SE IN JY WIEW

CR 02732

## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

## RICHARD LEONARD EDWARDS

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Mr. Justice J. Z. Vertes, at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on Wednesday, October 26th A.D., 1994.

## APPEARANCES:

MR. A. REGEL:

Counsel for the Crown

MR. V. FOLDATS:

Counsel for the Accused

CHARGED UNDER s. 4(1) NARCOTIC CONTROL

1 THE COURT: Richard Leonard Edwards has entered a
2 plea of guilty to a charge of trafficking in a
3 narcotic. The facts are not particularly unusual.

The offence consists of a sale of a quarter ounce of marijuana for \$70 and couple of T-shirts by Mr. Edwards to some undercover officers. The sale occurred on September 5th of this year here in Yellowknife in one of the local bars. Apparently the undercover officers had targeted Mr. Edwards as part of a larger operation to try and crackdown on street-level sales of narcotics.

Mr. Foldats has argued that in sentencing Mr. Edwards, I should keep in mind the circumstances of the offence and not go beyond what can be considered as the ceiling or the uppermost appropriate sentence for this particular type of crime (not the general crime of trafficking in a narcotic but the particular crime of trafficking in a small amount of a soft drug in circumstances more akin to social trafficking, that is to say, trafficking among like-minded or apparently like-minded individuals as opposed to street sales to "innocent civilians", if I can use that term).

There is something to be said for that submission.

If I were to look simply at the particular circumstances of the offence, it is obvious to me that while it would warrant a jail term, it would certainly

6 ·

R

not warrant a significantly lengthy jail term.

I would agree with the comments of the Alberta

Court of Appeal in the MacGregor case where they say
that the normal sentence for a first offence of a
street sale of a small quantity of cannabis is
probably between one and three months imprisonment.

And I do regard this transaction here in Yellowknife
no differently than I would regard a similar
transaction in Edmonton or anywhere else in southern

Canada. So, I don't think that we need to treat it
any differently because this is Yellowknife as opposed
to Edmonton or Montreal or anywhere else.

But I can not overlook the particular circumstances of the offender.

In <u>MacGregor</u>, the Court says that when an accused reoffends, the jump rule should apply. The jumps must stop however when a sentence greater than that fit for the crime would be imposed. So, what is a sentence fit for a particular crime?

The circumstances of the particular offence certainly play a big part of it but the circumstances of the offender play equally a big part of it because any crime must be considered in the overall context and any penalty imposed for a crime must be specific to the individual involved. Some Courts have used the term "moral blameworthiness" for a crime.

It seems to me, and I have said this before, that

the level of moral blameworthiness for anybody committing a crime is far greater when that person has been previously convicted for similar crimes, has been previously punished for those crimes and has not, certainly in the past, exhibited any attempt to change his behaviour.

If I were to consider what a Court, say, in Edmonton would impose for this crime under these circumstances having regard to the age of the offender, having regard to the background of the offender, having regard specifically to the fact that over the past 18 years he has, by my count, 16 criminal convictions, eight of which are trafficking related, it would not surprise me at all if a penitentiary term would be imposed even for this sale, minimal as it may be.

The Crown has suggested a term of two years less a day. I think that would be at the higher end in all of the circumstances.

However I do take into account as a significant mitigating factor the guilty plea that was entered at a very early opportunity.

I take into account what was said about the, at least professed, intentions of Mr. Edwards to start all over again, perhaps in another environment. And I do take into account the six weeks of remand time that has already been served.

1	I would	give significant mitigating effect to
2	especially	the remand time and the guilty plea.
3	Would y	ou please stand.
4	The sen	tence of this Court is that you serve a
5	term of imprisonment of 18 months.	
6	Is there any point in a surcharge, Mr. Regel?	
7	MR. REGEL:	I don't believe there is, My Lord.
8	THE COURT:	There will be no surcharge under the
9	circumstanc	es. There will be no other disposition.
10	Is there anything else, counsel?	
11	MR. FOLDATS:	No, sir.
12	MR. REGEL:	I believe that's it, My Lord.
13	THE COURT:	Thank you, gentlemen.
14		
15		Certified Pursuant to Practice Direction #20
16		dated December 28, 1987.
17		
18		
19	hourt	
20	Lois Hewitt, Court Reporter	
21		Court Reporter
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		