

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

MOSESEE KILABUK (NOWDLUK)



Transcript of the Oral Sentencing Delivered by His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Frobisher Bay in the Northwest Territories, on Wednesday, September 14th, A.D., 1983.

APPEARANCES:

MR. J. SHIPLEY:

Counsel for the Crown

MR. J. BOVARD:

Counsel for the Defence



THE COURT: The accused, Mosesee Nowdluk, also known as Mosesee Kilabuk is convicted of a number of offences: offencescontrary to Section 294(a), 306(l)(b), 133(3), 306(l)(b), 306(l)(b), 312(l), 306(l)(a), and 294(b), and he candidly admitted to his counsel and instructed counsel to advise the court that the crimes were committed so he could go back to jail. He candidly admits and instructed his counsel to advise the court that he enjoys the programs there, and that his crimes are calculated specifically to keep him in jail.

This crime spree, starting the 5th of August and ending the 2nd of September, was commenced within weeks of being released from imprisonment for causing a disturbance. The accused has ten criminal convictions on his record starting in 1982 which included break, enter and theft.

It is quite the situation where the court is being used, and crimes are being committed, in order that a person can go back to jail and enjoy the amenities there. I don't know if that speaks more to the conditions that this accused was raised in or to the conditions in jail. In any event, I don't think that is a great consideration for the court. The court can only impose a sentence that is appropriate under all the circumstances, although I believe I can take crimes committed for the sheer purpose of going back to jail somewhat in aggravation, I am somewhat reluctant to do so without the benefit of research and submissions by counsel.

It would appear to me at first blush that it can be so



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

used: People are entitled to be protected from criminals and that includes people who live in houses, people who own property, people who carry on businesses. They are all entitled to be protected from the actions of this accused, whether it is for the purpose of going back to jail or not.

The whole purpose of the criminal justice system is to protect the community. As I have indicated in R. v. Ittaigait ϕ k this court is going to impose sentences for offences contrary to s. 306 that are more in keeping with the sentences that are imposed in the south. I see no reason why the people of Frobisher Bay or Rankin Inlet or anywhere else shouldn't be entitled to the same protection as is given citizens in the I might just indicate to Mr. Nowdluk that in the south a Break, Enter and Theft conviction even for small things such as the court is faced with today, after a second or third conviction, may result in jail terms in excess of three years. I want Mr. Nowdluk to contemplate that because if he is back before this court again on a Break, Enter and Theft, then in my estimation, without trying to tie my discretion in the future or any court's discretion, in my estimation that is the kind of sentence Mr. Nowdluk is going to be looking at. He has had ample opportunity to rehabilitate himself, but refuses. He has chosen this particular path and will have to bear the consequences.

Under these circumstances, the court must respond by way of a deterrent sentence, if not to deter Mr. Nowdluk, hopefully to deter other people who feel that Break and

26

27



1.4

Enter offences are a casual thing that they can commit without serious consequences.

I would adopt the same reasoning as I gave in $\underline{R.\ v.}$ Ittaigaitok with respect to sentencing of this accused.

A few comments on some of the particular offences: With respect to the offence of stealing the Honda three wheeled cycle, contrary to s. 294(a): while I can accept that the accused did not ultimately see to the final disposition of the vehicle by dumping it in Frobisher Bay, I don't think he can escape the consequences of what happened to that vehicle being that he was the agent that effected its theft, and he simply abandoned it to the hands of other wrong doers. I don't think he can come to the court now and say, "well, it is not my fault it ended up in the bay."

with respect to the offence involving theft under \$200 contrary to s. 294(b) on the 1st of September: the most common offences in this jurisdiction are offences of violence and offences of theft, but luckily, so far, for some reason there has been very few robberies in this jurisdiction, and it is distressing to see an accused prepared to do violence to someone in order to obtain money to pursue his goal, be that either of getting into jail or having money to spend on the video games. Standing outside the Legion waiting for prey, as it were, is something that must be discouraged.

In taking all of these matters into account; the matters that are normally considered as set out in Morrissette and Overton, which counsel haven't specifically addressed, but



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

which I know are behind their submissions. I note that.

The accused has pleaded guilty, which I am taking into account. I am taking into account what has been said on his behalf by his counsel, and I am of the view that a global sentence is appropriate for all of the offences or for one offence for which all other sentences will be made concurrent. I seek to make an impact on the accused in terms of deterrence with respect to the offence of Break, Enter and Theft.

Therefore, with respect to the offence occurring on the 2nd of September, a break and enter with intent contrary to s. 306(1)(a) of a facility belonging to the people of Frobisher Bay, I am going to impose a jail term of two years less a day. With respect to the offence of break, enter and theft on the 29th of August and possession of property obtained by an offence punishable by indictment on the 27th of August, I am going to impose a sentence of one year concurrent on each. With respect to the offence of the 28th of August, a break, enter and theft into house 1040, there will be a sentence of one year concurrent. With respect to the offence of failing to attend court in accordance with an undertaking contrary to Section 133(3), the accused will be sentenced to one month in jail concurrent. respect to the offence of break, enter and theft into house 187, there will be a sentence of two years less a day, concurrent. With respect to the offence of theft of property of a value exceeding \$200, contrary to s. 294(a), there will

24252627

N IN/ T 5349 /3/771



_ .

be four months in jail concurrent. And finally, with respect to the offence of theft under \$200 contrary to Section 294(b), there will be six months in jail concurrent.

I hope the accused will take the opportunity that I am sure will be afforded to him while he is in prison to do something with his education so that when he is released from prison he won't be back before this court again. He will have some way of surviving on the street without committing crimes or finding himself back in jail.

MR. BOVARD: Thank you, Your Honour.

(AT WHICH TIME THESE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED.)

Certified a correct transcript,

Laurie Ann Young

Court Reporter