

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

3

IN THE MATTER OF:

P

7

8

.

į.

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

VS

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

EDGAR DESJARDINS

Transcript of the Reasons for Judgment Delivered by
His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at
Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on
Thursday, November 17th, A.D., 1983.

APPEARANCES:

MS. N. BOILLAT:

MR. L. SEBERT:

Counse O for the Crown

Counsel for the Defence



THE COURT: The accused, Edgar Desjardins, is convicted of an offence under Section 234 of the Criminal Code, his eleventh drinking and driving offence, and an offence under Section 85 of the Criminal Code.

Needless to say, and it is candidly admitted, the accused is an alcoholic, and had been drinking on both of the occasions that are before the court.

In dealing with the Section 234 offence: the accused, as I have mentioned, has a criminal record. His last sentence for an offence under the drinking and driving section was eighteen months imprisonment, and the Crown is asking the court to impose a sentence for this offence in excess of eighteen months. This follows the normal, accepted practice of increasing penalties based on the logic that an accused will at some point in time react after he keeps getting punished more and more severely and come to the conclusion that further offences will result in very harsh treatment, therefore persuading him to stop offending. I think that is a fair approach and a proper approach in most circumstances - but not with an alcoholic.

Mr. Desjardins, as I say, is an alcoholic, and he has a heart condition. He is fifty-seven years old. He is a threat to society. He is a threat to the lawful users of the highways and streets. He is a threat to pedestrians on the street, but he is not a threat because he is a gross criminal. He is a threat because he is a drunk. To me, to put a man in jail for two years for impaired driving when



2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we see people charged and convicted of manslaughter getting two years or a smidgen more, the system starts looking out of whack in a sense. I am very reluctant to impose such a sentence.

I have no information or evidence before me that there was an accident or personal injuries involved in this particular incident or in any of the incidents in the past. As I say, the accused isn't a master criminal, a member of the Mafia or whatever group you want to call it - he is just a drunk.

I am limited in what I can do, however. I have only three options: probation, jail or a fine. I think I know what I want to do with the accused, but in a sense it involves a mixing of the penalties involved for both convictions, which I don't believe is legally a proper thing to do. Each offence must involve its own penalties and stand independently, related only to other offences through the principle of totality, and yet dealing with the impaired, probation is inappropriate. Jail and probation may be appropriate with conditions with respect to ownership of motor vehicles, but I am concerned about the situation if there is a failure to comply with the conditions in the probation. The only recourse then will be for the court to start dealing with the man on the breach of probation charges which will very quickly, assuming the worst, lead to jail terms if there are In light of the alcoholism, that is a consistent breaches. real possibility.



2

3

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With respect to the Section 85 offence, I am satisfied that a jail term is appropriate. It is beyond me why people have to drive around with rifles and shotguns in their vehicles up and down the streets of Yellowknife. regularly see the half-ton trucks go by with two or three rifles loaded up on the back window. It is just beyond me why that is necessary, why Mr. Desjardins has to drive his vehicle with two guns behind the seat. There is no reason It is incomprehensible. We are not in the wild west for it. we don't have terrible creatures and alien beings attacking cars and people up and down the highways. The availability of guns in this jurisdiction for someone to resort to after a disputeor an argument is something that must be deterred. Time and time again this court sits and hears matters where an accused is drunk and seeks in some way to strike out at his antagonist. He reaches for the nearest thing, and it isn't a brick, it is not a stick - it is a gun, and that is what must be deterred.

What I would like to do with the accused is to put him on probation with some conditions, but I am concerned that if I do so that there must be very significant consequences if the accused does not live up to the terms of the probation. If I don't put the accused in jail for a term of eighteen months or two years, but rather try and protect the public by placing the accused on conditions, then it must be understood that there will be substantial consequences for failure to live up to his obligations, and



1.

I am just not satisfied that a breach of probation conviction with the accompanying penalties is such a substantial consequence as to assume compliance with conditions by this accused. I am going to do what I said I don't think I should do, and that is to say I am going to use both convictions and mold the sentences in effect to give the accused one sentence but from two sources, and I am doing that because on the one hand I believe it is important to protect the public from this accused, yet on the other hand, I just can't see putting this accused in jail at his age and in his condition for this offence for two years. He may deserve it, and I have no doubthat he does deserve it, but I think there has to be some compassion and some attempt to look at an alternative rather than let this man kill himself in jail.

What I propose to do is this: With respect to the Section 234 offence, first I am going to prohibit the accused from driving for a period of five years pursuant to the Motor Vehicles Ordinance.

Secondly, the accused must be well aware at this point, acutely aware - he has been in jail now for a few weeks, he is sober - that he is looking at an eighteen month term of imprisonment for impaired driving charges. He has heard the Crown attorney ask for two years imprisonment, and that 1 believe is a fair and natural consequence for the offence, and that is a fair and fit sentence under most circumstances.

With the accused conscious of that, what I am going to now is suspend the passing of sentence. I am not going to



10

15

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

impose a sentence on Mr. Desjardins today. I am going to place the accused on probation for a period of two years. There will be terms on that probation. First, he is not to own directly, indirectly, in his own name or beneficially, any motor vehicle of any description or any kind. I want it specifically understood that that means that his wife, his friends, his family cannot own a motor vehicle for him.

## Secondly--

(The accused begins to gasp and convulse.)

11 MR. SEBERT: Excuse me, Your Honour.

12 THE COURT: Would you like to recess briefly?

13 MR. SEBERT: Yes, Your Honour.

14 ---- RECESS FOLLOWS.

sentence.

(UPON RESUMING AFTER AN ADJOURNMENT.)

16 MR. SEBERT: Your Honour, Mr. Desjardins has been taken to I understand that Your Honour is going to be the hospital. going away tomorrow, and that the next day that you will be back won't be until Monday the 28th I understand from the clerk. I guess we will have to set this over to a definite time.

THE COURT: Can we proceed with sentencing in his absence?

I would certainly like to. He was here for the MR. SEBERT: finding of guilt, and if we possibly can, I would like to in view of--I realize it is an indictable offence, Your Honour, but the accused was here for the beginning of the



.10

11

12

1 THE COURT: Miss Boillat?

MS. BOILLAT: Your Honour, I have no objection with proceeding ahead with sentence.

THE COURT: Can we? Never mind if none of us objects!

MS. BOILLAT: Section 85, seeing it is an indictable matter, it is my understanding that the accused has to be present for all matters relating to that offence, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Well, Section 577 would appear to cover the situation. I can permit the accused to be out of the court during the whole or any part of his trial, and sentencing is part of a trial, on such conditions as the court considers proper. What do you say, counsel?

13 MR. SEBERT: Your Honour, I urge you to accept this as being something that would come within Section 577(2)(b).

15 THE COURT: You are his counsel, Mr. Sebert.

16 MR. SEBERT: Yes, I am.

17 THE COURT: You have instructions to act today.

18 MR. SEBERT: I do.

19 THE COURT: You have instructions to make representations
20 on sentence which you have done and you are prepared to,
21 on behalf of the accused, consent to this matter proceeding

and finishing in his absence?

23 MR. SEBERT: I am, Your Honour.

THE COURT: What does the Crown say?

MS. BOILLAT: That is fine, Your Honour.

THE COURT: It is not a question of agreement. Does that

bring us within subsection (b)? Can either of you see any



prejudice to Mr. Desjardins?

MR. SEBERT: I see no prejudice at all, Your Honour. I assume he will be taken to the hospital, and I will undertake to deliver a letter explaining the balance of the sentencing, the whole of the sentencing to him this afternoon if he is at the hospital.

THE COURT: Miss Boillat?

MS. BOILLAT: Your Honour, I understand that there would be no prejudice caused to the accused and Defence counsel is agreeing to his absence.

THE COURT: Alright. Well, I will, based on the consent then, the concurrence of Mr. Sebert, I will conclude.

I have indicated that there is to be a licence prohibition pursuant to the Vehicles Ordinance of five years. I am going to suspend the passing of sentence with respect to the Section 234 and place the accused on probation for two years. I have dealt with the no vehicles to be owned drectly or indirectly.

Secondly, I want the accused, or his agent, which if you are still acting, Mr. Sebert, that will be you I assume, to appear in court on a date that is mutually acceptable between the Defence and the Crown, but a date within two months of today's date, and confirm or advise the court that the two motor vehicles formerly owned by the defendant have in fact been sold. I understand today that they have been transferred to a child of the accused, and that the intention is that those vehicles are to be sold.



I want confirmation that they are sold, and I make it a condition of the probation order that those vehicles be sold to someone who has no relationship with the accused.

Mr. Sebert, I will recite the provisions of Section 662 and 664, which I will ask you to bring to the attention of your client. Under the provisions of the Criminal Code, if the accused does not comply with any of the terms of his probation, he may be charged with an offence called breach of probation, and if convicted, subject to a term of imprisonment of six months or a fine of \$500 or both. addition to that, if the accused is convicted of any criminal offence while on probation which includes breach of probation he may be brought back to this court and sentence may be imposed for this Section 234, the original offence. client is already aware that the last time he got eighteen Again sticking my neck out, it would seem to me months. a logical conclusion for a person to arrive at that should Mr. Desjardins not comply with the terms of the probation, it would be reasonable for him to expect a term of imprisonment of eighteen months if the Crown brings this matter back for sentencing.

Now, I have already indicated that I am, in order to try and properly address the situation, mixing the sentencing which I don't think I should do, but I feel compelled to do to keep this man from spending the rest of his life in jail.

I also feel that a term of imprisonment for the impaired driving is appropriate. However, I cannot suspend

2 3 4

6 7 0

9

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

26



1.

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

sentence and put him in jail at the same time for the impaired driving. I have suspended the passing of sentence specifically to get those conditions and to ensure that there is a significant repercussion on the accused, if he doesn't abide by those conditions, and I am only doing so in my attempt to protect the public. The public can't be protected by this man going to jail. His past record shows that. Maybe it can be protected by keeping him off the road.

With respect to the Section 85 offence, there will be an order pursuant to Section 98(2) prohibiting the accused from possessing any firearms, ammunition or explosive substances for a period of five years. In addition to that, for the reasons I have already given, I am going to impose a jail term of four months, and I say this because if counsel feel I erred, then the matter should be brought to a higher court, and I want my reasoning clearly understood. I am imposing a jail term under Section 85 which is perhaps a little heavier than I would have if I had been dealing with the Section 85 only. I am including in effect in the four months imprisonment a period that is probably more properly tied to the impaired driving. However, that is what I have done , and counsel have the reasons why I have done it. If counsel feel I am making an error then I would invite an appeal so that better minds than mine may find a different or better disposition of this case. Does that take care of the matter?

MR. SEBERT: Yes, sir. I have the licence.



THE COURT:

Surrender it to the clerk.

(AT WHICH TIME THESE MATTERS WERE CONCLUDED.)

Certified a correct transcript,

Laurie Ann Young

Laurie Ann Young

Court Reporter