IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

HENRY BASIL

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice L.A. Charbonneau, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 29th day of May, A.D. 2013.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. A. Godfrey: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. C. Davison: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 253(1)(a) x2 Criminal Code of Canada)

1	THE	COURT:	Henry H	Basil h	nas pleade	ed guilty
2		to having operated	a vesse	el whil	e the	
3		concentration of a	Lcohol	in his	blood was	s over
4		the legally permitt	ted limi	it. I	must now	decide
5		what sentence should	ld be ir	mposed	for that	offence.

The Crown and the defence have presented me with a joint submission as to what the sentence should be. That joint submission is that I should impose a fine of \$2,000 together with a driving prohibition of 18 months.

As a rule, sentencing courts have a very wide discretion in deciding what penalties should be imposed for any given offence, but when a joint submission is presented, the law says that it should be followed unless it is clearly unreasonable. Whether the joint submission presented in this case is reasonable depends on the facts of the offence, the circumstances of the offender, and the interpretation of the relevant sentencing principles that are set out in the Criminal Code.

Dealing first with the facts of this offence and the procedural history of the matter, the events that led to this charge happened almost three years ago. Mr. Basil had been at a camp on an island in Yellowknife Bay near the community of Dettah with two other people, Collin Lafferty

and Chris Bourke. On the evening of June 30th
and into the following day, the three of them
consumed alcohol. On July 1st, at 1:30 in the
afternoon, they left the camp in Mr. Basil's
boat. I heard that this is the boat he had
purchased recently when these events occurred.
The photographs that were filed as exhibits show
that it is an open boat with a removable cover,
and appears to be about 20 feet long.

It was a windy afternoon on July 1st, 2010, and the waters were very rough. At some point, and for an unknown reason, the boat suddenly stopped. It quickly became swamped by waves coming from the south, which would be the larger opening of Great Slave Lake, and the boat sank quickly thereafter. None of the three individuals in the boat were wearing lifejackets. Mr. Lafferty decided to try to get to shore using a gas can as floatation. Mr. Bourke said that he lost sight of Mr. Lafferty 15 to 20 minutes after the boat sank. Mr. Lafferty did not make it to shore and he drowned.

Mr. Basil and Bourke stayed with the sunken boat which had, apparently, the bow sticking out of the water still. Someone noticed from a house on shore that there was something amiss on the waters, realized what was happening and called

for help. Mr. Basil and the other man were rescued when help arrived and they were taken to hospital. Mr. Basil was treated for hypothermia. I heard that to this day he continues to suffer some physical consequences as a result of what happened. I also heard that he continues to suffer significant psychological consequences for which he continues to take treatment. In fact, it was to have better access to this treatment that he relocated to Edmonton after these events.

While he was in the hospital that day, though, blood samples were taken from Mr. Basil and were analyzed. The amount of alcohol found in his blood was determined to be 201 milligrams of alcohol in 100 millilitres of blood, which is almost three times the legal limit.

It took some time for the investigation into this matter to be completed. Charges were eventually laid against Mr. Basil in May 2011.

By then, he had already relocated to Edmonton.

Presumably because the authorities could not locate him, a warrant was issued for his arrest.

I heard that once he learned of the existence of that warrant, he turned himself into the custody of police, was taken into custody and escorted back to the Northwest Territories within a few days to appear on these charges. As a result, he

spent a few days in custody before he was
released on bail.

Mr. Basil was charged with driving a vessel with a concentration of alcohol in his blood that was over the legal limit, with impaired driving, and also under subsection (5.1), Section 253 of the Criminal Code. That provision says that every one who, while driving a motor vehicle or a vessel with a concentration of alcohol in the blood over the legal limit, causes an accident resulting in the death of another person is guilty of an offence.

Mr. Basil had his preliminary hearing on those charges. I believe there may have been a fourth charge on the original Information on which he was discharged at the preliminary hearing, but he was committed to stand trial on the three others. In August 2012, the Crown directed a stay of proceeding on the third count, the one under Section 253(5.1) of the Criminal Code.

At the sentencing hearing this morning, I was provided with the agreed facts which were reduced to writing. The Crown also filed

Mr. Basil's criminal record, photographs that show the sunken boat as well as the boat once it was taken out of the water. In addition, a

1	Victim Impact Statement prepared by
2	Mr. Lafferty's common-law spouse was marked as an
3	exhibit and I have reviewed it. That document
4	talks about the devastating consequences that
5	Mr. Lafferty's death had for his spouse and the
6	family emotionally, mentally, and financially.
7	The Court also heard this morning from
8	Mr. Lafferty's mother who expressed the depth of
9	the loss that she has felt as a result of this
10	and also told Mr. Basil directly that she
11	forgives him. Finally, defence counsel has filed
12	letters from the psychologist who assessed
13	Mr. Basil a month after the events or wrote
14	the letter a month after the events in August
15	2010 and sets out some of the symptoms that he
16	was experiencing then. There is also a letter
17	from his treating doctor that confirms that
18	Mr. Basil has been in his care since 2010.
19	Given some of the things that were said this
20	morning and some of the materials presented, I
21	think it is important for the Court to address
22	the question of whether Mr. Lafferty's death can
23	have a bearing on the sentence that I have to
24	impose today.
25	Drinking and driving is a serious problem in
26	this country and the ravages that it causes are

27 well known. For that reason, any charge

1	involving drinking and driving is considered to
2	be a serious matter. But, obviously, charges
3	that include having caused a person's death or
4	serious injuries are considered more serious than
5	charges that involve simply driving a motor
6	vehicle while impaired or with a blood alcohol
7	concentration that is over the legal limit. The
8	difference in seriousness between the two types
9	of charges is reflected in the maximum penalties
10	that can be imposed for these offences. For
11	example, driving with an alcohol concentration in
12	the blood that is over the legal limit is
13	punishable by a maximum of five years in jail if
14	the Crown proceeds by indictment. When the
15	charge is one involving impaired driving causing
16	death, the maximum penalty life imprisonment. In
17	addition, drinking and driving charges that do
18	not involve causing death or serious injury can
19	be proceeded summarily, which signals generally
20	less serious offences with less severe potential
21	penalties, whereas the charges that involve the
22	causing of death or serious injuries are
23	automatically indictable offences.
24	Here, the charge on which a stay of
25	proceedings was directed in August 2012 was by
26	far the most serious one that Mr. Basil faced.
27	The fact that this charge was stayed makes a

significant difference as far as what sentence this court can impose today because it changes the fundamental nature of what Mr. Basil is admitting or acknowledging that he did and is responsible for within the meaning of the criminal law.

The decision as to what charge is proceeded on is up to the Crown's office; it is not up to the Court. In making its decisions as to which charges should be proceeded on, the Crown follows prosecution policies and guidelines which are a matter of public record. Those policies are publicly available. Those policies say that matters are prosecuted when two criteria are met. The first is that the evidence available to the Crown is such that there is a reasonable prospect of conviction on the charge. The second is that a prosecution is in public interest. Having a reasonable prospect of conviction means that the evidence is strong enough to prove each element of the offence charged beyond a reasonable doubt. That is the standard of proof that applies on a criminal case and it is a very high standard of proof. It means that to have Mr. Basil convicted of the count that was stayed, the Crown would have had to prove something that is called causation: that while his blood alcohol level

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

was above the legal limit, Mr. Basil caused an accident that resulted in Mr. Lafferty's death.

There is a difference between what that means within the context of criminal law and how people understand causation in day-to-day life and this was apparent this morning.

It is not surprising at all to the Court that in the minds of Mr. Lafferty's family and loved ones, Mr. Basil is responsible for Mr. Lafferty's death. In fact, based on what he has said, my impression is that Mr. Basil himself seems to accept responsibility for that in that sense, and I am not sure how this presents in his mind. I am not sure if he thinks that if they had only stayed on the island and waited for the wind to die down, this would not have happened; or if he wonders if he had taken some other route to get back to shore, this would not have happened; or if he feels responsible simply because he was the one driving the boat. Whatever it is, the fact is causation within the meaning of criminal law means more than that. It means looking into all of the circumstances, not just what the accused person did but also what everyone else did as well - and this is very important - as well as outside factors that were beyond anyone's control: in this case, factors

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

like the weather, the wind, the water

temperature, whatever caused the boat to stop,

everyone's conditions and decisions. Things of

that nature.

It is not for the Court to inquire why the Crown made the decision it did to stay the count that was stayed, but I will say for what it is worth that based on the facts that were alleged and admitted, it seems clear that there were many factors at play that day that, very sadly, in combination, led to this tragic result. These included very rough water conditions on the lake; it included whatever caused the boat to stop and the conditions that were such that it became swamped so quickly; the fact that there were no lifejackets being used; the distance from shore when the boat sank, which meant it was going to inevitably take a while for someone to know what was going on and for help to arrive; the fact that the waters in the Great Slave Lake remain very, very cold even in the summer. Based on all the information that was presented this morning, what I have been told overall, and although I do not have the benefit of all of the evidence, I have to say that it does appear that the Crown would have had some problems establishing causation beyond a reasonable doubt in this case.

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

2.5

26

1	That of course in no way changes or diminishes
2	the death and the loss experienced by
3	Mr. Lafferty's family. The Court recognizes
4	that, recognizes that loss and wants to express
5	its empathy for the family members, those who are
6	here today and those who are not here today.
7	There are all sorts of levels of

There are all sorts of levels of responsibility. There is criminal responsibility, that can only be attributed based on that very high standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt that I have already talked about. There is civil responsibility, that can be established on a lesser standard of proof.

And then there is moral responsibility, which is not something that is dealt with or can be dealt with by the courts.

Mr. Lafferty's family members, at least some of the ones I heard from, hold Mr. Basil responsible for what happened. As I have said, Mr. Basil himself clearly feels responsible for what happened. Those are normal human reactions. But for the purposes of sentencing, I cannot take into account, in the sentence I impose, the fact that Mr. Lafferty died as a result of these events because that is not what Mr. Basil has pleaded guilty to. Even so, it is the Court's hope that the fact that these proceedings took

place may play a part in helping those affected
by this in their own process of healing and
closure.

I have to say that the forgiveness expressed to Mr. Basil by Mr. Lafferty's mother is something that shows amazing character, required a lot of personal courage, and was very compelling and moving to hear.

Mr. Basil's apology and obvious distress about what happened leaves no doubt about the fact he is genuinely sorry, and hopefully that can also be an important piece in healing from all of this, although, of course, nothing can change what has happened.

Having said all of that, I must turn to the analysis that has to be undertaken to decide what a fit sentence is for this offence.

In any sentencing decision, the Court must take into account the principles and objectives of sentencing that are set out in the Criminal Code. It is well established that in dealing with drinking and driving offences, the principles of denunciation and deterrence are very important.

Every time a person uses a motor vehicle or a vessel while under the influence of alcohol, the risk of serious injury or death being caused

is very real. The case books are full of such tragic cases where lives have been ruined because someone made the decision to drive when they should not have been. Alcohol impairs judgment and reflexes. Motor vehicles and motor-propelled vessels are powerful and they should not be operated by people whose faculties are diminished.

The majority of drinking and driving cases involve people who are driving cars. There are fewer cases involving vessels, but that does not mean that the risk of mixing alcohol and driving motorboats should be underestimated. The mix of alcohol and motorboats is every bit as dangerous as the mix of alcohol and cars. Driving a motorboat requires skills, knowledge, and good reflexes. Conditions on the water can change very quickly. The person driving a motorboat needs all their wit, judgment, and reflexes. They need to be able to react quickly to changing conditions, to the weather, to obstacles they may encounter on the water, and on a body of water the magnitude of Great Slave Lake, that is especially the case.

I think it is fair to say that public awareness about the risks of driving cars while impaired has increased a lot over the last 20 or

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

30 years. The problem of drinking and driving is far from resolved on our roads, but there is more awareness and more public outcry about the possible consequences of this type of conduct.

Drinking and driving a car is certainly not something that is generally considered to be "cool" or acceptable in our society of today. I am not convinced at all that the same awareness exists about the risks of operating vessels while intoxicated. For that reason, the Court has to send a clear message about the seriousness of that conduct because of the risk that it entails. This is especially true in a jurisdiction like ours where lakes are everywhere and many, many people operate motorboats in the summer months.

In considering the importance of general deterrence, I also take into account that the detection of these offences regarding motorboats is more difficult than with cars. It is much harder for the police to monitor activities on the many lakes in the Northwest Territories than it is on the relatively few number of roads that we have. The authorities, I know, do sometimes patrol the navigable waters in the Yellowknife area, but, realistically, I think people know there is a greater risk of getting caught drinking and driving a car than drinking and

driving a boat. And as I have already alluded to, in a jurisdiction where water is everywhere and many, many people go boating in the summer, it has to be made very clear to people that if they take the risk and get caught, there will be severe consequences.

In addition to the sentencing principles, the Court must also be focused primarily on the specific facts that it is dealing with and take into account aggravating and mitigating factors. Here, the guilty plea and what I accept as genuine, heartfelt remorse on Mr. Basil's part are mitigating factors. So is the fact that Mr. Basil recognizes that he needs to keep alcohol out of his life and the steps that he has taken to achieve this, which are to his credit. But there are aggravating factors as well. Mr. Basil has been convicted of drinking and driving offences before and has a number of other convictions on his criminal record. I recognize that the related convictions are very dated and that the last time he was convicted of anything was 13 years ago, but, still, he does not come before the Court as someone who has never been in trouble with the law or never been convicted of this particular type of crime. In addition, the concentration of alcohol in his blood was very,

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

very high. The Criminal Code now makes that a statutory aggravating factor, but readings as high as these were always treated as an aggravating factor by the courts in this jurisdiction.

The minimum penalty for this offence is a fine of \$1,000 and the maximum penalty is five years in jail. Although this court does not usually deal with these types of offences because most of them are dealt with in the Territorial Court, the Court is aware that absent significant aggravating factors, fines are usually imposed for a person who is convicted for the first time of drinking and driving offences. For a subsequent offence, even when the minimum penalties are not triggered because the Crown has not filed a Notice of Intention to Seek Greater Punishment, jail is sometimes imposed even if it is not mandatory. But obviously that depends on the individual circumstances of each case and, to an extent, on how dated the other convictions are.

I have already talked about the sentencing principles of deterrence and denunciation, but another important sentencing principle is restraint. That principle means that jail should only be imposed where no other sanction will

1

2

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1	achieve the sentencing goals set out in the
2	Criminal Code. Applying that principle, taking
3	into account that Mr. Basil has pleaded guilty,
4	his overall circumstances, the consequences he
5	has already faced and will continue to face
6	arising from these events, and the fact that he
7	did spend some time in custody after he turned
8	himself in in Alberta and was escorted back to
9	the Northwest Territories, I cannot in this case
10	say that a jail term is required to achieve the
11	goals of sentencing and I accept that the proper
12	penalty for the offence Mr. Basil has pleaded
13	guilty to is a fine. That fine, however, has to
14	be significant enough to address the concerns I
15	have talked about, to denounce his conduct and
16	deter others who may be inclined to behave in the
17	same manner, in particular in relation to
18	motorboats. Coincidentally, the boating season
19	is almost upon us. The message has to be clear
20	that driving motorboats and being intoxicated is
21	a potentially lethal mix every bit as much as
22	driving a car while intoxicated.
23	At first blush, given the aggravating
24	factors I have talked about and the other
25	principles I have talked about, I would have been
26	inclined to impose a fine higher than what is
27	being suggested by counsel. But in imposing a
27	being suggested by counsel. But in imposing a

fine, the Court must take into account the offender's ability to pay. Here, based on what I heard about Mr. Basil's situation, his health problems and his limited income, I have concluded that what is being jointly submitted by counsel is, in fact, reasonable.

As I indicated this morning, I would also normally be inclined to impose a victim of crime surcharge in circumstances such as this because no jail term is being imposed, but, again, I have taken into account what defence counsel has said generally about Mr. Basil's means and specifically also the costs he has incurred to return to the Northwest Territories to attend these proceedings. I heard that it cost him between six and seven hundred dollars to come to Hay River and, given his means, that is not an insignificant amount of money. So I have concluded, under the circumstances, that there should not be a victim of crime surcharge imposed because it would result in hardship.

Mr. Basil, stand up, please.

Sir, for the charge that you have pleaded guilty to, I hereby sentence you to a fine of \$2,000 as was suggested by the lawyers. I will give you 18 months to pay that fine or to work it off, again, because of what your lawyer has told

me. In addition to that, you will be prohibited
from driving any motor vehicle for a period of 18
months. You can sit down.

Mr. Basil, I just want to say a few more things to you. I believe you. I certainly believe you when you say you are sorry about what happened, and I know that living with this for the rest of your life is a burden that is a lot heavier than anything than I could have done today as part of my sentence. I understand that. I have heard that you do some volunteer work, that you are involved in some community organizations where you live. Maybe if you have the opportunity ever when you do that kind of work, you have the opportunity to share your experience with people when you are ready to do that, the importance of not mixing alcohol with boats and vehicles, you can share some of what you have lived through. It might be something that could make a huge difference in someone's life. Because of what happened, I am sure you will be more convincing if you talked about that than any ad than the government can put on the radio or on television about what can happen. So if you are ever able to do that, you might actually be able to make a difference and avoid someone living through what you have lived

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- through and what others have lived through. I
 leave that thought with you. I am not ordering
 you to do it, of course, I am just saying that
- 4 that is something perhaps, if you are ever able
- 5 to do, you could. That might actually make a
- 6 significant difference to someone on some lake.
- 7 But in the same way as I have expressed my
- 8 empathy for Mr. Lafferty's loved ones who are
- 9 here today and shared their loss, in the same way
- 10 that I said that I hope today's process will help
- 11 them with their process and closure, I hope that
- in some way it will help you in that process as
- 13 well.
- 14 There will be an order that any exhibits
- 15 seized as part of this investigation can be
- 16 either returned to their rightful owners or
- destroyed if that is more appropriate.
- Is there anything else, Counsel, that I have
- not addressed that needs to be addressed?
- 20 MR. DAVISON: Not that I can think of.
- Thank you.
- 22 MR. GODFREY: Nothing I can think of, Your
- Honour.
- 24 THE COURT: Before we close court, I want
- 25 to thank the people who attended today and I want
- 26 to thank those who shared what they could today
- 27 as part of this process. I want to thank counsel

1	for their work in resolving this difficult case.
2	With that, we can close court.
3	THE COURT CLERK: Thank you, Your Honour. All
4	rise. Court is now closed.
5	
6	
7	
8	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723 of the Rules of Court (transcribed
9	from audio recording)
10	
11	
12	Jane Romanowich, CSR(A) Court Reporter
13	Court Reporter
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	