

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

 IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

DALE ALEXANDER CARLSON

Transcript of the Oral Sentencing delivered by His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on Wednesday, December 14, A.D. 1983.

## APPEARANCES:

MS N. BOILLAT

On behalf of the Crown

MR. L. SEBERT

On behalf of the Defend



N.W.T. 5349 (3/77)



COURT: Dale Alexander Carlson is to be sentenced on an offence contrary to Section 236 of the Criminal Code. As has often been stated, there is usually no great difficulty in addressing or identifying the particular factors to be considered in sentencing, but it is always difficult in trying to weigh which factor should be the most important and most significant and to achieve a balance that hopefully will have as its goal one or more of the goals set out by Mr. Justice Cullitin in Morrissette.

This accused presents a challenge. He is convicted of an offence of driving over eighty milligrams of alcohol in his blood. He was observed by the police on patrol on Saturday night in Yellowknife, well into the evening, pulling out from a side road and then proceeding down the main street in Yellowknife with his lights off, and running a stop sign, before he was pulled over. He was unable to produce evidence of insurance or a driver's licence. Two tests on the Borkenstein breathalyzer resulted in readings of a hundred and forty, and a hundred and fifty.

The accused is thirty-five years old; and from 1964, until 1980, he was almost continuously involved in confrontations with the law. It is admitted in the submissions that during that period he had a gross problem with drugs and alcohol, and that is certainly reflected in his criminal record with a number of offences of break and enter, possession of a narcotic, and the like. I am not



1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

too concerned about that aspect of the man's record, it doesn't really have much to do with what I have to deal with today. What I am concerned about is that in 1978, he was convicted of driving while suspended; in 1979, he was convicted of driving while his ability was impaired, refusing to provide a breath sample, and driving while disqualified. Again, in 1979, a few days later, he was convicted of driving while his ability was impaired, and again driving while suspended. In 1980, in Edmonton, he was convicted of another criminal offence.

The accused, I don't know how long he has been in Yellowknife, but I am advised that after some time in Yellowknife he has finally managed to secure a job which he has held now for a week and a half; and he asks the Court to impose some sentence that will enable him to continue in that employment. I am sympathetic to that plea, however, I wonder how far a Court can go in protecting an individual from the consequences of his own acts. I think Mr. Carlson must clearly understand that whatever happens today is not my doing, it's his own doing; and all the Court is doing today is telling him what he has done to himself. think that in some instances it is appropriate for the Court to try and protect people from the consequences of their own acts. That only leaves them to continue their belief in a fictional state of affairs that there perhaps are no serious consequences for their activities. activity of driving around by a person whose ability is

impaired or driving with over eighty milligrams of alcohol in their blood is a crime. It is treated like that, it is described like that, and it is becoming an even more significant problem. It is treated as a crime because of the potential for injury to innocent members of the public. On a Saturday night, there could have been children or adults walking the street that could have been injured, killed, or maimed as a result of this kind of driving.

The accused has not responded to his obligations in the past. He shows—at least in 1978 and 1979—a total disregard to his obligations as a citizen while piloting a ton of steel. He showed a total disregard to the requirements for licencing and whatever suspensions were placed on him at that time

I would take it in this case that my primary responsibility is to the general members of the public who are entitled to walk the streets or drive the streets on a Saturday night without worrying about men such as the accused running stop signs or driving with lights off, putting all members of the public in jeopardy.

Had the Crown Attorney served a notice of previous convictions, this accused would be looking at a very lengthy time in jail. It's unfortunate, I don't believe I have any choice but to impose a term of imprisonment. It is unfortunate that this means that the accused is going to lose his job, but he should have thought of that before he bent his elbow, before he got into his car, before he scooted down the streets of Yellowknife.

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

MR. SEBERT: Your Honour, if the Court is going to impose a sentence, would you consider an intermittent sentence?

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Sebert.

It's given that the accused, since 1980, has not been involved in any criminal activity and has no convictions for that period; and that he realized in 1980, that he had to grow up. If that is in fact the case, then hopefully his appearance in court today is but an aberration in this new-found maturity, and I can only hope that this new-found maturity continues. But in the event that it doesn't, and in order to bring home to the accused—not necessarily bring home to him only because he has had ample opportunity to have that brought him to him—and in order to protect the public a prohibition is in order, and I believe it should be a lengthy prohibition.

The Counsel for the Defendant seeks an intermittent term of imprisonment. Again, I can only assume that from the accused's perspective it is a lesser evil than serving straight time, and it would be some extention of leniency by the Court. I am not convinced that it is appropriate under this circumstance. This accused has to learn his responsibilities when he's behind the wheel of a car. I cannot protect him from the consequences of his acts. No one can protect him from those consequences. This Court has to be concerned about the public, and I think that a short, sharp term of imprisonment, if anything, may bring home to this accused that he has responsibilities and obligations, and he has to live up to

them. If he is not going to live up to them, he will have to pay the price. It's unfortunate if it's going to be a severe price, and if it means his job. Were this a first or even a second conviction, I might consider an intermittent sentence, but his accused has had years to learn the simple truth that there are consequences to criminal activities. He continues to ignore them. I can't protect him from those consequences any more. To do so I believe would be ultimately detrimental to the accused and the public.

I am taking into account that there have been no convictions in the last three years. I am taking into account that the accused, apparently, after a long string, almost fifteen years of criminal activities, he has managed to stay clean.

Firstly, I'm going to make an order pursuant to the provisions of the Vehicle's Ordinance and prohibit the accused from driving in the Northwest Territories for two years. I want to make it very clear to the accused that if he's ever back before this Court on a conviction for driving while prohibited, he can expect to be treated at least as harshly as he was treated in Edmonton where he received ninety days in jail for a similar offence.

With respect to the 236 matter, there will be a term of thirty days in jail, together with a fine of five hundred dollars; in default, thirty days consecutive.

Does the accused require time to pay the fine?

MR. SEBERT: Yes, he would, Your Honour. Perhaps three months.

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284



Three months to pay the fine from today. Does THE COURT: the accused have a driver's licence?

Certified a correct transcript

Edna Thiessen, Court Reporter

MR. SEBERT: No, he doesn't.

(AT WHICH TIME THIS MATTER WAS CONCLUDED.)

N.W.T. 5349 (3/77)