R. v. Fraser, 2007 NWTSC 13

S-1-CR-2006000062/S-1-CR-2006000083

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

MICHAEL ROBERT FRASER

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence delivered by the Honourable Justice J.E. Richard, sitting at Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on January 31st, A.D. 2007.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. S. Hinkley: Counsel for the Crown

Ms. S. Tkatch:

Mr. D. Rideout: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 149(1)(a), 465(1)(c) Criminal Code)

Official Court Reporters

1	THE	COURT:	The offender before the Court
2		is Michael Fraser,	a 53-year-old, long-term
3		resident of the Nor	rthwest Territories and a man
4		with a long crimina	al record.
5		Last month he	completed his most recent

Last month he completed his most recent sentence of imprisonment as a result of having committed an offence in January, 2005, the offence being possession of cocaine for the purpose of trafficking. He now pleads guilty to two other offences, both of them serious, both of them outstanding for some time.

The first matter is an offence of so-called "public mischief" contrary to section 140 of the Criminal Code. That section of the Criminal Code states that it is an offence to, with intent to mislead, cause the police to enter into an investigation by reporting a non-existent crime.

The charge is that in June and July of 2005, with intent to mislead the police, Mr. Fraser caused Inspector Fortin, the Officer in Charge of the Yellowknife Detachment of the RCMP, to enter into an investigation by making a false statement to the effect that certain members of the RCMP had sexually assaulted his female friend, Julie MacKeinzo.

The background to this is that in January, 2005 Mr. Fraser and his friend, Ms. MacKeinzo,

had been arrested by the RCMP and charged with unlawful possession of cocaine. While those charges were pending, Mr. Fraser and

Ms. MacKeinzo attended at the RCMP Detachment to see Inspector Fortin and accused members of the RCMP of sexually assaulting Ms. MacKeinzo while she was detained at the detachment upon her arrest in January, 2005. The accusations were entirely false and Mr. Fraser knew that they were false.

Although the Criminal Code terms this offence "public mischief", that is really a misnomer, because the word "mischief" in the English language has the connotation of something minor, or wrongdoing that is merely annoying or irritating. It may be that some crimes of public mischief are minor, but this one is not. It is a serious offence against the administration of justice. As stated by the Alberta Court in the Ambrose case, the sting of this kind of crime is not so much causing the police to waste their time and resources, but, rather, the real harm done is the danger that innocent persons might be prosecuted and lose their reputations, their jobs, their livelihoods.

The accusations of Mr. Fraser and

Ms. MacKeinzo were taken seriously by the police

2.4

authorities. These accusations were investigated promptly and thoroughly. The investigation concluded that nothing untoward had happened at all. Subsequently, Ms. MacKeinzo attended again at the RCMP Detachment and recanted her earlier accusations.

Mr. Fraser and Ms. MacKeinzo were both charged under the public mischief section of the Criminal Code. The Crown proceeded separately against each of them and proceeded by indictment. The maximum sentence is five years' imprisonment.

Mr. Fraser elected trial by Judge and jury. A Preliminary Inquiry was held in August, 2006 and Mr. Fraser was committed to stand trial. A pre-trial conference was held in November, 2006, at which time Mr. Fraser indicated the trial was proceeding. Subpoenas were issued in December, 2006 for 11 trial witnesses, including 10 police officers and detachment guards. Mr. Fraser's jury trial was scheduled for March 5th, five weeks from now.

Although he came before the Court this week and pleaded guilty and acknowledged that what he told the police commander in June, 2005 was false and although that plea and that acknowledgement act in mitigation of sentence, it cannot be said that this plea of guilty to that charge is made

2.4

by Mr. Fraser at the earliest reasonable
opportunity.

2.4

One of the purposes of the sentencing process is to promote respect for the law. The principles of denunciation and deterrence are particularly important considerations in determining an appropriate sentence in this case, as is the principle of proportionality, in other words, the sentence ought to be proportionate to the gravity of the crime.

If I were to consider this offence as a stand alone offence, and taking into consideration all of the circumstances of this offence committed by this offender, including the circumstances of the plea to this offence and the criminal history of this offender, I would have imposed a sentence of 18 months' imprisonment.

I turn now to the other serious offence to which Mr. Fraser pleads guilty. He is charged in an indictment with conspiring with another man, a Mr. Wong, to commit the crime of trafficking in cocaine contrary to section 465 of the Criminal Code. The time frame in the indictment is July to October, 2005.

It is a notorious fact in our community that there has been a flourishing but illegal trade in cocaine in Yellowknife for a number of years. I

1	will repeat again what was said in another case
2	in this courtroom a few months ago:
3	"The illegal trade in cocaine and
4	crack cocaine in Yellowknife has had
5	a devastating effect on the people
6	and on the social life of our
7	community. We know this because of
8	the many cases that come before the
9	courts where we see the snowball
10	effect on the commission of crimes
11	in this community. We see thefts,
12	B & Es, assaults, domestic violence,
13	and we have seen homicides, all
14	related to cocaine addiction. We
15	have seen broken families. We have
16	seen destroyed lives. It has been
17	said many times in this courtroom
18	that the illegal cocaine trade is
19	like a plague which has infested the
20	social fabric of our community.
21	Those who are involved in the supply
22	and sale and trafficking of cocaine
23	are like vultures or predators who
24	are preying upon those weak members
25	of the community who are addicted to
26	this drug. The traffickers are
27	presumably doing this for profit or

1	money. They apparently have no
2	scruples about preying upon
3	vulnerable people. For this reason
4	alone, they ought to be punished.
5	They are doing so even though there
6	is a risk that they will end up in
7	jail for a substantial period of
8	time."
9	I will acknowledge here that it is said on
10	behalf of Michael Fraser on this sentencing
11	hearing that he was engaged in cocaine
12	trafficking in our community, in part, to finance
13	his own addiction to cocaine.
14	The RCMP in Yellowknife have devoted many
15	resources to combatting the illegal cocaine trade
16	in Yellowknife in recent years and have conducted
17	major investigations. One such major
18	investigation resulted in this charge against
19	Mr. Fraser and many charges against other
20	individuals.
21	One of the primary targets in the subject
22	investigation was Mr. Wong. The RCMP obtained
23	judicial authorization to intercept Mr. Wong's
24	private communications, commonly known as wire
25	taps. They intercepted Mr. Wong's telephone
26	communications, and, also, by means of a
27	recording device placed within his residence they

intercepted conversations taking place there. In this manner, the police learned of conversations between Mr. Wong and Mr. Fraser, and in-person meetings between Mr. Wong and Mr. Fraser, in which they discussed Mr. Wong supplying quantities of cocaine to Mr. Fraser for resale on the streets of Yellowknife.

In one conversation between the two of them on September 16th, 2005 Mr. Fraser is heard to say that he wanted to get going again with his trafficking in cocaine. I pause here to note that this would have been at a point in time when he was on bail awaiting trial on a cocaine possession for the purpose charge stemming from January, 2005 for which he was later convicted and sentenced.

The transactions which Mr. Wong and Mr.

Fraser were discussing and on which they made agreements generally involved quantities of one ounce or less, although Mr. Fraser is heard to request three or four ounces at a time. The recorded conversations also give an indication that Mr. Fraser had many customers, and perhaps also one or more street dealers working for him.

Mr. Fraser was arrested and charged in connection with this cocaine trafficking matter in October, 2005 and released on bail. A few

2.4

months later he was arrested on the public mischief charge. Although he has been in custody since December, 2005, counsel on this sentencing hearing are in agreement that because of other matters, including being a serving prisoner, that he has only been in remand, in effect, on the matters for which he is being sentenced today since December 24th, 2006, or one month ago.

Mr. Fraser elected trial by Judge and jury on the drug conspiracy charge. The Preliminary Inquiry was concluded in late October, 2006 and Mr. Fraser was committed to stand trial. The trial date had not yet been set when Mr. Fraser appeared in court this week to plead guilty to this charge.

Crown counsel concedes that had the trial of the charge against Mr. Fraser proceeded, it would have likely required a lot of time and resources, given the anticipated challenges to the validity of the wire tap authorizations and, in any event, the sheer quantity or length of the wire tap evidence. Crown counsel acknowledges, then, that Mr. Fraser's plea of guilty operates in mitigation of sentence on this drug conspiracy charge for that reason.

Once again, denunciation and deterrence, both general and specific, are important

2.4

principles in determining the appropriate
sentence for this drug conspiracy charge. To
these I would add the principle of parity. That
is, the law requires that any sentence imposed be
similar to sentences imposed on similar offenders
for the commission of a similar offence. Sadly,
we have had lots of similar offences and similar
offenders in Yellowknife in recent years.

Mr. Fraser's guilty plea is a mitigating feature in the determination of an appropriate sentence on the drug conspiracy charge. An aggravating feature of this crime is the fact that he was engaged in this illegal activity while on bail and awaiting his trial for a similar offence.

His past life of criminal behaviour is also an aggravating factor. He has a horrendous criminal record. That record is mainly one of property offences, but also includes many crimes of violence, and drug offences. He has been sentenced to a penitentiary term on four separate occasions in the last 20 years. He has four prior convictions for drug offences, including three in the past five years. Indeed, we are instructed by Parliament in section 10 of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act that his similar convictions in the year 2002 and the year

2.4

2.6

2006 constitute an aggravating factor in thissentencing determination.

2.4

If I were to consider this drug conspiracy offence as a stand alone offence, and taking into consideration all of the circumstances of this offence and this offender, including the guilty plea, I would have imposed a sentence of two years' imprisonment.

These two offences of which Mr. Fraser is convicted today are separate and unrelated.

There is no connection between the two. The only element they have in common is that both were committed within the same three or four-month time frame here in Yellowknife.

Separate offences merit separate punishment. In the normal course, then, consecutive sentences ought to be imposed. In that regard, I am then required by law to consider the principle of totality, as Parliament has provided a direction to sentencing Judges in section 718.2 of the Criminal Code that where consecutive sentences are to be imposed, the combined sentence should not be unduly long or harsh.

If I imposed the two individual sentences that I have mentioned and made them consecutive, the global sentence would be three and a half years' imprisonment. Upon careful consideration,

I cannot say that such a combined sentence would
be either harsh or unduly long in the
circumstances before me.

However, I have been given by two Crown counsel and defence counsel for Mr. Fraser a joint recommendation or a joint submission for a global sentence for Mr. Fraser of two and a half years' imprisonment.

Although a joint submission from counsel in the case is not binding on me as sentencing Judge, I am required by law to give it serious consideration. Previous decisions of this Court and of the Court of Appeal indicate that a sentencing Judge should depart from the joint submission only if there are cogent reasons for doing so; for example, if the sentence being recommended is unfit or unreasonable or contrary to the public interest.

So I have considered that question, as I am required to do so: Is a global sentence of two and a half years for these two crimes unfit or unreasonable? In my view, it is light, or on the lenient side, and, although I might disagree with it, upon reflection I am unable to say that it is unfit or unreasonable.

It is in the public interest that reasonable plea bargains be encouraged, as well as joint

2.4

submissions on sentencing, so that trials do not have to be held in every case, so that witnesses do not have to be further inconvenienced, so that the workload or the backlog of cases before the Court can be dealt with in a more expedient way; always, though, with the proviso that the ultimate sentence is in the Court's discretion in the final analysis.

Again, on reflection, I cannot say that a global sentence of two and a half years' imprisonment for Mr. Fraser for these two crimes is contrary to the public interest.

In some other cases, the Court has not hesitated to depart from a joint submission when the proposed sentence is unreasonable, but, after careful deliberation, I find that this is not one of those cases.

So, after much deliberation, I have decided to accept counsels' joint recommendation on an appropriate global sentence.

I decline to make any recommendation or endorsement about where Mr. Fraser might serve his term of imprisonment. I know nothing about William Head Institution at Victoria, B.C. or the programs or resources available there, and it would be irresponsible of me to make any such recommendation. The corrections authorities, I

2.4

1		am certain, are fa	miliar with Michael Fraser, and
2		it is for them to	decide where Mr. Fraser should
3		appropriately serv	e his sentence.
4		Please stand,	Mr. Fraser. Michael Fraser,
5		for the two crimes	that you have been convicted
6		of, the sentence o	f the Court is as follows: For
7		the offence of con	spiring to traffic in cocaine
8		contrary to sectio	n 465 of the Criminal Code, the
9		sentence is two an	d a half years' imprisonment.
10		For the offence of	public mischief contrary to
11		section 140 of the	Criminal Code, the sentence is
12		two and a half yea	rs' imprisonment concurrent.
13		In the circum	stances, there will be no
14		victim fine surcha	rge.
15		You may sit.	Now, counsel, is there
16		anything further o	n this case?
17	MR.	HINKLEY:	Not from the Crown, Your
18		Honour, no.	
19	MR.	RIDEOUT:	Nothing further, Your Honour.
20	THE	COURT:	Fine. Thank you. We will
21		close court.	
22			Certified to be a true and
23			accurate transcript pursuant to Rules 723 and 724 of the
24			Supreme Court Rules.
25			
26			
27			Jill MacDonald, CSR(A), RPR Court Reporter