IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- **v** -

MARTY BOUVIER

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence Delivered by The Honourable Justice L.A. Charbonneau, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on July 10, 2017.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. B. Green: Counsel for the Crown

Ms. A. Seaman: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 271 of the Criminal Code)

No information shall be published in any document or broadcast or transmitted in any way which could identify the victim or a witness in these proceedings pursuant to s. 486.4 of the Criminal Code of Canada

This transcript has been altered to protect the identity of the victim /young person pursuant to the direction of the presiding Judge

THE COURT: Marty Bouvier has pleaded guilty to a charge of sexual assault, and it is now my responsibility to impose a sentence on him for that crime. Earlier today, I heard the submissions of counsel, and they have jointly submitted that a sentence of four years imprisonment should be imposed for this offence.

For any given crime, there is never just one fit sentence. There is always a range. The law about how a sentencing judge should approach sentencing when a joint submission is presented is very clear. Joint submissions are to be given very careful consideration and should never be departed from lightly. For the reasons that follow, I agree that what is being proposed here by counsel is appropriate under all the circumstances. But I do want to make it clear, in particular to Mr. Bouvier, that he could have faced a more significant sentence for this crime. Four years is a significant jail term, but he could have been facing an even more significant jail term.

I want to refer briefly to the circumstances of the offence to put my other comments in context.

At the time of these events, J.C. was 15 years old, and Mr. Bouvier was 20. On the

1

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

evening this happened, January 1st, 2016, she ran into him, and he invited her to a party. They went there, and they both consumed alcohol. At one point, he invited her to come for a walk with him. They walked to an abandoned house and went inside that house at his invitation. Once inside, he pushed her on a mattress on the floor. She told him to stop. He told her to remove her pants, and she did so. He kissed her. Again, she told him to stop. But he did not stop. He had sexual intercourse with her.

Later that evening, the RCMP received a complaint about a potential sexual assault and began an investigation. They saw J. at the health centre shortly after midnight on January the 2nd. She was with her mother. J. was shaking, and she was crying. She was very upset.

Based on the information that the police officer received from J., he went to the abandoned house and seized items. Those were later submitted for DNA analysis, and the results from that analysis were that material found on a condom and on a blanket at the house matched Mr. Bouvier's DNA. The test results, however, only became available after the preliminary hearing had already proceeded.

Mr. Bouvier has a criminal record.

2.4

Exhibit 2 includes transcripts of the sentencing decisions for three of his convictions. Those must be referred to because they show a very disturbing trend.

The first is a sexual assault conviction that Mr. Bouvier received in the Youth Criminal Justice Court on July 10th, 2015. That offence involved an act of forced intercourse with a 12-year-old. On that charge, but for his remand time, he would have been sentenced to a custody and supervision order of 135 days. Once credit was given for the remand time, that sentence was reduced to a custody and supervision order of three days, followed by probation for one year.

On that same date, July 10th, 2015,

Mr. Bouvier was also sentenced on an assault charge in adult court. That assault was committed after he had been convicted of the sexual assault charge, but before sentencing. So he was still on process for the sexual assault charge when he committed the assault. The facts of that assault were that he attempted to drag a 12-year-old to a wooded area. By the time he committed that offence, he was 19. He received a jail term of four months followed by two years probation. One of the conditions of that order was that for the first year, he was not to have

2.4

any contact with a person under 16 outside of his immediate family unless he was in the presence of another sober adult person. He was also required to take counselling and treatment to address his alcohol abuse issues and with respect to sexual behaviour, and he was prohibited from consuming alcohol or other intoxicants.

The third sentencing that I have a transcript for relates to a conviction for a breach of probation. That was a breach of the probation order that arose from the sentencing on the assault charge. That offence was committed in November 2015, about four months after that sentencing. The condition that was breached was the condition that Mr. Bouvier not have contact with a person under 16.

The facts of that offence are very, very disturbing. Mr. Bouvier confronted an 11-year-old at a restaurant. He called her "sexy." He tried to convince her that he was only 13. He told her that she "walked sexy." This made the child afraid. She started to cry, and she went to hide in the bathroom. Mr. Bouvier was intoxicated on that occasion. So on that day, he breached more than one condition of the probation order that he was on.

The sentence imposed for that offence was

2.4

120 days, deemed served because of the remand time. The sentencing judge was the same as the judge who had sentenced him on the July 2015 court appearance. That judge placed Mr. Bouvier on probation for three years, with a condition, this time, that he not have any unsupervised contact with anyone under 16 years. That sentence was imposed in July 2016, so it was actually imposed after the offence that I am sentencing him for today was committed.

Mr. Bouvier is not to be punished again for those offences, and I am very mindful of that. But the fact is that the circumstances of these three prior convictions raise grave concerns. They show predatory behaviour on Mr. Bouvier's part as far as young girls are concerned. The sentences that were imposed and the comments that were made by the Territorial Court judge at those sentencings reflect an understandable concern on the judge's part about his behaviour. The sentences show an attempt to use various sentencing tools to limit his opportunity to commit similar crimes again.

Things that were said at the earlier of these sentencings reflect a very clear recognition that Mr. Bouvier needed treatment to address both his issues with alcohol and other

2.4

underlying issues that have led to his conduct.

Unfortunately, Mr. Bouvier did not address his
issues. And now he has to be sentenced again for
a very serious offence.

Mr. Bouvier's counsel has told me about his personal circumstances, including the fact that he himself was sexually abused as a child.

Unfortunately, we often see this cycle repeated. Something has to happen to break that cycle.

Mr. Bouvier, I think, needs help, professional help. Alcohol alone cannot explain his behaviour. Right now, he is a danger to young girls and women, and if he does not address his issues, he will be back before the Court.

Even at a young age, as of today, his criminal record is such that I would expect the Crown, if Mr. Bouvier commits similar crimes in the future, is going to have to take a serious look at the options under the Criminal Code to have him dealt with either as a dangerous offender or a long-term offender. So this is where it has to stop. By this, I mean today, for the safety of the members of his community but also for his own sake; otherwise, Mr. Bouvier will have no future.

The harm that the sexual abuse of children causes is now well documented and well known.

2.4

The Alberta Court of Appeal talked about those things many, many years ago in R. v. S.W.B., 1992 AJ No. 601. As I have said several times in other cases, that decision is now 25 years old, but the comments made in it are as true now as they were then. In fact, perhaps we know even more now about the impact that these crimes have. Mr. Bouvier knows, since it happened to him, although perhaps he is still too young to have any real insight into this.

The two Victim Impact Statements filed this case speak eloquently about this impact. Sadly, we often read these types of reports from victims. Just like J., victims of sexual assault lose trust in others, isolate themselves, often are suicidal, and engage in self-destructive behaviour. It takes a long time to recover from this kind of trauma, and it takes a lot of Thankfully, it sounds as though J. has support. that support from her mother and the rest of her family. But it is terribly sad and unfair after having been victimized in this way by Mr. Bouvier, she has felt, in a sense, further victimized by having people talk to her about this and about her in a way that may not have been as supportive as we would like to see. Ιt is unfair that she feels that, somehow, this

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

her fault. It was not her fault. Let there be no mistake about that. The one who was responsible for what happened here is

It takes immense courage to disclose a sexual assault in a small community, immense courage. The Court hopes that J. and her family will receive support from the community.

Communities need to rally behind victims of these crimes and support them. They also need to help offenders understand the seriousness of their conduct and support them through rehabilitation and to lead healthier lives and have healthier relationships with their fellow community members.

There is no doubt that this offence falls within the parameters of a major sexual assault. The main mitigating factor is the guilty plea, as counsel have noted. It is not an early guilty plea, far from it, but I do take into account that the preliminary hearing took place before the DNA results were known to Mr. Bouvier and his counsel. I also take into account what the Crown has said about how difficult the preliminary hearing testimony was for J. In a sense, it cuts both ways because that ties in with the fact that there was a preliminary hearing, and she had to

2.4

testify. But it also speaks volumes as to what she was spared in not having to testify again, before a jury, about these events.

I adopt what I said in R. v. Holman, 2014

NWTSC 13, about the value of a guilty plea. It spares the victims from having to testify. It provides certainty of outcome. It hopefully can end the uncertainty about what really happened within the community, which is especially important in a small community. It tells the world in clear terms what happened and who was at fault. Ideally, it would help with healing and eventual closure, and, hopefully, that can be the case here.

Mr. Bouvier has apologized today for what he has done. He has apologized to the victim and her family. He has apologized to his own family for what he has put them through, which I am sure must have been very difficult over the past few years.

Hopefully, Mr. Bouvier will now take the next step, because apologizing is only one step.

The next step goes beyond the words of an apology. He has heard it said in Court several times already now that his conduct is criminal and disturbing. This conduct suggests that he needs to address some issues within himself, and,

2.4

as I have already said, it is crucial that he do that; otherwise, he will be back before the Court and will spend longer and longer periods of time in jail, and no one wants that to happen. He has the support of his parents, and that makes him a lot luckier than many of the people I have had to sentence over the years. I recognize the importance of their support.

Given the criminal record and the disturbing particulars of some of the convictions, the sentence imposed for this major sexual assault could have been more significant than what is being jointly suggested here, and it certainly would have been much longer if Mr. Bouvier had been convicted after trial. But the sentence proposed, taking into account all of the factors, is not unreasonable, in particular given the mitigating effect of the guilty plea and the Gladue and Ipeelee factors that I heard about during submissions and that I have taken into consideration.

The Crown has asked for a number of ancillary orders, and those were not opposed by defence.

There will be an order under the SOIRA legislation , the Sexual Offenders Information Registration Act, for a period of 20 years.

2.4

There will be the firearms prohibition, a lifetime prohibition because Mr. Bouvier has already received such a prohibition on one of his earlier convictions.

It was not addressed during submissions, but I do not believe I have any choice but to also impose the victim of crimes surcharge pursuant to the *Criminal Code*. The time to pay and default time are provided by statute.

I will issue an order -- and I would like the notes to reflect this, Madam Clerk -- that any exhibits in police custody are to be returned to their rightful owners, if that is appropriate, or destroyed at the expiration of the appeal period. The exhibits that were filed as part of this sentencing hearing are to be retained on the court file.

Would you stand up, please, Mr. Bouvier. I will follow the joint submission. Had it not been for the time you have spent on remand, I would have imposed a sentence of four years. For the 557 days that you have already spent in custody, I am going to give you the maximum credit that I am entitled to give you under the law, which adds up to 715 days. That will leave 746 days to be served. In simple terms, that means two years and 16 days left to be served.

2.4

1 Do you understand? Yes?

2 THE ACCUSED: Yeah.

3 THE COURT: You can sit down.

The last issue I have to address is that I was urged by Mr. Bouvier's counsel to make a recommendation that he be permitted to serve his 6 7 sentence in a northern institution. That request 8 is often made of me, and more often than not, I 9 agree to do so, recognizing that support from 10 loved ones and culturally relevant programs 11 the custodial setting can be very important to 12 person's rehabilitation. Although the Court's 13 recommendations are not always followed, because 14 placement is ultimately in the discretion of the 15 correctional authorities, I usually have no 16 difficulty in at least making the recommendation. 17 I have decided, in this case, not to make that 18 recommendation. I am not making a recommendation either way. This, of course, does not mean that 19 20 the authorities will necessarily decide not 21 keep Mr. Bouvier in a northern institution, 22 because I am sure they will take into 23 consideration his age, his culture, and the 2.4 family support he has in the NWT. The fact that 25 I am not endorsing the warrant of committal is not determinative of theissue. 26

2.7

The reason I am not going to make the

1 endorsement in this case is that I think that Mr. Bouvier needs more than family support 3 take the next steps he needs to take if he does not want to be back before the Court again. 4 said already, the facts from his earlier offences as well as the facts on this one are 6 7 disturbing. One does not need to be 8 psychologist or a psychiatrist or a criminologist 9 to see the trend in these offences and to 10 that Mr. Bouvier's conduct has targeted a 11 This is very worrisome. group of victims. 12 not know how these issues can be addressed or 13 where, but I do think that in shaping the plan 14 for Mr. Bouvier's sentence, the correctional 15 authorities need to pay close attention to that 16 aspect of matters and make decisions on placement 17 based upon where Mr. Bouvier can get the best and 18 the most effective help to address his problem. 19 That said, his request to remain in the north is 20 part of the record of this sentencing hearing. I 21 am certain that as placement is examined, he will 22 have an opportunity to reiterate that request, 23 and perhaps his counsel can assist him in making 2.4 sure that the authorities are well aware that 25 would prefer to serve his sentence here and why, 26 and I am sure that they will take that 2.7 account. But I do think that access to programs

- 1 geared to reducing his risk of re-offence need to
- 2 be the priority, as opposed to only dealing with
- 3 the alcohol issue, for instance.
- 4 Have I overlooked anything, Mr. Green?
- 5 MR. GREEN: I may have missed it, but I
- don't know if Your Honour mentioned a DNA order.
- 7 THE COURT: I did miss it. Thank you for
- 8 reminding me. There will be a DNA order, as this
- 9 is a primary designated offence.
- 10 Anything further from defence?
- 11 MS. SEAMAN: Just the time to pay on the
- 12 victim crime surcharge , Your Honour.
- 13 THE COURT: I thought that was statutorily
- 14 provided.
- 15 Is it, Madam Clerk?
- 16 THE COURT CLERK: I believe it's 60 days from
- 17 release.
- 18 THE COURT: I am sorry?
- 19 THE COURT CLERK: I believe it's 60 days from
- release.
- 21 THE COURT: I think it is statutory now,
- Ms. Seaman. I --
- Can you help, Mr. Green? I seem to -- I
- 24 never seem to -- I do not seem to recall ever
- 25 stipulating a time to pay.
- 26 MR. GREEN: I -- yes, I agree it's
- statutory , 60 days from release.

1	THE	COURT:	So within 60 days from
2		release.	
3	MS.	SEAMAN:	Thank you, Your Honour.
4	THE	COURT:	As is the and the default
5		time is statutory a	as well.
6	MS.	SEAMAN:	Thank you.
7	THE	COURT:	Before we close court, I do
8		want to commend you	a, counsel, for having resolved
9		this matter. I kn	ow it must not have been easy.
10		And I would suggest	t, if it is possible,
11		Mr. Green, that you	ı or another member of your
12		office ensure that	what Mr. Bouvier said this
13		morning by way of a	n apology is actually conveyed
14		to J.	
15	MR.	GREEN:	I will undertake to dothat,
16		Your Honour.	
17	MS.	SEAMAN:	Thank you, Your Honour.
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

Τ	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT
2	
3	I, the undersigned , hereby certify that the
4	foregoing pages are a complete and accurate
5	transcript of the proceedings taken down by me in
6	shorthand and transcribed from my shorthand notes
7	to the best of my skill and ability.
8	Dated at the City of Edmonton, Province of
9	Alberta, this 21st day of July, 2017.
10	
11	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723
12	of the Rules of Court
13	
14	
15	Joanne Lawrence
16	Court Reporter
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	