ORIGINAL

CR 03348

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

MICHAEL THOMPSON

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Justice J.Z. Vertes, at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on Wednesday, September 17th A.D., 1997.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. M. Nightingale:

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. J. Brydon:

Counsel for the Accused

Charge under s. 4(2) Narcotic Control Act

1 THE COURT: In this case, Mr. Thompson has
2 entered a plea of guilty to a charge of possession of a
3 narcotic for the purpose of trafficking. The facts are
4 mundame to say the least.

The accused's vehicle was searched. In the search of the vehicle, the police located drugs and other paraphernalia. The total volume of drugs was approximately three-quarters of a pound of marijuana with an approximate street value of \$4,000. In addition, there was other evidence indicating the accused's involvement in sales of the drug although there is no suggestion that he is part of any wider or more nefarious trafficking ring. He does admit that he was in possession of these drugs for the purpose of trafficking.

The accused is 27 years old. I am told that he has lived in Yellowknife for a lengthy period of time. He has a Grade 12 education. I have been provided with good references from people who have known him for many years and have employed him in the past and are willing to continue to employ him notwithstanding this conviction.

All of that, of course, speaks to his credit as does the fact that he has decided to accept responsibility for his conduct, recognizing that it is criminal, and entered a plea of guilty thereby avoiding the necessity of a trial.

This is always a mitigating factor although in this particular case, as noted by Crown counsel, perhaps not as mitigating as it would ordinarily be since it came literally at the last moment prior to the start of his trial.

The question now of course is what would be an appropriate sentence taking into account the circumstances of this offence and the circumstances of this offender.

Crown counsel is quite correct in pointing out that traditionally in this jurisdiction, as in every jurisdiction in Canada, trafficking-related offences, no matter how small, no matter what type of drug, no matter what type of offender, have resulted in the imposition of sentences of imprisonment.

Based on the submissions that I have heard, and certainly from my own experience, it seems to me that it is fair to say that the traditional sentence has been one anywhere in the range of six to 12 months imprisonment, and here I talk of actual imprisonment.

The reason why actual imprisonment was imposed in the overwhelming percentage of trafficking-related offences was because the Courts deemed it necessary to emphasize what we call general deterrence; that is, sending a message to everyone else who may be like-minded out there in society.

Drugs are viewed as a pervasive problem in this

society. It corrupts minds and pocketbooks and the people who purvey drugs take advantage of the weaknesses of others and are in it primarily for greed. So because of that, it is felt necessary to send a message to others who might think that this is something that they could easily become involved in; that if you get caught, you are going to go to jail no matter who you are, no matter what the circumstances. The question then only becomes how long a period of jail. And, as pointed out by Ms. Nightingale, it is only in the extraordinary circumstance that jail would be avoided.

Frankly, there is nothing extraordinary in this case. We have a young man of apparently good background; a responsible young man who apparently has developed a drug habit of his own and the drug habit got to the point where he was financing part of it by selling it. There is nothing extraordinary about that. There are thousands of similar stories, and there are lots of people who have ended up behind bars in the same circumstances.

Now, the situation has changed somewhat with the introduction of a codified sentencing regime in the Criminal Code which has introduced the new option of a conditional sentence.

I am asked by defence counsel, I am urged by defence counsel indeed, to consider the imposition of a

conditional sentence in this case.

A conditional sentence can be imposed in a situation where the sentence of imprisonment would be under two years and where allowing the accused to serve the sentence in the community would not endanger the community and would be consistent with the fundamental principles and objectives of sentencing.

Among those fundamental principles and objectives are, as has been pointed out, that incarceration should be considered as a last resort, that other less severe sanctions should be considered, if appropriate, and that the individual should be segregated from society only if necessary.

The accused is a first offender. There is no history or record of violence. He appears to have the support of other individuals and organizations in the community. It appears that he has taken some steps since his arrest and charge to try and address what he says are his own drug abuse problems. So in terms of the personal circumstances of the offender, I think that I can conclude that allowing him to serve his sentence in the community with appropriate conditions would not endanger the community.

I have to now though consider whether the circumstances of the offence are such that the community may be endangered and here I touch on what I said during the course of argument.

There is a line of argument that for those crimes where general deterrence is important, is perhaps more important than in some other types of crimes as opposed to the other factors of sentencing, that the lack of incarceration would send a less meaningful generally deterrent message and thereby others may be more inclined to commit the same type of crime and thereby endanger the community.

Frankly, I have some difficulty with that type of argument because in effect what it means is that for those types of crimes where the emphasis in sentencing was on general deterrence, such as drug trafficking-related crimes, it seems to me what we are really doing is setting up a classification of offences for which conditional sentences would not be available. It seems to me that we would then be undermining the clear intent of Parliment in enacting this new regime.

So I am not prepared to adopt the sentiment of the Ontario Court of Appeal in the Ly case, as referred to by Crown counsel, in which they said that it would ordinarily be in the rare case where a conditional sentence would be imposed for a drug trafficking offence.

I note only that that case came before <u>Wismayer</u>, also a decision out of the Ontario Court of Appeal, and in my view that case modifies the earlier comment of

the Court of Appeal and makes it clear that really there is no category of offence for which a conditional sentence is not available provided the statutory prerequisites are met.

In this particular case, I have concluded that an appropriate sentence would be a term of nine months. However, I have also concluded that that sentence may be served in the community on conditions without endangering the community.

Stand up, Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Thompson, I impose upon you a conditional sentence of nine months. The conditions will be as follows:

You are to keep the peace and be of good behaviour. That means that you are to stay out of trouble. You are to appear before this Court if and when required to do so. You are to report to the conditional sentence supervisor within 48 hours and continue to report when and as required by your supervisor. You are to remain within the jurisdiction of this Court, that is within the Northwest Territories, unless you receive written permission to go outside of the jurisdiction either from your supervisor or from this Court. You are to notify your supervisor of any change in your address or in your employment.

Now, do you understand those conditions?

1 THE ACCUSED: Yes, sir. THE COURT: In addition, you are to abstain absolutely from the possession of nontherapeutic 3 drugs. I am not going to restrict that to just prescription drugs. I am not going to say abstain 6 absolutely from the possession of nonprescription drugs 7 because then a bottle of aspirin would be precluded. How shall we put it? Recreational drugs are a no no. 9 So you are to abstain absolutely from the consumption 10 and possession of nontherapeutic drugs. I do not 11 include nicotine or alcohol in that prohibition. 12 That you are to attend at such rehabilitation, therapy, or counselling sessions or programs as may be 13 14 directed from time to time by your supervisor. Now, by that, I mean to include whether it is at the Tree of 15 16 Peace, you can do so voluntarily; you don't need to 17 have your supervisor's direction to do so but if your supervisor does direct you to attend some program, you 18 19 have to attend it. Do you understand that? THE ACCUSED: 20 Yes. 21 THE COURT: I am going to further place as a condition that you perform 120 hours of community 22 service work under the direction of your supervisor. 23 24 And if your supervisor can arrange it, certainly it can include the requirement to go and perhaps give public 25 talks to school children and others who may be tempted 26 27 by narcotics.

```
You will be on a curfew, house arrest, call it
  1
            what you will, which will require you to remain in your
  2
            residence between the hours of 9 p.m. and 6 a.m. every
  3
            day unless otherwise required to be at your
  5
            employment. But if it is not required for your
            employment, you are to be at home between those hours
  7
            every day, and I include every day.
                 Do you understand those conditions?
  9
        THE ACCUSED:
                                 Yes.
 10
        THE COURT:
                                 Are there any other conditions that
            counsel feel would be appropriate?
 11
        MS. NIGHTINGALE:
12
                                 That has covered most of them,
                  One point that I would ask is that if the Court
13
            would consider placing the community service work
14
            requirement in a probation order as opposed to the
15
            conditional sentence order or limit the time in which
16
           the community service work must be completed so that if
17
18
           there is a violation of that, it can actually be
19
           remedied before the sentence expires.
20
       THE COURT:
                                Any comment, Mr. Brydon?
21
       MR. BRYDON:
                                I think that I know what Crown is
22
                        Perhaps a schedule of times within which
           getting at.
           portions of the community service work are to be
23
24
                          In other words, I can see the Crown
           accomplished.
           doesn't want a situation where eight months and 28 days
25
           from now he has done two hours of community service and
26
27
           all that can be done is to breach him because he
```

```
couldn't possibly do 120 hours in the time remaining.
  1
            Perhaps the easiest way to deal with that is to require
  2
            that the first 40 hours be done within two or three
  3
                     In other words, to schedule the time within
            months.
  5
            which portions of that work is to be done.
                                                         I can see
  6
            what the Crown is getting at.
  7
        THE COURT:
                                 I said 120 hours, is that right?
  8
        MR. BRYDON:
                                 Yes, I was thinking 40 and 40 in
            terms of three months and three months and three
  9
10
            months.
        THE COURT:
11
                                Well, I don't think 20 hours a
12
            month is too onerous. You are to do the first 60 hours
            of that within the first three months, the next 60
13
            hours within the next three months, so all 120 hours
14
            within the first six months of the nine month
15
            sentence. Does that cover your concern?
16
17
       MS. NIGHTINGALE:
                                Yes, sir.
       THE COURT:
18
                                Now, Mr. Thompson, as I said, if
           you had been standing before me maybe a year or two ago
19
           under the same situation, under the same circumstances,
20
21
           you would be going off to jail. So I paid particular
           attention to the expressions as to how you are now
22
23
           coming to grips to what you consider to have been a
24
           serious problem, I sincerely hope that you are.
           obvious from what your counsel said and these letters
25
26
           that you have alot going for you so get a life, don't
27
           be a dope, stay out of drugs.
```

```
1
                 With respect to exhibits?
 2
       MS. NIGHTINGALE:
                                Yes, before that though, I just
           wanted to address the requirement under 742.2 that the
 3
           Court must address whether a firearm prohibition order
           is required. We have made no submissions on that.
 5
           are certainly not looking for that, I just want to make
 6
           sure that the process is fulfilled.
                                There is no relevance whatsoever to
       THE COURT:
 8
           a firearm prohibition order and I decline to consider
 9
10
           it.
11
       MS. NIGHTINGALE:
                                Thank you. With respect to the
12
           exhibits that have been seized, particularly the
           narcotics, we're asking for an order of destruction.
13
           There was also money that was located on the accused at
14
15
           the time of arrest which we are seeking to have an
16
           order to return to the accused. And the police are in
17
           custody of that money.
18
       THE COURT:
                                I take it, Mr. Brydon, you have no
19
           problem with any of these provisions?
20
       MR. BRYDON:
                               No, My Lord. There is one other
21
           matter that probably has to be addressed and that is
           the matter of the victim service order -- or victim
22
           impact. Because it is a jail sentence, I think it is
23
           $35 maximum.
24
                               There is a set scale, is there not?
25
       THE COURT:
26
      MR. BRYDON:
                                     I believe it is $35 because
                               Yes.
27
           of incarceration.
```

1		
1	THE	COURT: There will be, in addition, a
2		Victim of Crime fine surcharge of \$35. Mr. Thompson,
3		you are to pay that within two weeks.
4	THE	ACCUSED: Okay.
5	THE	COURT: That will go into a fund for
6		programs for victims of crime for your information.
7		In addition, there will be an order directing the
8		destruction of the drugs that were seized at the expiry
9		of the appeal period as well as the return of monies
10		presently under seizure by the police to the accused,
11		also at the expiry of the appeal period.
12	MS.	NIGHTINGALE: Thank you.
13	MR.	BRYDON: Thank you, My Lord.
14	THE	COURT: Thank you, counsel.
15	(AT	WHICH TIME THE ORAL REASONS FOR SENTENCE CONCLUDED)
16		
17		
18		Certified pursuant to Practice Direction #20 dated December 28, 1987.
19		#20 dated becomber 20, 1907.
20		
21		Lois Hewitt,
22		Court Reporter
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		