1	TERRITORIAL COURT
2	IQALUIT, N.W.T.
3	•
4	
5	
6	REASONS FOR JUDGMENT
7	
8	JUDGE ORV A L TROY
9	
10	
11	
12	IN THE MURDER CHARGE OF
13	Pa N.
14	
15	
16	UNDER SECTION 218(1) OF
17	THE CRIMINAL CODE OF CANADA
18	
19	
20	
21	Hearing held in the Territorial Court Igaluit, Northwest Territories on the
22	8th day of July, 1987.
23	
24	
25	
26	

THE COURT: Well, I have had the opportunity during the adjournment to read the six exhibits that both counsel agreed should be entered in this matter in respect to Peter Noah.

]]

1.3

1.7

Earlier today in the proceedings he was charged with First Degree Murder as a Young Offender and under the provisions of the Code he pleaded Guilty to Second Degree Murder, pursuant to Section 534 of the Criminal Code whereby he can plead Guilty to an included or lesser offence. And Second Murder is a lesser offence to First Degree Murder. And after the facts were given to the Court by the Crown and commented on by the Defence and the Defence accepted those facts, with a couple of qualifications, the Court agreed that this was a proper case for Second Degree Murder.

It appears that on December the 7th, 1986 that the victim in this matter, Mary Lucasi and her husband, came home and they had been drinking. An argument took place between them and the husband left the house, and Mary Lucasi was left in the house alone. And she remained in the home at that time when the husband left. She laid down on the couch and went to sleep, probably because of her drinking.

At that time the young offender, P N , was in the house and he was the only other person in the house with Mary Lucasi. He wandered around the house and went into the kitchen and got a knife and went back into the living room and apparently there had been some words about his association with the daughter of the victim and as a result

of that, for some reason or other, he got a knife and went up to Mary Lucasi as she was on the couch and cut her in the throat with the knife.

He stabbed her several times in the lower back area. She rolled over trying to protect herself with her hands and got several cuts on her hands, all of which is reported and accepted by both counsel, and is contained in the medical reports that were filed as exhibits.

She was left with several stab wounds, some of them quite severe and internal, and he then threw the knife on the floor of the house and left the residence. He went to some relatives' house, and he washed up and then went to his own house which was not the house in which Mary Lucasi lived.

This all happened in the mid-hours of the evening, 9:00 to 9:30, 10:00 - between 9:00 and 10 o'clock in the evening and at 11:30 p.m. in the evening he went back to the residence of Mary Lucasi and found the knife on the floor in the house. He saw Mary Lucasi on the floor, who had not yet been discovered by anyone, and he went out of the house and threw the knife in the snowbank and returned to his own residence. All of this took place before midnight.

At around 1:10 a.m. in the morning of 8th of December,
Mary Lucasi was located by a returning relative to the house
and she was still alive. The police were called and an
ambulance and she was taken to hospital where she had 14
hours of emergency surgery and intensive care treatment. A

kidney was removed; there were three punctures to the lung, and there was several medical treatments given to try to save her life which was in grave danger at this point. And eventually the medical authorities decided to medivac her to Montreal. And they did that, and there she was in intensive care and more reports on efforts to save her life.

She deteriorated while in Montreal, and she died on January the 11th, 1987 of massive trauma from the injuries received from this assault by P $_{\rm N}$.

I should mention at this point that when these proceedings began there was an order by the Court at the request of the Crown Attorney and allowed under the Young Offenders' Act that the name of the young offender is not to be publicized and that Order is in effect, and if there are any newspaper people here I am sure they are aware of the Order and that they will pay attention to that.

That Order means by not being publicized that there should not be any mention of the name of the father of this young offender either because you might as well put his name in neon lights if you are going to name the father because everyone would know who it is.

So I just caution everyone concerned that there is an Order to that effect issued by the Court under the authority of the Young Offenders' Act.

I should also point out that before surgery was given to Mary Lucasi she mentioned that it was the accused who had stabbed her and cut her throat. There was some discussion

by Crown Counsel in his alleged facts that there had been some arguments between the victim and the accused about his relationship with the victim's daughter and apparently one can only assume that this may have had some bearing on what happened. This has not been fully explained and one can only guess.

On being questioned after being arrested the young offender admitted that he had stabbed her several times and he said that he had used a big knife which was the knife that he got from the kitchen. He said he had done it when Mary was sleeping and that he had cut her throat. He said it was not his fault, it was "Evil's fault"; some indication that he thought the Devil made him do it or something like that.

2.3

2.7

There were several exhibits which were entered. Now those were the facts as given by the Crown. The Defence adultted that these facts were the true facts with some qualification. The accused admitted telling the Police that Mary Lucasi had limited his access to her daughter, who was a young person about his own age. He admitted saying this to Police but he denies that this was the motive of his actions.

He also admitted, through his counsel, that he had been knife-toking most of the day of the 7th. That was the day - but he had denied this to the Police when he was questioned. And the R.C.M.P. had investigated this knife-toking incident. Apparently they questioned some of the people who

were supposed to be knife-toking with him, and the police were of the opinion that this did not support P $\,$ N $\,$'s theory, but the Defence did their own investigation and questioning various people and they came to an opposite point of view, that there had been some knife-toking during the day by this young offender.

The Defendant's position is that he was knife-toking drugs, which would be hash I suppose, and according to the Defence of what knife-toking is, is that you heat little pieces of hash on the tip of the knife, heat the knife and you sniff the resulting aromas and smoke which could cause you to have some sort of a high. And there has to be some reason for this bizarre action by young P N who was 17 at the time, very immature, not very experienced with life or association with people, or even with young girls. Maybe he was upset between the knife-toking and lost his judgment and did this terrible thing that he did on this occasion.

I am willing to accept the qualifications submitted by the Defence because it seems to give some reason for why this was done. It is a terrible thing and as Defence Counsel has said, this young man is full of remorse when he realizes now the terrible thing he had done. It appears that he didn't intend to kill, but he certainly intended to cause bodily harm to this lady which resulted in her death. And that is what he has been convicted of - Second Degree Murder.

There were exhibits recorded. There was a Dr. Hinches' report which dealt with the multiple wounds given to Mary Lucasi and the great effort made by the doctors, not only in Igaluit, but in Montreal, to save her life, but there wasn't much they could do.

There was a report of an Andy Langford, who is an M.A., a trained psychologist and he has a degree in psychology as well and is with the Government of the Northwest Territories Social Services, who gives a background report on the life style and background history of the young offender and his family, and makes some assumptions as to what may have led up to this.

1.7

2a

I also accept the Defence's qualification in respect to his report in that his assumptions that there is a major mental disorder finding in respect to this young man may or may not be so. The Defence do not accept that.

In some of the reports, in the Langford report and in the Pre-Disposition Report prepared by the Social Service Agency, they said this young man was - sometimes could relate quite well with other people. He was not of average intelligence. He was slightly below average intelligence. His background was such that he had not had much chance to learn how to live and relate with other people or cope with emergencies and criticism that may have resulted in this situation.

His family background is such that he was brought up by other than his natural parents. His relatives have been

associated with alcohol and he seems to have been happy when he was out on the land with his grandparents. Apparently he is a carver and can make money at carving, and can get along with people if given the right opportunity, although it seemed that from some of the reports, especially when he was in the Correctional Institute, that when faced with crises, emotional crises or criticism from others, that he flares up and shows great temper. The result of that being that he is an immature young person who needs discipline and guidance and supervision.

He also has a record of convictions. And I have read all these exhibits, not only once but twice in full, because this is a serious matter for the community; for this young man; for his father and his mother and his grandparents, and for the relatives of the victim. And of course it was a serious, most serious matter for the victim who of course did not survive.

As a result of her tragic death her life has been cut short by several years, perhaps 20 years or more. It was a needless, stupid death that there was no need of taking place under any circumstances. No justification whatsoever for this type of action and this desire to hurt someone else in this way over some little misunderstanding which is not fully known in the facts given to the Court, and probably will never be known.

Under the Young Offenders' Act it is one of the requirements that notice be given to the parents and that

they be present in Court if they wished to be, and I understand that the young offender's father has been here today. I don't know whether he is here now. He was here all afternoon.

MR. SHARKEY: It is J N

that's fine. I am glad to see you are here and taking an interest in your son and his future. So I am sure you are very interested and concerned about what is going to happen to him and what is going to happen to try and straighten him out so that he can, when whatever penalty is given to him, he can come back and try to, with some rehabilitation, try to lead a normal life and one that will allow him to go back into society with some feeling of self-esteem and a chance to make up for what he has done and to do some good, not only for himself, but for society and for this community and for his own family and possibly the family of the victims. He does have some remorse.

This is a very, very serious case and counsel have been most helpful, both counsel, and I realize they have had some very important and serious decisions to make in respect to the recommendations that they have put before the Court.

It is agreed that he was 17 years and 3 months at the time of the offence. He is now 17 years and 9 months. And he has spent from the 8th of December until now on remand in jail which is what - which is nearly 7 months, and is a long time for a young person.

And under the Young Offenders' Act the law provides that whatever penalty a Youth Court Judge gives to a young offender who is almost an adult, and that penalty is called a disposition in Youth Court, that that disposition may continue after he becames an adult.

So whatever is done to this young offender today he will still fall under the Young Offenders' Act and under the provisions of that Act. The principles laid down in the Young Offenders' Act is that it says — one of the things it says is that young persons who commit offences that are contrary to law should bear responsibilty for those offences.

It is also laid down in the Young Offenders' Act that society, although it has a responsibility to take reasonable measures to prevent criminal conduct by young persons, must be afforded necessary protection from the illegal behaviour of this type.

It is also laid down in the Young Offenders' Act that young persons that commit offences require supervision, discipline and control, but because of the state of dependency and level of development and maturity they also have special needs and require guidance and assistance.

So young people are to be treated in a different way than adults under the Act. And these principles, and many others, must be kept in mind. And it appears that all his rights under the Charter, and all of the legal assistance that can be given has been given to him. He has received

legal advice from the Legal Aid people who are here. The representations made by the Crown were very fair. The representations made by the Defence were proper and were fair, not only to the accused, but to society and to his

parents, his father.

And it is a very difficult thing to know what to do.

But both counsel have agreed in this case that it was a serious crime and the Crown has requested that the maximum penalty be applied here - the maximum penalty under the Young Offenders' Act be applied here. And the maximum penalty that can be applied to a young offender who is found Guilty of First or Second Degree Murder, in this case Second Degree Murder, is three years closed custody.

Now, in three years closed custody means exactly that.

That means that this young man will go to jail for three years or will go into closed custody for three years. It is not jail. There are special facilities for young people.

There is special supervision, special rules and discipline that they are exposed to which undoubtedly this young man has been in need of for many years, and he will now get.

There is a hope that under the proper supervision and programs that in the next three years that he is in jail that he will receive the kind of discipline and supervision and counselling that will result in him being released back into society as a decent young man.

He will be 20 years old, nearly 20 years old when he finishes his three-year sentence. Because of his immaturity

and his need for discipline and development, the Court is convinced that this is a proper sentence that should be applied and from the unanimity and from the unanimous recommendations made by Counsel it would appear, and the Court has considered this as well, that they took into consideration the seven months that he has spent in remand.

I could, I suppose, take off that seven months and make it two years and six months, but I don't intend to do that because this offence, because of its senseless attack without provocation, without too much provocation, I am not sure if there was any provocation that deserved this kind of conduct resulting, but I think that that has been considered and I have no hesitation in imposing the three years closed custody. And I hope that as a result of that that this young person will come out of this supervision and control by society as a useful citizen.

Another thing that I am going to do is if the results of this closed custody give him the necessary rehabilitative, positive results that everyone hopes will come out of it, and of course the Young Offenders' Act advocates and Parliament and society have agreed is the best way to treat young offenders it would, I think, be disastrous for this young man to be released once more on society without some type of supervision and control while he is readjusting himself back to a normal life.

Last year, as was pointed out by the Crown Attorney, there was a bill passed in Parliament, C-19, and they made

some amendments which both counsel agree result in the Court having, where there is one offence, the power and the authority to impose a period of probation.

And it is in the best interest, it is being done not only in the best interest of this young man, as I previously stated, so that he can come back into society and continue, I hope, with a positive result that may result from his closed custody; but that he will be under some supervision while he is readjusting and getting to know his father and his mother and his grandparents again and the people in the community; and by that time would have lost his desire to get annoyed and upset every time things don't go his way; and that he will have lost any feelings he might have to want to rush out and hurt someone because they have criticized him, or don't agree exactly with his idea of the way things should be done.

So there were certain conditions that were agreed upon by both counsel and they were submitted to the Court as recommendations of conditions that should go in a probation order. I agreed with the recommendations from all counsel and the Court and this community thank counsel for the many hours that they have spent in preparing these conditions.

So, P. , in addition to the three years closed custody, I am going to prescribe in the probation order that for a period of three years after you are released from custody, that will be three years from today, that you shall keep the peace for two years under that probation order;

that you should keep the peace and be of good behaviour; that you as a young person shall appear before the Youth Court when required by the Court to do so and even though in three years time you will be 20 years, you will still be under the direction and authority of the Youth Court of the Northwest Territories, and under supervision you will be answerable to that Court as well.

The young person must notify the Territorial Director or the Youth Worker assigned to his case or her case, as the case may be, of any change of address or any change of place of employment, education or training.

]]

1.5

2]

Upon your release you are to report to the Youth Worker in Iqaluit immediately and thereafter as directed by the Youth Worker. You are to submit yourself to any psychiatric or psychological counselling directed by your Youth worker. You are not to possess or consume any known prescription drugs including hashish and marijuana. You are to refrain from the possession and consumption of any alcoholic beverages. You are to submit to any breathalyzer test upon demand from any police officer, and you are not to have in your possession any knife other than in your residence or if living on the land.

Now what that means, you only use a knife to eat with.

You are not to use it to toke up and smoke hash because you are not allowed to do that, and not to have any big knives in your possession. You can use knives for eating or hunting, for skinning caribou or cutting or skinning fish or

something like that, but that is all.

now those are the conditions which I am giving and they are quite lengthy and they are thorough and they have been agreed upon by both counsel. I am sure that your counsel has discussed this with you and that he has discussed it with your father and that both you and your father are aware of what everyone is trying to do to help you to become a good boy.

Now in addition to that, you are subject to all the same laws as any adult in Canada even as a youth offender which you are today. And under the laws of Canada this Court, as the Youth Court, has the authority to prohibit you because you used a weapon of violence and committed a violent act on a fellow human being, has the power to prohibit you from the possession and use of any firearm, ammunition, or explosive substance for a period of up to five years from the time of your release from prison.

Now that is contained in your Probation Order, but I am going to make that Order prohibiting you and that will be a written-out Order and you will be given a copy of it and just so that you understand what it is and what it means under Section 98(2) of the Criminal Code in addition to any other punishment that may be imposed for your offence, the Court may make an Order prohibiting you from having in your possession any firearm or any ammunition or explosive substance for any period of time specific in the Order which is five years - five years after your time and release from

imprisonment after conviction for the offence. So that is what I am going to do.

Now that doesn't mean that you can't go hunting. You can go hunting with other people but you can't, yourself, be involved in the use, possession, handling, shipping or storage of any firearm. You have to be very, very careful that when you are around people with firearms because you can get in a lot of trouble. Do you understand?

THE YOUNG OFFENDER: Yes.

THE COURT: The best thing to do is just forget about being around any firearms until you are 22 years old. Okay.

THE YOUNG OFFENDER: Yes.

THE COURT: Yes. And in addition to that under the Criminal Code, Section 98(13), the Court can also put in that Order that you must surrender to a peace officer or firearms officer or otherwise lawfully dispose of any firearm, ammunition or explosive substance lawfully possessed by you.

So if you have a gun or knife, rifle, given to you by your father or grandfather and is at your home, you'd better write a letter to them and tell them that that rifle is given to them and you don't want it any more because I am making an Order that you can do it that way or you can just turn the rifle and anything you have of that nature over to the police and they will keep it for you for five years.

But that is up to you. Your lawyer will explain all that to you.

Now, what is going to happen now is that you are going to remain in custody. A Probation Order is being made so it will be prepared by the Clerk of the Court who is sitting up here, and when we have an adjournment, along with your lawyer, he will take you into the registry, the Court Registry in here, and he will read that Probation Order to you and I will sign that Probation Order and then they will ask you to sign it and it will be witnessed by either your lawyer or by some other independent witness so that we will know that, and you will be asked if you understand it, and if you don't understand anything in it or anything I have said I want you to tell your lawyer and it will all be explained to you by the Court or if you wish to come back in Court I will explain it to you myself.

Your father I notice is here and he has been listening, and I am sure he understands. If he wants to be present when you sign that Probation Order he can be there as well.

Now, under the Act I am supposed to give everyone involved with the young offender and interested in the young offender the opportunity to be heard, either yourself or you can be heard through your counsel, which you have been, or your father has a right to be heard by this Court. I am sure that was explained to him and he knew he had that right throughout this whole proceeding. If there anything you wish to say about this now, now is the time for you to do it.

Do you wish to tell us your story? You can do that.

1	There is not much anyone can do about the situation now. We
2	certainly cannot bring Mary Lucasi's life back, but we
3	certainly may be in a position of brining your life back to
4	a normal course in due course.
5	So is there anything you would like to say?
6	THE YOUNG OFFENDER: I would like to say sorry to Mary
7	Lucasi's family.
8	THE COURT: That is fine. Thank you.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	CERTIFIED CORRECT:
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	- 2 Corma Caniel
27	Norma Daniel, Shorthand Reporter