Patel M, Aoun J, Langer J. The Case for Emergency Orders Under the CYFSA: A Paradigm Shift in Youth Mental Health Care. *JAACAP Connect*. 2026;13(3):5-9.
doi:10.62414/001c.161547

Clinical Perspectives

The Case for Emergency Orders Under the CYFSA: A Paradigm Shift in Youth Mental Health Care

Mitesh Patel, BSc, MScCH:HPTE, MD, FRCPC[1], John Aoun, BSc, MD, FRCPC[2], Jason Langer[2]

[1] Psychiatry, University of Toronto, [2] University of Toronto

Keywords: certification, mental health act, children's mental health, mental health crisis

https://doi.org/10.62414/001c.161547

JAACAP Connect

Vol. 13, Issue 3, 2026

Across many jurisdictions, youth in crisis are supported by parallel systems of mental health legislation and child protection frameworks, but these systems are often poorly integrated, leading to gaps in care for highly vulnerable young people. This article contrasts psychiatric involuntary admission laws for young people in Ontario, Canada, similar to civil commitment statutes in the United States, with child welfare legislation that permits secure, community-based treatment. While hospital-based civil commitment models prioritize imminent risk, they often fail to address the chronic trauma, environmental instability, and caregiver incapacity that drive many youth crises. In contrast, child-protection–based secure treatment legislation allows earlier, developmentally informed intervention with mandated family involvement and multidisciplinary care. This article argues for a paradigm shift toward broader adoption and expansion of secure, trauma-informed residential treatment models within child protection frameworks. For American and global audiences, the Ontario experience illustrates how bridging mental health and child welfare legislation can reduce reliance on crisis-driven hospitalization, promote continuity of care, and better align systems with international child rights standards. Child and adolescent psychiatrists are positioned to lead this shift through clinical expertise, cross-sector collaboration, and policy advocacy.

INTRODUCTION

Canada's publicly funded health care system ensures access for insured individuals, including citizens, permanent residents, and many eligible non-citizen residents, regardless of income or health status.[1] In Ontario, Canada's most populous province, youth experiencing acute mental health or safety crises may access involuntary mental health care through 2 distinct legislative pathways. One pathway is involuntary psychiatric hospital admission under the Mental Health Act (MHA).[2] The other is admission to a secure, community-based treatment program under the Child, Youth, and Family Services Act (CYFSA) through Emergency Orders.[3]

These 2 pieces of legislation serve different but complementary functions. The MHA is a mental-health–specific statute that governs voluntary and involuntary psychiatric hospital admissions, authorizing detention, assessment, and inpatient stays when strict criteria for imminent risk are met. By contrast, the CYFSA is a broader child and family statute that governs child protection, developmental supports, and family services and provides the legal authority for secure, community-based treatment when a child is in need of protection.

Despite these different roles, the current youth mental health system in Ontario is heavily weighted toward the MHA pathway. Hospitals that can admit youth under the MHA are numerous and widely distributed, while there are only 3 secure treatment programs operating under the CYFSA. As a result, many youth with crises driven primarily by trauma exposure, environmental instability, or caregiver limitations, rather than by an acute psychiatric illness meeting MHA thresholds, are left without a developmentally appropriate pathway to care.[4]

This article reviews how legislation can be operationalized to better serve youth in crisis. The CYFSA and MHA can be understood as complementary systems, with the CYFSA Emergency Order pathway playing a far more prominent role than it currently does. We first describe the legislative pathways themselves, compare their scope and impact, and explore the international relevance of expanding secure treatment.

LEGISLATIVE PATHWAYS FOR YOUTH IN CRISIS

THE MENTAL HEALTH ACT

The Ontario MHA, first introduced in 1967 and updated over time, is the legislation that governs voluntary and involuntary psychiatric hospital admissions across the lifespan.[2] For youth, as for adults, the MHA authorizes detention for assessment and treatment when the individual is:

> "suffering from mental disorder of a nature or quality that likely will result in (a) serious bodily harm to the person; (b) serious bodily harm to another person; or (c) serious physical impairment of the person" (Section 15)[2]

THE CHILD, YOUTH, AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

The CYFSA is Ontario's primary legislation governing child protection, child and youth services, and family supports.[3] It reflects a child- and family-centered approach that emphasizes developmental needs, safety, and continuity of relationships. The CYFSA states that a child is in need of protection if:

> "the child has suffered physical harm, inflicted by the person having charge of the child, or caused by that person's failure to adequately care for, provide for, supervise, or protect the child" (Section 74(2))[3]

The CYFSA includes provisions for Emergency Orders and Secure Treatment Orders. Emergency Orders permit involuntary admission of a child or youth to a secure treatment program in the community for up to 30 days. Secure Treatment Orders, granted by civil courts, may authorize longer-term treatment when criteria are met and may follow an Emergency Order admission. These orders allow for intensive, structured, and multidisciplinary intervention in an involuntary, therapeutic environment outside the hospital system.

ADMISSIONS UNDER THE CYFSA VS THE MHA

BROADER INTERVENTIONAL SCOPE

The MHA's risk-based criteria are intentionally narrow to protect civil liberties. While appropriate for adult populations, they can inadvertently exclude youth who are highly vulnerable but not imminently dangerous. Children and adolescents experiencing chronic self-neglect, exploitation, or escalating risk behaviors may not meet the MHA threshold, yet their circumstances clearly warrant intervention.

By contrast, the CYFSA defines risk in a broader, child-centered way, focusing on whether caregivers can adequately provide for the child's safety, supervision, and developmental needs. This allows for earlier intervention. Emergency Orders under the CYFSA thus create a pathway for youth whose crises arise from environmental and relational factors, rather than solely from acute psychiatric illness.

FAMILY INVOLVEMENT AND SOCIAL SYSTEMS ENGAGEMENT

The CYFSA's preamble and guiding principles emphasize the importance of maintaining family connections where safe, supporting continuity of relationships, and respecting cultural identity. The MHA, by design, does not legislate family engagement or cross-sector collaboration; its focus is on hospital-based risk management. As a result, discharge planning from MHA admissions may be uneven, and youth may return to environments where the underlying drivers of crisis remain unaddressed.[5]

DURATION AND CONTINUITY OF INTERVENTION

Under Form 1, the MHA authorizes involuntary hospital admission for up to 72 hours, with additional forms required for ongoing involuntary status. Clinicians are required to end certification once the youth no longer meet the imminent-risk threshold. Youth may then decline further treatment, even when their broader environment, trauma history, or developmental vulnerabilities leave them at high risk of relapse. This can lead to a pattern of rapid admissions and discharges, fragmented care, and repeated crises.[5]

CYFSA Emergency Orders authorize secure treatment for up to 30 days, with the possibility of longer Secure Treatment Orders if criteria are met. This longer timeframe supports comprehensive assessment, stabilization, trauma-informed therapy, skill development, and gradual reintegration planning. It better matches the developmental needs of children and adolescents, particularly those with complex trauma and attachment disruptions.

APPEALS AND RIGHTS PROTECTIONS

The CYFSA includes a robust rights framework for children and youth. Those aged 12 years or older must be informed of their rights, be given an opportunity to participate in decisions, and have access to advocacy, often through the Office of the Children's Lawyer. Appeals processes related to secure treatment are designed to be timely and accessible, balancing protection with autonomy.

The MHA also includes rights advisement and review mechanisms, such as Consent and Capacity Board hearings. However, these processes were originally designed with adults in mind and may be less tailored to the developmental and communication needs of children and adolescents. In practice, CYFSA secure treatment programs may offer more consistent opportunities for youth-friendly advocacy and participation in care planning.

DISTINCT BUT COMPLEMENTARY ROLES

The MHA and CYFSA serve fundamentally different, yet complementary, roles in responding to youth in crisis.

The MHA is appropriate when youth mental disorders create an immediate risk of serious harm that requires hospital-based containment, rapid medical assessment, and short-term stabilization. The CYFSA is designed for situ-

ations where a youth's safety and development are compromised by caregiver incapacity, trauma, chronic environmental risks, or complex behavioral patterns that cannot be adequately addressed by hospital-based care alone.

In practice, youth often move between these pathways. For example, a young person may initially be admitted to the hospital under the MHA during an acute crisis, but their longer-term stabilization and safety may be better supported by a CYFSA secure treatment admission. Conversely, a youth in secure treatment under the CYFSA may occasionally require brief MHA admissions for acute exacerbations of mental health symptoms. A balanced system would recognize that both are essential, with the CYFSA offering a critical complement to the MHA for youth whose crises are rooted in trauma, protection, and developmental concerns.

EVIDENCE BASE SUPPORTING CYFSA PATHWAYS

Internationally, evidence from trauma-informed residential and secure treatment programs indicates that integrated, multidisciplinary models can reduce crisis presentations and support longer-term recovery. These models typically combine psychiatric care, psychotherapy, education, and family intervention in a structured environment, similar to CYFSA secure treatment programs.

Cost analyses further demonstrate that hospital-based psychiatric care is substantially more expensive.[6] This highlights the potential for more efficient resource use when CYFSA pathways are expanded.

ONTARIO'S CURRENT LANDSCAPE: CRITICAL GAPS

Despite the CYFSA's legislative potential, its implementation remains severely constrained. Only 3 secure treatment programs operate under the CYFSA across the province, each with distinct practices and varying levels of psychiatric involvement. Youthdale Treatment Centres, a community-based organization, provides one of these programs and exemplifies an integrated model combining intensive psychiatric care with trauma-informed therapeutic interventions, education, and family work. Youthdale accepts youth under Emergency Orders deemed in need of protection due to high-risk behaviors, trauma, and environmental instability, and it offers a structured pathway from stabilization to reintegration.

The other 2 programs provide limited direct psychiatric involvement. One does not accept Emergency Orders, limiting access to Secure Treatment Orders only; the other accepts very few Emergency Orders annually. These inconsistencies create a patchwork system where a youth's access to CYFSA secure treatment depends heavily on geography and local program policy. Rural and northern regions are particularly underserved.

In contrast, more than 60 Schedule 1 hospitals in Ontario are authorized under the MHA to admit youth for psychiatric care, although only a minority have dedicated child and adolescent inpatient units. This disparity illustrates the structural tilt toward hospital-based care and underscores the need to expand and standardize CYFSA pathways.

INTERNATIONAL RELEVANCE

The challenges faced in Ontario are not unique. Many jurisdictions grapple with balancing hospital-based crisis care, community-based mental health services, and child protection responsibilities.[7] In some countries, such as New Zealand and parts of Australia and the United Kingdom, youth justice and child protection systems have developed therapeutic residential and secure models that integrate mental health treatment, education, and family work. These models similarly aim to reduce reliance on emergency departments and custodial settings.

For the United States in particular, where civil commitment laws and child protection statutes vary by state and county, Ontario's experience highlights the potential benefits of integrated legislative approaches. US systems typically rely on separate mental health commitment laws and child welfare statutes, neither of which consistently provides for secure, trauma-informed, community-based treatment analogous to CYFSA Emergency Orders.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CHILD AND ADOLESCENT PSYCHIATRISTS

Child and adolescent psychiatrists play a crucial role in both the MHA and CYFSA pathways. In the CYFSA Emergency Order process, psychiatrists play a central role in assessing whether a youth's presentation meets criteria for involuntary secure community-based admission, integrating information about mental health symptoms, developmental functioning, trauma history, and environmental risks. During secure treatment admissions, psychiatrists are responsible for providing psychiatric stabilization, diagnostic clarification, and ongoing medication management within a multidisciplinary, trauma-informed model of care.

For clinicians outside Ontario, these implications highlight the broader importance of understanding local legislation, building partnerships with child protection and community agencies, and engaging in system-level advocacy to ensure that youth have access to developmentally appropriate, trauma-informed care.

CONCLUSION

Ontario's CYFSA Emergency Order framework offers an underused but essential pathway for youth whose crises stem from trauma, environmental instability, and developmental vulnerabilities not well addressed through the MHA alone.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

Many young people go to the hospital during a mental health crisis, but they may not be admitted for treatment because they do not meet all the criteria. This article explains another option used in Ontario, Canada: commu-

nity-based secure treatment through child protection laws. We describe how this pathway allows for earlier, trauma-focused care with strong involvement from families and support teams. We reason that it reduces repeated hospital visits and offers youth a recovery plan. These ideas may help other regions create better support systems for children and teens in crisis.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Mitesh Patel, BSc, MScCH:HPTE, MD, FRCPC, Chief of Psychiatry, Youthdale Treatment Centres, Program Director, Psychiatry, Toronto Metropolitan University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

John Aoun, BSc, MD, FRCPC, Medical Lead, Acute Services, Youthdale Treatment Centres, Toronto Metropolitan University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Jason Langer, Senior Director, Youthdale Treatment Centres, Toronto Metropolitan University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Correspondence to: Mitesh Patel, BSc, MScCH:HPTE, MD, FRCPC; email: **mpatel@youthdale.ca**, 227 Victoria Street, Toronto, ON M5B 1T8.

FUNDING

No external funding was received.

DISCLOSURE

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This article is part of a special Clinical Perspectives series that will shed a new and focused light on clinically important topics within child and adolescent psychiatry. The series discusses the care of children and adolescents with psychiatric disorders from a new vantage point, including populations, practices, or clinical topics that may be otherwise overlooked. The series was edited by *JAACAP* Deputy Editor Lisa R. Fortuna, MD, MPH, MDiv, *JAACAP Connect* Editor David C. Saunders, MD, PhD, and *JAACAP* Editor-in-Chief Douglas K. Novins, MD.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Writing – original draft: Mitesh Patel (Lead). Writing – review & editing: John Aoun (Supporting), Jason Langer (Supporting).

Submitted: April 30, 2025 EDT. Accepted: March 24, 2026 EDT. Published: May 14, 2026 EDT.

REFERENCES

1. Government of Canada. *Canada Health Act*.; 1985. Accessed April 23, 2025. https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-6/

2. Government of Ontario. Mental Health Act. Accessed April 23, 2025. https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90m07

3. Government of Ontario. Child, Youth, and Family Services Act. Accessed April 23, 2025. https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/17c14

4. Saya A, Brugnoli C, Piazzi G, et al. Criteria, Procedures, and Future Prospects of Involuntary Treatment in Psychiatry Around the World: A Narrative Review. *Front Psychiatry*. 2019;10:271. doi:10.3389/fpsyt.2019.00271. PMID:31110481

5. Corderoy A, Kisely S, Zirnsak T, Ryan CJ. The benefits and harms of inpatient involuntary psychiatric treatment: a scoping review. *Psychiatr Psychol Law*. 2024;32(5):734-781. doi:10.1080/13218719.2024.2346734. PMID:41001406

6. Thornicroft G, Tansella M. Balancing community-based and hospital-based mental health care. *World Psychiatry*. 2002;1(2):84-90. PMID:16946858

7. United Nations. Convention on the Rights of the Child. Accessed April 23, 2025. https://www.unicef.org/child-rights-convention