## R. V. BENNETT A, 30 January SC CR 71 001 15 December 1971 (Trick 1, 3, to the 1991)

THE COURT: Members of the jury, I think we will take your verdict count by count, if that is acceptable, so there will be less confusion.

THE CLERK: Members of the jury, have you arrived at your verdict. If so, say so by your foreman.

THE FOREMAN OF THE JURY: We have. On count number one ---MR. FROOMKIN: If I may make this suggestion, I think it is
easier if the clerk would ask the foreman whether
they find the accused guilty or not guilty on

Bennett guilty or not guilty, and then R.W. Bennett

count 1, that they find the accused Clifford James

THE COURT: Well, let's try the foreman. I think they probably know what they are doing.

THE CLERK: Count 1.

THE FOREMAN: Count 1, We have listed both defendants under each count.

THE COURT: All right. I think if you would take each count,
may be we should use Mr. Froomkin's suggestion.

On count number 1, shall we take them in the order
that they are in the indictment, and have Richard
William Bennett mentioned first. What was the
verdict with respect to him on count number 1.

THE FOREMAN: Count number 1, Richard William Bennett (Bud)
guilty on count 1.

THE COURT: Now take the same count with respect to Clifford

James Bennett.

THE FOREMAN: Count number 1, Clifford James Bennett, guilty.

May I just go over this and make sure we have it

right, and then ask on each one.

THE COURT:

1 THE CLERK: I was just going to repeat it. 2 That's all right, you go ahead. THE COURT: 3 THE CLERK: You find the accused Richard William Bennett guilty 4 on count; Clifford James Bennett guilty on count 5 number 1. Richard William Bennett guilty on count 6 2; Clifford James Bennett guilty on count 2. 7 Richard William Bennett guilty on count 8 3; Clifford James Bennet quilty on count 3. 9 Richard William Bennett not guilty on 10 count 4; Clifford James Bennett quilty on count 4. 11 Richard William Bennett not guilty on 12 count 5; Clifford James Bennett guilty on count 5. 13 Richard William Bennett guilty on count 14 6; Clifford James Bennett guilty on count 6. 15 THE FOREMAN: We do. 16 THE CLERK: Do you all agree. 17 (EACH JUROR ANSWERED IN THE AFFIPMATIVE) 18 Thank you very much member s of the jury; yes? THE COURT: 19 MR. FROOMKIN: My Lord, I was going to suggest perhaps after the 20 jury has been discharged by Your Lordship, we 21 might have, if My Friend's are ready to speak to 22 sentence, I would ask for about ten or fifteen 23 minutes only. 24 Does that suit everyone. THE COURT: 25 Yes My Lord. MR. PURDY:

Well then, members of the jury, I wish to thank you

on behalf of everyone here for what must have

been sometimes a tedious job and a difficult job.

27

26

THE COURT:

You have performed your function for the state, for your country, and for the accused. You are in a position where you should not be called for jury duty for at least two years now.

You are free to go now, or you may remain. We are going to adjourn for a few minutes, and then you can remain for the sentencing if you wish. That's entirely up to you. In the meantime, I believe at least some members of the jury have perhaps lost financially if I was to allow them the normal per diem rate. Because of the length of this trial I am going to make a direction that for each day, whether full or partial that the jury sat, they shall be awarded one and one half the normal rate.

Similarily the jury guard has put in some extra time with regard to the Exhibits and so on, so he will be awarded twenty-five dollars per day, and that in addition for the two partial days that he worked he will be given a full twenty-five for each of those days. Will that satisfy then?

I wanted to make those awards before we adjourn, in case they want to leave.

Now is there anything else I have missed.

THE CLERK: For my records, My Lord, is that twenty-five dollars for each partial day.

THE COURT: For each partial day, in other words ---THE CLERK: He came back for a few hours on Sunday.

THE COURT:

a full day, he gets paid for a full day, each day.

MR. FROOMKIN: My Lord, I know I can speak on behalf of My

My Lord, I know I can speak on behalf of My
Friends with respect to the jury guard. He
performed admirably, and he came on Sunday and spent
some hours with My Friends and I, and I am grateful
to him.

If he did that to accommodate the lawyers he gets

THE COURT: Very well, we will adjourn.

(THE TRIAL RECESSED FOR FIFTEEN MINUTES, THEN RESUMED SESSION)

THE COURT: Mr. Froomkin?

MR. FROOMKIN: May it please My Lord. The juryhave convicted the accused Clifford Bennett of the six counts on the indictment, and the accused Richard William on four counts in the indictment, excluding counts 4 and 5, I think one can infer that the jury must have felt that the accused Bud Bennett was not aware that the prospectus was materially false. I say that only in respect to sentence. My inference may not be correct, but it seems to be a reasonable one, bearing in mind -----

THE COURT: I don't think we have to speculate.

MR. FROOMKIN: Fine My Lord. Now the Crown's position in respect of these offences is that they are particularly henious, bearing in mind that we have two people from outside of the area who decided out of obviously as desire for easy money, come down to the Northwest Territories, or go up to the Northwest Territories, and on the basis of

4 5

false documents and fraudulent representations to obtain and to attempt to obtain monies from working people in the area, in particular Your Lordship will recall the evidence of Mr. Roy and Mr. Pelechaty, who are two relalively humble working men. Your Lordship will recall the approaches made by Bud Bennett. Your Lordship will also recall some of the documents which did not go in evidence, but which Your Lordship saw, letters written by Bud Bennett, and I just refer to one short paragraph of the so called big Bennett story, which did not get before the jury, and I am reading -----

MR. PURDY: I wonder if it's proper for you to consider it sir.

THE COURT: Just how deep were you going to go into it.

MR. FROOMKIN: Just one two three four five lines as to what the intentions of the accused were.

THE COURT: Well, you know I have heard the evidence for tendays.

MR. FROOMKIN: Fine My Lord. Then I will put it in my own words.

THE COURT: I think I have a pretty good idea.

MR. FROOMKIN: In my own words My Lord the intention of the two accused was, knowing that the stock market had fallen badly, and that all kinds of small investors and big investors had been hurt badly, found the market was right for plucking, and came down here like parasites to exchange worthless stocks I sugges for failing stocks.

In respect of Mr. Paul Roy, perhaps I

3

4

5

7 8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

24

23

2526

27

should mention first the maximum penalties provided by law in respect of count 1, which is two years My Lord. In respect of count 2, 3, 4 and 5, ten years, and in respect of count 6, five years.

THE COURT: Now count 6, is there a value established in count 6.

MR. FROOMKIN: No My Lord, the attempt section says any persons convicted of an offence for which he is liable to fourteen years or less, or one half the maximum.

THE COURT: Yes, then the maximum would be two years wouldn't it?

MR. FROOMKIN: Well no My Lord, with respect I think the maximum would be five years.

THE COURT: Why.

MR. FROOMKIN: Because it is one half the maximum amount.

THE COURT: Yes, but isn't the maximum amount two years if there is no value? Don't I have to assume it's under fifty? It may be relativtely acedemic, but I wonder if to be correct, if that isn't so. You see, if it's possible to have one or other value, don't I have to give the benefit to the accused, even in sentencing.

MR. FROOMKIN: Yes of course My Lord.

MR. PURDY: Why not make it one year.

MR. FROOMKIN: I think if Your Lordship's interpretation is

THE COURT: We ran into it on one case, I think Mr. Purdy was

on it, but involving a different matter where the Crown had established guilt, but there was a difficulty about value, and the law as I recall Mr. Purdy saying and I accepted it, if there is any doubt then you went in favour of the lower sentence

MR. FROOMKIN: That doesn't sound unreasonable My Lord.

THE COURT: So we will call it one year.

MR. FROOMKIN: On count six it is one year, one count 1 it's two years and on the others, 2 3 4 and 5 it's ten years.

THE COURT: And the other counsel agree on that?

MR. PURDY: Yes sir.

MR. FROOMKIN: My Lord, I stand corrected again, I am sorry.

I obviously was more rushed than I thought. Count

5, using the mails, is two years.

THE COURT: Count number five is two years, that's correct.

MR. FROOMKIN: Yes My Lord, counts 1 and five two years; counts

2,3 and 4, ten years, and count 6 one year. I

think that's correct.

THE COURT: I think we are right; now you agree with my figures

MR. FROOMKIN: Pardon.

THE COURT: You agree with my reading.

MR. FROOMKIN: Fine My Lord. So that as I have said, we have

got these two individuals who, strictly out of a

desire to make easy, fast money by use of

fraudulent representation and fraudulent prospecti

financial statements, brochures, defrauded and

attempted to defraud citizens of the Northwest

Territories. The court I think must, having heard the evidence over the past ten days, bear in mind the scope of this operation. I don't think it would be an overstatement to say it was an International operation. Your Lordship has seen the quantity of material that was sent down to the Northwest Territories. We are not only talking about four people who are named in the indictment. Your Lordship also saw a list of other people who had invested. Your Lordship has seen some hundreds of application forms, some hundreds of prospecti, hundreds of balance sheets, all obviously, patently false.

Your Lordship must of course in sentencing bear in mind the deterrents to these two gentlemen who have been in the Mutual Fund business for many years. You have heard evidence from Mr. Bud Bennett through some of the documents that have been filed that there were times when he sold millions of dollars worth of funds, so one can see the scope of operations like this. We know from the evidence that he was drawing a commission of not less than a thousand dollars a month. We know that Clifford James Bennett in about four months drew about sixteen thousand dollars in respect of one man along in respect of drawings from Select. We know that there were management fees and custodian fees and registrars fees.

THE COURT:

3

5

8

7

10

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

THE COURT:

MR. FROOMKIN: That's so My Lord, but I think one must bear in mind it was shown on the balance sheet as being a contingent liability, so that I am only asking Your Lordship to bear in mind the scope of this operation. It isn't some small town fellow who defrauds three or four people out of a few thousand dollars, and we mustn't, we must not forget this is a fund of International scope, and the intention was obvious to flood the Yukon and the Northwest

Territories. We have got all those documents here.

Some of the evidence was that wasn't paid out.

Your Lordship has heard their representat: ns made. I don't have to go over them again, and I don't intend to, but not only must Your Lordship impose a sentence which may be deterrent upon these two individuals but more important I think in a case of this sort, there must be a deterrent upon others who will come to the Northwest Territories where people perhaps in many areas are relatively remote from communications, and perhaps not as sophisticated as southerners, and who come here for the obvious purpose of selling phony mining stocks, phony mutual funds, securities, so there must be a deterrent to the outside of Canada, when I say outside I mean outside of the Northwest Territories, that this is not going to be tolerated We sometimes feel we are outside Canada.

MP FROOMKIN: Yes, I am hoping that I am now going to be part

but My Lord, with these offences, I think it is most important to deter others as well as these two accused, There is no alcohol involved here, it is not a mitigating factor, it is strictly greed, out and out greed. The fact that a false prospectus is used is particularly henious My Lord. The legislature has seen fit to impose a maximum imprisonment of ten years, and no proof being needed that anyone even acted on the prospectus, just publishing or circulating or making a false prospectus is punishable with a sentence up to ten years, and that is how serious the legislature intended the matter to be.

In the case which was in my brief case My Lord, Justice Maclellan said and I may have the date of this judgment, 1970, January the 28th, almost two years ago now, His Lordship said at page 19, amongst other things, that the judgment, he says "I realize the effect of this judgment on count number 1 is to require the person filing a prospectus to be scrupulous about the information contained, and to be absolut certain that no member of the public may be mislead by the statements contained in the prospectus or by the ommission of any material from it. It is my view this is exactly what the Parliament of Canada intended when they passed Section 643", so that I say that the false

prospectus for which only the accused Clifford

James Bennett was convicted and the using of
the mails for a fraudulent scheme, are
particularly serious offences, and that again
there must be a deterrent to others who see
fit to publish this kind of questionable
material to be put before the public, because
that's really what the public sees when they
are buying stock or security from salesmen.

I say My Lord that there are no

mitigating factors here, none whatsoever, and the fact that the accused or that someone on behalf of either one or both of the accused, after the charges were laid, paid back the four investors here or any other investors, has no bearing on the seriousness of the offend or the deterrent to this accused or others. I suggest to the court that it was obvious that the accused felt they could buy their way out, because Clifford James Bennett said in his statement "even though I am no longer associated with AFCA the company would make I say that was an attempt up their losses". to buy their way out. The court must impress on these accused, and more important upon others that on these financial frauds the Northwest Territories is not going to be a haven.

27

\_

 Accordingly, I would ask Your Lordship to impose a sentence of such magnitude as to perhaps with some hope deter these two, and to deter others so that it is not worth their coming up here to defraud the people of the Northwest Territories.

Thank you My Lord.

THE COURT: Is there any record.

MR. FROOMKIN: Each accused has a record, but they are unrelated.

THE COURT: I don't want to go back past five years anyway. All right Mr Purdy.

MR. PURDY: Just to clear that up sir in case any lingering impression might be left on your mind, I would like to refer to the record of Mr. Clifford J. Bennett.

Sixteen years ago he was convicted of obstructing a Peace Officer and fined twenty-five dollars.

THE COURT: I am going as though there was no record.

MR. PURDY: That is the only thing he has ever been convicted of sir.

My Lord, Mr. Clifford Bennett is fortyseven years of age, and he has been connected with
the investment business for some twenty years. The
Crown prosecutor found he is a bachelor, and up until the
time of this trial was living with his mother in North
Bay, Ontario, who is an elderly lady there. You have
heard the evidence of course, and know that in the previous
few years he had been spending considerable of his time
in Europe.

The Crown prosecutor referred rather

Sweepingly to operations like these in connection with his past activities.

THE COURT: Well, I am only going to deal with the one.

MR. PURDY: Yes sir, I was going to make that point, because there
is no evidence before the court or evidence elsewhere that
I know of that these other matters in which Mr. Bennett
has been connected for twenty years were in any way
a fraudulent scheme.

THE COURT: I will assume that everything except the one he has been found guilty of were completely legal.

MR. PURDY: It is interesting to note I think too during this relatively short while on the remarks made by the Crown prosecutor that if the market was failing, and if the AFCA stocks were worthless, that it would seem that Bud Bennett at least and the company was prepared to accept failing stocks, rather than money.

THE COURT: Well, of course I don't want to get into that

argument, but I am sure if Mr. Froomkin, if he was

replying would say "If you take a failing stock and

cash it in, and then the assets can't be found, it's your

problem", but let's not get into that.

MR. PURDY: It is also interesting to note that of the hundreds
of documents that were sent to Bud Bennett in the
Northwest Territories suggesting he was to quote for the
Territories, that the evidence is clear that he was
instructed by the company on October the 8th to cease
his activities, and further, that Colin Alexander was
instructed not to take instructions from Bud Bennett

yone on his behalf, and to cease advertising.

I understand sir that the total sum of money dealt with in the charges amounts to six thousand six hundred and eighty-two dollars and twenty cents. Further, the evidence is clear that this money has been returned, and that no investor in the Northwest Territories has suffered a loss in connection with this matter. Mr. Bennett's statement to the effect that "I am confident or sure the company will reimburse anybody who wants their money back" was made before he knew that he was to be arrested, although he was arrested very shortly after that. He did not have any indication that he himself was in trouble although he had been asked

I am advised sir that the indication. at the time of the statement was that his brother in the Territories was being asked to make a statement in that regard.

It's difficult of course to decide what it was that influenced the jury, it was the falsity in the prospectus, whether it was the Guardian Custody, or some other statement, or the addresses or companies or whatever. It is clear however My Lord that there was no falsity, none was referred to in the evidence, as to surely the vital matters which the Crown now presses on for the matter of sentence.

THE COURT: Self-securing .

MR. PURDY: That is to say, the charges be made.

to make a statement.

THE COURT: Mr. Purdy, I don't think we should indulge in

speculations. There was evidence before the jury that indicated that every detail on the prospectus was equally ----

MR. PURDY: But there was no evidence and no suggestion that the charges set out in the prospectus which the Crown now refers to and says this shows that they were trying to make more money. The charges were clearly set up, that these charges would be made against the monies invested in the fund. There was no misrepresentation in that regard.

THE COURT: We are not going to re-try it here.

MR. PURDY: No sir, but the Crown is now pushing this point on the matter of sentence. Now it may be useful sir to remind the court of one or two other cases of a similar nature that have been in this jursidiction. A very recent one was the Lorraine Scott case, where she was convicted I believe on five counts of defrauding her employee. She was not dealing at arms length as these people were, with various people. She was in position of trust with her employers, and I believe that on the five charges there was five or six thousand dollars taken over a peric of some months from her employers. There had been no restitution, there were two related previous convictions and in that case the court imposed a sentence of -----

THE COURT: There were no convictions before me.

MR. PURDY: And in that case the court imposed a sentence of one year. The court may also recall the case of ---THE COURT: Which of course is being appealed by the Crown.

MR. FROOMKIN: Yes, I am informed there is only three thousand dollars, by the way.

THW COURT: Well, does it matter.

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

MR. PURDY: The court will also no doubt recall the rather colourful case of Pete Barhope, alias Mr. Cottrell, who was convicted under the same section as presently before the court, who sold a mining stock in a company known as Yukon Epohrab Mines. He had a criminal record stretching back to 1932, with repeated convictions on related offences. He had been out of jail on the same matter only two or three months when he was re-charged with the same section. The evidence indicated that he was operating under a number of different names, alias,', and in an attempt to deceive people who dealt with him. He was charged also of course with the use of the mails, the same charge there, and was convicted on two or three counts, and in spite of his criminal record and repeated offences of the same nature, and the attempt to deceive people as to who they were dealing with and this sort of thing, with the same volume of documents I believe that were listed here, correspondence and shares and so on

THE COURT: These are documents he typed out while he was in jail under the first offence.

MR. PURDY: There was quite a few of them, I believe he was supplied with a typewriter while he was in jail.

THE COURT: But you pursuaded me because he was over seventy or eighty I wouldn't see him again.

MR. FROOMKIN: I was maing just going to say that My Lord, I

believe it was seventy-five or eighty, and there obviously wasn't a deterrence.

MR. PURDY: He was about seventy sir.

THE COURT: I think it was his beard that appealed to me.

MR. PURDY: And he received a sentence of one year.

In this case sir I would submit to you for your consideration that what happened was that these people were, firstly, may I say that on charges 1,2,3, and 6 that these surely must overlap and in effect form part of charges 4 and 5, in respect of Clifford Bennett in that his only connection with charges one, two, three and six was his connection with the printed material, and the printed material, the circulation of it, the prospectus, and the use of the mails for the delivery of it is dealt with in four and five, so I would submit that surely the sentences in 1,2,3, and 6 should be concurrent with those in 4 and 5, which in the case of Clifford Bennett of course surely must be the main charges.

Now if the court veiws this as being a scheme, taking it as a whole, I would submit that 5fellows on 4 because the use of the mails to circulate the prospectus surely overlaps with that charge. He simply used the mails to circulate the prospectus and the financial statement, and the evidence is clearly before you in the case My Lord. I don't think there is any need for me to receive it in any detail. I would point out this is a first offence, the man has

27

not been in trouble for the forty-seven years of his He would appear to have failed to comply adequately with the standards required for the production of the prospectus. The intent I suppose you must accept from the verdict as being fraudulent, but in any event My Lord I would suggest that in spite of the urging of the Crown, and bearing in mind the remotness of this accused person from the operations in the Northwest Territories, the bearing in mind further that the money has all been refunded, and that there has been no loss here, and there is no evidence that anyone else has lost elsewhere, that you should seriously consider whether Justice would not be adequately served in this case by a suspended sentence, considering it as a first offence. Secondly, that if you do not consider a suspended sentence appropriate, that you consider the nature of the sentences imposed in the other cases I have referred to, which I would suggest are more in mous than this. Thirdly, that you remember that the six charges really intertwine into one, which is basically count 4, and that you impose your sentences accordingly. Oh, I might add that Mr. Bennett has spent seven day sin custody in connnection with these charges, and of course has been present during about thirteen, plus I think twenty-six days here.

THE COURT: Mr. Finall, thank you, Mr. Purdy, Mr. Finall.

MR. FINALL: Your Lordship, Mr. Bud Bennett is forty-four years He was born in North Bay Ontario, and went to school there and attained grade nine. He has been a salesman for a large portion of his life in various areas of selling, and then later on afterwards he was in the Canadian forces actually for a short while in 1944 I understand, and more recently in 1960 he purchased a Department store, which he ran until it was destroyed in a fire in 1965, and at that time he joined his brother Clifford Bennett as a salesman for a mutual fund that his brother was distributing at that time. Prior to that in 1959, I gather he had also been involved in selling activities, and since 1965 he has been involved in selling mutual funds in these sort of investments .

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Your Lordship, the defendant is separated, he has a grown up family now, and intends to marry a lady that he has met more recently, when his marital situation is resolved.

Your Lordship, I don't intend to go into the evidence. As you have already indicated, it is difficult to comment on it, but I would like to make one or two comments on the approach taken by Mr. Froomkin, particularly the stressing of the deterrence factor in consideration of sentence.

Your Lordship, perhaps one of the things that will deter this sort of episode arising again will be the recent securities legislation, which I believe

has been enacted up here, which brings the requirement for selling and dealing in funds, and investments of this nature, more in line with the sort of provisions that are required elsewhere in Canada.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

There is no previous record before you sir, at the age of forty-four years. I submit that serious consideration should be given, not so much to the deterrrent factor, but to the rehabilitation of this accused, and in again considering that of course you will sir consider the significance in your own mind of the acquittal of this accused in respect to counts four and five. Your Lordship, the amount involved, as Mr. Purdy mentioned, appears to total something in the region of six thousand and six hundred dollars, and of course you have already heard from my friend on that, that amount has been refunded to the investors concerned. I understand from Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bud Bennett that he spent two days in custody in Whitehorse, a day from his recollection in Watson Lake, and two days in Yellowknife, and a further two days of course recently, totalling seven days in custody, plus the period he has been in court on the preliminary, and this hearing. Your Lordship, in view of the circumstances I submit respectively that this is a case where you can consider a suspended sentence for this accused, and I earnestly request you to consider that sentence as being the appropriate one in this case.

THE COURT: Mr. Froomkin?

MR. FROOMKIN: No My Lord.

THE COURT: I have listened to the evidence and to the remarks of counsel here today.

In reaching a conclusion as to what sentence to hand down in respect to each accused and each offence, I am aware that I must keep in mind the gravity of each offence as it is indicated by the penalty, the maximum penalty shown in the statute, and the Criminal Code. I must bear in mind the character of the act, of each act, which forms the basis of the charge. I must consider the deterrent effect, and I must take into consideration the reformation factor. I must also take into consideration extenuating circumstances, such as perhaps here, as pointed out by Defence counsel the fact of re-payment after the event.

This is the type of case however where although my general sympathies are well known to first offenders, to give them another chance in the sense of a suspended sentence, and my sympathies are well known I think where a first offender comes before me, who has perhaps been a poor person and has stolen something. I think most people can feel a certain sympathy for that type of thing.

Unfortunately, in this case I don't think the word unfortunately is the right phrase, but in this case however, there is an element that I think

I have to pay a great deal of attention to, and that is the deterrent effect both in respect to the two accused and in respect to others who may be encouraged to try to make crime pay. This is not a group of one or two people who are hard up, and are desparate. This was, as I view it, a series of deliberate efforts which could have resulted in, and might have resulted in ordinary working people being cheated out of the sweat of their labours by deceit or false pretences. This is the very type of case I think where the deterrent factor is more important, and must be given a higher accent then some of the other factors, not that I am not taking the other factors into consideration. I think it is - I don't use the word heinous as the Crown counsel used - but I don't think that the Parliament of Canada considers that people should be permitted by false documents and false representations to take anything from the general public, or take securities from the general public as was done here. Not only must the public, the ordinary John Doe be protected, particularly in the Northwest Territories where there are vast resources to be developed, and private enterprise will be expected to develop some of those resources by presumably calls on people to invest in shares, and the public must be protected as much as possible.

Taking all those things into consideration

I am now prepared to sentence each accused.

Mr. Robert William Bennett, would you stand up. On count number 1 I sentence you to one year. On count number 2 I sentence you to three years to be served in the penitentiary at Prince Albert, or such other institution as they may see fit to send you. I hope they won't place you in Prince Albert. I made a personal check of that place, and I am not happy with it. On count 3, three years. On count 6, six months, all

Mr. Clifford Bennett, would you stand up. On count 1, one year. On count number 2, three years. On count number 3, three years. On count number 4, five years. On count number 5 one year. On count number six, six months.

On counts 2,3,4, and I suppose the effect is that the others will also be served in the Prince Albert Penetentiary, or such other institution as you may be sent to. All sentences concurrent. Sit down.

(THE TRIAL TERMINATED)

concurrent.