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1. THE COURT: Lacey Forrest has pleaded
2. guilty and now stands convicted of a charge of
3. conspiring with four others between February 29,
4. 2016 and March 17, 2016, to traffic in cocaine
5. and to possess cocaine for the purposes of
6. trafficking. It is now my duty to sentence
7. Ms. Forrest, a duty that is a solemn one and is
8. often described as one of the most difficult
9. duties a judge has.
10. The facts agreed on by the Crown and
11. Ms. Forrest are set out in the Agreed Statement
12. of Facts filed. I will summarize them and then I
13. will have some comments about issues relevant to
14. the facts on which the Crown and Ms. Forrest do
15. not agree.
16. The agreed facts include that Norman Hache
17. and Dolapo Bode-Harrison arranged to transport
18. cocaine from Alberta to the Northwest
19. Territories. They supplied cocaine to
20. Ms. Forrest, who was then a resident of Fort
21. Resolution. Her role was to distribute the
22. cocaine to street-level traffickers in the same
23. drug network and to collect money from those
24. street-level traffickers, primarily, in Fort
25. Resolution. She also made deliveries to dealers
26. in other communities, including Hay River and
27. Fort Smith.
	1. The Agreed Statement of Facts, more
	2. specifically, states that on March 3, 2016,
	3. Ms. Forrest picked up at the Hay River Airport a
	4. shipment from Mr. Hache of four ounces of crack
	5. cocaine and eight ounces of powdered cocaine,
	6. which she distributed to dealers in Fort Smith
	7. and Fort Resolution. On March 8, 2016, she
	8. arranged for $13,200.00 in cocaine trafficking
	9. proceeds to be hand delivered to Mr. Hache by her
	10. husband, who flew to Yellowknife for that
	11. purpose.
	12. Between March 15 and 16, Ms. Forrest and
	13. Mr. Hache agreed that Mr. Herback, who was also
	14. involved in this drug trafficking network, would
	15. drive from Yellowknife to Fort Resolution and
	16. deliver cocaine to her, and she would send back
	17. with him money that she had collected for
	18. Mr. Hache.
	19. The police put Mr. Herback's vehicle under
	20. surveillance, and when Mr. Herback arrived at
	21. Ms. Forrest's home in Fort Resolution, both she
	22. and he were arrested.
	23. Items seized from her residence included
	24. just over $8,000.00 in cash and some score
	25. sheets, that is, lists of drug debts; 362.5 grams
	26. of cocaine was located on the ground next to
	27. Herback's vehicle, along with some other items in
28. and around the vehicle.
29. To maintain the integrity of the
30. investigation, both Mr. Herback and Ms. Forrest
31. were released, and then in April 2016,
32. Ms. Forrest was charged.
33. The Agreed Statement of Facts includes
34. transcripts of some intercepted communications,
35. mostly between Ms. Forrest and Mr. Hache.
36. Audiotapes of those intercepts were also played
37. at the sentencing hearing.
38. Ms. Forrest, through her counsel, sought to
39. expand on the admitted facts with what Crown
40. counsel objected to as new facts that are not
41. agreed to. These additional facts were that
42. Mr. Hache, whom Ms. Forrest had known for ten
43. years, asked her in February of 2016 to do him a
44. favour and pick up some money, that she agreed,
45. knowing that it was drug money, and then on March
46. 3, she was asked to pick up, not just money, but
47. also drugs.
48. Later she was asked to deliver money to
49. Mr. Herback, but by the time he arrived at her
50. home, she had decided not to do anything more and
51. locked the door and was not going to let him in.
52. Ms. Forrest points to the fact that Mr. Herback
53. was arrested outside her residence while she was
54. arrested inside.
	1. It may well be that Mr. Hache approached
	2. Ms. Forrest with the request that she help him
	3. out in his drug business. I do not think that
	4. makes any difference in the larger scheme of
	5. things. But the remainder of the additional
	6. facts that were proposed are not consistent with
	7. the Agreed Statement of Facts in many ways. They
	8. ignore the fact that Ms. Forrest admits being
	9. part of the conspiracy. They ignore the fact
	10. that she delivered drugs to street-level dealers
	11. in the communities.
	12. Ms. Forrest submits that the initial
	13. intercept, which is at tab 1 of the Agreed
	14. Statement of Facts, shows that she was confused.
	15. I have listened to and read that intercept, read
	16. the transcript of that intercept, and I do not
	17. see it as revealing any confusion. She does seem
	18. somewhat nervous or anxious, but I would think
	19. that is not unusual for someone who is picking up
	20. a package of drugs at an airport.
	21. The later intercepts make it clear that
	22. Ms. Forrest was to deliver to various dealers,
	23. that Mr. Hache was listening to her views about
	24. the people she was dealing with, for example,
	25. when she expressed frustration about the
	26. individual called "Ryan," who led her on a bit of
	27. a chase in Fort Smith. Those intercepts also
55. make it clear that she made arrangements to get
56. money to Mr. Hache. She did not wait for him to
57. do all of that.
58. The intercept of March 15 shows that she was
59. contacting Mr. Hache on that date, asking him
60. when he was going to send her more drugs because
61. she had people calling her, asking for them. She
62. also told him on that date that she had taken
63. $1,500.00 in pay for herself out of the
64. trafficking proceeds. She complains, at one
65. point, about her father "cutting my grass" by
66. delivering drugs to another dealer in Hay River,
67. in other words, that he is affecting her drug
68. business.
69. So the intercepts, in my view, show
70. Ms. Forrest very much in control of what she is
71. doing, not confused at all, and there is no
72. indication that she is trying to terminate her
73. involvement or is reluctant.
74. So I am unable to accept these new facts
75. proposed because they do conflict with what is
76. admitted in the Agreed Statement of Facts. I
77. also note that the Agreed Statement of Facts says
78. that Mr. Herback was arrested when he arrived at
79. the residence, so that does not necessarily
80. support a scenario where Ms. Forrest is refusing
81. to let him in. It may be, at that point, she did
82. not even realize he had arrived yet, but it is
83. clear from the intercepts that she knew he was
84. coming.
85. A second issue has to do with what
86. inference, if any, I should draw from the
87. intercept at tab 9 of the Agreed Statement of
88. Facts. In that intercepted call, Ms. Forrest is
89. talking to Mr. Hache about the fact that she and
90. Mr. Herback had been arrested the night that he
91. drove to her home in Fort Resolution, and as I
92. have said, they were arrested and then released.
93. And she talks about having told everyone that she
94. did not know anyone was in a truck outside her
95. door, and then she tells Mr. Hache that she
96. thinks it will all blow over because of other
97. events that have occurred or are going to occur
98. in the community: a carnival and two unfortunate
99. deaths.
100. Crown counsel says that I should infer from
101. this that Ms. Forrest had every intention of
102. continuing her involvement in the drug operation.
103. I am not completely satisfied that I can go that
104. far, but what I can tell from that intercept is
105. that Ms. Forrest certainly was not telling
106. Mr. Hache that she was finished or that she did
107. not want to be involved anymore. It is clear
108. that she wanted Mr. Hache to know that she had
109. denied to others any knowledge of Mr. Herback and
110. what he was doing, so it seems to me she wanted
111. Mr. Hache to know that she was not betraying him.
112. That suggests to me that she was at least
113. open to continuing her involvement. In that
114. sense, Mr. Forrest's new fact is not completely
115. consistent with the Agreed Statement of Facts,
116. but I would not draw the inference that she had
117. actually made up her mind or was intent on
118. continuing as described by Crown counsel. It may
119. well be that she wanted to see what the fallout
120. of the arrests would be before she really thought
121. about that.
122. Crown counsel has also pointed out that
123. Ms. Forrest minimized her involvement in the drug
124. operation when she spoke with the author of the
125. *Gladue* report. She told the author of the report
126. that all she did was pick up money for Mr. Hache
127. on two occasions but that she did not deal drugs,
128. and that is, plainly and clearly, not true. It
129. is completely contradicted by her admission in
130. the Agreed Statement of Facts that she was
131. distributing cocaine to dealers in the
132. communities.
133. Now, I have thought about that. That does
134. not lead me to doubt everything she told the
135. author of the report. I do find it surprising
136. that while Ms. Forrest told the author of the
137. report about an upbringing filled with addictions
138. and abuse, her parents, when interviewed, denied
139. any abuse and said that they only used alcohol on
140. special occasions. However, there is some
141. support for Ms. Forrest's version in the
142. interviews with her siblings.
143. On balance, and having considered the
144. report, I do accept that Ms. Forrest had a
145. difficult, unhappy upbringing in Fort Resolution
146. and that there was some violence and alcohol
147. abuse in the family home.
148. Ms. Forrest is a 35-year-old Métis woman.
149. On her mother's side of the family, there were
150. relatives who attended residential school, so
151. that legacy is part of her background. Despite
152. her difficult upbringing and her own abuse of
153. alcohol and drugs over the years, Ms. Forrest was
154. able to get into and attend nursing school,
155. although she withdrew, apparently, due to
156. financial issues in her third year.
157. She has taken a number of other courses
158. including bookkeeping. She has worked in a
159. number of different administrative and
160. finance-related jobs. With her current partner,
161. she is the co-owner of a trucking business and
162. works part-time for another such business. She
163. has also embarked on an aesthetics business out
164. of her home in Edmonton, where she and her
165. partner now live.
166. She has children ages 8 and 10 from her
167. previous marriage and helped to raise two
168. stepchildren from that marriage. In the *Gladue*
169. report, she describes that marriage as abusive
170. and unhappy and says it left her with financial
171. problems. She and her current partner have a
172. three-month old baby. She has no criminal
173. record.
174. Ms. Forrest indicates that she has abstained
175. from drugs for two years and alcohol for one
176. year. From the letters filed on this proceeding,
177. and I am referring to the letters from the Métis
178. Nation, the Deninu K'ue First Nation and the Fort
179. Resolution Métis Council, it appears that
180. Ms. Forrest is well regarded. She is considered
181. to be bright and capable and hard working and a
182. good mother.
183. Crown counsel characterizes the activity
184. that Ms. Forrest was engaged in as wholesale
185. trafficking, while defence counsel characterizes
186. it as commercial trafficking.
187. The distinction is important because the
188. law, as set out in the case of *Lau* from the
189. Alberta Court of Appeal and followed by judges in
190. this Court, is that wholesale trafficking means
191. the starting point sentence, which is then
192. adjusted up or down, is four and a half years in
193. jail whereas with commercial trafficking, the
194. starting point is three years.
195. Those starting-point sentences reflect the
196. seriousness of drug trafficking, as does the fact
197. that Parliament has set the maximum punishment at
198. life in prison for conspiracy to traffic. That,
199. of course, would be for the most serious example
200. of the offence.
201. In the *Lau* case, the Court said that
202. commercial trafficking cases that attract a
203. three-year starting point typically involve a few
204. grams of cocaine, with two ounces, or about 57
205. grams, at the high end of the scale. Wholesale
206. trafficking cases tend to be in the range of
207. hundreds of grams.
208. In this case, Ms. Forrest admits that she
209. received 4 ounces, in other words, 114 grams of
210. crack cocaine, and 8 ounces, that being 228
211. grams, of powder cocaine, so a total of 342 grams
212. of cocaine, from Mr. Hache, which she then
213. distributed to the street-level dealers. And on

25 March 15 to 16, Mr. Hache arranged a delivery of

1. cocaine to her via Mr. Herback, and the amount
2. then was approximately 362 grams. So she was
3. dealing in hundreds of grams.
4. Now, it is not simply the amount of the
5. drugs that makes the difference between wholesale
6. and commercial trafficking but also the role of
7. the person in the drug organization.
8. Ms. Forrest's role, as I have said, was to
9. receive drugs and distribute them to street-level
10. dealers in communities south of the lake, and as
11. seen from the intercepts, there were several
12. dealers that she was supplying. She distributed
13. almost 350 grams in that way. She was not at the
14. top of the organization or network, but she was
15. not a street-level dealer, either.
16. She sent a significant amount of money to
17. Mr. Hache from the drug dealing. She was a
18. trusted associate. That comes across very
19. clearly from the telephone intercepts. She made
20. arrangements for delivery of the money to
21. Mr. Hache. She did not wait for him or rely on
22. him to make the arrangements. As I have said,
23. she wanted to keep others from cutting in on her
24. business.
25. Although there is no evidence that she was
26. involved in the dial-a-dope operations that some
27. of her co-conspirators were, it is clear that she
28. dealt with cocaine in significantly greater
29. amounts than the accused in the case of *Maskill*,
30. who was found to be engaged in "a commercial
31. operation on more than a minimal scale," and in
32. that case, the drugs involved were marijuana and
33. 17 grams of cocaine.
34. So I find that Ms. Forrest was involved in
35. wholesale trafficking. I note as well, although
36. my finding is based on what I have just
37. described, that her co-conspirators, Mr. Hache,
38. Mr. Bode-Harrison and Mr. Herback, were found at
39. their sentencings to have been engaged in
40. wholesale trafficking, and that in her decision
41. on Mr. Dunn's sentence, Justice Smallwood found
42. that the organization, in other words, this
43. network of conspirators, was engaged in wholesale
44. trafficking. And Ms. Forrest was clearly part of
45. that network.
46. The devastating effects of cocaine are well
47. known. The cost to society is high in crime and
48. family breakdown. We see this all the time in
49. the courts: people commit crimes to get money to
50. buy cocaine because they are addicted to it;
51. people who squander their good reputations,
52. squander money and their family's resources to
53. get cocaine; parents who do not look after their
54. children properly, or at all; people who commit
55. acts of violence because of their desire for
56. cocaine or when under its influence.
	1. I do want to pause here to observe that it
	2. is ironic that Ms. Forrest, who I believe is
	3. sincerely concerned about her children because of
	4. the situation she has put herself in, did not
	5. show that same concern for the children of the
	6. people who would end up buying the cocaine, and
	7. using it, that she was supplying, and I think
	8. that is a very sad comment.
	9. It is because of the terrible consequences
	10. of cocaine use that the Courts of the Northwest
	11. Territories, as courts elsewhere, have repeatedly
	12. said that the main principles of sentencing in
	13. cases of trafficking in cocaine are denunciation
	14. and deterrence. Significant sentences are
	15. considered appropriate as a tool to deter those
	16. who prey like vultures on those who are more
	17. vulnerable by supplying them with cocaine in
	18. order to make money.
	19. Because Ms. Forrest is Métis, I must, and I
	20. do, consider Section 718.2(e) of the *Criminal*
	21. *Code*. That section requires that the Court
	22. consider any sanctions available other than
	23. imprisonment that are reasonable in the
	24. circumstances, paying particular attention to the
	25. circumstances of Aboriginal offenders.
	26. In the *Gladue* and *Ipeelee* cases, the Supreme
	27. Court of Canada spoke of that section as
57. recognizing the over-representation of Aboriginal
58. people in Canadian jails, and I have read the
59. *Tobac* case decided by Justice Smallwood, which
60. reviewed statistics illustrating that
61. over-representation.
62. The Court is to exercise restraint and to
63. give attention to the unique background and
64. systemic factors which may have played a part in
65. bringing the offender before the Court, and if
66. those factors have played a significant role,
67. they are to be considered in determining whether
68. imprisonment will actually be a deterrent.
69. Now, some of those factors are present in
70. this case. There is, as I have said, a legacy of
71. the residential school experience. There was
72. drug and alcohol abuse and family violence, so I
73. take that into account. But those
74. considerations, of course, have to be balanced
75. with the pressing need to deter people from
76. trafficking in cocaine, which is an
77. ever-increasing problem in the north.
78. I also have to consider what is
79. called "moral blameworthiness." As noted by
80. Justice Smallwood in Mr. Herback's case, the
81. moral blameworthiness of those who traffic in
82. cocaine is high, and it is particularly high in
83. Ms. Forrest's case because her trafficking was
84. not a spontaneous one-off action. She had time
85. to think about what she was doing and to decide
86. whether to get involved or whether to stop at any
87. point along the way. She could have looked for
88. other ways to deal with the financial problems
89. which she says were her motivation, but instead
90. she took on an important role in this drug
91. trafficking network.
92. I also have to consider the sentences
93. imposed on the others involved in this venture as
94. well as other cases so that parity is observed,
95. in other words, so that there is some
96. compatibility between sentences in similar cases,
97. some parity. I have reviewed all the cases
98. submitted by counsel, although I will not refer
99. to all of them.
100. Mr. Hache, who was the head of this drug
101. trafficking network, pleaded guilty and was
102. sentenced to five years' imprisonment less credit
103. for remand time. He had a criminal record,
104. including convictions, for drug trafficking.
105. Mr. Bode-Harrison, on his guilty plea, was
106. sentenced to four years in jail less remand time.
107. He supplied the cocaine from Alberta to the
108. Northwest Territories. He was on an equal level
109. to Mr. Hache as far as the hierarchy and the
110. direction of the network. He had a less serious
111. criminal record than Mr. Hache. Both he and
112. Mr. Hache were involved in dial-a-dope
113. operations.
114. Mr. Dunn was sentenced to three years in
115. jail on a guilty plea. He had no criminal
116. record. His role was to transport the drugs via
117. the airline he was employed with.
118. Finally, Mr. Herback was also sentenced to
119. three years' imprisonment. He was a street-level
120. dealer who also supplied other dealers and
121. collected money for the organization. He had a
122. limited and dated criminal record.
123. So, clearly, there are differences between
124. all of the co-conspirators. However, I find that
125. Ms. Forrest's role is more similar to the roles
126. played by Mr. Herback and Mr. Dunn than the roles
127. played by Mr. Hache and Mr. Bode-Harrison.
128. I also want to mention the case of *Katrina*
129. *Stiopu*. She was involved in a different drug
130. trafficking scheme, which dealt in cocaine,
131. marijuana and fentanyl. She arranged and
132. coordinated storage of drugs on her property, and
133. she involved some of her relatives in her work
134. with the drug network. She was an Aboriginal
135. woman who abused drugs and alcohol, and she had
136. no criminal record. She was sentenced to four
137. and a half years in jail less remand time.
	1. That is a very recent case, and I do have to
	2. observe that the starting point for trafficking
	3. in fentanyl is higher than for cocaine.
	4. There was also reference during the
	5. sentencing submissions to the cases of *Grandjambe*
	6. and *Tobac.* However, the facts of those cases are
	7. so completely different from this case that the
	8. short sentences imposed are completely
	9. inappropriate in a case like this.
	10. Crown counsel seeks a sentence of three
	11. years in jail. Ms. Forrest, through her counsel,
	12. asks that I impose a suspended sentence with
	13. probation and conditions, or alternatively, an
	14. intermittent sentence or one of several months.
	15. It is acknowledged on behalf of Ms. Forrest
	16. that I would have to find this to be an
	17. exceptional case in order to impose a short
	18. sentence. However, there is simply nothing
	19. exceptional in the circumstances of this case.
	20. Ms. Forrest takes the position that absent
	21. exceptional circumstances, a sentence of two
	22. years plus a day in a federal penitentiary is
	23. sufficient.
	24. To determine the appropriate sentence, I
	25. have to look at the mitigating and aggravating
	26. factors.
	27. The guilty plea is a significant mitigating
		1. factor. By pleading guilty, Ms. Forrest has
		2. given up her right to a trial, and this case
		3. would have required a lengthy and complicated
		4. trial. She also waived the preliminary inquiry.
		5. The guilty plea means that Ms. Forrest is taking
		6. responsibility for her actions and it signifies
		7. remorse, so it is a significant factor in her
		8. favour.
		9. It is also to Ms. Forrest's credit that she
		10. has got her life back on track since being
		11. charged. She has been working and looking after
		12. her children and has given up drugs and alcohol.
		13. She has not got into any further trouble with the
		14. law. And, of course, her rehabilitation is a
		15. goal in sentencing and must not be lost sight of.
		16. However, with this type of charge, it is not the
		17. paramount concern.
		18. There is no pretrial custody to take into
		19. account in her case.
		20. As to aggravating factors, the fact that
		21. Ms. Forrest was trafficking in crack cocaine,
		22. which is known to be very dangerous and highly
		23. addictive, is an aggravating factor. She was
		24. also working in association with, and at the
		25. direction of and for the benefit of, a criminal
		26. organization, in other words, Mr. Hache's drug
		27. dealing network, and that is specified to be an
138. aggravating factor in Section 718.2 of the
139. *Criminal Code*.
140. In the *Gladue* report, there is reference to
141. Ms. Forrest describing Fort Resolution as full of
142. substances, and the writer of the report also
143. received information that drug and alcohol misuse
144. is a major problem there.
145. It is an aggravating factor that
146. Ms. Forrest, who is well acquainted with the
147. social problems in Fort Resolution, and I would
148. assume in other communities but certainly Fort
149. Resolution, chose to distribute drugs to be sold
150. to vulnerable people in those communities. And I
151. would also observe that in that situation, it is
152. not just the vulnerable person to whom the
153. cocaine is sold and then who then has to deal
154. with the consequences, even though they have
155. willingly bought the cocaine, but it is not just
156. that person who, in a sense, is a victim because
157. they are being preyed upon, but it is the
158. community that is a victim of this type of
159. activity.
160. I have taken into account Ms. Forrest's
161. Métis heritage and the *Gladue* factors. I have
162. taken into account that she is a mother to three
163. young children. As I have said, there are no
164. exceptional circumstances here, and the law is
165. clear that a significant term of incarceration is
166. called for.
167. I will deal first with the ancillary orders
168. sought by the Crown, none of which were opposed.
169. First, there will be a DNA order. Although
170. not mandatory for this offence, DNA is an
171. important investigative tool, and this is a very
172. serious offence so, in my view, the order is
173. appropriate and will issue.
174. Second, a firearm prohibition order is
175. mandatory, so there will be that order, in the
176. usual terms, commencing today and expiring ten
177. years from Ms. Forrest's release from
178. imprisonment. Any firearms and other items
179. covered by the order that are in her possession
180. are to be surrendered to the RCMP forthwith.
181. Finally, there will be the mandatory victim
182. surcharge of $200.00, with the default time and
183. time to pay as set out in the statute. The
184. Crown's forfeiture application may be brought
185. forward at a later date.
186. Please stand, Ms. Forrest.
187. Ms. Forrest, you and your counsel have
188. emphasized the negative effect that a prison
189. sentence will have on your children and your
190. relationship with your children; and I am sure
191. that when you first got involved with this drug
192. dealing enterprise, you must have thought about
193. what would happen if you got caught and,
194. unfortunately, you decided to take that risk. I
195. hope, I sincerely hope, that it is a risk that
196. you will never take again. It gives me
197. absolutely no pleasure to send a young mother to
198. jail for a lengthy period of time.
199. Having considered and balanced all the
200. factors and recognizing the terrible problem that
201. cocaine is in the Northwest Territories and the
202. need to deter those who traffic in it, I sentence
203. you to three years in jail. You may sit down.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 13 |  | Anything further, counsel? |
| 14 | MR. | PRAUGHT: Counts 2 and 3 could be |
| 15 |  | stayed, Your Honour, and we will file papers |
| 16 |  | today. |
| 17 | THE | COURT: All right. Anything from you, |
| 18 |  | Mr. Bock? |
| 19 | MR. | BOCK: No, thank you, Your Honour. |
| 20 | THE | COURT: All right. Thank you. We |
| 21 |  | will close court. |
| 22 | **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
| 23 | **PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED** |
| 24 | **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |
| 25 |  |
| 26 |  |
| 27 |  |
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