IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

NORMAN VOISEY

Transcript of Reasons for Sentencing and Sentencing delivered by His Honour, Judge R. M. Bourassa sitting at Whale Cove in the Northwest Territories on Wednesday, May 18th, A.D., 1988.

## **APPEARANCES:**

MS. B. KOTHE:

MS. L. AUSTIN:

Counsel for

Counsel



(CHARGES UNDER SECTION 169 AND SECTION 133 (3) OF THE CRIMINAL CODE)

NW7 5349/0687

THE COURT:

1

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Norman Voisey has pleaded guilty to two criminal offences; one offence which I will call 'indecent exposure' and another offence of failing to comply or obey the promise that he made to the Court to stay away from a little nine year old girl.

Generally speaking I don't think anyone would view these offences as being terribly serious in isolation. Both of them are punishable by a maximum of a \$2,000 fine or six months in jail or both, however, this is not a usual context, it's a very difficult and troublesome one.

Norman Voisey was before the Court in February of this year for a Preliminary Inquiry on a charge of sexual assault on the same nine year old girl. He was ordered to stand trial for that very serious offence which can result in imprisonment of up to 10 years. He was released on what's called an undertaking which is just another word for a promise. He was let out of jail in return for promises that he made, one of those that he would not have anything to do with the same little girl.

He was found standing on his porch inviting the same little girl to come over and not only did he break his promise to the Court, which is a criminal offence, but by dropping his pants and exposing himself and inviting the girl over, he committed a further criminal offence. What is worrisome to the Court is that it may very well be that Mr. Voisey might have to wait as long as a year before he has his trial in Supreme Court and that little girl is entitled to protection.

27

WW7 5340/0687

If the impact of the Court action and police action in February did nothing to modify Mr. Voisey's conduct, I believe that I have solid grounds for being concerned about him and that little girl throughout this summer and fall.

Now, it's argued on his behalf that there may be a medical condition here which may have contributed or somehow have been involved in this act. It may very well be that a psychiatric assessment would be appropriate and useful for the ultimate disposition of the other charge but absent expert or professional opinion before me today, I can't do anything with that submission. I have to assume, and I do assume, that Mr. Voisey knows right from wrong, good from bad. No one has to read the criminal code to understand that dropping ones pants in front of a nine year old girl is not acceptable.

In one way one could treat the indecent exposure in an off-hand manner in that obviously it didn't bother the little girl, at least she kept going, and it just exposes Mr. Voisey to the ridicule of the community. The only thing that act in itself does is bring shame on Mr. Voisey and his whole family, however, because of the other matter that is pending in Court, and the fact that this was the same little girl, such a breach, apart from any other reasons, a nominal sentence is totally out of the question.

I take into account he has pleaded guilty and that is important. It saved the nine year old girl from having to come to Court and go through the whole ordeal again. I take into account as well that Mr. Voisey has no criminal record which

obviously shows that he knows right from wrong and without question as a matter of law, first offenders, if possible, ought not to be sent to jail.

In aggravation, what makes these offences worse, are the facts that first of all the victim is a nine year old little girl, a child. Children are entitled to look to adults for guidance and to look to adults to assist them in deciding what is right and what is wrong. Mr. Voisey standing on his porch is far removed from that ideal.

Secondly, as I have already indicated, this little girl, the victim of this offence, is the alleged victim of another earlier sexual assault. In this tiny community how is she to escape him? Is she supposed to hide in her house in order to stay away from Mr. Voisey? None of this is her doing, none of this is her fault. If anyone should be kept away, it's Norman Voisey.

I think it's important that community peace be reestablished and everyone become reconciled but at the same time, I want Norman Voisey to understand without a shadow of a doubt that this conduct is totally unacceptable and that he is to leave that little girl alone -- and any other little girl. In light of all the circumstances, particularly the fact that this occurred under the cloud of another sexual assault charge, I am of the view that a jail sentence must be imposed.

I accept that it should be reasonably short and it must reflect the principles that I think I have already referred to raised in argument by Crown and Defence. Perhaps stepping out

of my role for a moment, I would urge Counsel to see that a psychiatric assessment is made available to this accused. It may be of assistance to him in the future. It may spare this little girl or some other little girl further problems but I have to make a decision on what is before me.

Mr. Voisey, you are going to jail for what you did. and if you are released from jail, you leave little girls and boys alone. Finally, Mr. Voisey, when you make promises to the Court, you remember, they have to be obeyed.

With respect to the Section 169 offence, there will be a term of imprisonment of one month and that is for exposing himself to the little girl; for failing to obey the promise that he made to the Court, his undertaking, firstly I am going to cancel the undertaking and secondly impose a term of imprisonment of one month consecutive.

There will obviously have to be another bail hearing when he has served his time on the original offence. Is that everything?

MS. KOTHE:

There is the other information under Section 169 which is a duplicate and I would ask that be marked

THE COURT:

Withdrawn.

There is no evidence offered and I will

mark it dismissed.

MS. KOTHE:

And I believe that would be also the most appropriate means to deal with the Section 307 offence,

Your Honour.

THE COURT:

Thank you.

HW7 5349/0687

25

26

	ı
	ı
4	I
1	ĺ
	l
•	ı
	l
	Ì
3	I
	l
А	Ì
	ı
	ı
5	l
	ı
	ŀ
6	ĺ
	l
7	ı
	ı
	l
8	l
	l
	ı
y	ı
	l
10	l
	l
	ı
11	
12	
13	
14	
14	
14	
14	
14 15	
14 15	
14 15	
14 15 16 17	
14 15 16 17	
14 15 16 17	
14 15 16 17 18	
14 15 16 17 18 18	
14 15 16 17 18 18	
14 15 16 17 18 18	
14 15 16 17 18 19	
14 15 16 17 18 19	
14 15 16 17 18 19	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	

27

NWT 8349/0687

MS. KOTHE:

THE COURT:

MS. KOTHE:

Thank you.

Thank you, Counsel.

Thank you, Your Honour.

(AT WHICH TIME THIS PROCEEDING WAS CONCLUDED)

Certified a correct transcript,

Brenda MacDowgall

Court Reporter