Ry. Clement, 2005 NWTSC 69

S-1-CR2005000045

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

PHILLIP DON CLEMENT



Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice V.A. Schuler, at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on July 14th A.D., 2005.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. D. Mahoney:

Counsel for the Crown

Ms. M. Smith:

Counsel for the Accused

Charge under s. 271, s. 267(b) Criminal Code of Canada

Ban on Publication of Complainant / Witness Fursuant to Section 486 of the Criminal Code THE COURT:

I will now sentence Phillip

Don Clement for the offences to which he has pleaded guilty. There have been guilty pleas to Counts 1 and 2 in the Indictment, Count 1 being sexual assault and Count 2 being assault causing bodily harm, both offences having as the victim Mr. Clement's common-law spouse. In hearing about the events that led to these offences, it is clear that it is really one series of events.

For purposes of the sentencing judgment, I will just summarize briefly the facts.

The situation apparently came about because Mr. Clement became angry at his common-law wife when he was at home drinking. He punched her in the face four or five times, threw chairs at her, slapped her in the face and head and when she managed to flee the residence he chased her, grabbed her by her hair and forced her to return to it. He then hit and choked her and at one point kneed her in the stomach. She in fact tried to help him when his foot was cut on some glass but he continued to assault her. demanded oral sex which she did not want to do but complied with because she was afraid of a further boating, and he then forced sexual intercourse on her and kicked her in the face. He finally passed out after these events and as a

1

2

3

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

result of what he did to her, she was bed-ridden for two days. According to the Agreed Statement of Facts, she had difficulty breathing and sleeping due to the soreness of her ribs. The ribs continued to bother her for almost a month. She also suffered two black eyes as well as bruises and swelling on her forehead, cheek, hands, back, arms and legs.

So the events that I have just described can be described really as nothing other than a very serious, lengthy assault on the victim.

It is very aggravating that these events took place in the presence of the three-year-old child of the accused and the victim, and even the child's protests did not stop Mr. Clement from continuing.

It's also aggravating, obviously, that this is a spousal assault and the Criminal Code indicates that to be an aggravating factor.

In terms of mitigation in this case, the accused has no criminal record so that is something that has to be considered in his favour. He also entered his guilty pleas at a very early opportunity and waived his right to a preliminary inquiry. The fact that he did that indicates that he is remorseful, that he is taking responsibility for what he did. It means

2.7

that the victim did not have to testify at all, did not have to go through the trauma of testifying and also the trauma of waiting for a trial, waiting for the matter to be finished.

Also indicative of remorse is the fact that Mr. Clement has offered apologies to the victim. He also apologized here in Court today and I also take into account that he came here to Yellowknife from Tulita to deal with this matter instead of waiting for the Court to go to Tulita at some future date. So I am satisfied that he has made efforts to deal with the matter, take responsibility, and in effect take his punishment.

There is before the Court a letter from the victim. I have read it over and it appears to me to be a thoughtful and a considered letter. It is very supportive of Mr. Clement. The child is obviously very important to both Mr. Clement and his common-law spouse, and she speaks very positively about him in this letter in terms of what he is like as a father.

But that being said, Mr. Clement, you have to realize and you should spend some time thinking about the fact that what you did to your common-law spouse is really the worst example that you could set for your child, and in my view

1.8

2.1

that's something very serious. It must have been terribly traumatic for your little girl to see this happen. It must have been very traumatic at the time. But you should also keep in mind that children who see this sort of thing happen on a repeated basis may start to thinking that this is normal behaviour between a husband and wife and that may mean that when your little girl grows up that if someone does something like this to her she may think it's normal and she may not get help for herself. So if nothing clsc makes you make sure that this never happens again, it should be concern and love for your child. Don't inflict this on her, don't let her see that this is the way that some people live. Because it's not the right way to live obviously, it's not right for a husband to do this kind of violence to his wife.

I accept what the victim has said in her letter, that you are a very good father but I am sure that you realize that this is not what a very good father does.

T take into account that Mr. Clement is 23 years old. He is still fairly young. He is from and he lives in Tulita. He has been employed there with a camp catering company but he also engages in traditional pursuits on the land such

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

as hunting and trapping. It has been indicated that he was raised by his grandparents. It has also been indicated that his family members have had problems with alcohol. Mr. Clement himself indicates that he started drinking at the age of 16 and acknowledges having an anger management problem. And certainly from his own experience, and especially the incident that was described when he was a young child where his uncle held him hostage with a gun when he was drinking, that experience, Mr. Clement, should teach you the reason not to drink.

If, as has been indicated here today, you were so drunk on this occasion that you don't clearly remember what you did, the obvious answer is you should not drink because if you drink and you don't remember or you drink and you become angry and you do such a terrible thing, you can only expect that more terrible things may come out of you when you are drinking. So I accept that this incident is out of character for you but you have got quite a lot of thinking to do about how to make sure it never ever happens again.

Because of Mr. Clement's youth, his lack of a criminal record, it is important that there be an individualized disposition, that

rehabilitation be kept in mind but denunciation and deterrence are still factors. Denunciation of this offence as behaviour that society rejects and condemns and deterrence of other people, those are still important factors because of the alarming rates of spousal and sexual assault in this jurisdiction. So I do have to consider those as well.

I also consider the fact that Mr. Clement is aboriginal although there are no systemic factors that have been brought to my attention.

All of these considerations have to be blended, in effect, to arrive at a suitable sentence in the circumstances.

The Crown seeks a sentence of two and a half to three years; the defence seeks a sentence of less than two years with probation with terms for community service work and counselling.

It seems to me in considering the general range of sentences for spousal and sexual assault, looking at the circumstances of the offence alone, certainly a sentence in the range of four years would be within the range. Now, here, I am satisfied however that the guilty pleas are a significant mitigating factor for the reasons that I have mentioned. And taking that into consideration, along with Mr. Clement's

relative youth, his lack of any record, and the 1 positive description of him that is contained in 2 the letter from the victim, I believe that a sentence at the lower end of the range, notwithstanding the aggravating factors, is 5 justified in this case. 6 I have reviewed the cases that were submitted, the Pierrot and the Vermilion cases, 8 and while those cases are in some ways similar 9 and in some ways different, obviously each case 10 has to be dealt with on its own. 11 12

Stand, please, Mr. Clement.

I sentence you to a term of incarceration of two and a half years on each of the charges concurrent, so the total sentence will be two and a half years. And the warrant will be endorsed with a recommendation that you be permitted to serve your time in the Northwest Territories and that you be given access to anger management and alcohol counselling.

21 THE ACCUSED: Thank you.

THE COURT: You can have a seat, 22

Mr. Clement. 23

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

24

25

26

27

There will be the mandatory DNA order in the usual terms which will commence today and -- is it 20 years for the DNA? Actually, there is no limit on the DNA order so the DNA order is

mandatory, do you have the order form? Yes, Your Honour, it has been MR. MAHONEY: signed by Ms. Smith. 3 I will have a look at that THE COURT: when we finish Court and then have the clerk return it to you. 6 Under Section 109 of the Criminal Code, a 7 firearm prohibition order is also mandatory in 8 these circumstances so there will be one. 9 will commence today and it will end ten years 10 after Mr. Clement's release from imprisonment. 11 Because hunting for food is an integral part of 12 his life and because a firearm was not used in 13 the commission of these offences, under 14 Section 113 of the Criminal Code I am satisfied 15 that in his particular circumstances Mr. Clement 16 does require a firearm for sustenance and so I 17 will authorize the chief firearms officer and the 18 registrar to issue the appropriate authorizations 19 to Mr. Clement to hunt for sustenance. 2.0 And then under Section 490.12 of the 21 Criminal Code, for the sexual assault conviction 22 it is mandatory that Mr. Clement comply with the 23 Sex Offender Registry Act and an order will go to 24 that effect, that he comply for a period which 25 commences today and ends 20 years hence. 26 In the circumstances, I am going to waive 27

	1	the Victim Surcharge.
	2	Do you want to speak to Count 3 in the
	3	Indictment?
	4 MR.	MAHONEY: Yes, Your Honour, the Crown
	5	withdraws the remaining charge.
	6 THE	COURT: Count 3, then, will be marked
	7	withdrawn.
	8	Now, is there anything that I have not
	9	covered?
1	.0 MR.	MAHONEY: I think that's everything,
1	. 1	Your Honour, as far as I can tell.
1	.2 MR.	SMITH: Yes, Your Honour, I think
]	.3	that's everything.
	4 THE	COURT: Thank you, counsel. I will
1	L5	have a look at the order and then have the clerk
1	L6	return it to you.
	L7 MR.	MAHONEY: Thank you.
	L8 (AI	OJOURNMENT)
:	19	
:	20	
	21	Certified to be a true and accurate transcript pursuant
:	22	to Rules 723 and 724 of the Supreme Court Rules,
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	Lois Hewitt, CSR(A), RPR, CRR
	27	Court Reporter
ı		