R. v. Hache, 2017 NWTSC 62 S-1-CR-2017-000035

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

## NORMAN HACHE

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice L. A. Charbonneau, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 28th day of August, 2017.

## APPEARANCES:

Counsel for the Crown Ms. A. Piché:

Ms. C. Wawzonek: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 465(1) and 464(a) of the Criminal Code)

Official Court Reporters

THE COURT: Today it is my responsibility 1 to sentence Norman Hache. He has pleaded guilty 3 to having conspired with a number of other people to traffic cocaine and possess cocaine for the 5 purpose of trafficking in the Northwest 6 Territories between February 24th and April 13th, 2016. He has also pleaded guilty to having counselled another individual to commit an 9 assault. This event happened on February 26, 2016, but it did not result in the actual 10 commission of an assault. 11 12 These charges arise from a major 13 investigation that was conducted by the police

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

investigation that was conducted by the police into drug trafficking activities in Yellowknife and other communities in this jurisdiction. As part of that investigation, the RCMP obtained a judicial authorization to intercept the private communications of Mr. Hache and of other people. Hundreds of phone calls and text message exchanges were intercepted under the scope of this judicial authorization.

The investigation showed that Mr. Hache was the head of a drug trafficking network in the NWT. He coordinated the shipment of cocaine from Alberta to the NWT and its distribution through various communities in the NWT.

I am not going to re-read the entire Agreed

Statement of Facts now. It was read into the record on August 17th. That Agreed Statement of Facts is an exhibit on the sentencing. It is part of the Court record and all the details of what was alleged and admitted are included in it. But I do want to read excerpts from it because it is important for the record to be clear as to the scope of the activities that we are talking about here. These facts were gleaned throughout the investigation and, in particular, through the various conversations that were intercepted as well as other investigative means.

As I mentioned, the accused was the head of this drug trafficking network and he coordinated the movement of drugs between Alberta and the NWT. He was working with an Alberta resident who was his southern "business partner". Mr. Hache prepared cocaine shipments for delivery to some of the other co-conspirators for other individuals, three in Yellowknife and a fourth that was in Fort Resolution. Those people in turn organized for the sale of the drugs on the street. The accused also sometimes sold cocaine at the street level when the need arose.

Another co-conspirator facilitated the transport of drugs and cash throughout the NWT, as well as to and from Alberta, through his

1 employment with an airline company.

The three Yellowknife distributors and the

Fort Resolution one worked under the accused and

followed his directions. These people stored

5 cocaine in quantities sufficient to supply

6 street-level traffickers who worked for them.

They also sold directly to users.

The co-conspirator who was in Fort

Resolution supplied street-level sellers there as

well as in Hay River and in Fort Smith.

The three that operated in Yellowknife were the primary operators of what is commonly referred to a "dial-a-dope" system in Yellowknife. The system is very simple. A dial-a-dope phone is a phone that can receive calls from drug users to purchase drugs, making it actually very easy to buy drugs. The call is made and a meeting is arranged for the transaction to take place. These phones operated 24 hours a day every day. Several ounces of cocaine a day were being sold through this phone operation.

From April 4th, 2016 to April 13th, 2016, following the arrest of a rival group of drug traffickers on April 4th, eight to nine ounces of cocaine a day were being sold through the dial-a-dope phones. Those phones were all under

the Mr. Hache's control.

The investigation also revealed details of specific shipments. For example, on the 3rd of March, 2016, the accused shipped four ounces of crack cocaine and eight ounces of powder cocaine to the Fort Resolution contact. This was for distribution through the southern communities of the territory. A few days later, on March 8th, \$13,200 worth of proceeds from cocaine trafficking was sent to Mr. Hache by this person, through another person who flew to Yellowknife and hand delivered the cash to the accused.

On March 15th, 2016, the Alberta accomplice sent 15 ounces of crack cocaine and 15 ounces of powder cocaine to Mr. Hache, again using the person who worked for the airline. The understanding was that eight ounces of the crack cocaine and ten ounces of the powder cocaine would go to Fort Resolution for distribution through the southern communities of the territory, and the remainder would stay for distribution by Mr. Hache in the City of Yellowknife.

On March 16th, the cocaine was delivered to Fort Resolution. The RCMP moved in and made some arrests at that point. A large quantity of cocaine, cash, and various other items were

1 seized as a result of that intervention.

The Agreed Statement of Facts includes

details of many more searches and seizures and

arrests that took place as a result of this

investigation. I am not going to refer to all

those details here. I do not think it is

necessary. I think what I have said so far gives

a flavour of the scale of operation that

Mr. Hache was running.

The bottom line, as I have already mentioned, was that he was at the top of this organization. He controlled shipments, he supplied others, he used drug debt enforcers when he needed to, and, through this network, a large amount of drugs were sold in Yellowknife and other communities in this jurisdiction.

The allegations with respect to the counselling offence arise from calls that were intercepted between Mr. Hache and his accomplice from Alberta. It appears that another individual had double-crossed Mr. Hache and Mr. Hache wanted his Alberta partner to go beat him up and threaten him. In the two calls where this is being discussed, which were played at the sentencing hearing, Mr. Hache pleads with his accomplice to beat this person up, and he is using words like "smash the fuck out of him,"

"stomp him," and he encourages his accomplice to
threaten the person with more of the same.

The calls were played at the sentencing hearing and transcripts of the calls are attached to the Agreed Statement of Facts. The person on the other end of the phone appears reluctant to do what Mr. Hache is asking him to do. But Mr. Hache insists and pleads with him repeatedly to do so. It is clear that one of Mr. Hache's concerns at that point was that they would look like amateurs if they did not respond sternly to whatever it was that this other person had done.

As far as Mr. Hache's personal circumstances, I have the benefit of the thorough submissions of his counsel but also of a number of letters that were filed at the sentencing hearing. One is from him, and others are from people who have known him for a long time. They include a good friend of his who is a recovering addict, Mr. Hache's mother, and Mr. Hache's sister. Those letters provide a lot of information about his personal circumstances. It is clear that he has had his fair share of struggles in life and those perhaps explain some of the choices he ultimately made.

Mr. Hache has a criminal record. The first convictions were entered in the Youth Court back

in 1996. The first few convictions were for property crime, but then, as an adult, he was sentenced for trafficking in narcotics in July 1999. Those were not minor matters. He received two months in jail for one of the trafficking charges and then one year on each of two other trafficking charges that were to be served consecutively to one another. And he was convicted of an uttering threats charge on the same date. In April 2000, he received a further eight months' jail term, consecutive, for a charge of possession for the purpose of trafficking. Then in 2001 and 2005, he was sentenced on drinking and driving charges. And then nothing, until the matters that now bring him before the Court.

1

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Only Mr. Hache knows what he was up to during this gap between 2005 and now. Whether he was actually keeping out of trouble or simply not getting caught is something that only he knows. But the fact is, and this is reflected in the letter from his sister, that for a period of time his life seemed to be back on track. She noticed after he moved back to Yellowknife that things seemed to not be going well again.

I heard at the sentencing hearing that  $\operatorname{Mr.}$  Hache and his girlfriend found out she was

pregnant not long before his arrest. So now he is a father, and it has been argued that is one of the things, among others, that now provide him a powerful motivation to not go back to the drug trafficking world and lifestyle. Another important change I have heard about is that there has been a reconciliation between him and his father, and this, too, is a positive element for him.

1

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

His friend, his mother, and his sister, all say that they have seen and observed some important changes and shifts in him since he has been in custody. Initially, he was angry and blaming others, but over time, according to them, he has acquired some insight into his behaviour. That is also reflected in the letter he wrote to the Court. I am not going to read the whole letter. It, too, is a matter of the record. But in it he apologize to his family, he expresses his shame and remorse, his deep concern for the damage he may be causing his son by not being able to be there for him. He also refers to the damage done to the community. He writes that he realizes the harm that drugs cause, that he knows he contributed to those problems through his trafficking activities. He writes that he knows he preyed on people's addiction and destroyed

- 1 lives. He writes, referring to drugs:
- 2 ... this is a huge problem in the north and I have contributed to the loss in resources and I have help
- 3 loss in resources and I have help
  [sic] to destroy everything this
- 4 community is trying to fix.
- Especially being from the north I
- 5 know more than anyone [else] the problems we have here. I am truly
- 6 sorry.
- 7 Having read all of that, it is clear that
- 8 what Mr. Hache presents and projects to his loved
- 9 ones at this point, what he is telling them, what
- 10 he is telling the Court, is that he has insight,
- 11 he realizes what he has done and he never wants
- 12 to go there again. If he holds to that, we shall
- 13 never see him in the courts again and he will not
- 14 be a threat to the community when he finishes
- serving his sentence. On the contrary, he could
- very well help others overcome their struggles
- 17 based on his personal experiences. I really hope
- this is what will happen.
- There are a lot of people who support
- 20 Mr. Hache and believe in his potential, people
- 21 who care for him and want him to move forward.
- 22 For their sake and for his sake, I really hope he
- follows through with his plans and that the door
- 24 to this lifestyle is firmly shut and will never
- be reopened by him again.
- 26 The maximum penalty on the conspiracy charge
- 27 is life imprisonment. The maximum penalty on the

other offence is two and a half years'
imprisonment.

Crown and defence have presented a joint submission that a global jail term of five years' imprisonment should be imposed. They are jointly suggesting that the sentences imposed on the two counts be concurrent because the context of Mr. Hache's counselling the commission of an offence is very much intertwined with his drug trafficking activities.

It has long been the law that a joint submission on sentencing must be given serious consideration by the Court. This has been expressed in different ways by different courts and there were some slight differences or nuances as far as what was required for a Court to depart from a joint submission. But in the case of R. v. Anthony-Cook, 2016 SCC 43, the Supreme Court of Canada has adopted a very restrictive approach in this regard and has made it clear that the threshold to depart from the joint submission is very, very high. Unless what is proposed is clearly contrary to the public interest, a joint submission must be followed.

The Crown and defence agree with respect to the conspiracy charge that Mr. Hache's activities constituted wholesale trafficking, which engages

a four-and-a-half-year starting point under the law established by the Alberta Court of Appeal in R. v. Lau, 2004 ABCA 408. That starting point has been followed by this Court several times. It has essentially been adopted in this jurisdiction.

1

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

The starting point reflects the seriousness of this crime and the level of blameworthiness of those who choose to engage in this type of activity.

As it is said time and time again when dealing with drug trafficking offences, these are not victimless crimes. The sale of hard drugs ruins life. Over the last decade we have seen many examples of this in this jurisdiction and in this city. People who had worked hard building a business, or worked hard continuing to operate a business started by their parents, crashing down completely and losing everything to their addiction to crack cocaine. People being robbed in broad daylight by addicts who are so desperate for more drugs that they will do anything to get money. People tied up and terrorized in their own homes, forced to give up their bank cards and their PINs by equally desperate people in search of money. Children neglected, going hungry, empty fridges, and intervention of Social

Services because the parents are so overcome by their addiction that not even their own children matter. It is a very ugly world. A few years ago, a man's half-burned body was found at the Yellowknife River and that person was killed because of a drug debt.

I make these comments now because it is important that these things are remembered and repeated every time a case like this comes before the Court.

At the same time, I know very well that

Mr. Hache does not need me to tell him these
things. He knows exactly how ugly that world is.

The recordings we heard at the sentencing hearing
open a very small window into that ugliness. In
this courtroom, Mr. Hache is probably the person
who knows the most just how ugly that world is.

He also does not need a lecture from me. He knows exactly what he needs to do and not to do. He has been through the cycle of getting involved with trafficking, getting caught, doing time, getting out, and at some point choosing the path again. Choosing that path again, he made money and became one of those people, as he says himself in his letter, who prey on the weaknesses of others. Who knows how many other crimes, how much other devastation, how much other misfortune

and tragedy he shares responsibility for because

of that choice, and by that, I mean the choice he

made to contribute to making crack cocaine

available to people in this community.

I do accept, based on everything I have read and heard, that by the time he was caught things had really spiralled out of control for him. So goes the story more often than not. Getting caught may well have saved him and I do not just mean figuratively. As I have said already, only time will tell.

I hope that the people who support

Mr. Hache, his mother, his sister, his friend,

are right when they say there is a true change, a

true shift in him. I hope that for his sake and

for their sake and for Mr. Hache's child's sake.

It is certainly not too late for Mr. Hache to

turn things around if he sticks with his plan.

In terms of the sentence that should be imposed today, the threshold issue is whether the joint submission is contrary to the public interest, because, if it is not, then I am required in law to follow it.

There are certain things that Crown and defence did not agree on at the sentencing hearing. For example, the Crown took the position that the quantities of drugs constitute

an aggravating factor whereas the defence argued that wholesale trafficking, by definition, involves large quantities of drugs. That is reflected in the starting point and the quantity of drugs involved is not a separate aggravating factor.

Another example is the Crown argued that the nature of the substance, it being crack cocaine, a substance that is more addictive and more dangerous than powder cocaine, is also an aggravating factor whereas defence questioned whether this distinction really should be made.

I do not need to resolve these issues because, on the bottom line, counsel do agree on what sentence should be imposed.

The sentence that is being suggested is not an insignificant sentence. Far from it. I think it is at the low end of the spectrum considering the nature of the organization and its activities and considering that Mr. Hache was at the top of it. He was, as I have said, at the top of a distribution system that has, and this is certain, caused immense harm to a lot people.

At the same time, he has pleaded guilty. By doing so, he has saved the justice system considerable resources. In these types of case, there can be endless pre-trial motions, Charter

challenges. A considerable amount of court time would have been required had Mr. Hache decided to litigate this matter. Avoiding that, having taken responsibility for his role, and his remorse, which I believe is genuine at this point, are all mitigating factors.

1

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

I also heard at the sentencing hearing that this is a joint submission in the true sense of the word because it is the product of lengthy discussions between counsel. One of the reasons why joint submissions must be given as much weight as they do is precisely because counsel are privy to all sorts of information that the Court may not be aware of, including how much work went into arriving at the resolution. I can imagine the massive amount of disclosure that had to be reviewed and the complexity of some of the issues that arose and all had to be ironed out. So especially in a case like this, given what I have heard, I feel the Court has to show deference to the positions taken by counsel, and, in particular, the decision of the Crown to jointly propose a sentence which may be considered at the low end of the scale considering the seriousness of the crime.

For those reasons, not only do I not think

that following this joint submission would be

contrary to the public interest, I am satisfied
that it is an appropriate sentence in all the
circumstances. I also agree that it is
appropriate for the sentences on the two counts
to be concurrent because all of this is very
interconnected.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

At the sentencing hearing, the Crown suggested that for the charge of counselling an assault, a concurrent term of three to six months could be imposed. I certainly respect that position, but on that one point, even if it will not make a difference practically for Mr. Hache because the sentence will be concurrent, I do think that it is in the public interest that the sentence for that count be more than three to six months. I think the sentence has to reflect Mr. Hache's persistence in trying to get his associate to carry out this assault. I do not think three to six months reflects the seriousness of that kind of conduct. The maximum sentence is two and a half years for that offence, and I think that these particular circumstances fall in the middle of the range as far as level of seriousness and the sentence should reflect that.

We do not see these types of offences very often in our courts and I think there is an

immense need to deter them. As I say, in

Mr. Hache's case, it will change nothing to his
global sentence, but I do think the Court's

message, as far as its response to that type of
conduct, needs to be unequivocal.

I heard that Mr. Hache has spent, as of
August 17, a total of 491 days on remand, which
that as of today, there is a total of 501 remand
days. Under my calculations, if that is credited
at one-and-a-half-day credit for each day of
remand, which is the maximum credit possible, it
would work out to two years and three weeks. So
I am going to give Mr. Hache credit for two years
for the time he has spent on remand.

The Crown has sought a number of ancillary orders and I will deal with those first. First, there will be a firearms prohibition commencing today and expiring ten years from release. This is mandatory. This is a secondary designated offence, so a DNA order is not mandatory. The Crown is seeking one and the defence is not opposing that request. I am satisfied that given the nature of the offence and its circumstances, the related criminal record, it is appropriate that a DNA warrant issue. The victim of crime surcharge is mandatory - it is \$200 for each count - and the default time and the time to pay

1 are statutorily provided.

The Crown has indicated that this is not the point where any forfeiture order is being sought.

Forfeiture application will be dealt with at a later date.

Can you stand up, please, Mr. Hache.

Mr. Hache, as I said, I am going to go along with what has been suggested for the reasons I have been talking about. If it had not been for the remand time, the sentence on Count 1 would have been five years. I am giving you two years' credit for the remand time, so the further jail time is three years. And for Count 2, I have decided that the sentence should be one year imprisonment, but it will be concurrent, so it will be served at the same time as the other.

But I do want the record to reflect the seriousness of that conduct. You can sit down.

I sincerely hope this is the last time that you come to court. Many of the people I sentence at the time of sentencing are alone. They stand alone to be sentenced and sometimes they are sent away for a very long time. That is not you. You have people who support you, who want to help you. You have a lot to look forward to. You have a small child. Everything, really, is up to you at this point. There is nothing you can do

1	to change the past, but everything about the
2	future is completely in your hands. So I hope
3	that you stick with your plan.
4	Have I overlooked anything, Ms. Wawzonek?
5	MS. WAWZONEK: No, Your Honour. Thank you.
6	MS. PICHÉ: No thank you.
7	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
8	I thank counsel for their work on this
9	matter, and for their submissions. Ms. Piché,
10	please extend those to Mr. Praught, who appeared
11	for the Crown on the last date.
12	
13	
14	
15	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723 of the Rules of Court
16	of the Rules of Goule
17	
18	Jane Romanowich, CSR(A)
19	Court Reporter
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	