IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

CLIFFORD MICHAEL BOLINE

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice J.Z. Vertes, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 25th day of January, A.D. 2001.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. J. O'Halloran:

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. T. Boyd:

Counsel for the Defendant

(Charges under 253(a) x2 of the Criminal Code)

THE COURT:

The offender, Clifford Michael

Boline, also known as Clifford Michael Johnstone, was convicted after trial of three offences: impaired driving, operating a motor vehicle while disqualified from doing so, and resisting arrest. The offences occurred as parts of a sequence of events in Yellowknife in the early morning hours of April 24, 2000. The offender has been in custody since that time.

The circumstances of the offences themselves are not particularly serious or aggravating. It was a relatively short sequence of events and no one was injured. It is the offender's circumstances that are particularly serious.

The offender is 31 years of age. He is a Dogrib Indian born and raised in this region. He had a difficult childhood. His natural father died when he was very young; he was custom-adopted by his elderly grandparents. He later lived with other members of his extended family. He was shuttled between communities and homes for many years. He had no stability in his life, and there are indications that he was exposed to violence from an early age. He does not suffer from any psychological disturbances, but he has had a lengthy and entrenched problem with alcohol abuse. He has minimal education and few job skills.

The offender has a serious and disturbing record

of criminal convictions. He was first convicted in Youth Court in 1986. As an adult, he has accumulated twenty-one convictions since 1989 (not counting the three for which he is being sentenced today). The list of convictions include four previous drinking and driving offences, the last one in 1998, including a conviction for impaired driving causing bodily harm in 1990 for which he was sentenced to two years incarceration. The list includes a conviction for dangerous driving, three for driving while disqualified, and five convictions for failing to comply with court orders. He was a parole violator. He also has convictions for crimes of violence, including committing sexual assault and causing bodily harm in 1990 for which he was sentenced to a term of five years in prison. As Crown counsel said, the offender has spent most of the 1990s behind bars.

Yet, even with this history, there is some cause for optimism. The offender has the strong support of his common-law spouse. He is apparently a good and reliable father to the three children of the family. His wife appears to have a good deal of insight into what she and the offender need to do to build a strong and lasting relationship, free from the ill-effects of alcohol abuse and family histories of violence.

The pre-sentence report outlines the many resources that are available for the offender to

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

assist in his rehabilitation. There are signs that the offender himself recognizes that now is the last chance he has to come to grips with his problems. The report concludes with what I would call a conflicted recommendation from the probation officer who prepared it. I quote:

Based on the acquired facts and information, this writer is struggling with recommending a decision as to whether or not the subject would be a suitable candidate for a community-based I have known the subject for a sentence. number of years, and I think that with the proper mind-set and supports in place, the subject could find it within himself to obey the orders of the Court. Through my interviews with the subject, he appeared remorseful and serious about making some positive changes in his lifestyle and becoming a law-abiding citizen. On the other hand, his prior criminal convictions for failing to obey conditions of the Court have certainly impacted the writer's concerns as to his compliance with a community-based sentence and whether or not his risk could be managed at the community level.

Crown counsel in this case has suggested a total sentence of two years less one day of actual incarceration (after taking into account pre-trial detention). In his submission, the principles of deterrence and denunciation must be emphasized. Crown counsel argued that the offender is a continuing danger to the community and that it is unrealistic to think that there could be meaningful restrictions imposed on the offender in a community-based sentence.

I must say that I appreciate the position taken

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

by Crown counsel in this case because, frankly, as I said during the submissions, it showed a great deal of restraint. I was initially under the impression, having regard to this offender's record of convictions, that there might well be cause to seek a penitentiary sentence. But I think Crown counsel has shown admirable restraint in the position taken in this case.

Defence counsel argued strenuously for a community-based sentencing approach. He suggested a conditional sentence with requirements for counselling and treatment.

I must admit that this case has caused me a great deal of concern. On the one hand, the offender has a history of dangerous conduct with a complete disregard for external controls. On the other hand, past incarceration has failed to change his ways, and a lengthy period of incarceration now may have no greater chance of success. In addition, a lengthy period of incarceration may have devastating effects on his family. The prime objective of all sentencing is of course the protection of the community. But we do not ignore, as well, the aims of rehabilitating the offender and restoring him to the community as a worthwhile member of it.

This is not a case where either a penitentiary term or no term of imprisonment would be appropriate.

So I must give consideration to the imposition of a conditional sentence or some combination of sentencing alternatives. There are four criteria in Section 742.1 of the *Criminal Code* to be considered before deciding to impose a conditional sentence:

- (1) The offence must not be one punishable by a minimum term of imprisonment;
- (2) The term of imprisonment must be less than two years;
- (3) The safety of the community would not be endangered by the offender serving a sentence in the community; and
- (4) A conditional sentence would be consistent with the fundamental purpose and principles of sentencing as delineated in the *Criminal Code*.

As a starting point, it must be noted that a conditional sentence is not available on the impaired driving conviction. That offence carries a mandatory minimum sentence of not less than 90 days by virtue of the offender's previous convictions. The Crown served notice of its intention to seek the greater punishment provided by Section 255(1) of the Criminal Code, so the first criterion for a conditional sentence is not met. But that does not rule out some combination of actual custody, a conditional sentence, and even probation.

Here we have three separate offences. In $R.\ v.$ Alfred (1998), 122 C.C.C. (3d) 213, the Ontario Court of Appeal held that, when sentencing for more than one

=

1.8

offence, the Court cannot impose a conditional sentence together with a sentence of actual incarceration where the total sentence exceeds two years less one day. This would violate the spirit, if not the letter of the law, in Section 742.1(a) of the Criminal Code which provides that a conditional sentence can only be granted where the Court imposes a sentence of imprisonment of less than two years.

In the subsequent case of R. v. Ploumis, [2000] O.J. No. 4731 (Q.L.), the Ontario Court of Appeal went on to hold that a conditional sentence can be imposed together with a sentence of actual incarceration where the total sentence does not exceed two years less one day. It also held that such a total sentence can have added to it a period of probation. The Court supported this by reference to the Supreme Court of Canada case of R. v. R.A.R. (2000), 140 C.C.C. (3d) 523.

In R.A.R., the accused had been convicted of sexual assault and two counts of common assault. The trial judge imposed a sentence of one year imprisonment plus these years probation on the sexual assault count and fines on the two common assault counts. The Court of Appeal set aside those sentences and substituted consecutive conditional sentences of six months, two months, and one month. Finally, the majority in the Supreme Court of Canada restored the

one-year custodial sentence and probation order imposed by the trial judge. So the final total sentence in R.A.R. consisted of one year actual incarceration plus probation and three months of consecutive conditional sentences. And if one examines the concluding paragraph of the judgment in R.A.R., it is clear that the Supreme Court contemplated that the sequence of sentences would be one year in custody followed by the three-month conditional sentence and then followed by the three-year probation order. And it appears obvious as well that the Supreme Court must have thought that in a proper case a blended sentence combining actual imprisonment with a conditional sentence and a period of probation would be consistent with the principles of sentencing.

In the case before me, my concerns are to recognize the need for deterrence and denunciation, which would, of course, be more directly served by a custodial sentence, together with the goal of restoring the offender to the community and placing some structure to control his activities in the community. These goals can better be achieved through the restrictions of a conditional sentence together with the conditions of a lengthy period of probation. I emphasize the word "lengthy" because I think this offender will require a lengthy period of

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

rehabilitation and control.

2

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

In R. v. Proulx (2000), 30 C.R. (5th) 1, the Supreme Court held that the purpose of the conditional sentencing option was to reduce reliance on incarceration as a sanction and to increase the use of restorative justice principles in sentencing. clear message is for restraint in the use of incarceration. Conditional sentences are available for all categories and types of offences (so long as the statutory criteria are met). The requirement to ensure that the safety of the community would not be endangered by imposing a conditional sentence means that consideration must be given to the risk posed by the specific offender, not the theoretical risk posed by not imposing a sentence that emphasizes general deterrence. After all, a conditional sentence can itself provide significant deterrence and denunciation. The danger-to-the-community factor must be assessed on the basis of the risk of the offender reoffending and the gravity of the damage that could ensue if he does reoffend.

On this basis there is here a significant risk of this offender reoffending having regard to his past history. This militates in favour of some period of actual incarceration. Further, the fact that this offender habitually drinks and drives regardless of any disqualification imposed on him, and having regard

to the wide-spread national concern with drinking and driving offences as a social problem, I think it is fair to conclude that the objectives of deterrence and denunciation are particularly pressing in this case.

As noted in *Proulx* (at para. 114):

Where punitive objectives such as denunciation and deterrence are particularly pressing, such as cases where there are aggravating circumstances, incarceration will generally be the preferable sanction.

The other factor I must consider is the effect of Section 718.2(e) of the Criminal Code which requires that all available sanctions other than imprisonment that are reasonable in the circumstances be considered, with particular attention to the circumstances of aboriginal offenders. In R. v. Gladue (1999), 133 C.C.C. (3d) 385, and the subsequent case of R. v. Wells (2000), 182 D.L.R. (4th) 257, the Supreme Court of Canada acknowledged that, while sentences for aboriginal offenders should not be automatically reduced, Section 718.2(e) of the Code is meant to recognize the unique circumstances of aboriginal offenders, and thus there must be a different approach to the sentencing of aboriginal offenders because of the systemic or background factors that play a part in bringing them before the The aim is to ameliorate the serious problem of over-representation of aboriginal people in prison

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

and to encourage the use of restorative approaches to sentencing.

In this case, the offender's personal history is a poignant example of some of the deprivations that impact on the lives of aboriginals. There is no doubt that the wide-spread abuse of alcohol that has devastated many aboriginal families and communities played a role in this offender's current problems. For these reasons, I feel that a restorative and rehabilitative approach must be combined with the punitive approach I described earlier.

Bearing in mind all of these factors, I have concluded that the total sentence in this case should combine the deterrence provided by a custodial sentence, the rehabilitative measures provided by a conditional sentence, and the longevity of a control system provided by a further probation period.

I have taken into account the time spent in pre-trial custody. Of the nine months of his detention, three and a half months were allocated to serving a sentence. The remainder I credit as the equivalent of twelve months, and I take that into account on the sentence I impose on the impaired driving charge.

Stand up, Mr. Boline.

On the charge of impaired driving (count 2 of the Indictment), I impose a sentence of actual

1	imprisonment of 12 months less one day. In addition,
2	you will be subject to a probation order for a period
3	of three years. The conditions of that probation
4	order will be as follows:
5	(a) You are to keep the peace and be of good behaviour;
6	<pre>(b) You are to appear before the Court if and when required to do so;</pre>
8	(c) You are to report to and be under the supervision of a probation officer;
9	(d) You are to notify your probation officer of your address and employment at all times;
11	(e) You are to abstain absolutely from the
12	consumption of alcohol or other intoxicating substances and the consumption of drugs
13	<pre>except in accordance with a medical prescription;</pre>
14	(f) You are to submit on demand of a peace officer to provide a sample of your breath
15	for analysis;
16	(g) You are not to be in any place where alcohol is served;
17	(h) You are to participate actively in any and
18	all counselling and treatment programs as directed by your probation officer; and
19	(i) You are to perform 200 hours of community
20	service work as directed by your probation officer.
21	
22	Please note, Mr. Boline, that if you do not
23	comply with these conditions, that is a criminal
24	offence and you may be charged for that. Do you
25	understand?
26	THE ACCUSED: Yes.
27	THE COURT: If you commit an offence while

1: 		you are on probation, you may be charged for that and			
2		the prob	ation terms may be changed. Do you understand		
3		that?			
4	THE	ACCUSED:	Yes.		
5	THE	COURT:	On the charges of driving while		
6		disquali	fied and resisting arrest (counts 3 and 4 of		
7		the Indi	ctment), I impose a conditional sentence to be		
8		served in the community of six months on each charge.			
9		That is a total of 12 months which will be served			
10		consecut	ive to the sentence on the impaired driving		
11		charge.			
12		The	terms and conditions of the conditional		
13		sentence	s will be as follows:		
14		(a)	You are to keep the peace and be of good behaviour;		
15		(b)	You are to appear before the Court if and		
16			when required to do so;		
17		(C)	You are to report to the conditional sentence supervisor in Fort Rae within two days of		
18			your release from prison, and to continue to report when and as directed by your		
19		supervisor;			
20		(d)	You are to remain within the Northwest Territories unless prior permission is		
21		obtained from your supervisor;			
22		(e)	You must notify your supervisor of any change in address or employment;		
23		(f)	You are to reside in the home of Yolanda		
24		(- /	Lafferty and you are to contribute to the care and support of that family;		
25		(a)	You will be subject to a curfew whereby you		
26		(9)	must be in your residence between the hours of nine p.m. and six a.m. daily, subject only		
27			to:		

1			endance at church or other igious or cultural events;	
2		(ii) med	ical emergencies;	
3		(iii) par	ticipation in organized community	
4			vesting projects; or	
5			ticipation in treatment or nselling programs;	
	(h)		participate actively in any and	
7		all counse directed b	lling and treatment programs as y your supervisor;	
8	(i)	You are to	abstain absolutely from the	
9		consumption of alcohol or other intoxicating substances, and the consumption of drugs		
10		except in accordance with a medical prescription;		
11	(i)	You are to	submit, on demand of a peace	
12	() /		o provide a sample of your breath	
13	(1-)	-		
14	(K)	is served;	t to be in any place where alcohol	
15	(1)		abstain absolutely from having in	
16		your possession any weapon, firearm, or ammunition except when participating on a		
17		community	nunting trip.	
18	Are	these cond	itions clear?	
19	THE ACCUSED:		Yes, Sir.	
20	THE COURT:		Do you understand them?	
21	THE ACCUSED:		Yes.	
22	THE COURT:		If you do not comply with any of	
23	these con	these conditions, you may be imprisoned to serve the		
24	remainde	r of the cor	nditional sentence. Do you	
25	understa	nd that?		
26	THE ACCUSED:		Yes.	
27	THE COURT:		In addition, pursuant to Section	

259(2) of the *Criminal Code*, I hereby make an order prohibiting you from operating a motor vehicle for a period of ten years starting from the date of your release from prison. Do you understand that?

THE ACCUSED: Yes.

THE COURT: You may have a seat. Now,
Mr. Boline, Counsel, by this sentence, combined

sentence, you, Mr. Boline, are going to be under some form of control for the next five years of your life. As I outlined from my interpretation of the Supreme Court of Canada's judgment in R.A.R., I think the sequence of events will be actual imprisonment, the conditional sentence period, and three years of

14 probation.

Now, you know, Mr. Boline, and I know, that you will be out of the Yellowknife Correctional Centre within a few months. The sentence of 12 months less a day, unless you do something very wrong, you will be released well before the end of that time. And I hope that your family, Miss Lafferty, will understand that and will hang in there until you are released, because it won't be that long until you will be back home. And then it is up to you. Essentially, over the last 12 years you have wasted most of your time in prison for very serious crimes. I see and I have read how much support there is for you. You have a very big opportunity right now, Mr. Boline. I'm sure you

understand. And I suspect that your community, your home community, the people there, and your family members, with the support of Miss Lafferty, are willing to give you a final chance. So it is up to you from now on. All the talk that was put in the pre-sentence report about how you want to change your ways, how you want to get treatment and counselling, I took seriously. So this is your chance. Don't mess it up.

Now, Counsel, there is going to be a lot of paperwork that the clerk will have to prepare that Mr. Boline will have to sign. The conditional sentence orders, the probation order, and the driving prohibition order. So I wonder if he can be kept here for the next little while, down in custody, whatever arrangements there are, until the clerk has the paperwork ready and then he can be brought up to sign them. He can sign them in front of the clerk. And, Mr. Boyd, I wonder, if it is not imposing on you too much, if you could stay around until the paperwork is ready. Or maybe the clerk can call you and ask you to come back. I think it would assist the clerk if you were here to explain the paperwork to your client so he has a complete understanding.

25 MR. BOYD: Yes, I'll do that.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. O'HALLORAN: Just one clarification. Your

=		Honour did not a time	e to impose a time to complete or
2		a rate of completion	of the CSO.
3	THE	COURT:	The community service work in the
4		probation order will	be complete within the first 18
5		months.	
6	MR.	O'HALLORAN:	I think the rest is clear.
7	THE	COURT:	Thank you. Again, thank you,
8		Counsel.	
9		Mr. Boline, I mu	st say, and I meant to say this
10		at the conclusion of	the trial, your counsel did and
11		said everything possi	ble on your behalf. So I thank
12		Mr. Boyd as well for	his efforts. Thank you
13		gentlemen. We're clos	sed.
14			
15			
16			Certified Pursuant to Rule 723 of the Rules of Court
17			51 6.16 1.4165 61 65222
18		ζ.	Jane Romanowich, CSR(A)
19			Court Reporter
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			