

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

ROBERT BAPTISTE ABRAHAM

Transcript of the Oral Judgment delivered by His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on Tuesday, November 1, A.D. 1983.

APPEARANCES:

MR. M. E. N. ZIGAYER On behalf of the Crown

MS. P. SPENCE

On behalf of the Defence



1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

THE COURT: What a sad case. Here is fifty-nine year old man who has spent almost seventeen years in jail in his fortythree years of adulthood. Almost half his life has been spent in jail because of crime. After being sentenced to a three year term for indecent assault, being released on mandatory supervision, he is, within two months of release, participating in a crime of theft: he takes possession of the stolen property, a five hundred dollar camera and lens, and sells it for twelve dollars. I note that I am not punishing him for his record.

Usually, the last resort--for the most optomistic judge--after probation is found not to work and fines are found not to work and jail is found not to work, in the sense of rehabilitation, is an accused's age. Usually one finds by the time a person has reached the age of thirty, they are fed up or tired of being in jail, and that "rehabilitates" Unfortunately, for Robert Baptiste Abraham, even his age is not rehabilitating him.

I don't see that I have any alternative, much as I am sympathetic to the pleas of Defence Counsel on behalf of her client, to do anything else with Mr. Abraham but put him back in jail. The public has to be protected; people have the right to enjoy their property without worrying about it being taken and, as was done in this case, disposed of by Mr. Abraham for twelve dollars. People are entitled to protection; that is something that is simple and straight forward. I notice that this isn't the first time Mr. Abraham has been

convicted of offences of possession of stolen property.



9.

am only looking back as far as 1975; in 1975, 1977, in Edmonton he received fourteen months for a charge of possession of stolen property. As recently as March, 1980, in Fort Smith for possession of stolen property, he received only four months. Lenient sentences or severe sentences, it doesn't seem to make any difference to this offender.

The Court must respond to its duty to protect the public. As sad and as unfortunate a situation as this may be. I don't see that the Court has any alternative under the circumstances but to return this man to prison for a length of time that is proportionate to the crime. The crime is serious. The accused by virtue of his criminal record should know better. I think selling a five hundred dollar piece of photographic equipment for twelve dollars aggravates the situation. And of course, the fact is put before the Court today that as a result of the accused and the other person leaving the camera in the bush, the accused knowing it was in the bush and doing nothing about it, the camera now is certainly less valuable, not working the way it should be or at least not as it was.

It is an unfortunate situation. As badly as I feel, I don't have any choice, Mr. Abraham. I sentence you to ten months' imprisonment, consecutive to any other time you are now serving.

(AT WHICH TIME THIS MATTER WAS CONCLUDED.)

Certified a correct transcript:

dna Thiessen, Court Reporter