R. v. Bessette, 2013 NWTSC 92 S-1-CR-2012-000089

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

KYLE MATTHEW BESSETTE

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice V.A. Schuler, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 27th day of November, A.D. 2013.

APPEARANCES:

Counsel for the Crown Ms. K. Lakusta:

Ms. C. Wawzonek: Counsel for the Accused

(Charge under s. 5(1) Controlled Drugs and Substances Act)

- 1 MS. LAKUSTA: Good afternoon, Your Honour.
- 2 MS. WAWZONEK: Good afternoon, Your Honour.
- 3 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Is there
- 4 anything that Crown counsel would like to address
- 5 before I sentence, Mr. Bessette?
- 6 MS. WAWZONEK: No, Your Honour. Thank you.
- 7 MS. LAKUSTA: No thank you.
- 8 THE COURT: All right.
- Kyle Matthew Bessette has been convicted of trafficking in cocaine, contrary to Section 5(1)

 of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. He has admitted in an Agreed Statement of Facts, filed as Exhibit 1 in these proceedings, that on November 20, 2010, outside the Raven Pub here in
- 15 Yellowknife, he sold two spitballs or packages of 16 cocaine consisting of 0.7 grams each to an
- 17 undercover police officer for \$200.
- Mr. Bessette argued that he was entrapped by
 the police; however, that argument was found to
 be without merit in a decision I delivered on
 July 16, 2013. I will not go into all the
- 22 background that is set out in that decision.
- 23 It will suffice to say that the
- 24 circumstances of the sale are that on the night
- in question, the RCMP, as part of an operation
- 26 aimed at street-level trafficking in Yellowknife,
- 27 had undercover officers in the Raven Pub, a bar

1 known as a place where drug transactions
2 occurred.

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Although there were a number of individual targets who were the subject of the operation, Mr. Bessette was not one of the targets. The undercover officers were asking various individuals, at random, about drugs, and as Mr. Bessette was walking by the table where the undercover officers were sitting, one of them asked him, "Do you have any party favours? which the undercover officer testified is a term used for drugs here in Yellowknife. Mr. Bessette asked, "What kind?" The undercover officer said, "White," which he testified is a term for cocaine. Mr. Bessette asked, "You want one?" which the undercover officer understood to be one gram, and he replied, "Actually, I want two. One for me and one for my girlfriend." Mr. Bessette then said, "Okay, I'll hook you up," went to the bathroom area of the pub, and, after a while, he and the two undercover officers went outside and he produced the cocaine and received the money. One of the undercover officers testified that Mr. Bessette gave him his telephone number. The other undercover officer said that the first

undercover officer asked Mr. Bessette for his

telephone number. So there was a conflict in the

evidence about that, but the evidence was that there was some discussion between Mr. Bessette and the undercover officer about later contact by text.

The pre-sentence report relates that Mr. Bessette says he was drunk. He used the word "hammered" to the author of the pre-sentence report. So he stated that he was in that condition when he committed the offence and that he did not know what "party favours" meant and, being drunk, he just wanted to help out. But based on the evidence that I have just reviewed, which is the only evidence before me about the conversation, I really cannot accept that Mr. Bessette did not know what "party favours" meant. That simply does not fit at all with the conversation that the police officer testified took place. I can accept that Mr. Bessette was drinking because he was, after all, in a bar, but I am not able to make any finding on the evidence as to the extent of his intoxication. In any event, he was able to obtain cocaine within a very short period of time.

In this case, I do have the benefit of a very thorough and a positive pre-sentence report.

It indicates that Mr. Bessette is now 25 years old. So he would have been 22 at the time of the

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

offence. His parents are very supportive of him.

He was born in Saskatchewan but has lived in

Yellowknife since he was in Grade 3. He now

lives in Alberta with his fiancée and her

daughter, and the pre-sentence report indicates

that it is his intention to stay there.

He related to the author of the pre-sentence report that he had a stable upbringing with no alcohol or drug abuse in the home and that his parents were supportive and took an interest in their large family, and I have noted that they have been here in court with him and that they have been supportive during these proceedings.

Mr. Bessette has a Grade 11 education. He is interested in vehicles and apparently it is his goal to open his own garage and operate a motor vehicle business or a business as a millwright. He has worked consistently since leaving high school and is currently employed with a company for which he has worked for almost a year. He has been with his fiancée for two years. When interviewed by the probation officer, the fiancée indicated that she has never known Mr. Bessette to use drugs. She also described him as a wonderful father to her daughter and indicates that he has assisted in supporting them both financially and emotionally.

The pre-sentence report also indicates that Mr. Bessette's current supervisor at work speaks very positively of him, and it appears that he will still have a job there despite his conviction for this offence.

Mr. Bessette has had some problems. He told the author of the pre-sentence report that he began drinking at the age of 14 and was drinking on a weekend basis throughout high school. It seems, however, that he rarely drinks at present. This is confirmed by information from his mother who indicated to the probation officer that she had concerns at one time about his binge drinking, but she no longer sees him doing that, and it is also confirmed by the information from his fiancée. He has experimented with illegal drugs in the past.

It is indicated in the pre-sentence report that his mother left Mr. Bessette's biological father when Mr. Bessette was quite young and that the biological father was abusive to both Mr. Bessette and his mother.

Mr. Bessette is of Metis descent. His grandfather attended residential school and there was alcohol and abuse in his home when Mr. Bessette's mother was growing up there, which, according to the information in the

pre-sentence report, led to his mother taking precautions for Mr. Bessette's safety when in the presence of the grandfather when Mr. Bessette was a child.

The author of the pre-sentence report notes that Mr. Bessette appears now to be on a positive path and I accept that assessment. Certainly all of the information that has been placed before me indicates that.

Mr. Bessette does have a criminal record which consists of convictions in June, 2009, for driving with over 80 milligrams of alcohol in his blood and failing to appear in court and, in November 2009, convictions for driving while disqualified and failing to attend court. He received one day in jail for driving while disqualified and fines for the other offences.

There is of course no Victim Impact

Statement in this case, but as has been pointed

out in other cases, trafficking in cocaine is not

a crime without a victim. This community is

littered with victims of the drug trade, people

who have lost money, lost employment, their homes

and sometimes their families because of addiction

to cocaine, people who have been beaten or killed

because they were involved in the drug trade or

because they were seen as a threat to those

involved in the drug trade, and it is only ten

years ago that a young man was beaten and his

body burned out by Yellowknife River because of

his involvement in the drug trade. The list goes

on and on and references to the consequences of

the drug trade, particularly the trade in

cocaine, can be found in innumerable cases

decided in this court.

We do not hear about the devastating effects of cocaine only in criminal court, we also hear about it in family court. We often hear from one parent that the other parent is hooked on cocaine and, because of it, cannot properly care for the children or is a danger to the children or becomes violent when they are on cocaine.

Mr. Bessette heard Crown counsel read a quote from the Turner case, decided by Justice Richard in 2006, in which he said, "Those who are involved in the supply and sale and trafficking of cocaine are like vultures or predators who are preying upon those weak members of the community who are addicted to this drug." And I need not repeat that quote in detail, but I hope that Mr. Bessette was listening.

I do have some concern about Mr. Bessette's attitude to what he did. As I said, the pre-sentence report indicates that he says he was

1 drunk; he did a stupid thing; he was just trying 2 to help out. Yes, it was stupid. It was also 3 criminal. And who was he trying to help out? A drug dealer who does not care whose life is ruined so long as he makes money? The undercover police officer who was posing as a guy looking 6 for drugs, a guy who, for all Mr. Bessette knew 8 at the time, could have been spending his money on cocaine, leaving his kids without enough food. 9 Those are things Mr. Bessette needs to think 10 about, and I am sure did not think about on the 11 12 night in question. On the other hand, Mr. Bessette is clearly sorry for the 13 consequences that his offence has had for his 14 family. So he recognizes that he is not the only 15 16 one who is affected by what he did. 17 The law provides that for trafficking in 18 cocaine, the maximum sentence that the Court can impose is life imprisonment. So it is one of the 19 most serious offences in our law and that is 20 21 reflected in the way that drug trafficking has been dealt with by this court and other courts 22 across Canada when sentencing for it. 23 24 In the Desjarlais case, 2007 NWTSC 23, at 25

tab 1 of the Crown's authorities filed in this matter, Justice Richard noted that the range for cases of trafficking in cocaine here in the

26

Northwest Territories is between nine months and three and a half years imprisonment in cases involving low to mid-level trafficking. It always depends, of course, on the circumstances of the offence and the offender. And the other cases that are relied upon by the Crown certainly fall into that category. There are many, many cases from this court going back to at least the 1980s that talk about how drug trafficking is a serious problem in this community and that those who traffic in cocaine must expect significant sentences.

In 2010, in the Kara Dennill, case, I said that "sentences that have been imposed for drug trafficking do not seem to have discouraged drug trafficking in this community" and that "It may be a reason to start imposing even longer sentences in appropriate cases. At the same time", and again this is something that I said in the Dennill case, "the Court has to bear in mind the principle of parity - that sentences imposed on similar offenders for similar offences should not be so different as to result in a perception that people are not being treated equally or fairly."

Defence counsel relied on two authorities for the submission that a non-custodial sentence

1	should be imposed in this case. The first is the
2	Jaber case, 2007 A.J. No. 1320, a decision of the
3	Alberta Court of Appeal, which says there is no
4	presumption against imposing a conditional
5	sentence for a cocaine trafficker assuming, of
6	course, that all the statutory prerequisites have
7	been met. Nor, the case says, is there a
8	presumption in favour of a conditional sentence.
9	In that case, the Court of Appeal said that
10	having regard to the accused's guilty plea, his
11	positive pre-sentence report, his unrelated
12	record, the minimal level of trafficking (which
13	was the sale of .8 of a gram of crack cocaine to
14	an undercover officer), strong family support, in
15	light of all those factors, a conditional
16	sentence that carries strict conditions was
17	appropriate. And of course the Northwest
18	Territories Court of Appeal is largely made up of
19	members of the Alberta Court of Appeal, so that
20	decision does carry significant weight. It may
21	of course be affected in terms of its adoption by
22	local conditions, but clearly it says that a
23	conditional sentence can be appropriate in some
24	cases.
25	Defence counsel also relied on a 2013
26	decision by actually, I think it was 2012, the
27	decision itself, but it is reported at 2013 NWTSC

02, and that is the case of Taggart, and that case involved a joint submission by Crown and defence. I note that Justice Charbonneau expressed some reservations about agreeing with it, but she did, in the end, accept it and sentenced Mr. Taggart to two years less a day to be served in the community on strict conditions.

Mr. Taggart was targeted, apparently, in the same operation that was undertaken here. He was targeted because he was involved in selling cocaine in a dial-a-dope operation. On two separate occasions, he sold to an undercover officer, first 200 grams, then 300 grams. He pled guilty to two counts of trafficking in cocaine, he had no criminal record, and he was 19 years old when he committed the offences. So in that case there was a guilty plea and a joint submission, which is quite significant. However the circumstances of that offence, in my view, are also more serious than the circumstances of the offence Mr. Bessette committed.

Mr. Bessette did not plead guilty in this case, although he did admit that he sold the drugs to the undercover officer. He sought a stay of the conviction on the basis of police entrapment, which, as I have noted, was not a successful argument. I do acknowledge of course

that he is not to be more harshly punished just because he did not plead guilty. Defence counsel submitted that his acknowledgment, his admission, of the offence itself is the equivalent of a guilty plea. I was inclined to think that it is not, but having thought about it some more, I have concluded that in the circumstances of this case, it is very close to a guilty plea because Mr. Bessette did admit the offence. His position was simply that he should not be convicted because of the circumstances in which the police undercover officers approached him; and as I say, in his argument, that amounted to entrapment, although that argument was not accepted. So in the end, on balance, I have concluded that indeed there should be mitigation in his admission of the offence itself.

There are really no aggravating factors in this case except that the offence was committed only about a year after Mr. Bessette had been sentenced for the unrelated offences on his record.

The principles of sentencing that this court and others have said are of paramount importance in cases of drug trafficking are denunciation, first of all, and that simply means expressing the community's condemnation and rejection of

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

2.5

26

drug trafficking, and deterrence, meaning that the sentence should be significant enough that it would discourage other people from trafficking in drugs.

I also have to bear in mind the principle of proportionality, and that means that a sentence should reflect the seriousness of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the offender.

There is no question that trafficking in cocaine is serious. This court has said that many times.

As far as Mr. Bessette's degree of responsibility, I am satisfied that he knew what he was doing, however much he had had to drink. Even if he was not otherwise involved in the drug trade, he knew how to get cocaine fairly quickly and he was willing -- or said he was willing to at least arrange a line of communication with the undercover officer by providing his telephone number. The only thing that makes Mr. Bessette's degree of responsibility, or what we sometimes call moral blameworthiness, somewhat less than in other cases is that the police approached him at random and he did not approach them and was not actively engaged in -- he was not engaged in drug trafficking when the police observed him.

Since Mr. Bessette is aboriginal, Section 718.2(e) of the Criminal Code requires that I

Τ	give particular consideration to whether a
2	sanction other than imprisonment would be
3	reasonable in the circumstances. Other than the
4	issues involving his grandfather and his
5	biological father, whom I have already referred
6	to (and his biological father was not present in
7	his life for very long), Mr. Bessette's family
8	background seems to have been free of the
9	difficulties that are often present in aboriginal
10	families, such as alcohol abuse and family
11	violence, and, instead, he has received
12	consistent support from his family and looks back
13	on his upbringing as positive. So the issues
14	that are often at the forefront under Section
15	718.2(e) do not appear to have played a role in
16	Mr. Bessette having committed this offence.
17	It is often said that sentencing is one of
18	the hardest and perhaps the hardest task that a
19	judge has, and this case illustrates that quite
20	well.
21	Mr. Bessette comes before the Court as
22	someone who, from all accounts, has really turned
23	his life around; he has matured; he has taken on
24	family responsibilities, and I accept that in

25

26

27

many ways he is no longer the young man that he

was in November 2010. So I have to consider that

on the one hand. On the other hand, I have to

consider the long-standing practice in this court for the offence that Mr. Bessette committed, for that type of offence, and the reasons for that practice.

Crown counsel is seeking a sentence of 12 to 15 months in jail to be followed by probation of up to 18 months, and there is no question that that falls within the usual range of sentences for this type of offence. Defence counsel does not take issue with the length of the sentence sought by the Crown or the probation, but says that a conditional sentence - in other words, a sentence to be served in the community - would be appropriate in this case. Since parity - in other words, in order to treat Mr. Bessette on an equal basis with others who have committed a similar offence - makes a sentence of less than two years appropriate in this case, then the next step in terms of considering whether there should be a conditional sentence is to consider whether there would be a danger to the community if Mr. Bessette were to serve his sentence in the community and then whether a conditional sentence would be consistent with the fundamental purpose and principles of sentencing; and the fundamental purpose of sentencing is to contribute to respect for the law and the maintenance of a just,

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

peaceful, and safe society by imposing just sanctions. So I will deal, first, with danger to the community.

Based on the information before me, I am confident that Mr. Bessette does not pose a danger to the community. There is no reason to think that he will reoffend. There are reasons to think that he will not reoffend, because from all reports he has matured, he has taken on new responsibilities and is fulfilling them, as I have said. So there are indications that he has changed his life. So the real issue is whether a conditional sentence would be consistent with the fundamental purpose and principles of sentencing, and of course the principles that are of most concern are denunciation and deterrence.

Since we were here in court yesterday, I have done what I think and I hope is a fairly thorough review of cases in this court going back to the 1980s where an offender was sentenced for trafficking in cocaine, and unlike most, if not all, of those other cases, as I have said,

Mr. Bessette was not targeted by the police; he was randomly selected. And although, as I have found, the police did nothing wrong, that fact - in other words, that they picked him out; he did not approach them - is a distinguishing factor.

In the other cases that I have reviewed, either the offender was targeted or the case is silent on that point, but the circumstances suggest that the police had prior knowledge or information that the offender was involved in drug activity. So here the evidence is that Mr. Bessette was presented with an opportunity and he took it.

He knew the drug lingo, he knew where to get cocaine, but there is no evidence that he was actually involved in drug trafficking prior to this offence, and it is certainly conceivable that he knew about drugs and the language from friends who were drug dealers or from hanging around at the Raven, which, from the evidence of the police officers on the entrapment hearing, certainly at that time had a good share of drug activity going on in it.

So as I have said, there is no evidence that Mr. Bessette had any prior involvement in drug dealing. The evidence about providing his telephone number simply amounts to an indication that he was perhaps leaving the door open to considering another transaction with the undercover officer.

I will say that I am somewhat puzzled, and I am hoping that is not too strong a word, by the difference in the position taken by the Crown in

this case as compared to the Taggart case.

Mr. Taggart was, from my reading of that case,

operating a dial-a-dope business as opposed to

Mr. Bessette who, in this case, was simply

randomly selected. So notwithstanding the

various considerations that were presented by the

Crown as reported in the Taggart case in support

of a conditional sentence, I find the activity in

Crown counsel submitted that because of his convictions for failing to comply with court process or orders in 2009, the Court should be concerned about whether Mr. Bessette will obey a conditional sentence order, and Crown counsel also pointed to Mr. Taggart's situation and says that he has breached his conditional sentence order since it was imposed. I do not think it would be appropriate for me to take Mr. Taggart's situation and say that necessarily Mr. Bessette would act the same way. I certainly do not know enough about Mr. Taggart's situation. But I am persuaded, based on all the information before me, that Mr. Bessette has changed his ways since 2009 and 2010; and I am not persuaded of that simply because he is saying that he has changed or that he wants to change or that he will change, but, in fact, there is evidence that he

the Taggart case more serious than in this case.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

has made changes. As I said, he has taken on family responsibilities; he's doing well at his job; he's very involved with his new fiancée and her child. So from all appearances, he has made a break with the Yellowknife bar and drug scene.

He was very emotional when he spoke yesterday, and I am satisfied that he takes seriously the impact that his actions in November 2010 have had and will yet have on his life and the lives of those he cares for. So, in this case, I do not view the prior convictions on his records as a bar to a conditional sentence order, nor do I view them as an indication that he is not likely to follow conditions.

The new life that Mr. Bessette has made for himself is in Alberta. As I understand it from the pre-sentence report, his residence is in Devon, a community of approximately 3,000 people. The pre-sentence report indicates that community has the resources to monitor a conditional sentence order. In that small town, I would expect that it is likely that Mr. Bessette will be more visible, his status as an offender on a conditional sentence order more widely known, and his activities under more scrutiny than even here in Yellowknife; and, in fact, I have to say it seems to me that it would be far better for

2.4

Mr. Bessette to be there in Devon doing what he is doing there than here in Yellowknife where there is always a risk of him getting involved with or being influenced by his old associates.

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

So stand up please, Mr. Bessette. I have balanced all the factors that I have to in this case and I have decided, Mr. Bessette, to take a chance on you. I have decided that the principles of denunciation and deterrence can be adequately served in your case and that it would be in accordance with the fundamental principles of sentencing to put you on a conditional sentence. But, and you heard this said yesterday, there has to be a punitive effect. In other words, it is not a get-out-of-jail-free card, so to speak. There are going to be strict conditions. They are going to mean that you simply will not be able to do a lot of the things that you are used to doing, even with your family, and you may even at some point think, well, maybe it would have been easier to go to jail. But I am going to give you a chance because I think you have shown that you can turn things around. So I am going to -- I am imposing a sentence on you of 15 months. It is a jail sentence, but it will be served in the community subject to the conditions of a

1		conditional sentence order, and they are fairly
2		lengthy, so you can have a seat, but I want you
3		to listen very carefully.
4	THE	ACCUSED: Yes, Your Honour.
5	THE	COURT: First of all, there will be
6		the mandatory conditions that have to be in every
7		conditional sentence order. So, first, you will
8		keep the peace and be of good behaviour. I am
9		sure you understand what that means.
10	THE	ACCUSED: Yes.
11	THE	COURT: You do not get into any
12		trouble. You will appear before the Court when
13		required to do so. You will report to a
14		conditional sentence supervisor here in
15		Yellowknife within two working days after the
16		making of this order and thereafter when required
17		by the supervisor and in the manner directed by
18		the supervisor.
19		The next condition is also a mandatory
20		condition, although in light of the fact that
21		Mr. Bessette has been living and working in
22		Alberta, I will address it further on, but for
23		now, the mandatory condition is: You will remain
24		within the jurisdiction of the Court - in other
25		words within the Northwest Territories - unless

26

27

written permission to go outside the Northwest

Territories is obtained from the Court or the

supervisor. Number 5, you will inform the Court or the supervisor in advance of any change of name or address and promptly notify the Court or the supervisor of any change of employment or occupation.

So now the optional conditions. In other words, these are the conditions that I have decided to impose. So this is condition number 6 in the order. You will perform 160 hours of community service work within one year to the satisfaction of the conditional sentence supervisor and at a rate satisfactory to the supervisor. You will also provide proof of completion of the community service hours at such times and in such form as directed by the supervisor. Number 7, you will participate in any counselling or treatment programs recommended by your supervisor. Number 8, you will reside only where approved by your supervisor. Number 9, and this is a house arrest condition, you will remain in your residence or on its grounds at all hours except: when at your place of employment for purposes of work - that is the first exception; for travelling directly to or from work; for performing your community service hours and for travelling directly to and from your residence for that purpose; when authorized by

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1	your supervisor to be absent from your residence;
2	when attending court as required; when attending
3	to medical emergencies involving yourself or your
4	immediate family; when attending for treatment or
5	counselling; and when reporting to your
6	supervisor. A further exception to this house
7	arrest provision is that you may attend a shop
8	for groceries or other necessities of life for a
9	total of no more than three hours each week.
10	Condition number 10, you will provide a copy of
11	your work schedule to your supervisor and notify
12	the supervisor immediately of any changes to that
13	schedule. Number 11, when in your residence, as
14	required by this order, you will facilitate the
15	supervision of your compliance with this order by
16	presenting yourself at the door of your residence
17	when requested to do so and by answering or
18	coming to the telephone when the supervisor
19	calls. Number 12, you will carry on your person
20	at all times when not in your residence a copy of
21	this conditional sentence order. Number 13, you
22	will abstain absolutely from the consumption of
23	alcohol. Number 14, you will abstain absolutely
24	from the consumption of drugs, except in
25	accordance with a medical prescription.
26	Now, the 15th condition that I was going to
27	put in, and I will just say, Counsel Is there

1	anyone here from Social Services? No. All
2	right. I certainly in the past have given a
3	conditional sentence order when the person in
4	question has not been residing in the Northwest
5	Territories, and, as you know, under Section
6	742.5 there is a provision that an order can be
7	transferred to another jurisdiction. Now, I am
8	not sure And I should say that I do recall in
9	a case where a conditional sentence order was
10	imposed It was not a case similar to this
11	one, but in any event, I recall being presented
12	at one point in time with an order that the
13	conditional sentence essentially be transferred
14	to the Province of Ontario. I am looking at page
15	4 of the pre-sentence report, and the probation
16	officer spoke to a probation officer in Alberta
17	and what she says here is that they would accept
18	this file if Kyle was to receive a
19	community-based sentence. So I do not know
20	whether that is separate and apart from
21	transferring. Are you with Social
22	Probation
23	PROBATION OFFICER: I'm with Probation Services.
24	Michelle Marshman, Your Honour. No, that would
25	be accepted. Conditional sentence orders are
26	transferable. They might request a
27	jurisdictional transfer, but that's separate.

1	THE COURT:	Oh, that is a whole	
---	------------	---------------------	--

- 2 separate --
- 3 PROBATION OFFICER: That's a separate process than
- 4 what you would have to be dealing with today,
- 5 Your Honour, and that would come from Alberta.
- 6 And what we would do is Mr. Bessette would be
- 7 meeting with me today or tomorrow and then all
- 8 information, including the order, would be sent
- 9 down over to the probation officer and
- 10 conditional sentence supervisor that will be
- 11 helping him in Alberta, and it's pretty quick and
- 12 simple that way.
- 13 THE COURT: All right. So --
- 14 PROBATION OFFICER: To answer your question in
- short, it is considered to be a community-based
- sentence, yes.
- 17 THE COURT: So even though the order is
- 18 made here in the Northwest Territories, they will
- 19 supervise it in Alberta without an Alberta
- 20 court --
- 21 PROBATION OFFICER: Without an Alberta --
- 22 THE COURT: -- adopting it?
- 23 PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honour. Sorry to
- 24 interrupt you. I will need a certified copy
- eventually, and that is essentially what they
- 26 will require should he breach.
- 27 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

1	Well, then I think the only thing I need to
2	do in light of the condition that he remain in
3	the jurisdiction is simply add the condition that
4	notwithstanding that clause, he may leave the
5	Northwest Territories to reside in Devon,
6	Alberta, and to work in Alberta. It seems to me
7	that way he is not in breach of the first
8	condition I mentioned about remaining within the

jurisdiction of the Court.

Now, if either of you has any concern about 10 that, please tell me. I just want to make sure 11 that it is clear he has got permission to go back 12 13 to Alberta. In fact, I want him to go back to 14 Alberta, but I do not want to run into a problem because of that condition. So it sounds like it 15 will not be a problem from the point of view of 16 supervision of the order, and I suppose as long 17 18 as there is something in the order that says he can go to Alberta, he is not going to be in a 19 situation where he is in breach because he leaves 20

22 MS. WAWZONEK: I have no concerns, Your

the Northwest Territories.

Honour.

9

- 24 THE COURT: Any concerns from your point
- of view?
- 26 MS. LAKUSTA: (Negative, non-verbal
- 27 response).

1	miin	COLUMN Co. that I a file a
1	THE	COURT: So that's fine. So,
2		Mr. Bessette, do you understand all of those
3		conditions? There are a lot of them.
4	THE	ACCUSED: Do I stand up or Yes, I
5		understand.
6	THE	COURT: All right. I am not going to
7		impose probation in this case. I think that the
8		15 months with all the conditions I mentioned
9		will be sufficient.
10		Now, I just want to make it clear that the
11		conditions that I have referred to remain in
12		place for the entire 15 months; it is just that
13		the community service work has to be completed
14		within 12 month. In other words, a year.
15		Now, in accordance with Section 742.3(3), I
16		do direct that a copy of the conditional sentence
17		order be given to Mr. Bessette.
18		I also have to advise you, Mr. Bessette,
19		that under Section 742.4 of the Criminal Code,
20		your supervisor may, on notice to you and the
21		prosecutor and under certain conditions, may
22		request a change to the optional conditions. In
23		other words, the conditions that I have put in
24		that are not the mandatory ones. If that
25		happens, there are procedures for a hearing about
26		that.

27

Under Section 742.6 of the Criminal Code,

result in your arrest and you may be ordered to serve the rest of your sentence in jail. Just so you are aware, one thing that I do remember about Mr. Taggart is that he appeared here in court — I do not know what happened to his breaches, but he certainly spent some time in custody waiting to find out what was going to happen to his breach. To the breach charges, I mean. I want you to be aware that that is a possibility too. So the clerk will explain that further to you and will also explain to you the procedure by which you can apply under Section 742.4 for a change to the optional conditions. In other words, how you can go about making that application.

As to the ancillary orders, defence counsel did not take issue with the ancillary orders that are sought by the Crown. This is a secondary designated offence, however. So as far as the DNA order is concerned, I still have to consider whether to make the order. I have considered Mr. Bessette's criminal record. I have considered the seriousness of the offence he committed and the circumstances surrounding its commission, and I have considered the importance of DNA for the police as an investigative tool and the other purposes of maintaining a DNA

1	database as set out in the Alberta Court of
2	Appeal decision in the North case that was
3	submitted. I take into account that the
4	procedure for the taking of a DNA sample involves
5	minimal intrusion and that no particular or
6	unusual impact on Mr. Bessette's privacy or
7	security of the person has been advanced. And so
8	considering the balancing that the Court said in
9	North should be undertaken, I rule that the
10	balance weighs such that the order will be made.
11	There will also be a firearm prohibition
12	order which is mandatory for this offence. It
13	will commence today and expire ten years from
14	today, and any firearms or other items covered by
15	Section 109 are to be surrendered to the RCMP
16	forthwith.

I am not going to waive the victim of crime surcharge. Mr. Bessette is working, so he will have to pay the surcharge. That is a surcharge that is designed to go to a fund to assist victims of crime.

I am going to ask that there be a transcript of what I have said today and that it be expedited and a copy provided to the conditional sentence supervisor when it is available.

Is there anything else, Counsel, that I have not covered that I should have?

Τ	MS.	LAKUSTA: No. Thank you.
2	MS.	WAWZONEK: No, Your Honour. Thank you.
3	THE	COURT: Mr. Bessette, I hope you
4		realize I am giving you a chance here. I realize
5		that. I think that it is warranted in your
6		situation, and I really do not want to see you
7		either misuse it or abuse it. You have done some
8		good things and you need to stay on that path.
9		So if I see you back here, I hope it is only
10		because someone wants a change in one of the
11		conditions of the order and it is not something
12		controversial. All right.
13		So if there is nothing else, then we will
14		close court. Thank you.
15		
16		
17		
18		Certified Pursuant to Rule 723 of the Rules of Court
19		of the Nates of Court
20		
21		Jane Romanowich, CSR(A)
22		Court Reporter
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		