TC 002333 TC CR 86 045

## IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

VS

P.A.

Transcript of the Oral Sentencing delivered by
His Honour Judge T.B. Davis, sitting at Frobisher
Bay in the Northwest Territories on February 19,
1986.

## APPEARANCES:

T. Humphries, Esq.,

N. Sharkey, Esq.,

Sandra Haslett,

Counsel for the Crown

Counsel for the Defence

Court Reporter

JUDGE DAVIS:

P.A. was an 18-year-old resident of
Frobisher Bay and admits that at 2:00 in the afternoon July
17th, 1985 he was in a residence where he went to the bedroom
of a 12-year-old girl, and while others were sleeping in the
residence he, with the use of force, took off her pants and
panties, and while she was struggling and crying and trying
to resist he sexually assaulted her by ejaculating on her
abdomen and in addition thereto actually tried to have sex
with her, but it appears that there was no penetration
completed. By using this force in the circumstances he
violated Section 246.1 of the Criminal Code.

P. comes before the Court with a number of convictions in 1984 and '85 but none of them are of a similar nature in that they were not assault offences or sexual offences, and, therefore, I feel that it is possible for the Court to deal with this matter and have little regard to the other offences on his record because this is a different form of activity altogether. The property offences that he was involved with in the past I still have to note however; he has been involved with the Courts process and certainly knows he can be penalized if he breaks the law.

P. now finds himself to be under the Young Offenders
Act and the Youth Court because at the time of the offence
he was under 18 years of age. The major factors must be
that of individual deterence and the rehabilitation of the
accused taking into account the responsibility for any young
person to take responsibility for their own offences, which

in the end is intended that that should protect society by having young people acknowledge the responsibility but at the same time attempt to do what is best for them for their rehabilitation into society.

There was no physical injury, as pointed out by counsel, and although there may be possible psychological repercussions or some psychological damage to this young girl, the Court is not allowed to put a substantial emphasis on that possibility unless there is some evidence adduced before the Court.

Counsel has suggested that a combination of secure and open custody might be appropriate for the Court to consider in the sentencing of Mr. A., and has suggested because of the seriousness of the offence that a secure custody of up to eight months and open custody following that within the vicinity of one year might be appropriate. Defence counsel has pointed out that although a combination of forms of custody might be appropriate, that it would not be necessary to impose such a long term on the accused in order to accomplish the end of justice, especially considering the possibility that the balance or some of the balance of the term might be served in an adult facility because Mr. A. is presently serving a period of time in gaol.

Section 24 Subsection 15 of the Young Offenders Act indicates that where a person is committed to custody and is currently under sentence of imprisonment imposed in an adult court, that the person may serve his disposition for



the new sentence or of any portion thereof in a provincial facility, which means an ordinary provincial gaol which is available for adults, or may serve it in a place of custody for young persons.

I interpret that to mean that only during the time that there is concurrent serving of the two gaol terms, that is the two terms, that is the adult gaol sentence and the Youth Court disposition for custody, would it be that he would serve in either facility, and immediately upon the completion of the adult term it would no longer be concurrently being served. Therefore, I expect the disposition under the Youth Court would then require that he be put in a place of custody for young persons. There is, however, the further complication that under Section 24 Subsection 14 the Director may apply to a Court for the serving of sentence in the adult facility.

I, therefore, must seriously consider the suggestion by Defence counsel that a shorter time period might be more appropriate than that being recommended because of the possible consequences that might arise, and that would be the possibility that P. would have to serve his time in adult facility and, therefore, miss the benefits of an open custody arrangement which is available under the Youth Court or under the Young Offenders Act.

On a case heard by Mr. Justice DeWeerdt in the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories, 1982, Noocasey (phonetics) Ekidlek appeared before the Court on an indecent assault



charge on a 13-year-old girl at Sanakilwag by touching her genitals and almost having intercourse but in fact not having penetration. That particular case registers as number Supreme Court 24477. The accused was placed in gaol for a period of six months and it was recommended that counselling be available to him.

He also was charged with a second offence where there was no violence used on a different girl and was given a 15-month gaol term to run consecutively for the second offence of a similar nature. The Alberta Court of Appeal heard a case Queen Vs. Beere in 1982. It is reported in 3 Canadian Criminal Cases 3rd Edition at Page 304. A 7-year-old girl, being a daughter of a commonlaw wife of the accused, the accused had sexually assaulted the young girl but stopped before ejaculating when he realized what he was doing. The child appears not to have been penetrated, and the act appears to have been out of character for this person.

The Court considered that it was a serious enough matter that he was given one year in gaol just to show that society had been so strongly opposed to this type of activity.

Justice Tallis of the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories in 1979 on Supreme Court Number 1787 case of the Queen Vs. Aselamio had found that a 41-year-old uncle of a niece, who was also a young adult, had come to Aklavik from the bush and had tried to force her to allow



him to fondle her, put his hand in her pants and to put her hand on his penis. He tried to pull her into bed and tried to take off her pants and did force her to fondle him.

He had no record, but liquor had been involved in that incidence, and the Court took into account the native custom of living on the land and coming in from the land, and it seemed to have had some effect on this man's attitude. But at the time the Court felt that it was suitable to impose a \$200 fine, and because of this man's lack of knowledge of the circumstances of society as required at the time he was also placed on two years probation and directed to keep the peace and be of good behavior.

I refer to those two cases because I do feel that there has been a wide variance in the decisions and judgments of the Courts on various matters and that I can probably consider a lesser sentence on the accused as requested by Defence counsel than has been recommended by Crown counsel because it is the first offence of this nature, although I realize it is serious for any person to sexually assault a young girl. I feel that I can deal with it taking into account more substantially his rehabilitation and the benefits of counselling while he is in the young offenders facility and in custody under the Young Offenders Act than might be available if he were in gaol as an adult.

On that basis, therefore, I do feel that the offence is extremely serious, and I am going to impose a period of two months in closed or secure custody to be followed by a



1	period of 12 months in open custody which will, therefore,
2	run consecutively to the two-month secured term. My
3	expectation is that upon the expiry of the adult term that
4	Mr. A. is serving that he then would be transferred to Youth
5	Court facilities or facilities as directed under the Young
6	Offenders Act to serve the balance of the term or to serve
7	the term that we are imposing here today.
8	MR. HUMPHRIES: Do I understand he will be admitted
9	to an adult facility in the first instance?
10	JUDGE DAVIS: Yes. I think he is serving at the
11	present time in an adult institution and will remain there
12	until that term is served. I don't know the Youth Court
13	has any control over the balance of that term whatsoever.
14	
15	I, Sandra Haslett, C.S.R. (A), Court Reporter, hereby
16	certify that I attended the above Sentencing and took faithful
17	and accurate shorthand notes and the foregoing is a true and
18	accurate transcript of my shorthand notes to the best of my skill
19	and ability.
20	Dated at the City of Calgary, in the Province of Alberta,
21	this 3rd day of March, A.D. 1986.
22	
23	Danel Mark
24	Sandra Haslett, C.S.R.,(A). Court Reporter
25	SH/sms
26	