## IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## IN THE MATTER OF

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

VS

WILBERT FRANCIS COOK



Transcript of the Oral Sentencing Delivered by His Honour Judge B. A. Bruser, sitting at Fort Good Hope in the Northwest Territories, on Thursday May 3rd, A.D., 1990

## APPEARANCES:

MISS MARY HUMPHRIES Counsel for the Crown
MR. LEIGH GOWER Counsel for the Defence

271 CC; 271 CC;

147.1

THE COURT:

Wilbert Francis Cook plead guilty to a charge in which the Crown proceeded by Indictment, that, on or about between the first day of October 1988 and the first day of May 1989, at or near the settlement of Fort Good Hope in the Northwest Territories he did commit a sexual assault on S.T. He plead originally not guilty and then today the plea was changed to guilty. Today being the date set for trial.

There has been a ban on any publication on any information that could reveal the identity of S.T.

The charge relates to several incidents which took place in Fort Good Hope in Winter of 1989. In 1988-1989 the complainant was 12 years old at that time. The accused was then 23 years of age. I will refer to the circumstances of what occurred later in these reasons.

The accused was a life long resident of Fort Good Hope, was living in a common-law relationship during the time when he committed the offence. That relationship has now ended and there are young children of the relationship. Mr. Cook has told the court that he helps to support the family, which is no longer a unit, and that two of the children are dependant upon him for support.

In his careful and able submissions Mr. Gower, on behalf of Mr. Cook, argued that a discharge or a suspended sentence should result today. The Crown is opposed to discharge. I will deal with the discharge part of the Defence submissions at the outset.

In spite of the numerous good points in your favour, Mr. Cook, I am of the view that given your prior convictions for assault, and further, that in the circumstances of this offence as discharge, whether it be absolute or conditional would not be in the public interest. You must be dealt with more severely than through the imposition of a discharge which in effect the conviction would not be registered. In other words reason for not granting a discharge would be to do so would in the circumstances before me, fail to act as a sufficient deterrent to other people who might be enhanced to commit the serious crime of sexual assault.

Let me say this about sexual assault. Every sexual assault is a serious crime. Some sexual assaults are more serious than in the commission than others but every sexual assault is treated seriously by the court. I also believe it would not be in the best interests of yourself, despite what you have told the court personally and through your lawyer, to grant either form of discharge. The reason for this is so that you come before the court with criminal convictions for assault. Assault is a very closely related offence to sexual assault, in that assault is a crime against the person, as is sexual assault. Failing to enter a conviction by you, by granting a discharge would in my view, do little to deter you from committing future offences or rehabilitate you. There will be no discharge from this court.

Next, I turn to the question of whether or not it would

be appropriate to suspend the passing of sentence. In answering this question I have considered everything your lawyer and the Crown Prosecutor and yourself have told me today. I have also reviewed, during the numerous breaks that we have had, a good number of case authorities dealing with sexual assault.

It is particularly noteworthy that the fact of your being charged and coming before the court has embarassed you very much. I take that into account in your favour. You also have a genuine sense of guilt over the shame that you have brought upon your family, including your children. And I have been told, and accept, that your life has gone downhill since being charged. I believe that it has been a long slide. I say that because you have performed so much good for the community. Any community where you have been you have performed a good amount of assistance for that community.

For someone to come down hill from that sort of penacle is upsetting. It is upsetting to you and I can tell you it is distressing to the court. I conclude that a strong measure of compassion and mercy is necessary in dealing with you today. I have to weigh against all of the good things that have been said and I have not reviewed all of them. Some of the negative factors here is what I should the record is one of those. I have referred to it already. The record counts against you more than it would if it were for property offences. I said

something about that earlier.

While the record is about three years old I cannot overlook that the convictions were about one and a half years old at the time you committed the sexual assault. They were not almost three years old at that time.

Secondly, on the negative side there is a noticeable difference between your age and that of S.T. I reject the argument put forward by your lawyer, Mr. Cook, that this is not the case of an adult act being in a predatory manner toward a young girl. I do not accept that. Here is why: You took advantage of what you believed to be her early maturity. You preyed upon that. You did that in a

manner. You tried on a number of occasions to seduce her for sexual purposes to do that to satisfy your sexual needs. Every young female has the absolute right in our country to mature at her own pace without this sort of conduct shown towards her.

Your lawyer has said that she allowed you to make the advances in the sense that she did not repel you forcefully enough. And that she maybe should have done more. Those are the submissions made by your lawyer.

I have to assume that your lawyer made those remarks based upon your instructions. Those remarks tell me that you are not prepared to accept complete responsibility for what you did.

In my view S.T.is not in any way to blame, not in the slightest. Yet, despite her clear message to you on the

first occasion that she was not interested, you persisted, you kept after her. Those are negative factors I am taking into account. This is not a case of an isolated, spontaneous, minor act which might otherwise justify a suspended sentence.

I will now review some of the material facts.

In the first incident in February of 1989 'S' was babysitting. You tried to kiss her, but she would not let you do so. The next incident she was lying on the couch, you were lying on the floor and you touched her arm, her hair, her legs and her stomach. You apparently tried to touch her breasts and her vagina, but she pushed you away and you did not persist in that. The events on that date continued for the period of time.

On the third occasion about two days later, you kissed her on the mouth, after asking her to babysit in your home. She pushed you away and said, "don't" and you did stop. The stopping is to your credit on each occasion.

On the fourth occasion she was babsitting again, you put your hands around her neck, you blew in her ear, you asked her to lie down on the bed. She eventually did, and as I understand it you asked her to lie on top of you, as well as asked her to take off her snow pants, which she did not do. An the end of all that you told her not to tell anyone. During that event I can not speculate what was going through her mind, and I won't do so, but I do not accept that she wanted to do these things with you.

I outlined the circumstances of the incidents in detail. I did, because I want to make it clear that the incidents progressed from minor to more serious as time went on. I point to the acts of the person bent upon seducing a much younger person of the opposite sex.

Mr. Cook, the circumstances are serious. I already told you that the crime is a serious one. Fortunately at no time did you threaten S.T., nor at any time did you physically hurt her.

I do not propose to review the law. None has been submitted by either counsel. I am, however, very familiar with the sentencing decisions at all levels of court in the Northwest Territories regarding sexual assaults.

I assure you, Mr. Cook, that I am also very familiar with the sentencing of these types of cases in the South.

Given all the circumstances I am of the belief that suspending the passing of sentence would not be appropriate and I am not prepared to do so. Neither do I feel that a fine would be a proper way to deal wit it. A fine or a suspended sentence would not adequately address a very important element of public protection being the main purpose of the criminal law in our country. Public protection includes deterrence to you, deterrence to other people, your rehabilitation, and it also includes public revulsion and public condemnation for what you did.

I am of the firm belief that this case cries for

imprisonment. You are going to have to find someone else to care for your boy or boys. The period of imprisonment will not be terribly long in the sense that the maximum penablty for this type of offence is ten years imprisonment. Your period of imprisonment will not come anywhere close to that. I believe that a period of imprisonment in the range of 6 or 7 months might have been appropriate but for the many good qualities you have had throughout your life. You will not not be receiving that period of time.

The sentence of this court, taking into account everything I have said, and having considered what your lawyers said, and what the Crown has put forward, is four month imprisonment. There will be no victim of crime surcharge.

(CONCLUDED)

Certified Covied Peggy Leytland