he had advised them that he was going to start his own  
22 publication. In fact, he said that everything was ready to go to print when he  
23 lost his computer access, and that some of his reviews had been published  
24 in the Burnaby Mental Health Newsletter. He denied the hospital’s  
25 allegation that he was misrepresenting himself.  
26

27 ***Discharge into the Community***

28  
29 Mr. Mitchell confirmed that mid June 1995 was the last time that he had  
30 exercised unescorted access to the community.  
31

32  
33 Mr. Mitchell testified that he is currently at Level 3 privileges which means  
34 he can participate in Power Hour, a gym program; participate in Act I, a  
35 physical education program; he can have escorted grounds with the staff;  
36 and have staff escorted outings (“SEOs”) with his one to one worker.  
37

38  
39 Mr. Mitchell asserted he wanted to be out in the community, that having  
40 done ten years in custody already that he has served his time and ought not  
41 to be penalized any further.  
42

43 Dr. Noone: The independent psychiatric expert called on behalf of Mr.  
44 Mitchell.

45  
46 Dr. Noone’s expert report is found at Exhibit 109. In this report, Dr. Noone  
47 summarizes his opinion as follows:

48  
49 “... My clinical and consulting opinion on this matter supports that Mr. Robert  
50 Mitchell is manageable and ought to be managed in a sufficiently  
51 supervised structured and equipped community program model.... ...I do  
52 not see that he is a paraphillic, ie. has a sexual deviation, and I do not see  
53 him as meeting the criteria as a sexual predator. My assessment would  
54 concur with the statement of the Review Board 'we have no evidence before  
55 us of recent overt physical violence or serious aggression, beyond  
56 persistent, unpleasant, inappropriate, annoying, testing, even antisocial  
57 behavior... ... Certainly Mr. Mitchell at this stage could be aptly described as  
58 a square peg in a round hole for which his current placement at FPI is ill  
59 suited. ... More than a decade later we remain with Mr. Mitchell as a square  
peg in a round hole. We are back at square one, hopefully with the ability

1 this time to execute a least restrictive and most appropriate disposition in  
2 the community.”

3  
4 Dr. Noone elaborated on his report at the hearing as follows:

5  
6 ***Risk***

7  
8 Violent Behavior

9  
10 Dr. Noone was asked to express his opinion about the future possibility of  
11 violent behavior by Mitchell. Dr. Noone responded that we have the index  
12 offence, which was an offence involving personal violence using a weapon,  
13 we have some gray area regarding an incident in November 1999, and  
14 aside from that we have evidence of verbal aggression and inappropriate  
15 nuisance behavior. He stated we really only have two incidents upon which  
16 to predict serious violent crime. He emphasized that Mr. Mitchell is not a  
17 physically intimidating person, he has a shuffling gate, and neurological  
18 impairment due to epilepsy.

19  
20 On questioning by the hospital as to Mr. Mitchell's history of violence in  
21 boarding homes and whether that concerned him, Dr. Noone responded,  
22 yes, but emphasized that while that information was historically true we do  
23 not know if it holds true ten years later.

24  
25 Dr. Noone was asked whether he considered impulsivity to be a risk factor,  
26 and Dr. Noone responded that it depended on the situation, that violence is  
27 very interactional, and that how you treat a person can stimulate  
28 aggression including impulsive behavior.

29  
30 “Sexual Predator”

31  
32 As to Mr. Mitchell's sexually inappropriate behavior Dr. Noone stated that, in  
33 his opinion, there was a moderate risk for sexually inappropriate behavior,  
34 whether it was at the criminal level he did not know, since most of the past  
35 behavior was consensual.

36  
37 As to usage of the term 'sexual predator' Dr. Noone did not accept this label  
38 and said that instead one could describe Mr. Mitchell as more of an  
39 opportunist. He explained that predators don't get mad, just even, they stalk,  
40 and they issue no threats, whereas Mr. Mitchell is more verbally aggressive  
41 and moody. For these reasons he classified Mr. Mitchell is an opportunist  
42 not a predator.

43  
44  
45 ***Discharge into the Community***

46  
47 Dr. Noone agreed that Mr. Mitchell would continue to be a challenge. He  
48 has an impairment of social judgment and externalizes blame. However, in  
49 his opinion, Mr. Mitchell would be manageable in the community, in a 24-  
50 hour supervised facility. Dr. Noone said that after Mr. Mitchell exhibited a  
51 short period of appropriate behavior, a couple of months, at FPI he should  
52 be discharged into such a facility. He emphasized that an indefinite  
53 detention at FPI was not the solution.

54  
55 In addition, Dr. Noone stated that Mr. Mitchell does not need to be dropped  
56 back down all the way to the maximum-security level each time there was  
57 an incident. He stated that there has to be a goal (ie. to achieve the least  
58 onerous and least restrictive placement) within a set time limit and if that  
59 time limit has to be extended it must be on the basis of concrete observation  
60 of behavior.

1  
2 Dr. Noone explained that the eventual release into the community facility  
3 should initially be coupled with one-to-one escorted passes and with a back  
4 up plan. Dr. Noone explained that the back up plan would be the return to  
5 FPI if Mr. Mitchell's behavior warranted such a return. It was critical that any  
6 return be based on Mr. Mitchell's behavior and that impressing responsibility  
7 for behavior is the key issue. If the behavior warranted, in addition to a  
8 return to FPI, criminal sanctions should also be addressed to get this point  
9 across to Mr. Mitchell.

10  
11 According to Dr. Noone, the difficulty in making FPI anything other than a  
12 back up facility was that traditionally the forensic institutes deal with  
13 psychotic individuals and they are not really well geared for mental  
14 retardation and personality disorder type individuals. His opinion was that a  
15 community program potentially had more to offer. Dr. Noone reiterated what  
16 he wrote in his report, that Mr. Mitchell is a square peg in a round hole, he is  
17 not the norm in an institution, which deals with severely psychotic  
18 individuals who have committed serious offences. He said that Mr. Mitchell  
19 has an organic disorder which is substantial and that he would be best dealt  
20 with out in the community.

21  
22 Dr. Noone reiterated that FPI is not the appropriate setting that it is only  
23 appropriate as a back up to community placement. He stated that Mr.  
24 Mitchell has been warehoused in a total institution, held in a secure setting  
25 for ten years and not progressed beyond that. He restated that FPI is not  
26 the optimal setting, but can be the stepping stone to an optimal setting.

27  
28  
29 **Evidence of the Ministry of Children and Families ("MCF")**

30  
31 Dan Campbell: Mr. Mitchell's one-to-one worker.

32  
33 Mr. Campbell testified that currently he has a good rapport with Mr. Mitchell,  
34 but that every once and a while Mr. Mitchell needs redirection.

35  
36 As for the incident that led to withdrawal of SEO's last year, (Tab 94, p.3)  
37 July 22, 1999, Mr. Campbell responded that it arose after a discussion with  
38 Mitchell about his Internet usage. During this discussion Mr. Campbell  
39 stated that Mr. Mitchell was posturing and banging his fists on the table as  
40 a result of which he discontinued the meeting and cancelled outings for that  
41 day and progressively for the whole year.

42  
43 Mr. Campbell explained, however, that those outings have recently  
44 resumed, that in the past three weeks Mr. Mitchell has had nine outings, of  
45 four hours or less. Mr. Campbell anticipated more staff escorted outings.

46  
47 As to why it took a year to get Mr. Mitchell reestablished on SEO's Mr.  
48 Campbell said it was because of Mr. Mitchell's lack of ability to take and  
49 follow direction, and because they were also working on restoring the trust  
50 and comfort level between himself and Mr. Mitchell.

51  
52  
53 Mr. Gordon Towers: The designated social worker for the Ministry of  
54 Children and Families

55  
56 Mr. Towers testified via teleconference. He testified that he has been  
57 involved, since 1986, on a continuous basis, with Mr. Mitchell's case. He  
58 stated that he had inquired into the two community placements, the "Best  
59 Proposal" and the South Surrey Residence, and the results were as follows:  
60

1  
2 **"Best Proposal"**  
3

4 In regards to the 'Best Proposal' Mr. Towers stated that he met Mr. and Mrs.  
5 Best in December 1999, at their home in Port Coquitlam. He discussed with  
6 them how they would manage Mr. Mitchell in their home, how they would  
7 keep the community safe, and how Mr. Mitchell would spend his time.  
8

9 After his meeting Mr. Towers explained that he concluded that the "Best  
10 Proposal" was not a suitable facility for Mr. Mitchell for the following  
11 reasons:

12 -the facility, which was the house of Mr. and Mrs. Best was located  
13 right behind a park;

14 -Mrs. Best had no experience working with mentally challenged  
15 persons;

16 -the Bests had there own children for whose safety Mr. Towers was  
17 concerned;

18 -the program did not meet Mr. Mitchell's special needs and was really just  
19 aimed as having him become a part of their family.  
20

21 In addition, Mr. Towers expressed concern that Mr. Best had made  
22 comments that he was an approved caregiver at this meeting, but he later  
23 found this to be untrue and in fact discovered that Mainstream would not  
24 recommend him. For all these reasons Mr. Towers was not recommending  
25 the "Best Proposal" as a community placement option for Mr. Mitchell.  
26

27  
28 **South Surrey Residence**  
29

30 Mr. Towers testified that he met individuals from this residence twice in May  
31 of 2000. He described this residence as being a 5-bedroom home at 152nd  
32 street in Surrey. He stated that he had a good feeling from the staff. He  
33 indicated that the John Howard Society operated this facility and it has been  
34 running since March of 1997.  
35

36 Mr. Towers explained that the facility serves the mentally ill or challenged  
37 who come into contact with the criminal justice system. The individuals at  
38 this residence have quite a bit of experience dealing with clients with sexual  
39 issues. In fact, Peter Johnson a psychologist assists in this regard.  
40 Residents see Dr. Johnson once a week. In addition, the residence has a  
41 life skills component and they encourage individuals to develop connections  
42 with the community.  
43

44 Mr. Towers further testified that the South Surrey Residence was a secure  
45 facility, they have an alarm system, 2 full time staff at all times, and a full  
46 time director. He stated that the program is quite well structured around the  
47 five residents there.  
48

49 Mr. Towers concluded that if the treatment team decided that Mr. Mitchell  
50 could go into the community this is the place where he could go. Mr. Towers  
51 was convinced that this resource could cater to Mr. Mitchell's special needs  
52 and at the same time ensure that public safety was not an issue. As to  
53 whether there was an opening available now, Mr. Towers indicated that  
54 there was not but there would be in the near future, in the next few months,  
55 within the year. Mr. Towers verified that the South Surrey Residence has  
56 had residents from FPI in the past.  
57

58 Mr. Towers also provided evidence on funding. Mr. Towers indicated that  
59 MCF currently pays for the one-to-one worker for Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Towers  
60 explained that the annual ceiling is \$25,000.00 for the one-to-one worker

1 and that any placement contribution would have to come out of that. He  
2 advised that the cost of the facility is \$400.00 per diem and an extra  
3 \$100.00 per week for a visit to Peter Johnson.  
4

5  
6 Ms. Paula Grant: Manager for Community Living Services for Adults  
7 of the Ministry of Children and Families.  
8

9 Due to time constraints, Ms. Grant gave evidence in written format by way  
10 of letter dated August 1, 2000 and October 10, 2000. In the August 11, 2000  
11 letter Ms. Grant provides general information on the Ministry's capacity to  
12 develop a resource plan for Mr. Mitchell. The October 10, 2000 written  
13 statement from Ms. Grant responds to questions posed by Mr. Smith arising  
14 from her prior statement. As these letters pertained essentially to funding  
15 issues, which did not impact our ultimate decision, the contents are not  
16 being recited here.  
17

18  
19 **Evidence of the Forensic Psychiatric Institute**

20  
21 Evidence of Jim Broom Case Management Supervisor of the Forensic  
22 Psychiatric Institute  
23

24 Likewise, due to lack of time at the hearing, Mr. Broom provided his  
25 evidence in writing, by way of a Memo dated August 17, 2000, and by way  
26 of an attachment to a letter dated September 18, 2000. Mr. Broom confirms  
27 that he is employed as the supervisor of admissions and case management  
28 services of the Forensic Psychiatric Institute and that he has been employed  
29 in that capacity for approximately 15 years and worked in Forensic Services  
30 for more than 25 years.  
31

32 As with the evidence of Paula Grant, Mr. Broom's evidence focused on  
33 budgetary and funding issues, which did not weigh in our ultimate decision  
34 in this matter, accordingly, detailed reference to the same is not made here.  
35

36 **Request for Updated Information by the Review Board**  
37

38 As quite some time had lapsed since the onset of the hearing, on July 28,  
39 2000, and the receipt of evidence from Paula Grant and Jim Broom, the  
40 Panel requested an update from the hospital. Specifically, the panel  
41 requested an update of Mr. Mitchell's mental status and behavior and an  
42 update on the current availability of placement at the South Surrey  
43 Residence. Initially, the panel received a response from counsel, Ms.  
44 Acheson, dated September 28, 2000, stating:  
45

46 "At the date of the last hearing, July 28, 2000, Mitchell was having  
47 community outings in the company of his one-to-one worker. These were  
48 terminated on September 8, 2000. On August 25, 2000, he was teasing a  
49 co-patient and later that evening, struck the same co-patient on his head.  
50 On September 7, during an outing with his one-to-one worker, Mitchell was  
51 found to be accessing a chat line... which is conduct he has been prohibited  
52 from engaging in. He then became verbally aggressive to his caseworker.  
53 The outing was immediately terminated. Mitchell denied he was accessing  
54 the chat line when questioned by FPI staff and referred to his one-to-one  
55 worker as a 'liar'. His present privileges include Act I and power hour. He is  
56 refusing to participate in Act I. On September 8, 2000, while attending OT  
57 with his one-to-one caseworker he once again became verbally aggressive.  
58 It was after this incident that his outings with his case worker were  
59 terminated."  
60

1 On the issue of placement Ms. Acheson advised in this letter that:  
2

3 “Although the staff at South Surrey place have met with Mitchell and the  
4 treatment team, we have received no feedback from the South Surrey  
5 Place. The treatment team has not pursued community placement because  
6 it is our opinion that Mitchell is not yet ready for such placement.”  
7

8 Ms. Acheson suggests that perhaps Mr. Towers can be directed to contact  
9 the South Surrey Residence to find out such information. Accordingly, such  
10 a request was by the Registrar and in a letter dated October 5, 2000 Mr.  
11 Towers responded:  
12

13 “I spoke with Lynn Jones, Director of Forensic Services for the John Howard  
14 Society who manages the South Surrey Residence. She states there is a  
15 bed available but due to significant staffing changes at the resource, and the  
16 mix of the clients in the resource, it may not be in Mr. Mitchell’s best interest  
17 to access the resource at this time, even if the treatment team feels Mr.  
18 Mitchell should be placed in the community.”  
19

20 Then counsel for Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Smith himself wrote to the Registrar in a  
21 letter dated October 5, 2000 in which he provides the following additional  
22 evidence on behalf of his client:  
23

24 “Mr. Mitchell has instructed me that he strongly denies the allegations the he  
25 struck a co-patient on August 25, 2000 and improperly accessed a  
26 computer chat line on September 7, 2000.  
27

28 ....

29 I have also taken the liberty of contacting Ms. Lynne Jones, Director of  
30 Forensics for the John Howard Society. She advised as follows:

31 - She attended a case conference regarding Mr. Mitchell in late July  
32 or early August but has not heard anything further since that time.  
33

34 - At present, only three of the five beds in South Surrey Residence  
35 are occupied and they could accommodate at least one more resident.  
36

37 - Before approving Mr. Mitchell she would be required to consult with  
38 the Provinces’ brain injury contractor who has responsibility for one of the  
39 other residents.  
40

41 - John Howard Society has recently hired a new coordinator for the  
42 South Surrey Residence who is a nurse. The Life Skills Coach is formally  
43 certified and is experienced in the mental health field.  
44

45 - The South Surrey Residence is presently hiring new frontline staff.  
46 Preferred candidates will combine formal training with demonstrated skills  
47 and experience working with people with cognitive disabilities or mental  
48 illness, including management of difficult behavior.  
49

50 - The Emphasis in Life Skills Programming is shifting from counseling  
51 oriented approaches to Activities of Daily Living (ADL).  
52

53 - The per diem cost for residence with 24-hour supervision remains  
54 about \$400.  
55

56 - If the South Surrey Residence is selected, they will require some  
57 lead time (at least a few weeks) to make the necessary arrangements,  
58 including assessing the compatibility of Mr. Mitchell and current residents.”  
59

60 The above is the entirety of the evidence that was presented to the Review

1 Panel from the hearing date, July 28, 2000 to October 10, 2000. All parties  
2 then provided closing submissions on the merits of the case.: [Ex. 119].  
3

4 The closing arguments and submissions as summarized in Ex. 119 are repeated  
5 below:

6 “Submissions of Counsel for the Hospital Ms. Mary Acheson  
7

8 Ms. Acheson provided written submissions in which she stated the  
9 following:  
10

11 1. Mr. Mitchell is not ready for a conditional discharge. Both the  
12 defense psychiatrist and Dr. Wanis are in agreement on this point. He has  
13 not yet been successfully cascaded. To go from the high level of custody on  
14 A4 directly to the community would be precipitous.  
15

16 2. Dr. Noone and Dr. Wanis disagree only on one thing and that is the  
17 length of time this cascading should occur. Dr. Noone recommends the  
18 Board set an arbitrary date, and Dr. Wanis recommends that the release  
19 date be determined by Mr. Mitchell’s conduct.  
20

21 3. Protection of the public with an immediate discharge would require  
22 what amounts to a custody setting in the community, a “mini-FPI”, involving  
23 a high degree of supervision, locked doors, and one-to-one supervision,  
24 which is nothing but custody.  
25

26 4. Public protection is the primary mandate of the Board in making and  
27 reviewing disposition orders.  
28

29 5. The evidence is that the only reason there has not been violent  
30 acting out behavior is because of intervention by staff at FPI. The actions  
31 Mr. Mitchell has taken, such as verbal aggression etc. are precursors to  
32 violence. These have not escalated into violence because of experienced  
33 staff in a secure setting. Such would not be the case in a community  
34 boarding home.  
35

36 6. If the Board were to order the relief sought by Mr. Mitchell the Board  
37 would be making a payment order. It is beyond the jurisdiction of the Review  
38 Board to issue a disposition order specifying that a specific program, facility  
39 or resource be provided or funded by the ministry.  
40

41 Submissions Crown Counsel Mr. Ochitwa  
42

43 Mr. Ochitwa in his written submissions reviews the evidence and  
44 emphasizes that until Mr. Mitchell accepts responsibility for his acts, he is a  
45 great danger to re-offend. He points out that Dr. Noone also agrees that Mr.  
46 Mitchell must be held accountable for his actions including criminally. He  
47 submits that Mr. Mitchell displays no evidence of taking responsibility for his  
48 actions, and, therefore, cannot be released even conditionally.  
49

50 In summary, he submits that should the Board release Mr. Mitchell  
51 immediately, he would be a high risk to re-offend violently. He states that it  
52 is incumbent on the Board to leave Mr. Mitchell in detention for the year  
53 sought and allow him to ‘cascade’ through FPI as planned by his treatment  
54 team.

1  
2 Submissions for the Accused Mr. Mitchell  
3

4 On behalf of Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Smith provided written submissions the  
5 highlights of which are:  
6

7 **Protection of Public from Dangerous Persons**  
8

9 1. Mr. Mitchell's level of risk is manageable within a properly  
10 structured and supervised setting.  
11

12 2. Since becoming Mr. Mitchell's treating psychiatrist in 1997,  
13 Dr. Wanis has consistently stated that Mr. Mitchell remains a high risk to re-  
14 offend if discharged into the community prematurely. He has emphasized  
15 Mr. Mitchell's pattern of challenging authority, lack of insight, and antisocial  
16 personality traits.  
17

18 3. Dr. Wanis has characterized Mr. Mitchell as a sexual  
19 predator who 'plans his campaigns of conquest' against intellectually  
20 challenged females. However, the incidents described in the record disclose  
21 consensual activity that is deemed illicit because it occurs within the FPI  
22 setting. The July 5, 2000 report of Mr. Sheih indicates there have been no  
23 incidents of sexually inappropriate behavior in the past year by Mr. Mitchell.  
24

25 4. As for 'non-sexual' violence, the only significant act of  
26 violence since the 1990 index offence was the incident in November 1999,  
27 which lead to a criminal charge of assault for which Mr. Mitchell was  
28 acquitted. " It is submitted that the Board's previous characterization of his  
29 behavior as essentially annoying and disruptive rather than seriously violent  
30 or aggressive still holds."  
31

32 **Mental Condition**  
33

34 5. Mr. Mitchell's diagnosis is mild mental retardation and an  
35 organic personality disorder, both traceable to a severe form of epilepsy.  
36 Unlike the vast majority of FPI patients Mr. Mitchell does not suffer from a  
37 major mental disorder. He has been described by the Board as a "bit of a  
38 square peg in a round hole".  
39

40 6. The Board has previously acknowledged that "the accused  
41 has exhausted the services of FPI to the point where at this time much of  
42 his behavior is likely dictated by, or reactive to his environment." Despite  
43 this, Dr. Wanis proposes that Mr. Mitchell should not be cascaded through  
44 the FPI system and into a community placement until his behavior shows  
45 significant improvement.  
46

47 **Reintegration Into Society**  
48

49 7. Residence in a hospital setting has resulted in a severe  
50 curtailment of Mr. Mitchell's access into the community such that:  
51

- 52 - he has had only two staff escorted outings between December 1995  
53 and June 1996.  
54 - he has not had any unescorted day leaves since June 1995.  
55 - despite the Board granting liberal access to the community,  
56 including overnight visits, there have been no such visits  
57 - despite the Boards hope that there would be visit leaves to the Best  
58 Residence none have been undertaken  
59



1 - in July 1999 Mr. Mitchell's SEO's were suspended due to an alleged  
2 threat Mr. Mitchell made to his one-to-one worker and this suspension has  
3 remained in force until just before the July 28, 2000 hearing.

4 - in August 1999 Mr. Mitchell's computer privileges were suspended  
5 - in December 1999 the treatment team terminated contact between  
6 Mr. Mitchell and his former one-to-one worker Mr. Best

7 - In April 2000 Mr. Mitchell was transferred to a high security unit (A4)  
8 after being found in possession of pornographic material and becoming  
9 upset when confronted. Mr. Mitchell remained in A4 as of July 28, 2000.

10  
11 8. Mr. Smith submits that apart from restricting community  
12 access there is the danger that Mr. Mitchell's ongoing detention for such an  
13 extended period will lead to institutionalization and effectively foreclose the  
14 possibility of a return to community living.

15  
16  
17 ***Other Needs of the Accused.***

18  
19 9. Counsel submits that FPI does not serve the other needs of  
20 Mr. Mitchell, in particular his need for physical and psychological security,  
21 for the development of meaningful relationships and for a subjective sense  
22 of hope and purpose.

23  
24  
25 **Availability of a Conditional Discharge**

26  
27 10. He further states that the inadequacy of community based  
28 resources cannot dictate a custodial order that is not otherwise warranted.

29  
30 11. Counsel cites the Regina v. Olsen case, where the court  
31 was advised of a placement option, a supervised boarding home, which  
32 Crown Counsel admitted was the best alternative. However, Crown Counsel  
33 in that case took the position that because of a government spending  
34 freeze and this facility not being available that a jail sentence was the only  
35 way to ensure the accused received appropriate therapy. The court imposed  
36 a sentence involving 24-hour community supervision and in so doing stated:

37  
38 "Those are the realities of society that is experiencing restraint in every  
39 quarter... The easy – and at one level justifiable response – is to throw  
40 one's hands up in the air, and yield to market forces. But the administration  
41 of justice is above all a principled institution. If I determine by reference to  
42 the principles of sentencing that Mr. Olsen need not and for his own sake  
43 and society's sake, should not, go to jail, but send him there because Mr.  
44 Reid tells me there is no money to permit the better approach, the I have  
45 resorted to the 'illusory solace' through which judges and society avoid  
46 confronting reality...Pushing me to send Mr. Olsen to jail by reason of a  
47 spending 'freeze' is precisely the sort of institutional bullying I should be  
48 vigilant in resisting.

49  
50 12. Counsel also refers to Regina v. Lewis for the proposition  
51 that the failure to provide the appropriate resources for a mentally  
52 disordered accused cannot be allowed to deny the appellant his rights under  
53 the legislation. The court in this case states:

54  
55 " It is not enough for the Attorney General of the province to submit that  
56 medical opinions become moot if no community facility or caregiver will  
57 accept the appellant. Efforts must be made by those responsible to provide  
58 the required services and facilities so the Review Board can fulfill its  
59 mandate...."

1 13. In conclusion, counsel for Mr. Mitchell submits that the  
2 Review Board ought to make an order directing that Mr. Mitchell be  
3 discharged conditionally to reside at the home of Michael Best or such other  
4 community facility as the Board deems appropriate.  
5

6  
7 Submissions of the Ministry of Children and Families  
8

9 Counsel for the Ministry of Children and Families provided detailed  
10 submissions regarding the issue of payment orders. Counsel relies on  
11 Auckland Harbour Board v. The King for the proposition that “no money can  
12 be taken out of the consolidated fund into which the revenues of the state  
13 have been paid except in a distinct authorization from Parliament itself.  
14

15 Counsel then refers to a series of other cases in which the principal of  
16 Auckland is adopted and submits that these cases are consistent that  
17 neither a court nor an administrative tribunal, such as the Review Board,  
18 can order the Crown to pay money out of the Crown’s consolidated revenue  
19 fund without clear and express legislative authority to do so.  
20

21 Counsel then reviews Section 672.47(3) and 672.54 of the Criminal Code  
22 which are provisions regarding the Review Board’s authority on disposition  
23 orders. She submits that there is nothing in the wording of those provisions  
24 indicating an express intention by Parliament that the Review Board has the  
25 authority to order a minister of the crown to provide funding for services for  
26 an accused as part of a disposition order.  
27

28 She further submits that:  
29

30 “Courts and administrative bodies, such as the Review Board, cannot  
31 assume the responsibility to determine that a program or residence needs to  
32 be set up for an accused, no matter what the cost. To do so would take  
33 away the ultimate discretion of the minister who, as the courts have  
34 affirmed, has responsibility to decide where the limited funding that is  
35 available will go, in order to do the most good.”  
36

37 In the absence of prescribed residential community resources for accused  
38 who may be subject to a conditional discharge order, the Review Board has  
39 no jurisdiction to order that a specific community residential resource be  
40 made available for an accused or that the Minister for Children and Families  
41 must spend public funds to provide specified services....  
42

43 Aside from the absence of express legislative authority to make a payment  
44 order, the Review Board does not have any jurisdiction over third parties,  
45 namely a contracted service provider.  
46

47 The creation and continued existence of contracted resources are not only  
48 dependent upon the ability and discretion of the government to expend the  
49 necessary funding, but as well, the ability and willingness of the contractor  
50 to enter into a contract and continue to fulfill the contractual obligations.  
51 These are factors that would make it impractical to have, as a term of a  
52 conditional discharge order that an accused reside in a specified community  
53 resource.”  
54

55 In conclusion, counsel submits that it is beyond the jurisdiction of the  
56 Review Board to issue a disposition order specifying that a specific  
57 program, facility or resource be provided or funded by the ministry.  
58

59 Submissions by Counsel for the Attorney General of British Columbia, Mr.  
60 Loenen

Counsel for the Attorney General provided submissions dated July 27, 2000  
that dealt with the applicability of the Charter. Given our disposition on the

1 merits of the case the Charter arguments did not surface and need not be  
2 addressed.

3  
4 Otherwise, counsel took no position with the disposition aspect of the case.  
5 However, by way of letter dated October 10, 2000 he does express concern  
6 with the quality of 'evidence' tendered at this hearing. Specifically, he refers  
7 to Mr. Smith narrating a conversation he had with Ms. Lynne Jones of the  
8 South Surrey Residence and submits that:

9  
10 "not being privy to the conversation the Board and the other parties are  
11 unable to assess the accuracy, completeness or context of the statements  
12 attributed to Ms. Jones... While there is some utility in adopting an informal  
13 procedure it is lost when the poor quality of the 'evidence' results in  
14 unfairness to the other parties and provides a wholly inadequate basis for  
15 the Board to render its findings."

16  
17  
18 In response to Mr. Loenen's concerns regarding to the quality of evidence  
19 presented to the Review Board, the Review Board takes the position that  
20 being an administrative body that it has a fair amount of flexibility in the  
21 manner in which evidence is presented. Ultimately, it is a question of what  
22 weight is to be given to the evidence. We find nothing in the manner in  
23 which the evidence was presented that resulted in unfairness or prejudice to  
24 any party. Accordingly, we were able to proceed with our assessment of the  
25 evidence and arrive at a unanimous decision in support of a conditional  
26 discharge, the reasons for which we detail below.: [Ex. 119]"

27  
28 In its reasons the Review Board elaborated its analysis of what it had heard and  
29 found:

30  
31 "It is an undisputed fact that for the past ten years Mr. Mitchell has remained  
32 under a custody order and resided within the confines of the Forensic  
33 Psychiatric Institute on the basis that the strict custodial setting is required  
34 to protect the public. Within the Forensic facility Mr. Mitchell's placement  
35 has ranged from the most secure unit to lesser secure units depending on  
36 his behavior. For instance if his behavior was deemed by the hospital to be  
37 threatening he would be moved to the more secure units or privileges would  
38 be withdrawn.

39  
40 We agree with Dr. Noone that this method of withdrawing privileges and  
41 transferring Mr. Mitchell to a maximum-security ward is ineffective. This  
42 approach has failed to produce any notable results in the past ten years  
43 and, furthermore, is effectively a bar to the successful cascading of Mr.  
44 Mitchell into the community. In addition, we find the length of time that  
45 certain privileges have been withdrawn to be disproportionate to the  
46 behavior that led to the withdrawal.

47  
48 As stated by Counsel for Mr. Mitchell, the Review Board has, at least for the  
49 past three years been of the opinion that Mr. Mitchell could be maintained in  
50 the community in a secure boarding home, with 24 hour supervision. The  
51 Review Board has consistently stated the public safety could be achieved in  
52 such a setting in the community. However, because of issues primarily  
53 involving funding, such placement into the community has never come to  
54 fruition.

55  
56 The index offence was an assault on a caregiver while Mr. Mitchell was in

1 the community, and occurred on November 26, 1990, ten years ago, since  
2 that time, and we agree with Mr. Smith, Mr. Mitchell's behavior is best  
3 described as disruptive as opposed to violent behavior.  
4

5 In the more recent years there have been only two incidents of physical  
6 aggression. One was an incident of physical aggression in November 1999  
7 against a health care worker when the staff worker attempted to remove Mr.  
8 Mitchell's Walkman. This incident resulted in criminal charges being laid,  
9 and the matter proceeding to trial, with the outcome being an acquittal. The  
10 second incident is an alleged incident of striking a patient in August of 2000,  
11 which Mr. Mitchell disputes.  
12

13 We accept that, despite the two recent incidents of physical outbursts, that  
14 for the most part the past ten years reveals a persistent pattern of  
15 "unpleasant, inappropriate, annoying, testing, even anti-social  
16 behavior"(Exhibit 98, page 17). We do not accept Dr. Wanis'  
17 characterization of the past as being a 'chronic pattern of assault on his  
18 caregivers'. We note that during the hearing Dr. Wanis toned down  
19 somewhat to accept that Mr. Mitchell's behavior over time can be described  
20 as the "persistent pattern of verbal aggression and threats".  
21

22 With respect to the November 1999 assault, Dr. Wanis subsequently  
23 opined that when the Review Board ordered, on December 1, 1999, a  
24 Conditional Discharge and ordered that Mr. Mitchell "reside in the Province  
25 of British Columbia in a place which is staffed and supervised on a 24 hour  
26 per day basis" that this order set off the assault. Dr. Wanis was concerned  
27 that the 'false hope' created by such an order was a catalyst to the  
28 assaultive behavior and discourages against the same.  
29

30 The Review Board rejects this theory of Dr. Wanis, and finds that it is  
31 equally plausible that Mr. Mitchell is reacting to his ongoing strict custody.  
32 He is in a facility that caters to seriously psychotic individuals who have  
33 committed serious criminal offences. He is in a facility that does not cater to  
34 individuals who have organic based disorders as does Mr. Mitchell. In such  
35 a facility Mr. Mitchell has had no unescorted day leaves since June of 1995,  
36 his SEO's have been quite limited, his privileges have been withdrawn on a  
37 number of occasions for appearing verbally threatening. No doubt these  
38 factors have played a part in Mr. Mitchell's behavior while at the institute.  
39

40 To further justify a disposition of custody Dr. Wanis relies on his  
41 characterization of Mr. Mitchell as a "sexual predator." However, the Review  
42 Board is not convinced on the evidence before us that Mr. Mitchell bears  
43 such a title. We are inclined to accept the opinion of Dr. Noone that Mr.  
44 Mitchell may be somewhat of an opportunist but not a paraphillic. However,  
45 Dr. Wanis maintains his description and would suggest that it is the strict  
46 confines of the hospital that controls this dimension of Mr. Mitchell's  
47 behavior also.  
48

49 Dr. Wanis does not rule out placement in the community but is adamant that  
50 such placement can only be achieved after Mr. Mitchell successfully  
51 cascades through the hospital to less secure settings. At the hearing, Dr.  
52 Wanis maintained that in his opinion Mr. Mitchell still does have room to  
53 move within the forensic facility. He explained that the hospital can give him  
54 more privileges and that there was no reason why the hospital can not curve  
55 [sic] Mr. Mitchell's impulsivity.  
56

57 The Review Board finds this to be at odds with Dr. Wanis' earlier testimony  
58 before this Board, in October of 1999 where he testified that Mr. Mitchell  
59 "has essentially exhausted the benefits of the programs and services which  
60 have been provided to him at FPI" (Tab 98, page 15)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

We accept Dr. Wanis' earlier testimony, that the hospital has provided Mr. Mitchell with all that it could. Ten years have lapsed and nothing much has changed, Mr. Mitchell's troublesome behavior has continued. We find that the cascading approach and withdrawal of privilege approach has been exhausted in this setting. We are no further ahead than we were ten years ago. We agree with the concerns of previous Review Boards that the continued detention of Mr. Mitchell at the Forensic Psychiatric Institute is tantamount to a life sentence.

We remain cognizant of the need to protect the public but must equally pay adherence to the other factors set out in S-672.54. Mr. Mitchell's mental condition is one that doesn't fit into the general rubric of those confined at the forensic facility. He requires a facility that understands his mental condition. Mr. Mitchell deserves a sincere and concerted effort to reintegrate him into the community.

The South Surrey Residence where we have directed Mr. Mitchell's placement in our opinion is a facility, which has a bed available, and which would best meet Mr. Mitchell's needs. Mr. Towers from the Ministry of Children and Families endorsed this facility as it is experienced in serving the mentally ill or challenged individuals who have come into contact with the criminal justice system. The facility is a 24 hour supervised facility with experienced staff.

The updated information about the South Surrey Residence was that there may be staff changes taking place but that overall the critical structure of this residence, a fully supervised facility that catered to the mentally challenged who have become involved in the criminal justice system, remains intact. In addition, the evidence was that only 3 of the 5 beds were currently occupied, and that, therefore, there was a space available. Accordingly, we found that the least onerous and least restrictive disposition was one of a conditional discharge to this specific facility.

However, we agree with Dr. Noone, that if Mr. Mitchell was to become involved in criminal activity while on a conditional discharge in the community then he must made to realize that this would not be tolerated. In such circumstances Dr. Noone recommends that Mr. Mitchell be criminally charged and referred back to the Forensic Psychiatric Institute. We further agree with Dr. Noone that rather than continuing on with the indefinite cascading strategy, which has yet to succeed, Mr. Mitchell must be given the opportunity to try himself out in the community at a facility such as South Surrey Residence.

The Ministry of Children and Families along with the Hospital take the position that the Review Board does not have the jurisdiction to specify the institution of facility to which Mr. Mitchell can be discharged. They argue that the effect of such an order would be to make a payment order.

We rely on the case of Pinet v. Ontario (1995), 100 C.C.C. (3d) 343 (O.C.A.) for the authority that the Review Board does in fact have the power to specify the facility that Mr. Mitchell is to be discharged to. When the evidence before us is that the South Surrey Residence is available and is a setting that is the most appropriate for Mr. Mitchell we not only have the authority to direct placement in that specific residence, we are mandated to do so.

S-672.54 mandates the Review Board to make the least restrictive and least

1 onerous disposition. This mandate can not be undermined or clouded by  
2 administrative issues of funding or by an ineffective ministerial protocol.

3  
4 We take the position that our order is not a payment order. Our order does  
5 not impose upon any branch of government a duty to pay or disburse  
6 monies from their funds in a particular manner. Inevitably, in this case, with  
7 the different ministries involved, someone will have to sort out the funding  
8 issue and come to a resolution, but it is not our responsibility to become  
9 involved in such affairs. To ask that of the Review Board is to impose upon  
10 us matters that are not within our control and would unduly fetter our  
11 mandate under S-672.54.

12  
13 Accordingly, we maintain that Review Board has the authority to order a  
14 conditional discharge, directing the release to a specific facility, and that  
15 such an order is in keeping with our legislative mandate to impose the least  
16 restrictive and least onerous disposition. We conclude that the South Surrey  
17 Residence is the appropriate facility for Mr. Mitchell to be discharged to.:  
18 [Ex. 119].”  
19

### 20 **3.0 THE HEARING OF FEBRUARY 7, 2001**

21 The circumstances necessitating this hearing are outlined at 1.0 INTRODUCTION  
22 AND BACKGROUND, supra at P.1.

### 23 24 **3.1 POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES**

#### 25 26 **(i) AFPS**

27 The Director, AFPS sought a further disposition of custody at FPI.

#### 28 **(ii) CROWN COUNSEL**

29 Mr. Ochitwa supported the position of AFPS.

#### 30 **(iii) THE ACCUSED**

31 Mr. Smith, on behalf of the accused asked for a conditional discharge to a  
32 specified residential resource. In the alternative if the Review Board were to  
33 decide the evidence supported a custodial disposition due to the non-  
34 availability of a placement resource, Mr. Smith intended to argue this would  
35 violate Mr. Mitchell's charter rights and would be asking for a remedy pursuant  
36 to the charter as outlined in his written submission at Ex. 106, (p. 12 supra).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

(iv) **MINISTRY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL: LEGAL SERVICES BRANCH**

Mr. Loenen took no position with respect to the appropriate disposition and reasserted the position reflected in his previous written submissions, ie. that the Review Board lacks the jurisdiction to offer charter relief; that Mr. Mitchell's charter rights are not being violated; that in any event such a breach is justified under S.1 of the Charter (see P.12, supra)

(v) **MINISTRY FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES**

Ms. Grant took no position as to disposition but relied on her counsel's previous written submissions summarized at P.12, supra.

Subject to citing additional authorities the parties rested on the written submissions tendered for the July 2000.

**3.2 EVIDENCE AT THE HEARING OF FEBRUARY 7, 2001**

(i) **AFPS**

Following the Board's decision and disposition of October 16, 2000 Dr. Wanis wrote the following letter on October 27, 2000; addressed to the "Manager" of the South Surrey Residence:

"Dear Sir;

Re: Robert Allan MITCHELL

In the spirit of cooperation with you, we are forwarding the disposition of the B.C. Review Board, effective November 16, 2000.

We draw your attention to condition #2, which orders Robert Mitchell be discharged to reside in your facility by November 16, 2000.

This discharge is contrary to the Forensic Psychiatric Service's clinical opinion.": Ex. 121

1 The evidence at hearing indicated that the letter was in fact written by Mr. Carew. On  
2 October 30, Ms. Beaman, Manager of the residence, wrote Mr. Carew that Mr. Mitchell  
3 had not been accepted into the residence because:

4

- 5 1) Intake Process has not been completed  
6 2) Would not accept any client discharged against medical advice:  
7 [Ex. 121].  
8

9 A substantial part of this hearing dealt with the substance of the additional or behind  
10 the scene discussions which may have ensued between AFPS staff and South Surrey  
11 Residence staff resulting in Mr. Mitchell's non-placement at South Surrey Residence.  
12

13 The Board heard from Ms. Lynne Jones the previous manager of South Surrey  
14 Residence whom it had subpoenaed for this hearing.  
15

16 She stated that when she first visited FPI in July or August, 2000, Mr. Mitchell  
17 expressed his disinterest in the South Surrey Residence as he found it too restrictive.  
18 It was also Ms. Jone's evidence that:

19

- 20 • Gordon Towers the MCF Social Worker in charge of Mr. Mitchell's file would  
21 not fund Mr. Mitchell's placement "against medical advice"  
22 • Ms. Jones felt Mr. Mitchell could be safely accommodated at South Surrey  
23 Residence and would have accepted him despite Mr. Towers' reservations  
24 and lack of funding commitment.  
25 • That her successor, Gail Beaman, had told her that AFPS staff (Mr. Parnell)  
26 had communicated that AFPS was extremely angry at the prospect of South  
27 Surrey Residence accepting Mr. Mitchell and, as a "funder" of 2 other



1 residents @ South Surrey Residence, would, at an upcoming meeting,  
2 reconsider its funding of a FPS clients at South Surrey Residence and  
3 whether it would refer clients there in the future.

- 4 • Ms. Beaman stated she would not accept Mr. Mitchell due to FPS' objections

5  
6 This led to the letter of Mr. Towers dated October 5, 2000 that:

7 "it may not be in Mr. Mitchell's best interest to access the resource at this  
8 time...": Ex. 117.  
9

10 Ms. Jones said that she would have accepted Mr. Mitchell for placement at South  
11 Surrey Residence; she did not consider Mr. Mitchell as substantially more difficult or ill  
12 than other residents and would have had no difficulty accommodating him.

13  
14 In response to Ms. Jones's evidence the Board heard from Mr. Parnell, an AFPS social  
15 worker, that:

- 16  
17 • He was concerned about the placement of Mr. Mitchell at South Surrey  
18 Residence due to its potential effect on his 2 other patient/clients in that  
19 residence.
- 20 • He did not express or convey anger toward Ms. Beaman with respect to the  
21 Mitchell placement.
- 22 • He did indicate a need to review the "referral process".

23  
24 Ms. Acheson arranged to hear from Ms. Beaman, the current manager of South  
25 Surrey Residence, who essentially denied any memory of discussions about Mr.  
26 Mitchell with Ms. Jones, and confirmed the contents of her letter at, Ex. 121, supra.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

She reiterated that at the effective date of Mr. Mitchell's discharge no placement at South Surrey Residence was available to him.

The foregoing evidence makes it clear that as of the effective date of Mr. Mitchell's disposition and indeed well before November 16, 2000, the South Surrey Residence was not an available placement for this accused. To that extent Mr. Mitchell's non-discharge in compliance with the letter of his disposition was justified.

Despite this finding, and without purporting to comment on the credibility or neutrality of any of the witnesses, we feel obligated to leave some observations on the record. Clearly the scheme of Part X.X.1 of the Criminal Code exists precisely because of the potential tension that can exist between clinical opinion and an accused's rights. The law expects, failing appeal to the BCCA, that a disposition of the Review Board is to be complied with and implemented by the Director of AFPS, notwithstanding medical opinion. To the extent that the type of correspondence and discussions alleged above have the effect of removing decision making about an accused from the Board's oversight, they fly in the face of the social policy underlying Part X.X.1 of the Code. They may also violate an accused's Section 7 Charter Rights.

We commend the evidence herein to Senior Management of AFPS for their review, to the extent that it raises any policy, practice or indeed ethical issues which these managers may wish to address.

On behalf of AFPS the Board next heard from C.M.C. M. Shieh whose evidence

1 essentially indicated that :

- 2
- 3 • The accused remains on A-4, a maximum secure, ward at FPI. His privileges
- 4 include Fir Hall, Act 1, O.T., Power Hour, 1-2 Grounds access (prior to
- 5 resignation of his one-to-one worker
- 6 • Little has changed in his overall presentation: he remains “manipulative” and
- 7 “splits” staff.
- 8 • He has been “verbally abusive and threatening” toward staff and his one to
- 9 one worker.
- 10 • On September 29, 2000 there were concerns that the accused was physically
- 11 aggressive toward a lower functioning co-patient whom he was teasing,
- 12 pushing, name calling.
- 13 • In October the same co-patient stated Mr. Mitchell wanted him to get in to the
- 14 bathtub.
- 15 • On October 31, Mr. Mitchell threw milk at a co-patient.
- 16 • On November 10, Mr. Mitchell was told South Surrey Residence would not
- 17 accept him for placement.
- 18 • On November 14, Mr. Mitchell’s grounds privileges with his one to one worker
- 19 were terminated due to “verbal threats”.
- 20 • On November 15, Mr. Mitchell was placed into seclusion for “abusive verbal
- 21 behaviour” over an electric extension cord for his radio. He struck a staff
- 22 member in the face while resisting direction to undress in seclusion. He was
- 23 released from seclusion November 17 and grounds privileges were
- 24 reinstated.
- 25 • Mr. Mitchell refused to talk Dr. Wanis.

- 1 • December 1: exploitation of lower functioning co-patient in the purchase sale
- 2 of a walkman?
- 3 • December 12: “inappropriate” conversation with a female staff member.
- 4 • December 20: verbally harassed a co-patient.
- 5 • December 27: community outing with one to one worker and accused’s
- 6 mother.
- 7 • Mr. Mitchell’s one to one worker has tendered his resignation for personal
- 8 reasons and a replacement is being requested.
- 9 • He continues to deny responsibility for his behaviour when confronted.

10

11 On cross examination of Mr. Shieh, Mr. Smith elicited that:

12

- 13 • The events described have generally not been witnessed by Mr. Shieh.
- 14 • Mr. Mitchell’s “threats” usually do not include, indeed there have been no
- 15 threats involving personal violence. His verbal threats tend to consist of
- 16 statements such as “I’ll have you fired”; “I’ll report you to my lawyer”; “Where I
- 17 come from people like you get a punch in the nose”.
- 18 • Mr. Mitchell has had only 2 or 3 outings since August, 2000.
- 19 • Mr. Mitchell is currently enrolled in no programs or formal behaviour
- 20 modification plans, protocols or treatment.
- 21 • Although Dr. Wanis regularly reviews medications, there have been no
- 22 significant medication changes since the last hearing, when Dr. Wanis
- 23 indicated a possible increase in Tarazadone, which curbs impulsivity. This
- 24 medication has in fact been reduced to 100mg.
- 25 • FPI offers Mr. Mitchell security structure and supervision.

- 1           • Mr. Mitchell has requested a change of treatment teams.
- 2           • Mr. Mitchell is not ready or suitable for placement, including at South Surry
- 3           Residence.

4

5           Dr. Wanis did not provide evidence.

6

7           (ii)    **MR. MITCHELL**

8           Mr. Mitchell told the Board that:

- 9                   • “He attends Act 1, Power Hour and Fir Hall but remains on A-4 ward
- 10                   • He has had no outings other than over Christmas holidays with his
- 11                   mother, since August 2000
- 12                   • He denies the September 29 “pushing” incident
- 13                   • He alleges assault by his health care worker in relation to the November
- 14                   15 radio cord issue
- 15                   • He finds South Surrey Residence too restrictive and would prefer to
- 16                   reside in the “Best” home, the owner of which he has known for 8 years

17

18           (iii)   **THE “BEST PROPOSAL”**

19           The proposal to house Mr. Mitchell remains in substance as described in

20           Exhibits 91 and 97. Mr. Best sought to rebut some of Mr. Towers concerns as

21           articulated at Page 18, supra, in particular:

22

- 23                   • His home, while bordering on public park is separated from it by a 12’
- 24                   fence.
- 25                   • Mr. Best asserts he has extensive experience working with mentally
- 26                   challenged individuals.
- 27                   • There are no children living in the Best home.

28

29           Mr. Best went on to describe his day programming plans for Mr. Mitchell if the

1 accused is placed in his residence.

2  
3 **4.0 DISPOSITION**

4 In it's review of all of the historic as well as the recent evidence in this matter the  
5 Board has identified that an unfortunate pattern of inertia in planning and decision  
6 making has befallen this case. We find that for at least the past 3 years there has  
7 been no rigorous scrutiny or critical analysis with respect to the threshold issue of Mr.  
8 Mitchell's significant threat to the safety of the public. The Board has repeatedly  
9 ordered Mr. Mitchell's detention based on a combination of the consensus or  
10 concession of all parties, including his various counsel, and the absence of any less  
11 restrictive placement options to FPI. As recently as October, 2000 the Board  
12 acknowledged this:

13 "There was no question at this hearing that Mr. Mitchell was a significant  
14 threat to the public safety and that an Absolute Discharge was not even a  
15 consideration. The sole issue was what was the least onerous and least  
16 restrictive disposition given that Mr. Mitchell continues to be a significant  
17 threat: Ex. 119.  
18

19 It has become clear that Mr. Mitchell finds himself in the midst of a deadlock; that  
20 AFPS is unwilling or unable on the basis of what is characterized as clinical judgment  
21 or "medical advice" to participate in Mr. Mitchell's discharge under supervision despite  
22 the Board's orders to that effect.

23  
24 In that regard the status quo offends Mr. Mitchell's rights to fair and dignified  
25 treatment: Winko Par. 21, 22, 30, 42. It is therefore appropriate that we once again  
26 engage in a thorough review of the evidence with respect to that the threshold issue.  
27 With respect to Mr. Mitchell's **mental condition** we note:

- 28  
29
- He has been afflicted since childhood with epileptic seizures and assessed as

- 1 functioning at a borderline intelligence level.
- 2 • He has no history of an Axis I mental disorder diagnosis, nor does he exhibit
- 3 symptoms thereof.
- 4 • His organic personality deficits require that he be provided with a degree of
- 5 structure and supervision.
- 6 • His intellectual deficits limits his capacity to incorporate abstract reasoning and
- 7 principles into his behaviour or to take into account the point of view of others;
- 8 he tends to blame others rather than take responsibility for his actions.
- 9 • His capacity for emotional bonding in relationships, for example in such aspects
- 10 as loyalty, trust, commitment, is limited or lacking; his most positive historic
- 11 relationship has in fact been with Mike Best.
- 12 • He is neither paraphiliic nor a “sexual predator”; there have been no incidents
- 13 which support these pejorative labels: Ex. 109.
- 14 • Extensive behaviour modification treatments have been tried and failed after
- 15 some initial progress: Ex. 98, P.15.

16

17 With respect to Mr. Mitchell’s **reintegration into society** the Board considers:

18

- 19 • Mr. Mitchell’s behaviour can be controlled with supervision and instruction: Ex.
- 20 27, Ex. 109.
- 21 • AFPS is clearly unwilling to discharge/integrate Mr. Mitchell under any readily
- 22 conceivable circumstances or conditions: Ex. 74.
- 23 • The Director has for several years, held out promise of establishing a medically
- 24 acceptable discharge plan. The accused has in effect been deprived of the right
- 25 to discharge planning.

- 1           • He has exhausted (except for physical security) the therapeutic benefits of FPI:  
2           Ex. 86; Ex. 98.
- 3           • He is no longer suitable for placement at FPI: Ex. 109, Ex. 119.
- 4           • Despite repeated promises and direction to that effect the “Best” proposal has  
5           never been objectively or impartially assessed.

6

7           With respect to Mr. Mitchell’s **danger to the public** the Board notes:

8

- 9           • His history of childhood behavioural problems and alleged sexual misconduct.
- 10          • His 3 admissions to FPI related to assaultive behaviour as well as the index  
11          offence for which he has been in custody for a decade.
- 12          • He has been observed to behave in a sexually inappropriate manner, e.g.  
13          exposure in the company of his “girlfriend”.
- 14          • He has repeatedly been put on behaviour modification programs and had his  
15          privileges scaled back or withdrawn.
- 16          • In December 1995 he was accused of soliciting sexual partners for his  
17          girlfriend.
- 18          • In 1996 he was accused of “behavioural transgressions” such as “crossing  
19          sexual boundaries” or “conning staff”.
- 20          • Dr. Wanis has consistently labeled him as a high risk to reoffend (unspecified)  
21          and this assessment is unlikely to ameliorate or abate with intervention.
- 22          • Ex. 56 describes 8 incidents of inappropriate behaviour over a 12 month period  
23          none of which meet the legal definition of “significant threat”: Winko, Par 57,  
24          59.
- 25          • In 1998 he offered money for sex.



- 1 • An Independent Assessment concludes that his behaviour is largely reactive to  
2 his environment; that FPI's negative environment outweighs any positive  
3 influence in his life; that lengthy ongoing confinement is unlikely to improve his  
4 behaviour: Ex. 86.
- 5 • He does not meet criteria for the label of a sexual predator: Ex. 109; his sexual  
6 behaviour has lacked the element of coercion.
- 7 • There is little basis upon which to predict future violence considering there is no  
8 evidence of overt violence or serious aggression in a decade; the alleged  
9 assault in December 1999 was his first violence in 9 years and resulted in  
10 acquittal. His frequently mentioned "verbal threats" do not in our opinion,  
11 involve threatened violence.

12  
13 At his most recent previous hearing the Review Board concluded:

- 14  
15 • That FPI's approach to managing Mr. Mitchell's behaviour is ineffective and  
16 disproportionate, having demonstrated no clear results in 10 years;  
17 moreover it poses an effective barrier to discharge within any reasonable  
18 foreseeable future timeframe.
- 19  
20 • Statements that Mr. Mitchell presents a "chronic or persistent pattern of  
21 assault on caregivers" or a "persistent pattern of verbal aggression and  
22 threats" are overstated and mischaracterizations.
- 23 • Mr. Mitchell is not a sexual predator.
- 24 • The resources of FPI qua the accused have been exhausted.

25

1 At the current hearing we learn nothing that contradicts the foregoing. Mr. Shieh  
2 acknowledges the absence of violent behaviour or threats of violence beyond what he  
3 calls “verbal abuse”.

4  
5 We therefore conclude that despite Mr. Mitchell’s persistently annoying and testing  
6 demeanor [Ex. 109], the evidence falls short of demonstrating that the accused poses  
7 a significant threat to community safety. Mr. Mitchell is therefore entitled to an  
8 absolute discharge: Winko, Par 48, 49, 57; see also Jones, BCCA 1997, Par 59. To  
9 conclude otherwise would amount to the imposition of an inappropriate evidentiary  
10 burden on the accused that his current circumstances would, for an indefinite period,  
11 prevent him from dislodging: Winko, Par 52,53.

12  
13 It is our expectation that once discharged Mr. Mitchell will be able to access the  
14 services of M.C.F. to which we have repeatedly heard he is eligible and entitled, on a  
15 voluntary basis: Ex. 114. In addition he will of course also be subject to the provisions  
16 of Sections 1 and 22 of the **Mental Health Act** (R.S.B.C. 1996, ch. 288); see also  
17 Winko, Par 61.

---

Reserved reasons prepared by Bernd Walter  
with concurrence of the panel members  
February 22, 2001

\*\*\* \*\* \*\*