IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTERS OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

٧S

ELLEN MCLEOD, PATRICK HARRISON, MARTINA CARDINAL, BILLY CLARKE, AND MARTINA MALAGANA



Transcript of the Oral Sentencings given by His Hohour, Chief Judge J. R. Slaven, sitting at Inuvik in the Northwest Territories, on Wednesday, April 17th, A.D., 1985.

## **APPEARANCES:**

MR. G. BICKERT:

Counsel for the Crown

MR. R. REID:

Counsel for Martina Cardinal, Billy

Clarke, and Martina Malagana

MR. P. FUGLSANG:

Counsel for Ellen McLeod and Patrick

Harrison

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

THE COURT:
You can come forward if you wish, Mr. Fuglsang
and sit with Mr. Reid. Now, did I ask Martina Malagana when
she was convicted two years ago for a sale made two and a
half years ago, I believe she was in the same house that she's
now in?

MR. BICKERT: I'm told that is correct, sir.

THE COURT: Well, today, I have held six trials for offences against paragraph 77 (c) of the Liquor Ordinance for selling liquor. These six trials involved five different people. Here is some of the history of it. During the past ten years or so, our legislature has seen fit to increase penalties in the Liquor Ordinance, most particularly for bootlegging twice, and in those two steps up, the increase has been very marked so that now with first offenders, we're dealing with a maximum fine of \$5,000 plus 12 months imprisonment, which I assure you is much heavier than it was five years ago and much, much heavier than it was 10 years ago.

Since the revised ordincances of 1974 are here, I can refer to what the penalties used to be, a fine not exceeding \$500 and imprisonment to a term not exceeding four months. That was increased I believe in '76 and again in '83, so that the fines have been increased ten-fold in a matter of 10 years.

This illustrates to me, at least, how seriously the legislature views the problem. In addition, when the fines were first raised that was fine as far as it went, but there were few convictions because there was no protection in the

ordinance for undercover agents to make buys and apparently it's very difficult to get a purchaser in the North to give evidence against a bootlegger.

Accordingly, several years ago, there was an amendment to the ordinance which gave protection to undercover agents buying liquor from a bootlegger, similar to that given in the Narcotics Control Act. Not long afterwards, an undercover agent or two were brought into the Delta in the fall of 1982, as a result of which 12 or 15 or whatever charges were laid for bootlegging. As I recall, there were convictions in most of them.

Two of the people convicted at that time by me are back before me today. The charges laid two years ago were a cause celebre in the Delta. Surely everyone was aware of it, certainly the ones that are second offenders here today. Because of the history of the legislation, just about all of those that came before the Court two years ago were first offenders at that time and were treated possibly more lightly than they would have been if the undercover buys and resulting convictions had been going on for sometime.

Even though they were a cause celebre, it seems to me they didn't have much effect. Constable Ladouceur comes up here undercover and in a one-week stay in the Delta, she made 21 separate buys of liquor, granted not all in Inuvik, but she stated she was able to make four or five buys successfully just in one night, the 18th.

Mr. Fuglsang suggests that the evidence of Constable

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

1 2 3

Ladouceur was very pat, they were all the same. What struck me was the similarity of the transactions. It almost reminded me of the old joke, Knock, knock, who's there, Ida, Ida who? I want a bottle, and here's one. Who is Ida? They didn't know who Ida was. I want a bottle. Come in, here's a bottle and only once was a price mentioned. Every case was \$50, no talk about price. In every case it was a 26 of rye, and as I say, it's almost like a chain store doing business selling the same product at the same price, cheap rye for \$50 for a 26.

It seems to me these six people came in here for trials, showed no remorse, and seemed prepared to take their chances, pay their fines and their legal expenses or even go to jail at the expense of doing business. Mrs. McLeod told Constable Ladouceur, haven't you got a cab, are you walking? Don't get caught, I'm scared of the cops.

It's sad to mention the maximum penalties and I have to agree with Mr. Fuglsang there is no minimum, although the legislature tried to provide for a minimum for the second offenders, but one that can be circumvented, as Mr. Bickert tells me, and I suppose someone's talking to the legislative people. They might have their draftsman look at that and as Mr. Bickert points out, it says a minimum of \$5,000 for a second offence. If the Judge wishes to do so, he could sentence a person to one day in jail and forget about any fine, or as I did with one of the gentlemen, to one hour in custody.

Any of us that have been in the North for any length of time

know what a problem liquor is in the North, the problems it causes, broken homes, neglected children, the woundings, the beatings, the deaths, and surely many deaths that never get to Court or even to a Coroner's Inquest, are because of the accumulation of liquor in the system through the years that kills a person.

I have to agree with Mr. Fuglsnag that unlike drugs, liquor is not illegal per se. It's brought in by the Government and sold by the Government, and as he says, we're not here to stamp out liquor as we are to stamp out the supply and use of illegal drugs. I suggest to you, however, that the legislature has made it very clear to the police and to the Courts that they want us to play our part in stamping out bootlegging and certainly the legislature has played its part.

Now, the similarities, I've mentioned some, and the other general one, it was all so casual. One person asked Ida her last name and she gave a name and said she was from Fort Smith. It's not a surname common in the North. There they were, all of them, selling to a stranger. They're all in the business. It's not like the 98 percent of drug traffickers we get. They're not in the business. It seems to me these people, or at least someone in each of the houses, are in the business of selling liquor. They're in it for profit, making a profit of \$35 or more on every transaction.

In each sale they were all similar, so much alike. There were no special circumstances in any sale, except for the one that involved an apparent 11 year old as the seller's agent.

The first of the principles of sentencing we've talked about used to be called punishment and you've also heard the euphusim, "vindication for the law". It's not a bad one. I like to say to maintain respect for the law, the law that the legislature of the Northwest Territories has enacted. I have to give some consideration to that, but not too much.

To protect the public, I think I have to protect the public. I think I have to protect drunks who don't need any more or wouldn't get any more in a licensed premises or at the liquor store but could get it from the bootlegger. I think I have to protect minors who can't buy it at a licensed premises or in a liquor store, but presumably from time to time, and certainly in my experience, have been able to get it from bootleggers in the North.

So often people drink legally in a bar or drink legally acquired liquor and it's fine if they stop there, but they keep drinking and go to a bootlegger and get more and end up injuring themselves and others. Granted that's not the case with any of the six before me today. In each case here, the sale was made to a sober adult, albeit, a stranger who could have been on the interdict list for all the bootlegger knows.

Now, reformation and rehabilitation. I think the only way I can give thought to that is to put it in with deterrence to individuals, and I'm certainly looking at deterrence to these individuals and I'm certainly looking at general deterrence.

Ellen McLeod, would you stand up, please. I convict you as charged, an adult person and as far as the Courts know,

has lead a blameless life, no record of any convictions and you've spent a productive and worthwhile life keeping a steady job for, I'm told, 25 years. I'm told that I must direct the amount of fines to your means, well your means with a job for such a length of time are better than the means of most of the others here.

It seems to me in the circumstances of the trial that I heard that you sold from your home seemingly as a matter of course and that you were selling for your own personal profit. I direct that you pay a fine of \$2,000, in default of payment, four months in jail. I'll give you six months within which to pay that fine.

Patrick Harrison, you have been before the Courts before but not for bootlegging and nothing related to the Liquor Ordinance. You weren't in your own residence and I'm not convinced that you were doing this for your own profit, solely, in any event. I was going to impose a fine of \$2,000, however, your lawyer points out I inadvertently committed you to custody for an hour or two, so I convict you and fine you \$1,990, in default of payment, four months imprisonment. I'll give you six months to pay.

Martina Cardinal. Mrs. Cardinal, I convict you of both offences to which I found you guilty at the trial. I'm inclined to treat those two as one conviction in a way and look at totality. If you had been involved in the first sale of Constable Ladouceur, I suppose they wouldn't have gone back. Mr. Clarke was also caught on that night, but you've got two

previous convictions exactly two years ago. You were fined \$1,200 on each of them. You seem to be conducting a bootlegging business from your house. Somebody, Clarke, whatever he was doing there, was able to sell a bottle. A little fellow that looked to Constable Ladouceur to be about 11 years old, I don't know if he's a son or not, was involved in conducting a transaction for your profit.

As I say you are conducting a business there, selling as a matter of course for your own profit. The only deterrence from your previous convictions seems to be that you tried to get crafty and had the little fellows selling booze so that you could hide up in the bedroom. It's only by good police work that they were able to bring you to justice.

I believe the first matter was the--

MR. BICKERT: 20th of October.

THE COURT: The 20th and 21st, was it?

MR. BICKERT: Yes, sir.

8

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

THE COURT: So, on the offence of the 20th, I convict you as charged and direct you to pay a fine of \$3,000, in default, 3 months imprisonment, consecutive. I'll give you 12 months within which to pay. The offence on the 21st of October, I convict you and direct you pay a fine of \$3,000, in default three months imprisonment, consecutive, and I give you 12 months to pay. Also concurrent and pursuant to Section 104 of the Liquor Ordinance, I declare your residence to be a public place for a period of one year from today.

Billy Clarke. Mr. Clarke, you have a record but none of

it for bootlegging. You weren't in your own residence. I don't know what your status was there. You visited Inuvik from time to time. I don't know if you've always been there. I have some doubt that the transaction was for your benefit or whether or not it was for your sole benefit.

I convict you as charged and direct you to pay a fine of \$2,000, in default of payment, four months imprisonment. I'll give you six months within which to pay the fine.

Martina Malagana, I convict you as charged. You were convicted for the same offences two years ago and fined \$500, I believe it was. You committed the offence two and a half years ago and/convicted two years ago and you were living in the same home. In my opinion, you are benefiting from the bootlegging business being run from that home and it has been run for years, apparently.

I'm not saying you are the sole beneficiary, but you are the only beneficiary before me today. I convict you as charged and direct you to pay a fine of \$5,000, in default of payment, five months imprisonment. I give you 12 months time within which to pay that fine. Have I forgotten anything, gentlemen?

MR. BICKERT: Just for the clarification--

THE COURT: I'm sorry, I did forget something. In view of the situation with Miss Malagana, pursuant to Section 104, I declare the residence in which she resides to be a public place for a period of one year from this date. Is there anything else, Mr. Bickert?

MR. BICKERT: No, that was the only matter I wished to draw the

Court's attention to. Lastly, might there be an order in each case for forfeiture and destruction of the liquor on conviction pursuant to Section 177 (4), I think it is.

THE COURT: So ordered.

(AT WHICH TIME THESE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED)

Certified a correct transcript,

Brenda MacDougall

Court Reporter