IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

RANDOLPH D. WATCHORN

Transcript of the oral sentencing delivered by His
Honour Judge R.M. Bourassa, sitting at Frobisher Bay,
in the Northwest Territories, Wednesday, May 15th,
A.D. 1985.

APPEARANCES:

MR. N. SHARKEY

MR. J. BOVARD

Counsel for the Crown

Counsel for the Defence

THE COURT: This could be called the "with-friends-like-that-you-don't-need enemies" case.

Apparently, as a result of an involvement with a long time friend and a desire to maintain that friendship, the accused was involved in the possession of approximately two pounds of hashish for the purposes of trafficking. I believe it would be fairly accurate to observe that normally, notwithstanding the accused's antecedents, the lack of a previous criminal record of any note and his fairly positive antecedents, a jail sentence of anywhere from a year and a half to two years would be involved for this kind of possession.

The accused is described by the Crown as a duple of the so-called friend. Both Crown and Defence agree in this matter: that the so-called friend arrived at Mr. Watchorn's doorstep carrying the drugs unknown to Watchorn. Mr. Watchorn extended his hospitality to his friend and his drugs. The drugs ended up being secreted in a stereo speaker in Watchorn's residence over a period of six days. The accused knew the drugs were present. I have no indication before me that this accused was involved in any of the other activities related to trafficking such as selling or dividing, and cutting the drug. His involvement as described to me appears only to have involved providing a place for the drugs to lie.

I have already commented earlier today when dealing with a young offender, a seventeen year old who was caught up in the prospect of quick and easy cash with respect to drugs, the problem that Frobisher Bay has with drugs, and I am sure

I could say the same thing again to Mr. Watchorn, and I am sure I will have the occasion to say it again in the future.

But it is a very real problem here, and it's something that the Courts have to address. It is a situation, I think, that the Court can reflect in its sentence.

The accused is working, and from the references filed as Exhibit 1 he certainly isn't a total scoundrel by any means. It appears that he made a very significant error in judgment, and as a result of that error has severely compromised himself, not to mention the apparent hurt and embarrassment he has caused his family.

The issue is, I suppose, whether or not in response to that involvement as described to me the Court should impose a sentence that would be normally imposed for trafficking in that quantity of drugs, being a very significant quantity. Mr. Watchorn and others are going to have to clearly understand that when it comes to drugs it must be 'hands off'. People must understand that there is a hidden price to pay for fooling around with those substances, and that may very well take the glitter off the apparent gold that a lot of people think is available from selling and possessing drugs.

I accept in substantial mitigation the fact that he has pleaded guilty at the first opportunity. That he has cooperated with the Police I think to a small degree substantiates the position of Defence and Crown that he was the unwilling dupe in this matter. On the other hand, I have to

be concerned about general deterrence, and, as I have already said, drugs are such a problem in Frobisher Bay. I think the Court would be failing in its duty if anyone was left with the impression that they can be involved directly or indirectly with drugs and not be exposed to severe consequences. The thrust of all Court decisions with drugs has been to this effect. The fact that he has no previous criminal record doesn't assist him that much. I believeit's been said in other Courts that the very fact that people don't have a criminal record is an inducement for their involvement in the drug trade, because they are the last people one would think of as being involved in the drug trade.

Stand up, please, Mr. Watchorn. Taking into account what has been said on your behalf, the factors that I have already mentioned, I am going to sentence you to ninety days imprisonment. I am going to direct that you be imprisoned from this time until Monday morning at seven a.m., and that is the 20th of May, and thereafter each Friday at seven p.m. until each Monday at seven a.m. until you have served eighty-four days in total. The final day of your sentence is to be served on the 21st of December, 1985 at seven a.m. until seven p.m. the following day.

During the period while you are released, you are going to be subject to a probation order: to keep the peace and be of good behaviour. You are not to consume or possess any kind of non-prescription drugs or medication.

You are to report to probation services when and if required.

I hope you will exercise better judgment in choosing your friends, Mr. Watchorn.

MR. SHARKEY: Sir, I should point out, and this has been brought to my attention before, that in your disposition when you say shall serve eighty-four days, and you have given the times, that he will serve those days—the correctional authorities will normally remove one—third automatically for—I know you're aware of that, but despite your direction, it may be that he won't serve actually eighty—four days.

THE COURT: Oh, well, I understand that. What I am trying to do, Mr. Sharkey and Mr. Bovard, so you both understand is this: I can't place him on probation after an intermittent sentence. I want him on probation for a period of time, and by having him serve his last day of imprisonment on the 21st of December, 1985, I am, in effect, putting him on probation for six months.

MR. SHARKEY: Sir, that's an innovative and good idea. I under-

THE COURT: Well, then, I will direct that his first period of days be served until Monday. Perhaps, just repeating myself, thereafter he is to serve his time in custody on each weekend until there is one day remaining. That one day is to be served on the 21st of December, 1985. Do you understand that, Mr. Bovard?

stand that. I was just curious about the earlier part.

MR. BOVARD: Yes, I understand, Your Honour.

THE COURT: Then, of course, he is subject to the probation order in the interim.

MR. BOVARD: Yes, Your Honour. Thank you.

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

Certified a correct transcript,

Jill MadDonald Court Reporter