4 yrs in good 10 yrsh.

CR 03458

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -



CLIFFORD HARROLD DIGNESS

Transcript of Oral Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice J.Z. Vertes, sitting at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on Monday, January 19, A.D. 1998.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. M. Nightingale:

On behalf of the Crown

Mr. T. Kavanagh:

On behalf of the Defence

(Charge under s. 270(x3) of the Criminal Code)

My Lord, may Mr. Digness join me MR. KAVANAGH: 1 at counsel table? 2 He can wait in the dock. 3 THE COURT: The offender, Clifford Harrold Digness, was convicted after trial by jury on a charge that between 5 May 1996 and April 1997, he committed a sexual assault 6 upon the victim, his stepdaughter. The crime relates 7 not to one act but to ongoing acts over an 11-month 8 time frame when the victim was only 11 to 12 years 9 The acts consisted of touching and other gross old. 10 intrusions into this child's bodily integrity, 11 including acts of simulated intercourse, although there 12 were no acts of actual intercourse. 13 The victim tried to tell her mother early on in 14 the time frame but she was not believed. Eventually, 15 further disclosure was made and the police were called 16 in. 17 The victim, I am told, is doing well emotionally 18 through the support of her mother and counsel. 19 The offender was in the position of father to the 20 victim for the past ten years. He was therefore in a 21 position of great trust and authority. 22 We know now that possibly no crime has such 23 potential long-standing devastating effect as the 24 sexual abuse of a child by a person who is viewed by

25

26

27

that child as a provider of love and security.

abuse of that trust is so serious that courts across

Canada have consistently imposed severe sentences.

Indeed, as counsel have noted, the Court of Appeal has said that there should be a starting point of four years imprisonment for serious offences involving the sexual assault of a child by a person in a position of trust. In my opinion, the facts of this case justify reference to this starting point.

The offender is 30 years old. He has been employed primarily as a commercial cook. He comes from a large family. Unfortunately, however, this is not the first offence of this type. In 1995, in Alberta, the offender was convicted of the crime of sexual interference upon this same victim. The offence related to one incident in 1994 when the child was ten years old. The offender pleaded guilty at the time and was given a suspended sentence and two years probation. He took counseling at the time. He has apparently been on prescribed anti-depressant medication since that time. He apparently attempted suicide after that offence. Nevertheless, when the incidents relating to the current conviction started, he was still on probation. That is an aggravating feature.

I recognize that merely incarcerating someone who commits these types of offences is not likely to effect total rehabilitation unless it is coupled with programs of counseling and treatment for what is undoubtedly a

1

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

psychological imbalance. But incarceration is the only sure way of protecting this victim and other potential victims from a repetition of these types of offences by this offender. It is also the only way our society can adequately express its denunciation of this crime and provide a deterrence to others from committing these kinds of crimes.

There are a number of aggravating features. First and foremost is that the offender did the same thing to the same victim before. Even though he was convicted for it, even though that act caused him great emotional turmoil, he did not learn to control his criminal and deviant impulses. Thus if the severity of sentencing is to be based on the evident moral blameworthiness of the offender, then this crime committed by this offender calls for a severe sentence.

The offender has a record for other crimes, although unrelated. One is an assault on the victim's mother in 1992 and another is fraud in 1994. This is also an aggravating feature, although of less weight. I note, however, and it is somewhat significant to me, that the accused was never incarcerated for any of his past crimes. Therefore, the time he has spent awaiting trial and the sentence which I will impose now will be the first significant periods of incarceration for him.

What mitigating factors are there in this case? I

can find none. There has been no expression of remorse. The offender told me about how sorry he is to have caused trouble for his family. I am sure he is. The offender told me how he hopes he can, through counseling, be a better person in the future. I hope he can. But at no time did I hear either an acknowledgment of responsibility or an expression of remorse. He does not have to do either, I admit. I cannot hold it against him. But obviously there is no mitigation available either.

The offender's position throughout trial was a denial of these acts. The jury disbelieved him.

Whether the offender sticks to that position now and in the future is solely up to him to decide.

The offender has been in pre-trial custody for six and a half months. He has been receiving counseling and I commend him for that. He obviously must be given credit for the period of pre-trial detention.

I have concluded that an appropriate sentence, taking into consideration the nature of the acts, the length of time over which these acts were committed, the age of the victim, the nature of the relationship of the offender to the victim, and the prior offence against the same victim, would be one of five years imprisonment. From that I subtract credit for pre-trial custody. Such credit to be one year.

Stand up, Mr. Digness.

2.2

Mr. Digness, I sentence you to a total term of 1 imprisonment of four years. In addition, there will be 2 the usual mandatory order prohibiting the offender from having in his possession any firearms or explosives for 4 a periods of ten years from the date of his release. Any such firearms are to be surrendered forthwith. Under the circumstances, there will be no victim of 7 crime fine surcharge. 8 Mr. Digness, I do not know where you are going to 9 be serving your sentence, but it is my hope that you 10 continue with whatever counseling or treatment programs 11 are made available to you. You are still a young man. 12 We do not know and we cannot tell what effect your 13 actions have had, what lasting effects your actions 14 have had on the victim of your crimes. Hopefully, she 15 will get over them. Hopefully, you will learn to get 16 over your problems. You may sit down. 17 Is there anything else we need to deal with, 18 Counsel? 19 No, My Lord. MR. KAVANAGH: 20 Miss Nightingale? THE COURT: 2.1 I take it there are some No. MS. NIGHTINGALE: 22 exhibits, though, in custody of the clerk which can be 23 returned after the expiry of the appeal period? 24 The only exhibits I recall are the THE COURT: 25 videotape and a transcript. Do you have a note of any 26 others, Madam Clerk? 27

1	THE CLERK: No, My Lord, just the two. Just
2	the transcript and the videotape.
3	THE COURT: The videotape can be returned to
4	the Crown. There is no reason for it to be kept by the
5	clerk's office. So I'll direct that the videotape be
6	returned by the clerk to the Crown's office at the end
7	of the appeal period. The transcript can stay on the
8	file. Anything else, Counsel?
9	MR. KAVANAGH: No, My Lord.
10	MS. NIGHTINGALE: No, My Lord.
11	THE COURT: My appreciation for your
12	submissions. Close court, please.
13	(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED)
14	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
15	
16	Certified pursuant to Practice
17	Direction #20 dated December 28, 1987
18	
19	Tono Romanowi ah
20	Court Reporter
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

