## IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## IN THE MATTER OF:

OURT HOUSE LORENCE AUG 28 1991

FELOWKHIFE

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

DOREEN KALLUK

Territories on Thursday, April 25th, A.D., 1991.

Transcript of Sentencing delivered by His Honour

Judge R.M. Bourassa sitting at Yellowknife in the Northwest

## APPEARANCES:

MR. D. AVISON

Counsel for Crown

MR. J. BRYDON

Counsel for the Defence

(CHARGE UNDER SECTION 348 (1) (b) AND SECTION 239 OF THE CANADIAN CRIMINAL CODE)

THE COURT:

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

The Court has to sentence the accused, Doreen Kalluk, on two offences: break and enter and assault and aggravated assault. I won't go over the facts again, they're on the record, and with respect to the break and enter. An agreed statement is filed with respect to the aggravated assault.

Perhaps some initial observations. I certainly concur with the fundamental proposition put forward by both counsel speaking from their respective positions. From the defence, this is a personal tragedy; from Crown, it's a societal tragedy. is violence everywhere in this jurisdiction.

Unfortunately, I believe current statistics will bear me out that in the Northwest Territories we have a higher rate of convictions for violent offences than anywhere else in Canada, and when I say a higher rate, I mean multiples of tens. We're not dealing with a differential of a few percentage points. Of the thousand or so cases I deal with every year, at least 40 percent involve crimes of violence.

One of the really disturbing features about the violence is the apparent public acceptance or elevated threshold of public acceptance of violence. not long ago where I had to preside over a case involving three elderly people, one of whom set fire on the other two by pouring gas on them. This was an ongoing problematic relationship. No one in the

community was particularly upset or remained upset for a very long period of time.

Judge Slaven, in the Oscar decision, refers to the shootings that took place in Fort McPherson which were quickly obliterated from anyone's mind. Everywhere we go there are acts of violence. There is indeed a culture of violence in this overall community of ours which is very difficult to understand and very difficult to deal with.

There is so much expected by the Courts. There may be too much expected from the Courts. We are expected to solve these problems when, in fact, we cannot solve them. The Courts come along at the end of the line and respond after the fact, a burden that I would personally like to be relieved of, as this Court and no Court gets any satisfaction or pleasure out of sentencing individuals to long terms of imprisonment.

Mr. Avison, speaking for the Crown attorney, is accurate when he states that these problems of violence must be addressed in other ways. They cannot be resolved -- not that I think we can realistically hope to resolve them all forever -- but the level of violence must be resolved in other agencies. The only thing the Courts can do is respond after the fact. I cannot change the past personal circumstances of this offender any more than I can change the past personal

circumstances of other offenders before this Court; no judge can.

This Court, as in any criminal court, is responding to a breach of a law between the State and an individual member of this country. The laws set out in the Criminal Code are laws designed to ensure that, with a minimum of intervention, we all get along within certain parameters. Those parameters are not particularly broad. There's only a narrow base of unacceptable conduct and behaviour. Violence is one of them.

The offences before me are not an internal matter between Mr. Cushley, the victim, and Miss Kalluk. The violence between them, the violence exhibited by this accused, is a criminal act against society at large and it must be responded to appropriately in that context.

The victim is apparently forgiving. Everyone involved wants to forgive each other and get on with their lives. Just a few short days ago in presiding over a preliminary inquiry where a woman was sliced almost from ear to ear requiring 40 stitches in her throat - a most reluctant witness - the victim forgave the accused. He forgave her. (I don't know what he had to forgive her for.) They both wanted to get back together; two pieces of atomic material combining to create an incredible explosion. And these explosions

of violence which are so common are destructive of the whole society.

I have had the unfortunate experience all too often lately of presiding over cases dealing with individuals that I had to deal with ten years ago, small children that were apprehended by the Department of Social Services because they lived in an abusive home have grown up and start abusing their spouses and abusing their own families in a similar fashion. defence is correct: violence begets violence. Little girls grow up seeing their mothers being thumped and their parents drunk on the floor and believe that's the way you raise kids and that's what you expect in life. Little boys grow up seeing their fathers beating their mothers; small wonder they end up doing the same thing. It's a terrible situation, but that does not relieve me of the burden of enforcing our laws, the laws against violence.

It must be understood that a line has to be drawn, that at some point the society as a whole becomes totally dysfunctional, and as great a personal tragedy as it may be for this particular accused to be imprisoned for a lengthy period of time, I don't believe I have any alternative. My duty is to respond to the offence and the offender, to balance the factors, both aggravating and mitigating with respect to both, and impose a sentence all in the context of

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

the criminal law, a law which is designed - without too great an intervention -- to keep us all living reasonably peacably. We are, after all, a society premised in the constitution on "peace and order." While there will be many personal tragedies enacted in this Court, it must not be forgotten that while the personal tragedies come and go, it is society at large who bears the scars far longer.

In terms of a sentencing goal, which is what we're really speaking of, in my view, the goal must be deterrence. Once again, society at large, including all of the individuals involved, are suffering the effects of rampant drinking and violence. It's a deteriorating circumstance and it's one that bodes no good for the children that are on the street today and the generations to come, but I reiterate: the Courts can only respond after the fact. Too much is expected of the Courts in terms of correction or healing. The only thing I believe the Courts can really do in terms of deterrence and denunciation is to point out the tragedies that are involved and to make it clear that violence is not acceptable.

Hopefully in the process, over years individuals within our society will do something. Activists will do something to address not only the general causes, but the specific individual causes involved. The Crown, defence and this Court are experiencing the

same thing day in and day out: that something has to be done both on an individual basis and in society at large to reduce the frequency of these events, to eliminate the causative factors. It's too late when we come to court. The only thing the Court can do is reinforce the values set out in the Criminal Code, which I firmly believe reflect, by and large, the values of society at large. We are not, we don't want to be a violent society. We don't want Detroits and Chicagos in Canada.

In terms of dealing with the offences, first of all in terms of the break and enter: I have to agree with the Crown attorney that there is very little by way of mitigation there. The police intervened, they did everything they could to diffuse a bad situation, to protect a woman who was peacably asleep in her own house with no expectation, no reason, no dream of anything occurring when this accused and another smashed their way in and this accused commences an assault for her own reasons or upon the urging and goading of the male that was present, clearly intimidating, terrifying, threatening and hurting the woman she attacked, someone totally unknown to That, in my view, is highly aggravating, notwithstanding the other factors having to deal with that particular offence. It's something that we would not accept from anyone. It's a situation that would

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

cause any reasonable person to scream out in outrage.

The accused, after being confronted by the police trying to diffuse the matter, then returns some hours later and breaks her way in and commits the assault. I find those factors very aggravating.

With respect to the charge of aggravated assault, there are many aggravating features. The accused and her sister, in my view, premeditated the attack. Cushley, as good, bad or indifferent or as sympathetic or unsympathetic a victim as he may be, was asleep or passed out in his bed, and by mutual agreement the accused went in there armed with either a knife or a screwdriver and by agreement, attacked I agree with Crown that it is pure luck that the victim is walking today. It's pure luck and nothing more that he's not dead. 34 wounds, some of them pointed out in the agreed statement of fact, life threatening. Aggravating was the fact that the accused left and hid out and once they saw the victim stagger out, took off and tried to cover up in an ammaturish way their attack and involvement in this offence. It's a wonder he wasn't killed. I recognize that the Court does not deal with "if's"; we only deal with the facts that are before us. I only refer to this to reflect upon and emphasize the seriousness of the attack. This was not a one-stab situation, which

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

is unfortunately so common. The accused went after this man with a vengeance.

I would refer to the cases filed by defence, and I'm sure familiar to the Crown, where violence has been condemned time and time and time again by the Courts. The particular cases I'm familiar with or I've just read during the break to refamiliarize myself with them confirms that every Court in this jurisdiction has condemned violence.

The offences before me are both punishable by a maximum of 14 years imprisonment. I have to take that into account. The Courts are directed by the appellate levels and the law generally to scale the particular offence on the maximum penalty provided for by Parliament and Parliament speaking as the will of the people, and in my view, the aggravated assault to which the accused has pleaded guilty rates quite high on the scale of the offence. I'm not prepared to say it's the worst example of aggravated assault, but it is certainly well and above the medium or even -- the medium, I'll leave it at that.

In terms of arriving at a sentence that in my view must emphasize deterrence and denunciation, the Court has to look at the particular circumstances of the accused. Our sentencing is an individualized process. It is not as it is in Wisconsin or Minnesota, a question of following a table. This

leads to some disparity from time to time which I think serious students of the law would not particularly disagree with. Its fairness requires that the Court look at the particular situation of every accused, and every accused is different.

This accused presents as a particularly sympathetic accused. She was apparently, from her earliest childhood, the victim of abuse within the family. All her relationships with men apparently have been abusive ones. She in turn has acted out that upbringing of abuse, physical abuse, as manifested in her actions against Doctor. It is indeed unfortunate and a tragedy or personal tragedy, but as I pointed out at the outset, the Court can't undo the past. It is not an uncommon situation which is even more, even greater a tragedy in this jurisdiction, but that she was raised in a culture of violence and presents a sympathetic figure can only go so far in terms of mitigation of sentence. A scoundrel who does not present the same way as this accused ought not to be treated that much differently.

I take into account particularly her age and I accept what defence suggests, that receiving a long term of imprisonment is going to be difficult for her, but I really can't say that it's much different than anyone else. I don't envy anyone going to the federal

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

pennitentaries, but the line has to be drawn on acts of violence. Society, people generally, have to understand that we can only go so far in individualization before the Courts and the law too fall into the trap of accepting a certain level of violence and responding minimally to it. I can say that this accused's antecedents are not uncommon, but then to take it from there and say therefore she should receive a very modest term of imprisonment is simply to fall into that trap. The more violence there is, the more we get used to it. I believe every time the Courts are faced with facts like this it becomes increasingly more difficult, but we must remain resolute. The act itself is terrible and I recognize that imposing a meaningful sentence reflecting the act may, in a way, be compounding the tragedy for this particular victim, and while, on a personal basis, which I really should not be using or referring to, it may be too bad for Doreen Kalluk, my responsibility is to apply the law.

The accused has pleaded guilty, which the Court is entitled to take into mitigation, and I take that into mitigation without reservation and perhaps to be more specific, there is juris prudence from Ontario where the Courts have stated that up to one-third of what would otherwise be an appropriate sentence may be taken off to reflect a plea of guilty. She has saved

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

the State the cost of a lengthy trial. It is also indicative of remorse. It's also indicative, as defence suggests, that a specific deterrence may have greater application here. The offence was committed a few short months ago; she's going to receive her penalty today. Justice is operating in a swift fashion and that may carry its greatest deterrent effect.

Further in mitigation, she is apparently taking some steps to turn her life around. I'm quite certain that given her situation that there will be agencies available for her regardless of where she serves her term of imprisonment that will assist her in these steps and assist her in removing herself from the culture and the environment that she has found herself in, the environment or culture of violence and alcohol abuse, but I would point out to the accused that all of the well-meaning people in the world can only assist her. She has to do it. Only Miss Kalluk can stop drinking. Only Miss Kalluk can take herself away from those kinds of situations, no one else. are support mechanisms within institutions, there are support mechanisms outside the institutions - they can all help - but she has to be the prime mover. to pull herself up by her own boot straps. Other people will help her, and I would encourage them to do so, she's not a lost soul by any means.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

In trying to balance these factors then, both the aggravating and mitigating factors, the factors specific to the offence and the factors specific to this accused, keeping in mind what I believe the proper goals are here, which are general deterrence and denunciation, together with some rehabilitation, I have to impose a sentence. In my view, in imposing such a sentence I have to keep into account totality. I take into account the accused's record. She has committed an act of violence before, although it is not of great import to me. I have to take into account the two offences, while they occurred within a month of each other, are really distinct and separate and in my view consecutive sentences would be appropriate; however, having said that, I still have to sit back according to law and after determining what sentences would be appropriate, look at the total impact on the accused and make an adjustment accordingly so that the overall sentence is not untoward. I have done that, which leads me to reduce what I think would otherwise be appropriate on the two individual offences.

I also, in passing, should comment on the Crown submitting Exhibit number 3, which I have read and taken into account, and can only say that it reflects positively upon the Crown as a minister of justice more concerned with presenting the cases and the law

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to the Court and the problems to the Court rather than to seek the public denunciation or pillaring of a particular member. We all agree there is no two ways around it: this is a tragedy. Stand up, please, Miss Kalluk. Is there anything you wish to say before I impose sentence? THE ACCUSED: No. On the charge of break, enter and THE COURT: assault, there'll be a term of imprisonment of one year. On the charge of aggravated assault, a term of 10 imprisonment of two and a half years. The one year 11 will be consecutive. In addition, as required by law, 12 you will be prohibited from owning or possessing any 13 firearms, ammunition or explosive substances for a 14 period of five years from the date of your release. I'll allow you one month to dispose of or surrender any such items that you may have. I hope 17 you can get these circumstances behind you and get on 18 19 with your life in a positive fashion as quickly as possible, Miss Kalluk. 20 (PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED) 21 22 23 Certified a correct transcript, 24 25 Sonia Weiers 26 Court Reporter 27