TC CR 98 026

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:



HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

and -

LEE SHANE ELIAS

Transcript of Oral Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Chief Judge R.M. Halifax, sitting at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on Tuesday, January 13, A.D. 1998.

## APPEARANCES:

Ms. S. Aitken:

On behalf of the Crown

Ms. A. Davies:

On behalf of the Defence

(Charge under Section 145(1)(b) of the Criminal Code)

Filed Jan 19/98

THE COURT: Mr. Elias, you have got quite a 1 criminal record, starting in 1984, as a young 2 offender. Since 1990, in the last seven years, basically since you turned an adult, you have got eight convictions for failing to comply, with conditions of 5 orders, either release orders or probation orders, and 7 there are other property offences and drinking-driving 8 The last offence, you were sentenced on the 17th of April, 1997, to 21 months and prohibited from operating a motor vehicle for five years for an offence 10 of impaired driving causing bodily harm, and a further 11 two months consecutive for failing to comply with the 12 conditions of release; a total of 23 months. It just 13 kept you under the two years for pen time. Within four 14 months, you are released on temporary absences by the 15 16 Correctional authorities after basically one-sixth of 17 the sentence for an offence that the Parliament of this country has treated very seriously and increased the 18 penalties over the last 15 years and our society has 19 20 taken very seriously. And you have got eight 21 convictions for not paying attention to court orders. 22 Somebody at Corrections has to really start 23

Somebody at Corrections has to really start thinking about what they are doing here. The Court gave a disposition April of 1997 that assuming in the sentencing process is a fit and proper sentence. We then have, by administrative procedures, that sentence cut to one-sixth for somebody who obviously has a track

24

25

26

27

record for being a risk to breach it, and that's exactly what happens.

Seems to me people responsible for the administration of justice in this country cannot say on the one side we have to take a tougher position with people that are drinking and driving and causing bodily harm and death and then, on the other hand, without public scrutiny, turning around and releasing people earlier. One-sixth of the sentence. In the amount that he served between his jail term and the bush camp, he is only now eligible even to apply for parole. It seems to me that somebody has got to stop and think about what is going on here.

This is the process because there is lack of resources available for incarcerating people. But it seems to me you cannot have it both ways. You cannot on the one hand be asking and telling the public that you are going to deal with these matters in a harsh manner and then, on the other side of your mouth, start releasing people out into the community without the public being aware of it and no public accountability.

Obviously the government has a responsibility to carry out the sentences of the Court. There is obviously some question whether that is even being done under these kinds of processes. It is interesting that some bureaucrat can, in effect, be a Court of Appeal and change the sentence to this degree without any

public responsibility or accountability. I think it is important for the Court to make a statement about that particularly because of the type of offence that is involved here.

Now, of course Mr. Elias should not have to pay the price for that, of course, in my view. If Corrections Services is going to carry out these kinds of policies, I do not expect Mr. Elias, like anybody else, to not take advantage of them.

It seems to me there should be some comment made by the Court when we are talking about impaired driving causing bodily harm offences here. With the public statements made by senior law officers in this country and, basically, our society with regard to this type of offence, that that seems to be ignored to a large degree when I see only a sixth of a sentence being served in the institution.

You knew full well, Mr. Elias, that you were told that you would have to report back. You chose to take off and not do what is required of you under your release, and, obviously, at least you're going to be serving the balance of the sentence as provided for by law, I assume, without any early or any other temporary absence because the question is you can't be trusted. Of course, under the present provisions of the law, that means you have got to serve two-thirds of your sentence. Unbeknown to most people, regardless of what

the Court says, it is only two-thirds of the sentence 1 that is served in the institution anyway. It should be 2 made very clear that this is a matter done through 3 Corrections and has nothing to do with the courts. 4 In my view, when you are given an opportunity like 5 this, Mr. Elias, you have to recognize the break you are getting, particularly with your track record and all the convictions you have got. I think, also, there is a question of some general deterrence here. If all inmates think they can just breach the terms of these 10 release programs without any repercussions, obviously 11 the programs are going to be of little or no success. 12 In my view, there has to be some general deterrence so 13 that not only you, Mr. Elias, recognize that this kind 14 15 of behaviour will have consequences, but any of your other fellow roommates will realize as well. 16 Under the circumstances, I sentence you to three 17 18 months imprisonment to be served consecutively. 19 of crimes surcharge in the course will be waived in the 20 circumstance. Obviously Mr. Elias has not been 21 employed for sometime. 22 So you get three months added on, Mr. Elias, for 23 what happened. That will be all. 24 25 Certified pursuant to Practice Direction #20 dated December 28, 1987 26 27 Jane Romanowich Court Reporter