CR 03056

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

WAYNE JOHN ADAM DENNIS

Transcript of Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Mr. Justice J.Z. Vertes, sitting at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on Wednesday, May 15, A.D. 1996.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. L. Rose:

Mr. Posynick:

On behalf of the Crown

On behalf of the Defence

(Charges under s. 4(2) and 19.1(2)(a) of the Narcotic Control Act)

MAY 22 1996



THE COURT: The accused, Wayne John Adam

Dennis, has been convicted of two counts: count 1

being a charge of possession of a narcotic,

specifically marijuana, for the purpose of trafficking;

and count 2 being the possession of property, being

specifically cash, which was derived directly or

indirectly as a result of an offence under the Narcotic

Control Act.

The accused is 30 years old. He has a lengthy history in the Northwest Territories. I am told by his counsel that he has had a difficult upbringing and that he is alienated in many ways from his family; he has health problems that have made it difficult for him to secure and hold down steady employment; he has been involved in a common-law relationship for many years and apparently has a son by that relationship. But I am told that he has very little, if any, contact with his son now because of the fact that the son is being cared for by Social Services due to the son's medical problems.

The accused, unfortunately, also has a record which is relevant and aggravating in the circumstances. He has been convicted of seven criminal offences between 1982 and 1994. Six of those are drug related. Four of them are convictions of simple possession of narcotics, the most recent being in November of 1994 when he was sentenced to three months

imprisonment. Two of them, however, are convictions for possession of narcotics for the purpose of trafficking; once in 1988 when he was sentenced to eight months imprisonment, and once in 1990 when he was sentenced to ten months imprisonment.

Crown counsel has submitted that an appropriate sentence, before taking into account other factors peculiar to this case, would be in the high end of the territorial range of sentences; that is two years less a day or less. In my view, that is very generous on the part of Crown counsel.

The accused in this case was found to be in possession of approximately 12 ounces of marijuana, having a street value of \$5,000, and in possession of almost \$6,000 in cash.

It was admitted at his trial that the quantity of drugs, the manner of their packaging, and all of the other incidental facts to this case are inconsistent with the drugs not being for personal use. And it was submitted on sentence that the accused engaged in selling marijuana, admittedly only to people that he knew and to his friends, so he cannot be classified as some predatory street seller. But it was submitted that he sold to people he knew in order to raise money for himself and his common-law wife, to support themselves because of his difficulties in holding down steady employment.

2.3

Ordinarily, these circumstances would call for incarceration obviously, having regard to the general principles that deterrence, both specific and general, are to be the primary factors in sentencing on drug-trafficking-related charges. But I would think ordinarily the period of incarceration need not be so great as to put it out of the range suggested by Crown counsel.

In this case, however, if I look at the circumstances of the case itself, the quantity of drugs, the cash on hand, if I look at some of the facts that came out in sentencing such as the manner in which the drugs and cash were secreted in the accused's residence, this is more than just some casual trafficking-related activity. If I put that together with the accused's history, the conclusion I come to is that the accused has engaged almost for ten years now in a consistent pattern of drug use personally as evidenced by the drug possession charges and by involvement in the trafficking of drugs.

If I conclude, as I do in this case, that there is a consistent pattern of behaviour shown here, then I must also conclude that this accused is certainly in the category of those offenders for whom moderate periods of incarceration have obviously done nothing to either deter him or to effect any sort of rehabilitation or reformation and that perhaps more

severe sanctions are necessary. I must say, in all frankness, that were it not for the position taken by Crown counsel in this case, I would seriously consider sending this accused to the penitentiary even having regard to what was submitted on his behalf.

I can understand that when he was first convicted of a drug-related offence back in 1986 that one may have been able to say on his behalf that he was young, inexperienced, had never had serious problems with the law before. But he is a man of 30 years of age now; he is an adult. He has had experience in the drug culture, and he has had experience inside the correctional structure.

So what are the alternatives left to this court?

Because if I look at all of these facts, I have no
hesitation in saying that most courts in this country
would probably say, without skipping a beat, there is
no alternative but to send this accused away for a
lengthy period of time.

Defence counsel mentioned to me the jump principle. And I recognize that there is more or less a rule of thumb that says that any jump in the case of a re-offence should not be so great as to make it disproportionate to the sentences that were previously imposed for that same offence. And I also recognize that there is a general rule of thumb, when talking about re-offending and the application of this jump

principle, that the jumps must stop when a sentence greater than that fit for the crime would be imposed.

Certainly, in my view, the submissions of both counsel that a territorial-range sentence would be appropriate for this offence is within the range that has been considered to be fit and appropriate for the circumstances of the offence. But, and I have said this before, a significant factor is the peculiar circumstance of the individual offender. And as I have also said before, if someone has committed the same crime previously, if someone has been caught for it, if someone has been punished for it and then goes out and does the same thing, then I think that individual can only expect that he is going to be treated much more seriously than he has been in the past, because all it shows is that he is unwilling to change his behaviour.

I recognize that there may be all sorts of reasons why he feels he must engage in this type of conduct. Some of them may be quite legitimate. He may indeed have problems securing permanent employment because of his health problems; he may indeed have difficulties in terms of his relationship with members of his family; he may have other problems, including what I heard about personal addiction to marijuana use. I take these things into account and I do not discount them. But this man is still 30 years old, and I expect that he is intelligent and mature enough that he realizes

that only he is the one to have control over what he does in his life; and if he, knowing that this type of conduct is criminal, continues in it, then the courts at some point will have no alternative but to put him away for a long period.

Now, I am not going to do that in this case for a number of factors which I will list in a moment. But I must, Mr. Dennis, and I am speaking to you directly -- you are obviously an intelligent man. You know that what you did here was a crime. I think your lawyer, as I said before, put forward everything possible on your behalf in this case. Now, at some point you are the one that is going to have to take responsibility; and I am sure you appreciate that if you do not, if you do not change your way of living, then, you know as well as I do, at some point you are going to be sent away for a long period of time and there is nothing anybody can do about that because there is no alternative, and I am sure you understand that.

I have given serious consideration to the position adopted by Crown counsel. I think it is fair and generous. I think certainly the points put forward by Defence counsel on his client's behalf have been relevant and helpful in consideration of an appropriate sentence in this case. I take into account the fact that the accused has spent approximately eight months in pre-trial custody. I take into account the fact

that we are dealing with what are termed "soft drugs," and while it is not insignificant, it certainly, as I said before, does not evidence some sort of predatory street-type selling to -- How shall I put it? -innocent people. I also take into account as a mitigating factor the cooperation shown by the accused, through his counsel, in minimizing non-essential matters for this trial.

Will you stand up, Mr. Dennis.

With respect to count 1, that is the charge of possession for the purpose of trafficking, I sentence you to serve a term of imprisonment of 18 months. respect to count 2, the charge of possession of proceeds obtained from a crime, I sentence you to serve a term of imprisonment of 12 months. I will make that concurrent, however, to the 18 months on count 1. that is a total of 18 months, Mr. Dennis. further make an order forfeiting the sum of \$5,986, seized by the R.C.M.P., to the Crown. I will further make an order directing the R.C.M.P. to destroy the drugs that they seized in this matter at the end of the appeal period. Under the circumstances, there will be no victim of crime surcharge.

24

25

1

2

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Certified Pursuant to Practice Direction #20 dated December 28, 1987.

26 27

Jane/Romanowich Court Reporter

