

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence of The Honourable Mr. Justice J. E. Richard, at Fort Smith in the Northwest Territories, on Wednesday, December 6th, A.D. 1995.

APPEARANCES:

MR. D. CLAXTON:

Counsel for the Crown

MR. D. CROSSIN:

Counsel for the Accused

MR. D. McKAY:

(CHARGED UNDER s. 231(2) CRIMINAL CODE OF CANADA)

(CHARGED UNDER s. 233(2) CRIMINAL CODE OF CANADA) (CHARGED UNDER s. 135 CRIMINAL CODE OF CANADA)

(CHARGED UNDER s. 148 CRIMINAL CODE OF CANADA)

(CHARGED UNDER s. 156 CRIMINAL CODE OF CANADA)

AN ORDER HAS BEEN MADE IN THIS CASE PROHIBITING PUBLICATION OF ANY INFORMATION THAT COULD DISCLOSE THE IDENTITY OF CERTAIN COMPLAINANTS PURSUANT TO s. 486(3) OF THE CRIMINAL CODE

THE COURT:

J M has been convicted by a jury of the crime of assault causing bodily harm contrary to the former Section 231(2) of the Criminal Code. His crime was committed approximately 25 years ago here in Fort Smith and his victim was his first wife I M , now L K .

The victim told the jury a story of a very troubled marriage between she and the offender J M in the years 1967 to 1971 when they lived together as man and wife here in Fort Smith with their five children. There was much alcohol abuse by the two spouses, much quarreling and arguing, and a great deal of physical violence in the household.

The victim says she left her husband and children in 1971 and moved away from Fort Smith and she says she did so of fear for her life.

She told the jury of two specific serious assaults visited upon her by the offender J M in the time frame 1969 to 1971.

In the one instance, she said her then husband was angry with her because she had been out drinking while he was out of town and he took her to a basement room, tied her up, and administered a severe beating upon her with a board.

She says that she suffered painful injuries and had to stay away from work for a couple of days as a result.

In the second instance, the victim says she was in attendance at a community dance here in Fort Smith when her husband arrived in an intoxicated condition. She says he became angry when she was dancing with another man and he took her outside of the dance hall and administrated a severe beating upon her to the point that she lost consciousness and was taken to the hospital.

She says she remained in the hospital for two weeks and that she suffered severe injuries on that occasion, including scars that she still has on her body.

Prior to their deliberations, the jury was instructed that either of these incidents related by the victim could amount to an offence of assault causing bodily harm if they accepted that portion of the victim's evidence.

The jury was told that they need only find one incident of assault causing bodily harm in order to find Mr. M guilty of that charge of assault causing bodily harm; that is, Count No. 1 in the indictment.

Following their deliberations, the jury did find Mr. M guilty of Count No. 1; that is, assault causing bodily harm.

In my view, each or either of these assaults constitutes a serious offence which merits a

| 1 | meaningful sentence in order to give effect to the |
|----|---|
| 2 | important principles of general deterrence and |
| 3 | denunciation. For this reason, I therefore find that |
| 4 | I need not make any particular ruling or determination |
| 5 | as to what it is precisely that the jury decided with |
| 6 | respect to Count No. 1. |
| 7 | At the time that J M committed his crime; |
| 8 | that is, in the time period 1969 to 1971, the |
| 9 | Parliament of Canada prohibited this kind of criminal |
| 10 | behaviour by virtue of the former Section 231(2) of |
| 11 | the Criminal Code. |
| 12 | That subsection of the Criminal Code read as |
| 13 | follows: |
| 14 | Everyone who commits an assault |
| 15 | that causes bodily harm to any person is guilty of an indictable offence and is |
| 16 | liable to imprisonment for two years |
| 17 | The maximum sentence for J M 's crime is |
| 18 | therefore two years' imprisonment in a federal |
| 19 | penitentiary in southern Canada. |
| 20 | Today, the maximum sentence for the same crime is |
| 21 | ten years' imprisonment in penitentiary. |
| 22 | This offender before the Court today is a man of |
| 23 | 60 years of age and is a well-known businessman here |
| 24 | in Fort Smith, who has lived in this community for |
| 25 | almost 30 years. He has no criminal record. |
| 26 | In my view, Mr. M 's crime was and is a very |
| 27 | serious one. And it is no less so due to the passage |

of time since its commission.

General deterrence and denunciation are the important principles here.

I do not believe that the Court can or should ignore or minimize the importance of those two principles simply because the crime was committed in an era when spousal assault was common-place and was casually regarded by society as it was then.

These two important principles apply to the sentencing process which is occurring today. These two principles are aimed at achieving the overall purpose or objective of the criminal law system which is the protection of the public today.

In my view, a suspended sentence for this serious crime would not adequately reflect those two important principles of general deterrence and denunciation.

That kind of disposition today would send the wrong message to the members of the community and to society generally.

In my view, a meaningful period of incarceration is required to give effect to the overall purpose of the criminal law and those principles of sentencing that I have mentioned.

Spousal assault or domestic violence is today recognized by society, and particularly by people living in our northern communities, as a serious social problem, more so than it was in the '60s and

1 '70s.

Also, violence against women is today recognized by all Canadians as a horrific and unacceptable social aberration which unfortunately, unfortunately, exists in Canadian society.

Canadians are particularly mindful of this terrible social problem at this time of year on the sixth anniversary of what has come to be known as the Montreal massacre.

It is only today that J M. is being held to account by society for the serious crime that he committed a long time ago.

I do not agree that these are peculiar circumstances simply because of the passage of time. Today is the day of reckoning; today is the day on which sentence is being imposed.

In my view, the societal values of today must necessarily be reflected in the sentence that is imposed, within the limits prescribed by the law at the time of the commission of the offence.

Would you please stand now, Mr. M

Mr. M , for the crime that you have committed, the assault of L K between 1969 and 1971 causing her bodily harm contrary to the former Section 231(2) of the Criminal Code, it is the sentence of this Court that you be imprisoned for a period of 15 months.

| 1 | And in addition, there will be the statutory \$35 |
|----|--|
| 2 | Victim Fine surcharge. Time to pay, 30 days. In |
| 3 | default, one week consecutive. |
| 4 | Take a seat, sir. |
| 5 | Counsel, is there anything further on this case. |
| 6 | MR. CLAXTON: Just one matter, My Lord. I wonder if |
| 7 | I might have an order for the return of the exhibits |
| 8 | at the end of the expiration period? |
| 9 | THE COURT: Any difficulty? |
| 10 | MR. CROSSIN: No. |
| 11 | THE COURT: The usual order will go in that |
| 12 | regard. |
| 13 | Before we close Court, I want to commend counsel |
| 14 | on both sides for their conduct of this very difficult |
| 15 | case. |
| 16 | So we will close court, Madam Clerk. |
| 17 | THE PARTY OF THE P |
| 18 | (AT WHICH TIME THIS MATTER CONCLUDED) |
| 19 | Certified Pursuant to Practice Direction #20 |
| 20 | dated December 28, 1987. |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | - NEWW |
| 24 | Lois Hewitt, Court Reporter |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| | |