IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT

OF THE

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

REGINA

VS

BILL CONLEY

Submissions on Sentence
Reasons for Judgment
and Judgment
of Judge D.A. Peddle

S. Aitken, Ms.,

Appeared for the Crown.

J. Lilligran, Ms.,

Appeared for the Defense.

Jane Heerema, Ms.,

Court Reporter.

Inuvik, Northwest Territories
September 19, A.D. 1988

TEL DEC 28 1988 OF THE OFFICE OF THE OFFICE

(Charges under Section 245.2 of the Criminal Code)

MS. AITKEN: You'll see, from Mr. Conley's record, his record dates back to August of 1984. His most recent conviction is September 15th of this year for assault. Your Honor will see that he has three related convictions for assault. First, in January of '86 he received a hundred dollar fine, and in April of '88 he received a 45-day imprisonment for assault causing bodily harm, and he was just recently convicted in Justice of the Peace Court for assault and received 14 days imprisonment. That offense that he was just sentenceed on related to an incident that occurred on May 26th of this year. I can advise Your Honor as well that Mr. Conley has been in custody since this incident.

He appeared in Territorial Court on August the 26th and entered his guilty plea and consented to remain in custody — pardon me, I believe there was a show of cause hearing, and he was detained, and he's been in custody since that date.

A presentence report has been prepared, and I'm not sure if Your Honor has had an opportunity to read that.

THE COURT:

I have.

MS. AITKEN: It would appear from the presentence report that it's clear that alcohol is a problem for this accused, but that he has appeared not to have recognized his problem. He apparently — it states that he's considered attending Alcohol Anonymous meetings, but feels that he doesn't have a problem. I suggest it's clear



from that report that he does have a problem.

I note that the writer of the report indicates that Mr. Conley is not suitable for probation, that he fails to report and fails to meet conditions.

I'd suggest clearly that a period of incarceration is required here, and I suggest it should be a fairly lengthy period of incarceration. This man has appeared in Court before for violent-related offenses. I would suggest he has been treated quite leniently in his past, and it's clear that that has not deterred him from continuing to abuse alcohol. It's clear when he does abuse alcohol that he changes his disposition. He becomes violent. And as we've seen here, a very serious assault occurred.

It would appear that Mr. Wilcom (phonetic) did not do anything to provoke this incident. He was merely doing his job, asking Mr. Conley to leave the establishment as he was getting into trouble with someone else and, unfortunately for Mr. Wilcom, this incident occurred, which is going to be a factor of Mr. Wilcom's life for the rest of his life because he's lost of the sight of that eye it would appear.

So, I would be suggesting, in view of the serious nature of the offense itself, in view of Mr. Conley's previous record for related offenses, that a lengthy period of incarceration is required to deter Mr. Conley himself, to deter others, so that others will know that these sort of offenses are treated seriously by the Courts, and to protect persons in this community from having to suffer harm such as



Mr. Wilcom had to on this occasion. THE COURT: Thank you, Miss Aitken. MS. AITKEN: As well, Your Honor, I would suggest a Section 98 (1) order, of course, is mandatory in these circumstances. THE COURT: I'll hear from Defense counsel. MS. LILLEGRAN: Yes, Your Honor. Mr. Conley is quite a young man at 22 years of age. The presentence 8 9 report refers to, on Page 5 at the top, an incident, a car accident that occurred when Mr. Conley was 18, which 10 11 resulted in head injuries requiring a metal plate to be 12 inserted into his skull. From that time, he started to develop epileptic seizures, which appear to be exacerbated 13 by the consumption of alcohol, which appears to be much 14 lower. Mr. Conley's offenses would tend to bear that out, 15 that his experience with alcohol is worsening. 16 17 Finally, at the time of this offense, he was employed 18 by Kenting Drilling, and he was making a very good wage. 19 was working as a roustabout -- a crane operator, pardon me, 20 and he was making approximately \$3,000 a month. That's to support himself and his common-law spouse. Of course, he's 21 22 since lost that employment. He had been planning relocating

lives there on a farm. Grovedale, Alberta, is close to Grande Prairie. It's a northern community. And what Mr. Conley would be doing is he and his common-law spouse would be moving there, and work on the farm, which is a very

to Grovedale, Alberta, in speaking with his father, who

23

24

25

26

27



healthy, outdoor kind of life.

Mr. Conley has, although it's not set out in the presentence report, attended some A.A. meetings last year, but not on a regular basis.

Mr. Conley was certainly drinking excessively that day, and had been drinking since the early afternoon hours with his common-law wife. And speaking to him and considering the circumstances, it would appear that certainly Mr. Conley never intended to cause the harm to Mr. Wilcom that resulted. It's a case of an extremely unlucky punch, but it's results were very, very serious. He certainly pled guilty at the earliest opportunity — the offense date is the 24th of August — and has accepted responsibility quickly for his action.

He is a young man. He does, and the presentence report bears this out, have the ability to work and be a good worker. He lacks controls in his life; the ability to control his behaviour when problems or frustrations arise. He abuses alcohol as opposed to dealing with them. I note there is a mention he would benefit from counselling.

But it would appear that he has a reasonable work history for someone of his age. Prior to obtaining the job at Kenting Drilling, he worked '86 and '87 off and on for the Esso station here in Inuvik. He worked for Kenting Drilling in 1985 and Forestry in '85. As well, Shell in '85. So, he has a pretty good employment history for someone of his age. And he obviously is not a person that



one should consider locking up and throwing away the key.

I'd be asking Your Honor to take into consideration the fact that a lengthy gaol term at this point — I presume — I think my friend was probably referring to general deterrents as relate to this. I know Mr. Conley, from my conversations, is individually deterred. A general deterrent is obviously a consideration because assaults by patrons being ejected from bars for unruly behaviour often results in fights, and that's certainly to be discouraged. But Mr. Conley here, I think, never in his wildest dreams would have thought he would cause that kind of injury to Mr. Wilcom. It certainly wasn't his intention. However, he still has to accept responsibility for his actions.

He did have what appeared to be a good future. His father is very supportive of him, and they have not be able to see much of each other due to the geographical distance. But he does have a life planned for himself that he feels would be a good, positive one for both himself and his common common-law spouse. His common-law spouse also spoke to me and indicated she's very supportive of Mr. Conley, and she's willing to take part of in any alcohol programs as well, along with Mr. Conley. She cares for him very deeply, and would provide whatever support that she could.

Those are my submissions.

THE COURT:

Thank you.

I want to comment on the facts briefly. Of course, the offense is causing bodily harm, and I've learned from the



summary that Mr. Wilcom, as a result of this unprovoked attack upon his person, has lost the sight of his left eye. And I guess there may even have been a point where it was questionable as to whether or not they were going to save the eye at all, and there may still be some question on that very point.

But as a result of the behaviour of the Defendant, Mr. Conley, Mr. Wilcom has been left with a permanent disability, and that's certainly -- on the scale of seriousness, would range, I would guess, fairly high as opposed to a fracture, which can be repaired and returned to its original condition, as compared to the cut that can be sutured and returned to its original condition. We have a situation where this man is left, as I said, with a permanent disability whereas before had the benefit of two good eyes and now left with only one.

Touch upon the offender. At least three prior -- or three prior convictions involving an assault upon a person.

A number of other convictions, which indicate a disregard for the law.

There was a predisposition report compiled, and as I indicated at the outset, I read same. But I want to refer you, in particular, to the last paragraph on the last page:

"In the recent past the subject was on probation, and the prognosis of the probation officer was that he was unsuitable for probation. The problem is that he failed to report accordingly and meet the conditions appropriately. The subject appears to lack responsible motivation for plans about his future. As a result, the subject would be a



candidate for a period of incarceration where he would get some help for his alcohol problem and provide a period of time for him to develop his plans for his future."

That tells me that this individual has an attitude problem. And the report of this Miss McDonald (phonetic), which I assume was objective, her conclusion is that this individual should be the subject of a custodial term.

Now, in addition to looking at the offense and the offender, I'm guided by certain principals of sentencing, and I'm sure those principals are familiar to both counsel.

Reformation and rehabilitation. Well, even though the Defendant has a fairly substantial previous record, he's still fairly young, and we have to assume that he can be rehabilitated and returned to the community as a law-abiding individual.

The public interest is a factor. Well, we certainly can't have, can't condone this kind of behaviour where the management of an establishment are exercising their right to have somebody vacate the premises, and the response is an attack upon his person. I think it's certainly in the public interest that we try and discourage that kind of behaviour.

Deterrence is certainly a factor. Individual deterrence is particularly important because in the past the sanctions imposed have not been effective, because the Defendant still demonstrates a propensity towards violence against the person.



General deterrence is certainly a factor because, as I've already stated, we can't have people responding to a request that they remove themselves from business establishments with an attack on that person.

Retribution is something that Courts are reluctant to acknowledge in the sentencing process. But I think it is indeed a factor when a person behaves as Mr. Conley has, that he has to incur certain punishment as a result of his behaviour.

Defense counsel says that he didn't intend to cause that injury. That may be so. He certainly intended to strike Mr. Wilcom, and if death had resulted, he would have been the subject of a charge of manslaughter. There are lots of people who get in these similar situations, and there's an altercation, and somebody ends up dying as a result. This behaviour is totally unacceptable. It has to be discouraged, and I'm in agreement with Crown counsel when they say that a substantial period of incarceration is warranted. My conclusion is that the Defendant, Bill Conley, will serve two years in the correctional facility for his offenses.

MS. AITKEN: Your Honour, I would ask that

Section 98 (1)--

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 .

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Yes. Under Section 98 (1), this being a second conviction, I believe I'm required to make

26 the order for ten years.

27 MS. AITKEN: I believe he hasn't been served



1	with Notice of Intention	for that purpose, so I believe
2	THE COURT:	It's five years
3	MS. · AITKEN:	Five years. And it would be
4	required under under 98	(13) that there be a period of time,
5	either forthwith or with	in a period of time, for him to
6	surrender any firearms.	
7	THE COURT:	Okay, I'll make the order then for
8	five years that he's not	to possess any firearms,
9	ammunition, or explosive	substances for a period of five
10	years. And I don't know	if it's necessary how would you
11	facilitate the surrender	ing of any devise that he's right
12	into custody, so	
13	MS. AITKEN:	A family member could take care of
14	that, if that	
15	THE COURT:	Within seven days; would that be
16	reasonable?	
17	MS. AITKEN:	Yes, that would be reasonable.
18	THE COURT:	And an order that any firearms
19	owned by the Defendant, ammunition, or explosive substances	
20	be turned over within seven days.	
21	(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED)	
22 -		
23	I, Jane Heerema, Court Reporter, hereby certify that I attended the above Examination and took faithful and	
24	accurate transcript of my	and the foregoing is a true and y shorthand notes to the best of my
25	skill and ability. Dated at the City of	f Calgary, Province of Alberta, this
26	1st day of December, A.D.	. 1988.
27		Jane Heerema
		Court Reporter.

