CR 03079

## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## IN THE MATTER OF:

## HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

## FRANCIS ADOLPH HERMAN

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable Mr. Justice J.Z. Vertes, at Hay River in the Northwest Territories, on Monday, April 29th, A.D. 1996.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. L. Rose:

Mr. S. Shabala:



Counsel for the Crown
Counsel for the Accused

CHARGE UNDER s. 253(b), s. 255(2) CRIMINAL CODE OF CANADA

		)
		<b>.</b>

1 THE COURT:

The accused, Francis Adolph

Herman, has entered guilty pleas to two counts of impaired driving causing bodily harm. The facts are

4 set forth in an Agreed Statement of Facts.

On July 2nd, 1995 near Enterprise, Northwest
Territories, the accused drove a motorhome through a
road construction zone and sideswiped a dump truck
shearing away one side of the motorhome. This caused
two of his passengers to fall out and be seriously
injured. The accused had been drinking at the time and
his blood alcohol content was estimated to be at least
over the legal limit.

The accused is 62 years old.

He appears to have a long-standing problem with alcohol abuse as evidenced by the fact that he has seven previous convictions for impaired driving since 1975. The last three convictions were entered in 1990 at which time he was sentenced to a total term of 12 months' imprisonment with a three-year driving prohibition.

Given this background, and the circumstances of these offences, there is no doubt in my mind that sentences of anywhere from three to five years would be justified from the perspective of public safety, deterrence, and denunciation.

Appellate authorities generally reflect the conclusion that Parliament intends for the impaired

drivers who cause serious consequences to themselves face more severe consequences. Drivers are warned that if they drink and drive then they are taking unacceptable chances, and one of them, the chance of injury or death, will result in an increased penalty. Simply put, drivers must not take these chances.

In this case, however, Crown and defence counsel have joined in a submission that an appropriate penalty would be one of 30 months. Ordinarily, I would say that this was overly generous.

But I recognize, as Crown counsel does, that a guilty plea, even as here at the last moment, should always be considered to be somewhat mitigating.

Furthermore, I think that a certain degree of credit should be given to the fact that counsel make this joint submission after no doubt carefully evaluating their positions. A joint submission made in the context of a guilty plea should not be overridden unless it is unreasonable in the sense that the resulting sentence is not fit.

In my view, in this case it can not be conclusively said that a sentence of 30 months is not fit in the circumstances.

Please stand, Mr. Herman. Stand up, sir.

You're a mature man who obviously hasn't yet come to grips with the fact that one simply does not drink and drive. And as you said, it is just fortunate that

1	no one was killed in this accident.
2	The sentence of this Court, on both counts, to be
3	served concurrently, is that you serve a term of
4	imprisonment of 30 months.
5	In addition, I direct that your driving privileges
6	be prohibited for a period of six years. Under the
7	circumstances, there will be no fine surcharge,
8	counsel.
9	You may have a seat, sir.
10	Is there anything else that we need to deal with
11	with respect to this matter?
12	MR. ROSE: Not from Crown, sir.
13	MR. SHABALA: No, nor defence, My Lord.
14	THE COURT: Then we stand adjourned until 9:30
15	tomorrow morning.
16	
17	(AT WHICH TIME THIS SENTENCING HEARING CONCLUDED)
18	
19	Certified Pursuant to Practice Direction #20 dated December 28, 1987
20	
21	
22	Lois Hewitt,
23	Court Reporter
24	
25	
26	
27	

