

## IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

٧S

WILLIAM VANCE FRASER

---Before THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.F. TALLIS sitting as a Magistrate under Section 2 of the Criminal Code, at Yellow-knife, Northwest Territories, on October 30th, 1981.

## APPEARANCES:

G. BICKERT

Counsel for the Crown.

A. E. RICHARD

Counsel for the Accused.'

His Lordship's remarks on imposit OFERRITOR,
of sentence

Sit STERRI DAIA COUNTY OF THE LOWEN STELLOWEN STELLOWEN STELLOW STELLO

1 2

7 8



The accused William Vance Fraser has pleaded guilty before me to a charge that he:

"On or about the thirty-first day of August, A.D. 1981, at or near the City of Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, did steal money from the Explorer Hotel while armed with an offensive weapon, to wit: a vehicle wheel wrench, contrary to Section 303 of the Criminal Code of Canada."

After hearing the submissions of Crown and Defence counsel in this case, Mr. Bickert and Mr. Richard respectively, as to the facts surrounding the commission of this offence, I directed that a conviction be recorded against the accused. In yiew of the seriousness of this particular offence, learned counsel have dealt at length with the principles of sentencing that must be considered in a case of this nature.

I have had the benefit of a report by Doctor O'Brien which has been entered in evidence as Exhibit S-2. Doctor Allan Seltzer, a practising psychiatrist, gave evidence in court in conhection with the sentence to be imposed, and this is particularly relevant because the accused has been a patient of Doctor Seltzer\*for some time.

I am not going to repeat the facts of this particular case other than to point out that on the early morning in question the accused went to the lobby area of the Explorer Hotel in Yellowknife with a vehicle wheel wrench, as it is called. He apparently was somewhat nervous and went to the men's washroom initially, and then came to the lobby where he spoke to the desk clerk Mr. Schlosser. He jumped over the counter and took the money that was available. He had then



the wrench in his right hand. He left the premises, and one of the employees of the hotel recognized him from an earlier meeting in the local hospital. The accused was apprehended a little later on, and it is common ground that he stole approximately \$237 or \$240.

The accused had been drinking at the time in question, but learned counsel for the Crown pointed out that no violence was actually threatened, so that is conceded to be a mitigating factor in this particular case.

In dealing with this case, both counsel have quite properly referred to the comprehensive survey of sentencing in robbery cases in the Ontario Court of Appeal, and this matter is fully canvassed in the August 31st, 1981, edition of the Crown News Letter.

The offence of robbery is a serious offence. Section 303 of the Criminal Code provides:

"Every one who commits robbery is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for life."

However, Parliament has seen fit to vest a wide discretion in the presiding judge and, accordingly, no minimum sentence is prescribed for this offence. I must, however, in imposing a sentence for robbery exercise my discretion in accordance with established judicial principles.

In dealing with the principles of sentencing, I refer to the useful summary found in R. v Shaffer 50 CCC (2nd) 424 at 429:

"The principles of sentence have been expressed a countless number of times in various ways. Generally

1 2



they relate to the following:

- the protection of the public;
- the punishment of the offender;
- 3. the deterrent effect of the punishment not only on the offender but others who might be tempted to commit such an offence;
- 4. the reformation and rehabilitation of the offender.

How much emphasis will be placed on each of these principles will depend on many circums ances and will, obviously, vary from case to case. In some cases the major, if not the only, concern will be the protection of the public and little, if any, will be given to the reformation and rehabilitation of the accused. In other cases the emphasis will be How much weight will be attached to any of these principles will depend on a number of things including (a) the degree of premeditation involved; the circumstances surrounding the commission of the offence; (c) the nature of the crime and the gravity of it; (d) the attitude of the offender after the commission of the crime; (e) the previous criminal record, if any, of the offender; (f) the age, mode of character and personality of the offender; (a) any recommendation of a probation officer, and (h) character references: see R. v. Hinch and Salanski, (1968) 3 C.C.C. 39, 2 C.R.N.S. 350, 62 W.W.R.205."

In this particular case I am satisfied there was little premeditation involved. It was a matter that arose under the circumstances outlined by learned counsel for the Crown, and I do not quarrel with the way it has been stated. Similarly, the circumstances surrounding the commission of the offence are not in dispute. There is no doubt that in the eyes of the law robbery was committed, but in this particular case the accused was not using a gun or other type of offensive weapon, and the authorities quoted indicate that this is a mitigating factor. The nature of the crime and the gravity of it is, of course, obvious when you look at the Criminal Code. Robbery

1

3

4

5

8

9

TO

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

21

23

26

N W T 5340 12177



is a serious offence, and it is so perceived by members of the community, whether they are in business or whether they are ordinary citizens minding their own business.

As to the attitude of the offender after the commission, I think that it is common ground that he did display a reasonable degree of remorse for what he had done. He was reasonably cooperative with the police in connection with their investigation, and I am inclined to accept the statement of Doctor O'Brien and the evidence of Doctor Seltzer on this aspect of it.

The previous criminal record of the accused in this particular case does give me some concern because in 1979 the accused was convicted of break, enter and theft in Burton,

New Brunswick. He was sentenced to imprisonment for one month and placed on probation for two years. I am advised that he was under the influence of liquor at the time. It is often said that while the excessive use of liquor may be an explanation, it is not an excuse for misconduct. Unfortunately, the sentence imposed by the court at that time did not have the desired effect even though it would be viewed in some jurisdictions as a lenient sentence.

In dealing with the age, mode of life, character and personality of the offender, I find that the situation is somewhat more complicated. The accused is a young man of twenty-two years of age, coming from a good family. He is a very intelligent person, and this is confirmed by the psychological testing described in paragraph 5 on page two of

2,0



Doctor O'Brien's report. He does suffer from a disease or condition that is described as Bipolar Affective Disorder. In common parlance, he is a manic-depressive and is subject to cyclical moods which may partially explain his conduct on this occasion. He has been a patient of Doctor Seltzer, and in order to control his condition Doctor Seltzer has prescribed lithium. If this medication is taken in accordance with the medical directions given by the doctor it tends to stabilize his condition, and particularly his moods, and the at a reasonable level. [1997]. If the medication is not taken, his mood will swing, either to a high point or to a low point, and, of course, the consequences of this type of mood change are illustrated and discussed in Doctor O'Brien's report. It is also significant that the use of liquor aggravates the condition that the accused suffers from. Similarly, the use of narcotic drugs, whether soft or hard, aggravates that condition. Doctor Seltzer advised and instructed his patient to refrain from the use of those drugs, whether alcohol or narcotics, as I have described them, because of their detrimental effect on the patient, i.e., the accused.

It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that the accused acquire the necessary discipline to follow his doctor's directions as to the taking of lithium as prescribed, and also to refrain from doing those things which aggravate his condition. Unfortunately, the accused has not followed those directions, and I believe that is one of the primary reasons for him being before the court today. However, in dealing with his

2

4

7

10

11

13

15

17

18

20

21

22

23 24

26



unfortunate condition, I must bear in mind that there are many other people affected with conditions that give rise to great difficulties, and he has a responsibility with his intellectual ability to acquire the discipline to deal with the matters that have been dealt with in a very fair and clear-cut way by Doctor Seltzer.

While the disease of epilepsy is not relevant in a direct sense to the crime that was committed here, one must feel sympathy for the accused in the sense that he does have that additional condition, and that Doctor Seltzer indicated it can usually be controlled with the medication and, as I understood it, there was no problem in connection with epilepsy at this time.

In this particular case, I do not have to consider recommendations of a probation officer because the background of the accused has been fully canvassed by Doctor O'Brien and by Doctor Seltzer.

As I have said so often, the real problem that a sentencing judge faces is how to balance the various factors that must be dealt with in the sentencing process. I tend and, indeed, choose to ignore the principle of punishment of the offender as that term is used because I believe that an appropriate sentence can be arrived at by balancing the other three principles that I have mentioned. The fitness of a sentence imposed is always a matter of great concern not only to the sentencing judge but also to society and members of the family of the accused and, indeed, to the potential victims although, in this particular caseno harm same to the clerk at the hotel.

2 3 4

.10

· 15

N W/ T 5240 /2/77



In the case of youthful first offenders the courts have said in most jurisdictions that the emphasis should be on the reformation and rehabilitation of an accused person. In the case of sixteen-and-seventeen-year-old youngsters who get into difficulty for the first time the sentences have tended to be in the neighbourhood of three months or a little longer, together with probation for a period of a year or two. However, notwithstanding the special circumstances of the accused in a medical sense, I cannot view him as falling within the category of a youthful first offender. He is now twenty-two years of age, and on his first previous conviction for break, entry and theft he received a short, sharp sentence coupled with probation which I am sure was intended to remind him of his responsibilities and bring home to him without too much hardship the fact that he had an obligation to refrain from that Unfortunately, it did not have the desired type of conduct. result, and I now have to balance the factors of protection of the public and deterrence with reformation and rehabilitation of the offender. In the light of the medical evidence, I still feel that the factor of reformation and rehabilitation deserves careful consideration; the other two factors certainly do; but if the accused gets into further trouble, I have to say that I think the court will tend to disregard the element of reformation and rehabilitation and choose to place full emphasis on the protection of the public and deterrence.

Applying to the best of my ability the principles that I have discussed in sentencing and giving credit for the time

2

6

9

10

11

13

15

17

18

20

21

22

24

23

25



that has been spent in custody, I have concluded that a sentence of seven months' imprisonment, to be followed by probation with conditions for a period of two years after the expiration of his sentence, would be a fit and proper way of disposing of the matter today. I realize that I am erring on the side of leniency in imposing a sentence of seven months' imprisonment. I do that knowing that I am taking a calculated risk, as courts so often do, when there still appears to be hope that an accused person with the support of family, physicians, and other people of goodwill honestly feel that something can still be done. I view the period of two years' probation as being a very important part of this sentence, and so that there is no misunderstanding, I want to emphasize today to the accused that it should be regarded by him in that light.

The conditions of probation, which, of course, commence immediately upon the expiration of his sentence, are as follows:

That the accused keep the peace and be of good behaviour and appear before the court when required to do so by the court and; in addition, shall:

- (A) report in person forthwith to the senior probation officer at Yellowknife, and thereafter at such places and times as the said probation officer may require.
  - (B) remain within the jurisdiction of the court and immediately notify the probation officer of any change in his address, employment or occupation.



- (C) abstain from the consumption of alcohol, or other intoxicants; and submit to a breathalyser test upon the demand of any peace officer or probation officer who has reasonable grounds to believe that there has been a failure to comply with this condition.
- (D) take such counselling and attend such pronrams for alcohol addiction that his probation officer may recommend.
- (E) refrain from possessing, using or trafficking in prohibited drugs.
- (F) take such psychiatric or other counselling as his probation officer may recommend.

Is there anything else that counsel would like to deal with before I proceed to explain to the accused his respons ibilities?

MR. BICKERT: Nothing with respect to probation. Might/I have an order for the return of the money and the exhibits to the original owner?

THE COURT: With respect to the matter of the exhibits, including the money, that are held in connection with this case, there will be an order that the said exhibits, and particularly the money, be returned to the lawful owner thereof.

Is there anything else you have to say, Mr. Richard, before I ask the accused to stand and be addressed? MR. RICHARD: No.

THE COURT: Would you stand up, please, Mr. Fraser. (accused

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

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19



10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

stands) You have heard the sentence and particularly the terms of the probation that I have imposed on you. Do you understand those terms?

THE ACCUSED: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Under the provisions of Section 663(4) of the Criminal Code, I am required to inform you of certain things. First, I direct that immediately after the probation order has been prepared, the Clerk or Deputy Clerk of this court shall cause the probation order to be read to you or by you, and shall give you a copy of the probation order, and also give you copies of Section 664(4) and Section 666 of the Criminal You are also required to sign an acknowledgment of Code. compliance with the foregoing. Secondly, I tell you that the effect of Section 666 of the Criminal Code is that if you fail or refuse to comply with any of the conditions of the probation order, you may be prosecuted for that failure and, if found the court may impose a sentence for that failure. guilty. Thirdly, I inform you that the effect of Section 664(4) of the Criminal Code is that if while you are on probation you are convicted of an offence including a breach of the probation order, then in addition to any punishment that may be imposed upon you for that offence, the court may change or add to the conditions of the probation order. Do you understand that? THE ACCUSED: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you prepared to sign the necessary acknowledgment in connection with those conditions?

THE ACCUSED: Yes.

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



10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: Before I part from this case, I want to tell you as clearly as I can that I recognize that I have erred, if I erred, in favour of leniency. I have taken a calculated risk and, indeed, as I was reviewing some of the authorities, there is a very recent case of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal which points out that a sentence of a year can be viewed as a very lenient sentence unless there are special circumstances. I have taken into account your situation as far as your health, but I must emphasize to you in the strongest terms that you must be prepared to accept the instructions which your doctor has given you. You must follow his instructions with respect to the taking of the prescribed drugs and, more important, you must refrain from the use of drugs such as alcohol and marijuana which clearly create problems for you. You have a previous conviction where liquor was a contributing factor, and on this particular occasion I am sure it was a contributing factor along with your failure to take medication. If you do not do it and get into further trouble after the care and attention that has been given to your case here today, not only by Mr. Richard but by Mr. Bickert who carefully canvassed all the factors to be taken into account and carefully stated the facts in a very dispassionate way and without any embellishment, you will not receive the kind of consideration that you got today. I say that to you because, in a nutshell, the rest is up to you, and I cannot emphasize that too strongly. I am happy to hear that your family is supportive of you, and the fact that they are here today in court tells me something. In many cases



the family do not bother to turn up, and I can only hope in all sincerity that you will take this matter seriously, and that you will treat it in the way in which we hope you will in taking the calculated risk. You perhaps do not realize it but it is very easy for me to say a year, or eighteen months or as has been pointed out, three years, in some jurisdictions. I have not done it, and I accept the responsibility for doing it in the way in which I have, and I hope that you accept the responsibility that I have placed on your shoulders, and I hope that you do not disappoint Mr. Richard, your parents and, indeed, Mr. Bickert who with characteristic fairness has stated the position of the Crown.

Does that conclude matters?

MR. BICKERT: Yes.

MR. RICHARD: Yes.

THE COURT: We can close court,

Certified correct

. hitshee

(G. Mitchell - Court Reporter)