IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE MORTHWEST TERRITORIES

BETWEEN:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

JAN 17 1992

- and -

BOBBY ANAVILOR

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence Delivered by His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Coppermine in the Northwest Territories, on Friday, November 15th, A.D., 1991.

APPEARANCES:

MR. H. PRUDEN:

MR. A. REGEL:

Counsel for the Defenc

THE COURT: I thank counsel, particularly Mr.

Regel, for their efforts with respect to the law and the submissions with respect to an appropriate sentence.

Sentencing an individual is never an easy process. The court is acutely aware that we are dealing with a human being, and in the N.W.T. I suppose we have to be aware that we are dealing with communities. I can't help but notice there must be at least 100, 150 people in this courtroom. I also can't help but notice that in the ten years I have been coming to Coppermine, the terrible, terrible acts of violence that occur when people are drunk. One has to ask how long can this community withstand it. How long can it go on.

Last year I had the unfortunate duty of presiding over a case where an old man set two other people on fire. How many men have to go to jail for beating their wives? How many kids have to go without food watching their fathers beating their mothers, watching their parents get drunk, no food in the house? How many people have to go to cemetaries? How many people have to go to the hospital because of the shootings, the stabbings, the beatings, all alcohol related.

I don't question what Mr. Regel has said for one moment that when Mr. Anavilok is sober he is an ordinary fellow. But drunk, he is dangerous. Some

people might even call him a killer. He is a frightening man. How many other people fit that description from this community?

When the Territorial Court comes to Coppermine, I have seen it as high as 50 percent of the docket involving 10 percent of the population, involved in criminal acts of violence, all alcohol related.

Mr. Anavilok has been in and out of the courts for 10 years. Every one of his offences I have no doubt are alcohol related. He has been convicted of minor offences and major offences. But the drinking continues. It is so difficult to understand how a community can survive or prosper in this atmosphere. And it is a tragedy, both for Mr. Anavilok and it is a tragedy for the people who are injured, and for the community to once again have to face the consequences of alcohol abuse.

Mr. Anavilok is going to jail. We all know that. Two people were hospitalized. Other people were endangered. The community receives another black eye, as it were, in terms of its reputation. Kids are aware that somebody else has gone to jail for shooting up the town. It is a real tragedy. I don't know how it can continue.

I take into account perhaps as the greatest mitigating factor that Mr. Anavilok has pleaded guilty to two of the three offences. The other offence I

make no adverse finding obviously because he chose to have the Crown prove its case. He is entitled to that.

The offence in and of itself is terrible. On the facts that are before me, two people were injured as a result of this drunken individual shooting, one person behind a door, which is bad enough, but the other person was shot in the abdomen where there can be no mistake and no misunderstanding. Mr. Anavilok took the gun, pointed it at this man and shot him. One cannot argue or talk this away as being an accident. He shot him. He could have killed him. He came very close, as I understand it, to killing him. Nobody walks away with a five inch abdominal wound from a high powered firearm without their lives being endangered.

Mr. Anavilok apologizes, and I don't question his apology. But I don't think it helps the people who are laying in the graveyards and those that have been shot, beaten and stabbed that the person who did it is sorry after the fact. It represents perhaps an indication that Mr. Anavilok might do something about his drinking, but I don't know that. We don't know that. No one knows that. That is something that will come out in the future.

I hope he does, because regardless of how long he is imprisoned, Bobby Anavilok will be coming back to

his home community. The community will have to deal with him. He'll have to deal with himself. It may very well be that he'll go back to drinking. It may be that he won't. We can only hope that he won't. That decision is his and his alone, and the strength that's required to deal with that must come from him and him alone. Nobody knows if he has that strength or if he'll make that decision.

There are people in the community who are willing to help. There are people within the corrections services, be it Federal or Territorial who are willing to help. But they can only help. They can't direct or choose for Mr. Anavilok.

I take into account, as I indicated, that he pleaded guilty and pleaded guilty pretty quickly. He understands that he did wrong, and in that context, I accept the submission of Defence that there may be some reason to hope for Mr. Anavilok's ultimate rehabilitation.

I also take into account that Mr. Anavilok has an education. He has intelligence. He has potential to do good. He has skills on the land. He has potential to find reasons not to drink. He has the potential to rehabilitate himself. In other words, there is some reason to be optimistic to a degree that Mr. Anavilok will change his life in the future. At least he has the ability. We can't say that he is frozen in a path

of criminal conduct, nor can we say that he is a total scoundrel or an evil man.

In dealing with the offence, all of the cases that have been referred to me by Mr. Pruden speaking on behalf of the community, and Mr. Regel speaking on behalf of Mr. Anavilok, condemn acts of violence, and state that the basic principle is that a sentence must deter, that is to say, scare and discourage people from acts of violence, although I think we all recognize that it is pretty hard to scare or discourage people when they are drunk. They don't listen. They don't care.

I also take into account that there were a great number of people who were endangered on this particular night. There was the young girl, and I don't know if she was drunk or sober, who taunted Mr. Anavilok. He shot at her. There were the young girls who approached him. He shot at them in the ground a few feet from them. The constable was there. There is no evidence that Mr. Anavilok shot at the constable, but in dealing with the matter, the constable tried to talk Mr. Anavilok down. I think those of us that have some familiarity with other police forces recognize that some other police forces might simply have shot Mr. Anavilok dead and that would have been the end of the problem.

There was Miss Halla who was endangered and

actually injured. There were other people behind that door who could have been injured. Mr. Anavilok was totally out of control. Many people's lives and health were in danger.

I accept in mitigation that there was no planning or forethought which would make this much worse. But on the other hand, as I stated at the outset, this occurred in a community that is being subjected to outrageous acts of violence almost on a monthly basis. And I think that any sentence that is imposed must send a clear message not only to Mr. Anavilok, but to the other individuals in this community that this violence has to stop. It has to be slowed up. It has to be curtailed. And the courts will deal firmly. The law will deal firmly with outrages such as this.

I understand and accept that Mr. Anavilok has spent two and a half months approximately in custody awaiting these matters which I am entitled to take into account and I do. Anavilok's record is an aggravating factor. On the evidence before me, together with his record, he knows what happens to him when he gets drunk. He knows he is capable of violence. He knows he is subject to "blackouts". He knows he drinks until he blacks out. Knowing all of that, he just repeated his conduct. It is not surprising what happened.

I take in aggravation that after shooting at the

Halla house and being disarmed, that Mr. Anavilok somehow got more guns, rearmed himself, went to his house from where he shot Matus, held the police at bay, and shot four or five more times.

First of all, all three charges, of course, while they relate to different aspects and different elements of the drunken conduct of Anavilok that night, they were all part and parcel of the same dangerous shooting incident. In law I must ensure that the sentences for each of the three offences when added together are not out of proportion to the total conduct.

In my view, it would be appropriate to sentence the accused on the offence of pointing a firearm, and the offence of possession of a weapon dangerous to the public peace in a concurrent fashion, but consecutive to the charge of aggravated assault on Tom Matus.

I hope when this is all over with that it is clearly understood, the connection between alcohol abuse and violence, and that it is clearly understood that regardless of the reason, regardless how nice someone is when they are sober, the law and the courts will not tolerate or accept acts of violence, and even if the court must stand alone, acts of violence will be dealt with very firmly.

As I indicated at the very outset, the guilty pleas are an important factor in mitigation of

sentence. And I would simply end by urging Mr.

Anavilok to reassess his life while he is in custody,
and to realize, accept and understand why he is in
jail, why he has been in jail, and that's as simple as
opening up the next bottle. It is alcohol abuse, Mr.

Anavilok. Do something about it before it kills you
or before you kill someone else.

I am urged strongly and pursuasively by Defence not to impose a total sentence which would involve a penitentiary term, and I think I should address that particular submission. I have no doubt, having practiced law in a jurisdiction where there were five penitentiaries and having visited each of them on many occasions, that penitentiaries in the south are not very nice places. They are a lot different than the Yellowknife Correctional Centre. And I don't envy anyone either in a penitentiary or the Yellowknife Correction Centre.

Each level of institution, be it the Yellowknife Correction Centre or a federal penitentiary, has programs and classification officers that can deal on an individual basis with accused individuals. I am also aware that the Government of the Northwest Territories has implemented a plan with the federal authorities to have selected northern inmates remain in the correction system in the N.W.T. That assessment is made by the corrections authorities in

Yellowknife on criteria that I am not totally familiar with, but I don't think I need to refer to them beyond what I have.

I think I have to look at the law and see what the law states in terms of penalty for these offences. And I am of the view that a lengthy term of imprisonment, well in excess of two years, would be appropriate.

I am pursuaded by the submissions of Defence and the case authorities that Defence has referred me to that I ought to moderate what my initial assessment commenced at. However, I am left with the conclusion that more than two years is required for the reasons that I have given on the offences before me. The question of whether Mr. Anavilok will actually go south or not will, of course, be ultimately decided by the correction authorities in Yellowknife on a different assessment, and perhaps a broader assessment than I make mine.

My assessment is dealing with the offender and the offences and what penalty, after balancing the factors before me, should they attract. The assessment whether he should go south or not I think is more properly made by the correction authorities on different criteria.

However, I am pursuaded that a sentence somewhat less than I first contemplated would be appropriate

after hearing counsel.

Stand up, Mr. Anavilok. On the charge of aggravated assault, there will be a term of imprisonment of two years years. On the charge of possession of a firearm for a purpose dangerous, one year consecutive. On the charge of pointing a firearm, one year concurrent. I don't propose to impose a term of probation.

As is well known, Mr. Anavilok will not serve in custody three years imprisonment. He'll be eligible for a variety of early releases. And supervision at that time for reintegration into the community, and a continuation of any alcohol program, rehabilitation program that Mr. Anavilok may embark upon while in custody can be arranged under the post release supervision.

As I am required I think by law, and I will take a moment, so you can sit down, Mr. Anavilok, the use and possession of a firearm is a privilege. It is not a right. The courts have had great difficulty in applying the law in this jurisdiction when it comes to cases where there is an assault involving I have seen everything from cookie tins to rubber ducks, which require a firearm prohibition. The courts in a number of authorities in the Northwest Territories have made an exception to the constitution and to the particular law with respect to firearms that allows under certain

circumstances individuals who try to sustain
themselves on the land an exception from a firearm
prohibition. But I want to make it very clear, at
least so far as this court is concerned and until
directed otherwise by a superior court, that where a
weapon, a gun, is used in the commission of an
offence, that a person may need that gun for hunting
can be of very little assistance. Everyone in this
room probably has a gun in their house. The last
thing to reach for in anger is a gun.

Mr. Anavilok reached for a gun. Two people were shot. If anyone deserves to be prohibited from having a weapon, it is Mr. Anavilok. And I make the order conscious of the option of not making it deliberately. Mr. Anavilok will be prohibited from owning or possessing any firearm, ammunition or explosive substances for a period of five years. The order is effective today. That's five years from his release from custody. I will allow the accused two weeks to dispose of or otherwise surrender any such items he has to the R.C.M. Police. Is that everything you have, Mr. Pruden?

MR. PRUDEN: Yes, sir. If you can just clarify that
the Section 87 as well as the Section 268 requires
that mandatory Section 100 prohibition.

THE COURT: That's fine. All three will be referred to in the order.

1	MR.	PRUDEN: Very well, sir.
2	THE	COURT: Finally that leaves the matter of
3		attempted murder on Ida Halla. The accused has
4		pleaded not guilty. Is the Crown calling any
5		evidence?
6	MR.	PRUDEN: No, sir.
7	THE	COURT: I will mark that dismissed, Mr. Regel.
8	MR.	REGEL: Thank you, Your Honour. I have one
9		submission with respect to the sentence, or one
10	•	request with respect to the sentence. Although Your
11		Honour indicated, and I suggest quite properly so,
12		that the decision as to whether or not Mr. Anavilok
13		will remain in the Northwest Territories is a decision
14		made by the Corrections Authorities, I wonder whether
15		Your Honour would be prepared to make a recommendation
16		that based on information Your Honour has before you
17		that he should stay in the Northwest Territories if
18		possible.
19	THE	COURT: In the hope that he'll be able to get
20		some support from his family or friends in terms of
21		dealing with his alcohol abuse, yes, I will make that
22		recommendation.
23	MR.	REGEL: Thank you, Your Honour.
24	THE	COURT: I will see that the warrant is so
25		endorsed.
26	MR.	PRUDEN: Your Honour, there were not any
27		firearms exhibits entered. However, there were

1	firearm items seized by the police as well as
2	ammunition. I am just wondering if Your Honour feels
3	that Your Honour is is able to make any direction
4	concerning those, or if it should just be left to the
5	normal course in the handling of these things.
6	THE COURT: He has been ordered to dispose of them
7	or otherwise surrender them.
8	MR. PRUDEN: I am just thinking if there is any
9	that belong to a different rightful owner, I suppose
10	in due coarse
11	THE COURT: The order speaks for itself. Anything
12	that he owns he can'tI can't order him to dispose of
13	weapons he doesn't own. He is not to own or possess.
14	MR. PRUDEN: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Surely that speaks for itself.
16	MR. PRUDEN: Very well.
17	THE COURT: Is that everything?
18	MR. REGEL: It is, Your Honour.
19	MR. PRUDEN: It is.
20	THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
21	
22	
23	Certified a correct transcript,
24	certified a coffect classoffpt,
25	Land Cont I borne
26	Laurie Ann Young Court Reporter
27	court Reporter