ORIGINAL

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

V.S

JAMES EKPAKOHAK

Transcript of the Oral Sentencing Delivered by His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Cambridge Bay in the Northwest Territories, on Wednesday, January 13, A.D., 1988.

APPEARANCES:

IN THE MATTER OF:

MS. S. AITKEN:

MS. V. SCHULER:

Counsel for

Counsel for the Defence

(Charge Under Section 246.1 of the Criminal Code.)

3

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

Once again the court, and in a larger context THE COURT: the community, is faced with the fruit of drunkeness. This time it is a 16 year old girl who, on the floor of the bathroom, is preyed upon. I think that is the only word that is really accurate. This accused finds a woman apparently passed out on the floor and helps himself sexually as quickly as he can. His actions apparently precipitate a further act of intercourse by another individual. the ultimate of callousness, the bathroom door opens, and one would presume the 16 year old is there naked on the floor, and this accused figuratively tips his hat and says you are next. I don't mean to say that he said those words, but I agree with the submissions of Crown that his action was the first of the sexual encounters, and his actions and withdrawal in the presence of the second was virtually an invitation for the second individual to become This is on a 16 year old girl. Whether she involved. was drunk or sober, her age is an aggravating factor. Even accepting that she was drunk, and it was a "party", surely to goodness a woman can go to a party and not have to worry about having someone forcibly having intercourse with her if she happens to pass out or fall asleep.

This kind of predatory sex is not uncommon. I mentioned a moment ago in dealing with Akhok, the same thing happend in Coppermine and in Cambridge The accused, of course, states Bay on previous occasions. through the presentence report that this never would have

happened if he was sober. Well, that is a familiar refrain.

Unfortunately this accused is an alcoholic. He has been involved, as a result of his problems with alcohol, with criminal offences since 1978. He has served time in advance of these proceedings today as a result of an inability to comply with an undertaking or a recognizance, and clearly the abuse this young girl suffered at his hands is related to his alcoholism and his inability to control himself.

As I stated before, this court can't do anything about James Ekpakohak's alcoholism. He is the only one who can resolve that. He has been, according to the presentence report, put on the alcohol detox programs on three separate occasions, but to no effect. Until he finds the motivation within himself to do something about his alcohol problem, there is very little reason to expect a change in behavior. His antisocial behavior has been ongoing now for ten years.

I am concerned as well with his statement in the presentence report: He knows it was wrong to do, but at the time of the offence he didn't think of what he was doing. When asked if this would happen again in the future, he replied that he didn't know if it would happen again if he was drinking. Really, I suppose in a nutshell that is the problem the court has to face. The community must be protected. Women must be protected. It must be stated in no uncertain terms in this community of Cambridge Bay

HWT 5349/0687

that sexual abuse of women will not be tolerated. It is not acceptable. It is a criminal offence.

In terms of the actual sentence itself, in <u>Sandercock</u> it is stated clearly by the Court of Appeal that the starting point for major sexual offences is three years in a federal penitentiary and that is for someone of previous good character. I don't think that James Ekpakohak has demonstrated a past of good behavior. He has floated in and out of the courts and been involved heavily in the alcohol subculture for the past many years.

In this particular case the age of the victim, notwithstanding that she was at a party -so called - is an aggravating factor. For a sixteen year old to undergo this, whether or not she has liberal attitudes towards sex, is degrading. It is degrading to treat someone, anyone like this.

I take into account what has been said on his behalf.

I think from this court's perspective the biggest mitigating factor that has to be given the most weight is the fact that he pleaded guilty at virtually the first instance. As I understand the record, the first appearance was December 3rd. The Crown elected to proceed by way of indictment.

This accused elected trial by Territorial Court on December 15, 1987, and he is being sentenced today. So I take that in significant mitigation.

In trying to balance the aggravating factors and the few mitigating factors, in my view a sentence of three years

1		
2)	
•		
4		
5		
6	•	
Ų		
7		
8		
g		
1	0	
1	1	
	ı	
- I	2	
	3	
4	4	
	4	
	5	
	5	
1	6	
	7	
1	7	
	_	
, I	8	
1	9	
1	9	
1		
2		
2		
2	0	
1 2	0	
1 2 2	0	
1 2 2	0	
2	0	
1 2 2	0	
11 2 2 2 2 2	0	
2 2 2	0	
11 2 2 2 2 2	0	
1 2 2 2 2	0	
1 2 2 2	0	
1 2 2 2	0 1 2 3	
1 2 2 2 2	0 1 2 3	
1 2 2 2 2 2	0 1 2 3	
1 2 2 2	0 1 2 3	
1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	0 2 3 4	
1 2 2 2 2	0 2 3 4	
1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	0 11 2 3 4	
1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	0 2 3 4	

in a federal penitentiary reflects an acequate balance.

(AT WHICH TIME THESE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED.)

Certified a correct transcript

Laurie Ann Young

Court Reporter

27