IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

CAMERON BERNARDE

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice L.A. Charbonneau, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 26th day of March, 2018.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. B. Green: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. P.J. Harte: Counsel for the Accused

> (Charges under s. 344(b), 87, 88, 117.01(1), 351(2), 91(1), 733.1(1), and 85(1) (a) of the Criminal Code of Canada)

THE COURT: Mr. Bernarde has pleaded guilty to a charge of robbery. Sentencing is never easy for a sentencing judge, and in this case, it is even harder. I was given a lot of information about Mr. Bernarde in the medical reports and other documents that his lawyer gave me. Those documents talk about his medical and psychological condition. I also had two Presentence Reports that were filed. One was prepared several years ago in 2008. The other was prepared in 2017. And, of course, the lawyers gave me case law and they made lengthy submissions at the sentencing hearing.

As I have just told Mr. Bernarde, it is my responsibility to make sure that I explain my decision in this case, like it would be in any case; but because some of the issues that were raised in this matter were complicated, I want to make sure that the reasons I give are complete and for that reason I am going to prepare a written decision. Today I will try to explain in a shorter version why I have decided what I have.

In sentencing Mr. Bernarde, I have to take into account, as would be the case in any sentencing, the crime that the person has committed, the circumstances of the person who has committed it, and what the law says.

So dealing first with the offence, what I heard is that the night before this crime happened Mr. Bernarde had been drinking with one of his friends. He left the friend's house apparently intending on going home to bed, but that is not what he ended up doing. Instead, he got a firearm from his home and he went to the Rooster Gas Bar in Hay River. When he entered the Rooster, he was wearing a hoodie and something covering his face. By then it was the early morning hours of November 8th, 2016.

William Delorme was working as the cashier at the time. Mr. Bernarde pointed the firearm directly at him and demanded money from the till and the nearby automatic teller machine.

Mr. Delorme gave Mr. Bernarde about \$200 from the till.

The police investigated. They discovered that Mr. Bernarde was the one who had done this, and they arrested him. He gave a statement to the police, and he admitted that he was the one who had done this.

Mr. Delorme said afterwards that he was not afraid when this was happening because
Mr. Bernarde seemed nervous and he did not seem to be a very good criminal. Mr. Delorme said that when Mr. Bernarde pointed the firearm at

him, Mr. Delorme saw that the bolt and bullet
chamber were open. Mr. Delorme thought that the
gun, even if it was loaded, would probably
backfire because it looked too rusty to shoot.

It is important to say that Mr. Delorme was wrong
about this because the firearm was tested and, in
fact, it did fire.

That is the offence that Mr. Bernarde committed. That is the crime I have to sentence him for.

As for his circumstances, I know that he turned 23 earlier this month. He is of Mountain Dene descent. He was adopted shortly after birth by his aunt and uncle. His biological mother was not able to care for him because of serious substance abuse issues that she had. In fact, I heard that she consumed alcohol throughout her pregnancy, and sadly this had a significant impact on Mr. Bernarde.

Mr. Bernarde lives with Fetal Alcohol

Spectrum Disorder. This makes it more difficult for him to function within the rules of society.

It makes it harder for him to control his impulses. It makes it hard for him to connect what he does with the consequences of what he does.

The information I was given is also that he

has some intellectual challenges. That is not his fault either. I understand that it must be hard for him. For example, it must have been very frustrating to be in school. He is very good at certain things and has difficulties with others.

I know from one of the Presentence Reports that he is a very good bush man. His grandfather taught him well. I also know he is good at fixing things. He has a harder time with other things like abstract concepts, planning, and sometimes with making good decisions.

Mr. Bernarde would have needed a lot of support and structure growing up. He will need supports and structure throughout his life to function properly in his community. The need for these supports was identified clearly when he was very young. Unfortunately, he never received those supports. Instead, he grew up in a difficult environment, according to the Presentence Report that was prepared in 2017.

I want to say here that I know there is very conflicting information between the 2008 report and the 2017 report. The 2008 report says he grew up in a loving home and was probably loved more than his siblings. The report from 2017 says there was alcohol abuse in the home and a

1 lot of violence including serious violence
2 directed at him.

At the sentencing hearing, Mr. Bernarde's lawyer said that the information in the 2017 report was the correct information. I want Mr. Bernarde to know that I believe what he says when he says that the 2017 report is the one that has the correct information. I have no reason not to believe that. And it is also not hard at all for me to understand why he did not talk about those things when the 2008 Presentence Report was prepared. After all, back then he was only 13-years-old, and some of the things that are described in the 2017 report would have been very difficult to talk about even now but certainly even more so when he was 13.

Mr. Bernarde has been in trouble with the law regularly since a young age. He was not even 13 when he was first sentenced in the Youth Court. In the following years, he was in court many times; for crimes against property and for not following court orders. And this continued after he turned 18.

His last conviction in May 2014 was for a much more serious offence, though, than the previous ones. It was for sexual assault. For that crime, he received a fairly long jail term

and was placed on probation for three years. He was still on probation when he committed the robbery at the Rooster.

I agree with his lawyer that his criminal record is as much a symptom as anything else, but what worries me a lot is that his crimes seem to be getting more serious. In the past, he stole things. He didn't follow court orders. Those are crimes, but sexual assault and robbery with a firearm are far more serious crimes.

Turning briefly to the law, normally when deciding what a sentence should be a judge has to look at how serious the crime is and how much blame the person who committed the crime should receive for it. Normally a judge has a lot of different choices on sentencing. Sometimes the law gives the judge fewer choices. Sometimes the law says that there is a minimum punishment for a crime. And when that is the case, judges have to follow the law.

Here the law says that because Mr. Bernarde used a firearm in this robbery I have to sentence him to at least four years in jail.

Mr. Bernarde's lawyer says that I do not have to follow that law because that law is not valid.

The position is that the minimum sentence that

the law says I should give is simply too high to

A.C.E. Reporting Services Inc.

1 be a valid law.

The Crown agrees that four years would be a very high sentence for Mr. Bernarde, but the Crown says it is not high enough to be invalid law. So the Crown says I have to follow what the Criminal Code says.

This has not been an easy decision to make. It is not Mr. Bernarde's fault that he has an FASD. I also know he has not received the supports and structure that doctors and others said he should have received when he was younger. It does not seem fair that doctors, nurses, psychologists said that he needed certain things and that he did not get those things. And that on top of that, he was left in a very bad home situation with very little help.

At the same time, robbery is a serious crime, and even when there is no weapon used, the sentences for it are usually quite high. Here a firearm was used. That makes the crime more serious. In addition, Mr. Bernarde did not just have the firearm with him, he pointed it directly at Mr. Delorme. And that, too, makes the offence more serious.

He also hid his face which means he thought about what he was about to do and tried to make sure he would not be caught. The fact that he

planned and thought about this, even if it was not a complicated or long plan, also makes the offence more serious.

The things in Mr. Bernarde's favour are that he pleaded guilty. He admits what he did, and I believe him when he says he is sorry. Also, I do have to take into account his circumstances which I have talked about already and his challenges. These do not excuse his behaviour. They do not give him a defence to this charge, but his level of responsibility is lower than if he was someone without the challenges that he has.

But looking at the sentences that are usually imposed for robberies, looking at the things that make this one more serious, and even considering all the things in Mr. Bernarde's favour, the difference between the four-year sentence that the law says I must give him and the sentence that I would give him if that law was not there is not a big enough difference for me to say that the law is invalid.

There have been other cases where people have argued that this law is invalid. That this minimum sentence is simply too high for certain people. This happened in cases where the person being sentenced also had special challenges like a mental illness or addictions or other similar

circumstances. The courts in those cases decided that the law was valid because of how serious it is to use a firearm when committing a robbery.

And after careful consideration, I agree with those other decisions.

So my conclusion is that I do not have the choice. I have to follow what the law says. In this case, it forces me to impose what I consider to be a very severe sentence under the circumstances, but because I have decided that it is not severe to the point of making the law invalid, I have to apply it. I am not going to impose any more than what the law forces me to do, however.

Mr. Bernarde has been in custody for a total of 504 days, which works out to 756 days if I give him a day and a half of credit for each day he spent on remand. So I will give him the maximum credit for that.

There will be a firearms prohibition order.

Mr. Bernarde is already on one as a result of the sexual assault conviction, but there has been no notice filed that forces me to give him a life prohibition. I am still going to make the prohibition a little bit longer than the minimum,

because I am very concerned about the manner in
which he chose to use the firearm in this case.

So there will be a firearms prohibition order.

It will begin today and it will expire 15 years
from Mr. Bernarde's release.

There will be a DNA order, because robbery is a primary designated offence.

There will be a Victim of Crime Surcharge of \$200. The time to pay and the default time are set out in the statute.

With the credit that I am going to give

Mr. Bernarde, the jail term I will impose today

works out to two years and one week. The

sentence that I impose today will be below two

years, and that means that probation can be made

a part of the sentence.

Mr. Bernarde has not done very well with following court orders in the past, and sometimes that makes a judge not keen on putting someone on probation; but in this case I am going to add a Probation Order to the sentence, not for punishment purposes but hopefully to help Mr. Bernarde.

It is very clear that structure and supervision are things that he needs. I know he was on probation when he committed this offence, but this time when he is released, he will have

been in jail for a longer time. I hope he will have been able to benefit from some of the supports and programs available in jail. And I hope that he will have been able, with the help of others, to make a better plan to stay out of trouble and that being on probation might help him stick with that plan.

I hope very much that the Probation Services in Hay River, or wherever Mr. Bernarde will live when he is released, will provide very close supervision and guidance to him. Everyone must recognize, the jail authorities and the probation authorities, that Mr. Bernarde is not an ordinary offender. He has very special needs, needs that were identified by people who worked for the government many years ago in the medical and Social Services field. The supports that everyone said he needed were never given to him, and I hope that this will change and that perhaps through the assistance of Probation Services he will do better when he is released this time.

Mr. Bernarde cannot succeed in this alone. That is very clear. I hope that whoever will be assigned as his probation officer will deal with him and supervise him in a manner that takes into account his special needs. Mr. Bernarde is still very young. A lot of what will happen in his

future will be up to him, but there is also a responsibility on others, on the state, to provide him with the supports that he needs.

As I said, I am very worried about the fact that his crimes are getting more and more serious. If he does not receive the help and supports that he needs, I am scared that he will end up hurting someone even more badly than he already has. That would be awful for whoever the next victim is, but it also would be awful for Mr. Bernarde himself. So this time the system has to do its part to try to prevent that from happening.

Can you stand up, please, Mr. Bernarde.

Mr. Bernarde, as I said, I do not feel I have a choice here. If you had not spent time in custody already, the sentence would have been four years, and that would have been a penitentiary sentence. For the 504 days you have already spent in custody, I am going to give you credit for 756 days, and that works out to two years and three weeks. And so what that means is that the balance of the sentence is going to be 23 months and one week, so just short of two years, and that means that it is going to be served here in the north.

27 THE ACCUSED: Okay.

1 THE	COURT:	You	can	sit	down.

I really hope, Mr. Bernarde, that, while I 2 3 do not know if they are going to keep you in the same place where you have been; but whatever you 4 5 have been doing and whatever help you have been getting there, I hope that continues. I have 6 7 heard that you have skills and I hope that you can get help focusing on that so that you can do 8 9 better the next time you are released.

10 THE ACCUSED: Yeah.

11 THE COURT: For the reasons I have given,
12 I am going to have this followed by probation for
13 three years. So you are going to have to report
14 to Probation within 24 hours. As soon as you are
15 released from the custody, you have to report to

17 THE ACCUSED: (Affirmative, non-verbal

18 response).

16

19 THE COURT: And then report to them as

they direct you to.

them.

21 THE ACCUSED: Yes.

22 THE COURT: I am going to direct that you
23 will live where your probation officer tells you
24 to live. This is not going to be written in the
25 order; but for the benefit of the transcript and
26 reference for the people who will be making

decisions about you, residency options, in my

1		view, should include po	ossible placement into the
2		kind of supported living	ng that the last
3		psychologist who worked	d with you thought you
4		needed. I know the opt	tions are limited in Hay
5		River, but hopefully th	ney can help you find a
6		place where you will ha	ave the support you need.
7	THE	ACCUSED: Yes	
8	THE	COURT: The	third condition is going
9		to be that you take any	y educational programs that
10		your probation officer	might recommend. Now I
11		read in all of these do	ocuments I was given that
12		you are good with your	hands. You are good at
13		repairing things, and	there are a lot of people
14		who are not good at rep	pairing things and need
15		people like you to do t	chat work.
16	THE	ACCUSED: Yea	h.
17	THE	COURT: So	there is work for people
18		like you who are good a	at repairing snow machines,
19		ATVs, and small engines	s, and I know it is one of
20		those things that inte	rests you. So if you keep
21		that up, perhaps you ca	an have work and that will
22		help you stay out of to	rouble.
23	THE	ACCUSED: Yes	
24	THE	COURT: I h	ave not put a condition
25		that you not drink, bed	cause I do not want to set
26		you up.	
27	THE	ACCUSED: Yea	h.

- 1 THE COURT: For just being charged again,
- 2 but you have said yourself to the person that
- 3 wrote the Presentence Report that you do not
- 4 think you should drink.
- 5 THE ACCUSED: Yeah.
- 6 THE COURT: Bad things happen when you
- 7 drink.
- 8 THE ACCUSED: That's -- that's true. I'm
- 9 not going to lie about it, Your Honour. Yeah, I
- 10 mean I'm a young father. I just need to get
- my -- straighten out everything.
- 12 THE COURT: Exactly. So I am not making
- that a condition, but I hope you choose not to
- 14 drink.
- 15 THE ACCUSED: All right.
- 16 THE COURT: Ever again.
- 17 THE ACCUSED: (Affirmative, non-verbal
- response).
- 19 THE COURT: Have I overlooked anything
- from the Crown's perspective?
- 21 MR. GREEN: No, Your Honour. My friend
- and I have agreed in principle on a forfeiture
- and disposition order. There were a few exhibits
- 24 seized from Mr. Bernarde, and we will be filing
- 25 that over the counter. It will be an order on
- consent.
- 27 THE COURT: All right. So that can be

- 1 brought to my attention, Madam Clerk.
- 2 Mr. Harte, anything I have overlooked from
- 3 your perspective?
- 4 MR. HARTE: No, Your Honour, thank you.
- 5 THE COURT: Do you understand things I
- 6 have said, Mr. Bernarde?
- 7 THE ACCUSED: What's that?
- 8 THE COURT: Do you understand what I have
- 9 said?
- 10 THE ACCUSED: I'll get Peter to explain it
- 11 to me a little later.
- 12 THE COURT: Okay. I hope that things work
- out for you, Mr. Bernarde. This was not an easy
- 14 decision to make. I am not enjoying imposing a
- further jail term on you, but what you did was
- 16 very serious and it could have ended very badly.
- 17 THE ACCUSED: Yes.
- 18 THE COURT: So the main thing is you need
- 19 to stay out of court.
- THE ACCUSED: Yeah.
- 21 THE COURT: You need to focus on the good
- things and on your skills, and I am hoping that
- by saying the things I said today and the things
- I will write in my written decision that will
- 25 also go to the Correctional authorities that they
- 26 will do what they can and Probation Services will
- 27 do what they can to really help you so that we do

1	not see you back in court again.
2	THE ACCUSED: Yeah.
3	THE COURT: Thank you. We will close
4	court.
5	
6	
7	
8	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
9	
10	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that the
11	foregoing pages are a complete and accurate
12	transcript of the proceedings taken down by me in
13	shorthand and transcribed from my shorthand notes
14	to the best of my skill and ability.
15	Dated at the City of Edmonton, Province of
16	Alberta, this 28th day of March, 2018.
17	
18	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723
19	of the Rules of Court
20	
21	
22	Janla Kuball
23	Linda Kimball
24	Court Reporter
25	
26	
27	