CR 03770 and CR 03774 ANPREME

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

CR 03770

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

DAYL ELDON HEIN

- and -

CR 03774

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

SERENUS CHARLENE BRYAN

Transcript of Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice J.Z. Vertes, sitting at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on August 5, A.D. 1999.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. B. Schmaltz:

On behalf of the Crown

Mr. A. Mahar:

On behalf of the Defence

(Charges under s. 5(1) of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act)

1 THE COURT: Serenus Charlene Bryan and Dayl
2 Eldon Hein have each pleaded guilty to charges of
3 trafficking in cocaine. I will deal with them together
4 since their circumstances are similar.

Ms. Bryan has pleaded guilty to two trafficking charges. The charges encompass three separate sales of cocaine of one gram on each occasion. The total value is approximately \$380. The admitted facts also revealed incidental, small sales of marijuana and certain pharmaceuticals.

Mr. Hein has pleaded guilty to one charge encompassing two separate sales of one gram each. The Total value was \$220.

All of the sales were made to undercover agents of the police. They were made over a period of four months.

There is, sadly, nothing unusual about the circumstances of these offences or of these offenders.

Both offenders are dealers of street-level quantities of elicit drugs. They are supplied by others higher up in the chain. They dealt drugs as an ongoing activity so as to support themselves and their own drug habits. The commercial nature of these activities requires a deterrent sentence.

Both offenders are mature adults. Ms. Bryan is 32 years old. She has three children who are now cared for by her mother. She had a difficult marital

relationship and has been addicted to drugs for several years. This has caused significant financial difficulties.

Mr. Hein is 32 years old. He is a qualified plumber and led a productive life for many years.

Apparently, things deteriorated four years ago when his wife left him. He became depressed, unemployed, and soon found himself in the drug life. Drug dealing provided him with the necessary access to money and to drugs for his own use.

Both offenders express remorse for their crimes. Both understand that they must take responsibility for their actions. As an initial step, both pleaded guilty at an early opportunity. All of this is highly mitigating. In cases such as these, the motivations of the individual offender to rehabilitate herself or himself are especially critical. Given the invidious evil of drugs, rehabilitation is not easy. However, if the individual offender succeeds in the goal of rehabilitation on a long-term basis, then society will be the beneficiary of a recovered and productive member and an example for others. I have no reason, based on what I have heard, to think that either one of these offenders could not, with effort, achieve that goal.

Is there anything to differentiate between the two offenders? Only one thing.

Mr. Hein has a prior, related record. He has been

convicted twice of possession of a narcotic. The second time was in 1997 and the narcotic was cocaine. He served 45 days in jail. Obviously, if someone commits a crime and is punished for it, then commits a further similar crime, that person's punishment should reflect a greater degree of blameworthiness as opposed to someone who comes before the Court as, essentially, a first offender.

I take into account the fact that both offenders have spent approximately six weeks in pre-trial custody. I take into account the relatively small amounts of drugs involved in these tractions. I take into account the relatively low-level position in the drug-dealing hierarchy that these two offenders occupied. I take into account, however, that the nature of the drug, the nature of the activity, requires, as I said before, a deterrent sentence. Both counsel have recognized it, and I think both counsel recognized the fact that, in this case, there is no alternative but to an actual sentence in jail.

Stand up, Ms. Bryan. I sentence you to serve a term of imprisonment of 12 months.

Stand up, Mr. Hein. I sentence you to serve a term of imprisonment of 15 months.

With respect to both offenders, I direct that the warrant of committal be endorsed with a recommendation that they be assessed and considered for appropriate

| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 1 | drug addiction counselling programs. Under the |
| 2 | circumstances, there will be no victim of crime fine |
| 3 | surcharge. |
| 4 | Ms. Bryan, Mr. Hein, you are both, as I said, |
| 5 | mature adults. I take your comments at face value, |
| 6 | that they were meant sincerely and not just because you |
| 7 | got caught in these activities. I am sure you know |
| 8 | firsthand the dangers of drugs legally, financially, |
| 9 | physically, and psychologically, and now it is simply |
| 10 | up to each of you to see what you can do in terms of |
| 11 | turning your lives around. I wish you both luck. You |
| 12 | may sit down. |
| 13 | Miss Schmaltz? |
| 14 | MS. SCHMALTZ: Yes, My Lord, on Miss Bryan, 12 |
| 15 | months on each count? |
| 16 | THE COURT: I should have said, yes, 12 months |
| 17 | on each count, concurrent, for a total of 12 months. |
| 18 | MS. SCHMALTZ: Thank you, Sir. |
| 19 | |
| 20 | Certified Pursuant to Rule 723 of the Rules of Court |
| 21 | De Court |
| 22 | Jane Romanowich Court Reporter |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| | |

