IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

DAYLE ELDON HEIN

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice L. A. Charbonneau, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 14th day of February, 2017.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. A. Piché: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. C. Davison, agent for

Mr. D. Bullerwell: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 5(1) x6 of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act and s. 145(3) x 2 of the Criminal Code of Canada)

1 THE COURT: Mr. Hein has pleaded guilty to
2 two series of charges. The first three are for
3 drug transactions that took place in August 2014.
4 The other charges relate to activities that
5 occurred more recently, during the spring of
6 2016, while Mr. Hein was on process for the other
7 charges.

Mr. Hein admits that during the month of August 2014, he sold drugs a number of times to police officers who were working undercover as part of an operation that was ongoing in the City of Yellowknife. Police were targeting drug activities in the city as part of that operation and, during the course of their work, they came into contact with Mr. Hein.

The three counts on the Indictment refer to the three types of substances that Mr. Hein admits he sold to the undercover officers. Count 1 is for trafficking in cocaine, Count 2 is for trafficking in oxycodone, and Count 3 is for trafficking in fentanyl.

More specifically, with respect to Count 1, there was trafficking in cocaine on August 7th and 8th. On August 7, Mr. Hein sold one street gram of crack cocaine to the undercover officer for \$80. The next day, there were two sales of one street gram of crack cocaine, for \$100 each

1 time.

During the course of the second transaction,

a second undercover officer was present and he

asked Mr. Hein about purchasing "oxies",

referring to oxycodone. Mr. Hein said that he

would text him when he had some of that

available.

With respect to Count 2, on August the 10th, Mr. Hein did text to say he had two "oxies" for sale for \$120 each. The undercover officer went to meet with Mr. Hein and ultimately was able to make that purchase.

The third count is for trafficking in fentanyl and this occurred on August 11 and 12. On August 11, Mr. Hein texted to advise that the "80s" had arrived. There was a discussion about how many could be obtained. Ultimately, Mr. Hein sold three fentanyl pills to the officer that day for \$280. The next day, the undercover went to see Mr. Hein and asked if he could buy five fentanyl pills, and Mr. Hein sold him five pills for \$450.

Mr. Hein's supplier was sentenced in September 2016 for his involvement in these drug activities, and he received a term of imprisonment of 42 months, globally. R. v. Moore, 2016 NWTSC 57.

With respect to the second set of charges that Mr. Hein pleaded guilty to, they relate, as I said, to events that happened in the spring of 2016. Count 1 is for trafficking in cocaine over a period of one month, and Counts 2 and 3 are breaches of recognizance that Mr. Hein was bound by as a result of his other charges.

These charges came about as a result of another investigation police undertook, again targeting drug activities in the City of Yellowknife and also elsewhere in the territory. During this investigation, the police obtained an order authorizing them to intercept private communications. Several of the intercepted communications involved Mr. Hein. Essentially, the investigation showed that between March 14th and April 14th, 2016, almost daily, Mr. Hein was purchasing powder cocaine and crack cocaine, three to ten grams at a time, and was reselling it for profit. He used a cellular phone to carry out this enterprise.

The recognizance that he was bound by at the time and had been entered into in January 2016 required him, among other things, to be inside his residence at all times, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, with a few strict exceptions. Needless to say, drug trafficking

was not among the exceptions. Mr. Hein was also prohibited from being in possession of a cell phone under the terms of that recognizance. Evidently, he breached the condition regarding the cell phone repeatedly between March 14th and April 14th, 2016, as this was the means he was using to carry out his trafficking activities. He was also observed during the course of the investigation being outside his residence, completing a drug transaction on April 13th, 2016. In short, he breached his release terms repeatedly and blatantly.

Exhibit S-1, which sets out the facts of the 2014 charges, also includes information about the drug fentanyl. This was not a drug that the general public, or the courts, for that matter, heard that much about until relatively recently. But more and more across the country, we hear about it. Usually it is in the context of a death or a near death due to overdose. It is becoming more known, but it bears repeating:

Fentanyl is a very dangerous drug. It can be taken through various methods. It can be smoked, it can be ingested, it can be absorbed through skin. It is a drug that is prescribed legally for legitimate medical purposes, but it is now being redirected to the illegal market by

unscrupulous people who care only about making a profit and do not care how many people are harmed or killed in the process.

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

The illicit use of fentanyl creates a high risk of overdose. Its potency is 50 to 100 times that of morphine and 20 times that of heroin. The statistics that are coming out about the ravages that this drug causes are very daunting. Exhibit S-1 refers to some statistics from British Columbia from the year 2015. Those statistics were referred in other cases that have come before this court in the last year or so. But this is how the numbers have evolved as far as drug overdoses, deaths, in British Columbia related to fentanyl. In 2012, it was 5 percent; in 2014, it had risen to 25 percent; and in the first eight months of 2015, it had risen to 35 percent. There is absolutely no reason to think that this trend changed for the rest of 2015 or for 2016. Quite the contrary. I fully expect that when we have statistics for all of 2015 and when we have statistics for 2016, they will continue to show an increase in deaths or near death fentanyl overdose related incidents.

In the City of Yellowknife, as a result of some recent incidents, there are now posters in public places that actually describe the symptoms

of overdose from drugs like this one to facilitate, presumably, quick intervention when someone overdoses. That speaks volumes about how serious a public health problem this is becoming.

Mr. Hein is 49 years old and is of Metis descent. I have the benefit of a detailed pre-sentence report that goes over the details of his background and family history. It outlines some of the challenges that Mr. Hein has had during his life.

I am not going to go over things that are recounted in the pre-sentence report in great detail today, but I have taken Mr. Hein's personal circumstances into account. I have taken into account that he has suffered losses, in particular the tragic loss of his father at a very young age, and consequences flowed from this that were not positive for him as far as the environment he grew up in afterwards. He was exposed at a young age to drugs and alcohol and to parties in the house. There is no indication in the report that he was harmed or placed in danger in the home as a result of those activities, but exposure of these kinds of things was certainly not an ideal environment in which to grow up.

Also in the pre-sentence report, there is

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

mention that Mr. Hein, unfortunately, was sexually abused by baby-sitters on two occasions when he was young. Like many others and for very understandable reasons that we hear about frequently in sexual assault cases, he did not disclose what happened to him at the time, but he has struggled with it over the years. Hopefully, he can continue to get help to cope and recover from these events of his past and achieve some measure of healing from them to the extent that that is possible.

The pre-sentence report makes it clear that Mr. Hein has be plagued by his addiction to drugs for many years. Over time he became entrenched in the drug trafficking culture and lifestyle.

The criminal record is evidence of that as well.

Drug trafficking is basically how Mr. Hein has "made a living" for the last several years, and, with that, he has come into conflict with the law and has had general dysfunction in his life.

The challenges that Mr. Hein has faced are relevant to his sentencing because they may serve to explain in part why he chose the path that he did, but they do not excuse his conduct and that must be made clear. In being part of the drug trafficking world, in selling these substances and making them available to people, Mr. Hein has

contributed, no doubt, to creating more addicts, more broken lives, more despair, and more dysfunction. It is virtually certain that many of this "customers" are now on the same path as the one he found himself on because they too became addicted to cocaine or other drugs. It is a cycle that repeats itself and it does so exponentially. Every dealer has a number of customers and every single customer is at risk of becoming another Mr. Hein.

I agree with the Crown that there are some indications in the pre-sentence report about some measure of ambivalence on Mr. Hein's part as far as taking responsibility for his actions. For example, there are comments about a sentence dating back to 1997 for possession of cocaine which Mr. Hein feels apparently was unduly harsh and had negative consequences for him, such as the loss of a good job he had at the time. There are also comments in the report about him not realizing what he was selling and how dangerous it was.

Yesterday, during submissions, Mr. Hein's lawyer provided some context to the second comment, the one about the dangerousness of the drug. I do accept that in 2014 the harms caused by fentanyl and the risks associated with it were

2.4

less known than they are now, and I have no reason not to accept what has been said on Mr. Hein's behalf, that he did not fully understand the dangers of the drugs he was selling at the time he was selling fentanyl in 2014.

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

As for the other comment, I referred to, the one referring to the 1997 sentence, to the extent that it might signal somewhat of a rationalization on Mr. Hein's part for the choices that he has made during the 20 years after that sentence was imposed, I think that those comments are tempered by what Mr. Hein said yesterday when he was given an opportunity to speak. I listened carefully to what he said and I observed how he said it. He said he was sorry for having contributed to this problem in our city. He seems genuinely remorseful and I hope I am not wrong. I hope he is genuinely remorseful and that he realizes the harm this has caused not just to him but to others, and mostly I hope that he will have the strength to turn the page on this lifestyle for good and never ever return to it.

The pre-sentence report says that he has some support, including from his spouse, even though they have had their share of struggles. I

certainly hope that with the help of those around him and some of the programs available to him in custody, Mr. Hein will find within himself the strength to overcome his issues and never return to this lifestyle.

The report mentions that Mr. Hein's own children suffer from drug addictions too now. Sadly, that is not uncommon. But one thing is if Mr. Hein is able to overcome his addiction, then perhaps he will be in a good position to help others, including his own children maybe, to do the same.

Mr. Hein's criminal record is lengthy and includes all sorts of offences, including offences for crimes against people. He also has a number of drug-related convictions, not surprisingly, including trafficking convictions for which he has received jail terms of some significance, but nothing that comes anywhere close to the sentence that he faces today.

In imposing sentence, I have to apply the sentencing principles that are set out in the Criminal Code and in the case law. Like many crimes, drug trafficking covers a wide range of possible behaviours, some more blameworthy than others. People involved in drug trafficking are always somewhere in a chain of distribution. The

higher up the person is in the chain, the more
blameworthy they are and the more significant the
sentences become. This difference in
blameworthiness is why, in the sentencing case
law, there are distinctions between street-level
trafficking, commercial operations, and wholesale
operations. Mr. Hein's activities can be
characterized as a commercial operation within
the meaning of the case law.

As far as trafficking in cocaine is concerned, the law has been clear for many years that for that type of offence, the starting point is three years' imprisonment. That starting point was set out by the Alberta Court of Appeal and has been applied in this jurisdiction. R. v. Lau, 2004 ABCA 408, R. v. Hodges, 2015 NWTSC 59, and R. v. Mohammed, 2015 NWTSC 38.

already, is a more recent phenomenon, or at least more recent in terms of cases making it to court. But we have heard more about it over the past year or so, and, sadly, we can expect to hear more. As I have already noted, it is a very dangerous drug and the number of overdoses and deaths related to it have increased dramatically in various parts of the country. I talked about this at some length in R. v. Castro, 2013 NWTSC

1	8, pages 3 to 7, and in Moore, pages 15 to 21. I
2	am not going to repeat now what I said in those
3	cases, but I adopt here what I said then:
4	Fentanyl has caused ravages elsewhere. As is
5	often the case, it took a little longer to be
6	commonly available here in the Northwest
7	Territories compared to when it became available
8	in other places in Canada. But now, clearly, it
9	is part of the drug trafficking picture. That
10	being the case, as I have said in other cases, it
11	would be delusional to think that what has
12	happened elsewhere will not happen here. It is
13	entirely predictable that as this drug continues
14	to be sold, we will see more and more deaths
15	resulting from it. At this point, it would be
16	very difficult for anyone to claim that they do
17	not know the harm that this drug can cause. What
18	that means is at this point, anyone who chooses
19	to traffic in this drug to make money is making a
20	choice to take a very real risk of killing people
21	to make money. It is that simple. And if those
22	people get caught, they can expect to face very
23	stern sentences from the Court.
24	When I sentenced Mr. Moore, I was provided
25	several fentanyl related cases from other
26	jurisdictions, and, after having reviewed those
27	cases, I decided to adopt the same approach that

was adopted by some courts in Ontario. Those courts have decided that fentanyl trafficking should be treated in a manner similar to heroin trafficking on the basis that at this point, it is established that fentanyl is at least as dangerous as heroin. The starting point set out by the Court of Appeal of Alberta for trafficking in heroin is five years. R. v. Ostertag, 2000 ABCA 232. In Moore, I adopted that starting point for fentanyl trafficking here in the Northwest Territories.

The starting point in sentencing for trafficking in cocaine at the level Mr. Hein was doing it is three years. The starting point for trafficking in fentanyl, I continue to find should be, for now at least, the same as it is for trafficking in heroin, which is five years.

A starting point is not a minimum sentence. It is, just as the word suggests, a starting point that reflects the objective seriousness of the offence. From this the sentence has to be adjusted to reflect the mitigating and aggravating features of each case and all of its circumstances because sentencing is not a mechanical process. It is not a tariff-based process. It is a highly discretionary, highly individualized process.

Here, the main aggravating factors are the criminal record, the fact that there were several transactions, and the fact that Mr. Hein continued his activities while on process for the 2014 charges. The main mitigating factor is that Mr. Hein has pleaded guilty.

Considering those factors and the starting points that apply, it may seem at first blush that the global sentence of six years that was proposed by counsel yesterday could appear to be quite low. But there are other important sentencing principles that must also be applied.

The principle of totality is very important in this case. That principle means that when sentencing a person for several offences, the Court cannot simply add up what each sentence would be for each individual offence without taking into account the global impact of the sentence. Applying the principle of totality almost inevitably means that the sentences imposed for each offence is reduced somewhat to ensure that the overall effect of the sentence is not crushing for the person. That, in effect, is what totality means.

Sometimes people have a hard time understanding this because it seems like a sentencing discount for people who commit a lot

of offences. This could be seen, I suppose, as a 1 2 reward for committing many offences. I 3 understand that may be how it seems, but the principle of totality is there to ensure the overall effect of the sentence is not crushing on the individual. And that is important because, 6 ultimately, the hope always is that people will achieve rehabilitation. That is ultimately one 8 of the best ways for the public to be protected. 9 So in our criminal justice system in Canada, we 10 do not simply pile up sentences on people without 11 12 taking into account what the global effect of that sentence is going to be. 13

Another important sentencing principle is parity. That is a matter of fairness. People convicted of similar offences, who are in similar circumstances, should receive similar sentences.

I must take into consideration the sentence that I imposed on Mr. Moore for his involvement in the 2014 offences. As I mentioned, Mr. Moore's sentence was 42 months. Mr. Moore did not have Mr. Hein's criminal record. He too suffered from a drug addiction; he too was remorseful; and he too pleaded guilty. But there was an aspect of Mr. Moore's case that was more aggravating than Mr. Hein's because Mr. Moore was at a higher level in the organization than Mr. Hein. He was

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

Mr. Hein's supplier. And in Mr. Moore's case, the principle of totality was not really a consideration because he was being sentenced for one set of charges only.

Finally, as in all cases, the principle of restraint must also be remembered. Mr. Hein's circumstances must be taken into account, including his difficult upbringing, and the directions given by the Supreme Court of Canada in the cases of Gladue and Ipeelee must be brought into effect.

The principle of restraint applies to every sentencing, but in sentencing Aboriginal offenders, the Criminal Code and Supreme Court of Canada direct sentencing courts to pay particular attention to that principle. In simple terms, restraint means that no sentence should ever be harsher than what is required to achieve the goals and purposes of sentencing. Those include deterrence, denunciation, and protection of the public, but they also include the goal of the eventual rehabilitation of the offender.

There is no question that Mr. Hein could easily be facing a sentence longer than what counsel have jointly recommended, but even setting aside the weight that a joint submission carries in law, under all the circumstances, I

agree that what is being proposed is fair and just and that it is a sufficient sentence to reflect the seriousness of these offences while also giving due weight to Mr. Hein's personal circumstances and his guilty pleas.

The Crown has applied for a number of ancillary orders and those are not opposed.

There will be a firearms prohibition order.

It will commence today and expire ten years from

Mr. Hein's release from custody. The order for

the surrender of firearms will be forthwith.

There will also be a DNA order. This is a secondary designated offence.

I am required by law to impose a victim of crime surcharge under the Criminal Code. I have no jurisdiction to wave that surcharge. I stand to be corrected, but my understanding is that there has to be a surcharge of \$200 for every count, which means a total of \$1200 because there are six counts. The default time and the time to pay are statutory.

I have not mentioned this yet, but counsel agree that Mr. Hein should be given credit for the time that he has spent on remand. Based on the calculations I was provided by counsel, the total credit to be given to him, I gather, for a few of the days, counsel were in agreement that

he should be credited on a ratio of one-to-one. For the rest, counsel agree that he should be credited on a ratio of one-and-a-half-day credit for each day of remand. So the total amount of credit he is entitled to based on those calculations is 400 days and a half, which works out to 13 and a half months using 30 days per month as an average. This is not an exact science and, on the whole, I am going to give Mr. Hein credit for 13 months for the time he has

Please stand, Mr. Hein.

spent on remand.

Dealing first with the 2014 charges. For the reasons I have mentioned, I agree with the joint submission. For each of the Counts 1, 2, and 3, on that first file, 2014-137, if not for the time you have spent on remand, I would have sentenced you to three years on each count but concurrent (to be served together). I am giving you credit for 13 months for the time you have spent on remand. That means for each of these counts, the further jail term would be 23 months, served together. For the second set of charges, on file 2017-18, the sentence on Count 1 is three years' imprisonment, consecutive to the other sentences; Count Number 2, 90-days' imprisonment, concurrent; and Count 3, 90 days, also

1 concurrent. You can have a seat. The total
2 further jail term will be four years and eleven
3 months.

I do want to emphasize with respect to my sentence on Count 3, on file 2014-137, that sentence should not be treated as a precedent as far as sentencing for trafficking in fentanyl for all the reasons that I have been talking about. It is only as a result of the application of the principle of totality, the fact that this was a global joint submission, and under the circumstances of this case that I have arrived at that particular sentence for that particular count. It should not be an indication of what people can expect to be sentenced to if they are convicted of trafficking in fentanyl. Mr. Moore's sentence is a better indication of what would ordinarily be imposed for someone with circumstances similar to his. As time goes on, as more is known about the dangers of this drug, it may very well be the courts will see fit to impose even harsher sentences for those who choose to get involved in these activities. Given that Mr. Hein's supports are here in Yellowknife, I am going to endorse the Warrant of

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

26

27

Committal with my strong recommendation that he

be permitted to serve his sentence here in the

1		Northwest Territori	les so he can be closer to the
2		people who can help	him through what is going to
3		be, I am sure, a lo	ong road ahead.
4	THE	ACCUSED:	Yeah.
5	THE	COURT:	I hope that those who make
6		these decisions wil	ll take into account the proper
7		considerations. So	ometimes they look at things
8		like treatment prog	grams that are available and
9		what is better for	a person's rehabilitation, and
10		that is why it is t	their decision, not mine. But
11		I certainly hope th	nat in considering all the
12		factors, they will	consider the fact that you
13		need to be supporte	ed through this and the people
14		supporting you are	here.
15	THE	ACCUSED:	Yeah.
16	THE	COURT:	I can assist you with the
17		wording of the reco	ommendation, Madam Clerk, if
18		you wish, but certa	ainly I want the Warrant of
19		Committal to reflect	ct this recommendation. There
20		will also be a tran	nscript prepared of these
21		remarks, including	what I have just said.
22	THE	ACCUSED:	Okay.
23	THE	COURT:	And possibly that might have
24		an impact. I just	do not know.
25	THE	ACCUSED:	Thank you.
26			

Official Court Reporters

1	
2	
3	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723 of the Rules of Court
4	of the Rules of Court
5	
6	Jane Romanowich, CSR(A)
7	Court Reporter
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	