IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

VS

R.S.K. (A Young Offender)

Transcript of the Oral Sentencing Delivered by His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Coppermine in the Northwest Territories, on Monday, October 28th, A.D., 1985.

## APPEARANCES:

MR. J. LETELLIER Q.C.: Counsel for the Crown

IN THE MATTER OF:

MR. V. FOLDATS:

Counsel for the Defence

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

THE COURT: The community's problems with R.K. could have been cut by two-thirds had he been kept in custody following his second offence on the 15th of July. That was clearly a breach of his undertaking. Had he been kept in custody at that time pursuant to the provisions of the Code he wouldn't have been around to commit these additional offences.

In any event, he was released and he continued to commit offences notwithstanding he was awaiting trial on the charge of theft and break and enter. He continued on a string of offences right up until the court virtually arrived here.

The youth, R.K., has been before the court before. In 1984 he was convicted of break, enter and theft. matter was simply adjourned with no disposition. on in 1984, he committed a break, enter and theft again. This time he was given probation with community service In 1985 in March, he was convicted of possession work. of stolen property and received more community service He was also convicted at that time of a breach of probation, and the passing of sentence was suspended. Then in May of 1985, he was convicted of theft under and received more community service work. Obviously those dispositions had no impact on this young man at all. He is bound and determined to do what he is going to do, steal what he feels like stealing, and go where he feels like going regardless of anyone else's interests or rights

2

3

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

in the matter.

I cannot help but be concerned as to what is happening in Coppermine. There are seventy-seven charges on the docket, adult and young offenders. The number of persons involved is approximately ten percent of the population of this community. I don't know what is happening here. There are as many young offenders as there are adult offenders. It is astounding that a community this size sustains this kind of criminal conduct.

I don't think a suspended sentence or probation is adequate given all the offences before me, and given the nature of each of the offences, although some are more serious than others.

I am advised there are no facilities available for open custody, and I am quick to agree with Defence counsel that that is not a concern of the court. A concern of the court is to sentence according to proper principles and it is up to the executive to provide the mechanism for the execution of the court's orders. A failure to do so is an attack on the independance of the judiciary. The executive is bound to provide the methods and means of executing sentences imposed by the courts.

I am not of the view that a term of open custody
would be wholley appropriate in this case. I have, of
course, listened to the submissions with respect to the
G.K. case carefully. It would seem to me that this particular
case, given the long string of offences, the record, as

well as the continuation of offences, notwithstanding awaiting for trial, distinguishes this matter from that matter on the facts and while I can agree that there is nothing in the Young Offenders Act that says deterrence is a principle, I don't believe there is anything in the Criminal Code that says deterrence is a principle. That is to be found in case law.

I am unaware of any case that displaces the normal sentencing goals in dealing with young offenders, the normal sentencing goals that are found in case law with respect to the adults. I am, of course, acutely aware of the statement of principles at the beginning of the Young Offenders Act, and particularly Section 3(1)(a):

"While young persons should not in all instances be held accountable in the same manner or suffer the same consequences for their behavior as adults, young persons who commit offences should nonetheless bear responsibility for their contraventions."

Something, in my view, has to be done by the nature of a short, sharp sentence to try and shock this boy into understanding that he has reached certain limits. In my view, that can be best accomplished by a term of secure custody.

Now, perhaps a few comments with respect to each of the charges, dealing with the theft of the rifle, if every boy who ever took someone's gun to shoot off a box of ammunition was charged with a criminal offence and brought to court, I am afraid very few of us would

-9

escape the net. I can't in any way classify that as a greatly serious offence. While it was an offence strictly speaking, and the youth didn't have permission, and I suppose technically stole the rifle, it is not an offence that in any way warrants a term of custody.

With respect to the break, enter and theft at the Coppermine Inn, that is probably the most serious offence that this youth has before him. He has been convicted of break and enters in the past. He is well aware that this is not acceptable behavior. The break and enter showed skill. It showed daring and it certainly showed an inalterable intent that would not be deflected by locks or barred doors. This boy was going to steal liquor and he was going to steal whatever else he could get his hands on. On that charge there will be a term of secure custody of six months.

With respect to the theft of the bottle of liquor from his father, if his father wants to keep liquor in his house I don't see why his son should be brought to court and charged with an offence of stealing liquor. If his father doesn't want his son to drink, he might think of not keeping liquor in the house. On that charge there will be one day secure custody concurrent.

With respect to the theft of the rifle there will be one day in secure custody concurrent. With respect to the mischief charge under Section 387(3), again it just displays a very unhealthy attitude that this boy

is going to do what he wants to do regardless. There will be a term of secure custody of five days concurrent.

With respect to the charge of break, enter and theft in the amusement arcade, I am accepting from the facts that were read in to me that this youth was not necessarily the leader, that he was involved in the last two unlawful entries, but not in the planning and execution of the first entry which I would categorize as being the head of this unlawful act. On that offence there will be a term of six months secure custody concurrent.

With respect to the 133 matter, there will be five days concurrent.

(AT WHICH TIME THESE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED.)

Certified a correct transcript,

Laurie Ann Young

Court Reporter