R. v. Bernhardt, 2013 NWTSC 01 S-1-CR-2012-000124

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

TONY ROBERT BERNHARDT

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence delivered by The Honourable Justice S. H. Smallwood, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 17th day of December, A.D. 2012.

APPEARANCES:

Ms. W. Miller: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. M. Hansen: Counsel for the Accused

(Charges under s. 253(1)(a), 259(4) and 355(a) of the Criminal Code of Canada)

THE COURT: This morning, Mr. Bernhardt
re-elected to judge alone, pled guilty to counts

1 and 3 on the Indictment; that is operating a
motor vehicle while his ability to drive was
impaired by alcohol and having possession of a
van knowing that it was stolen. I must now

sentence him for these offences.

The events that led to those charges date back to March 3rd of this year. At approximately 1:55 p.m., the RCMP in Aklavik received a report of a suspected impaired driver. The complaints that were received was that someone had driven the ambulance into the ditch. The RCMP responded and observed the ambulance in the ditch. The pictures in Exhibit S3 depict what the officers saw. The ambulance was stuck in the snow, the right rear tire was stuck in the soft shoulder, and the accused was in the driver's seat. The accused showed signs of impairment: slurred, slow speech; a strong odour of alcohol on his breath; slow motor skills; wobbly when standing; and staggering while walking. He was placed under arrest. Subsequent investigation showed that the accused had taken the ambulance, without permission, in Inuvik. He had driven to Aklavik, which is an approximately one-and-a-half-hour drive and stopped at the Northern Store in

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Aklavik to buy cigarettes, and when he left, got the vehicle stuck in the ditch in the snow.

The accused was initially released on these charges but failed to appear on his court date of June 6th, 2012. He was arrested on a warrant that same day. Mr. Bernhardt subsequently consented to his remand, reserving his right to show cause. He has been in custody since then some 195 days.

Impaired driving pursuant to Section 253(1)(a) of the Criminal Code is punishable when the Crown proceeds by indictment by a maximum of five years' imprisonment. Possession of property obtained by crime pursuant to Section 355 when the value exceeds \$5,000 is punishable by up to ten years' imprisonment. There is also a mandatory driving prohibition.

In this case, there is a joint submission of three years' imprisonment less credit for remand time and a lifetime driving prohibition.

Mr. Bernhardt is 48 years old and he has a significant record of driving while under the influence of alcohol. This record goes back almost 30 years to 1983 where he was convicted of driving while impaired and received an \$800 fine. He was also convicted of dangerous driving at the same time. Since then, he has accumulated eight

more drinking and driving convictions. In 1991,

he was convicted of driving with more than 80

milligrams of alcohol in his blood and received

do days of jail intermittent. In 1991, he was

again convicted of the same offence. He received

a fine this time. 1991 again, he received

another conviction and received 21 days in

custody.

The next entry on his criminal record for drinking and driving is in 1993. At that time, he received five months' imprisonment. In 1996, he received a sentence of a year. In 1999, he received a sentence of a year. In 2001, he received a sentence of 18 months. In 2010, he received a sentence of two years less six months' credit. All along with this, he has been receiving driving prohibitions which have gradually increased so that he is now currently on a ten-year driving prohibition.

In addition to these convictions, he also has nine convictions for driving while disqualified, and, as well, there are numerous convictions for other offences against the administration of justice. He has a prior conviction for taking a motor vehicle without consent and, also, for theft.

As noted in his criminal record with respect

to the drinking and driving convictions, he has receive sentences of increasing terms of imprisonment, culminating in his most recent conviction in November 2010, which I have referred to.

Mr. Bernhardt's extensive, related criminal record is the most aggravating feature of this case. It is also aggravating that Mr. Bernhardt was under a ten-year driving prohibition at the time of this offence, and it is aggravating that this offence occurred approximately four months after his release from his last conviction which was for the same offence.

The Supreme Court of Canada, in the cases of Gladue and Ipeelee, require courts to consider the circumstances of aboriginal persons in passing sentence. I take judicial notice, as I am required to, of systemic factors that have unfortunately caused many aboriginal people to become involved with the criminal justice system.

Mr. Bernhardt's counsel advises that he is of Inuvialuit descent, that he attended residential school, and was both a witness to and a victim of abuse at residential school and at home. I am well aware of the devastating impact that residential schools have on aboriginal people, their families and their lives. The impact is a

2.5

long-lasting one and can take years to deal with.		
This is not a situation where either counsel		
is suggesting that sanctions other than		
imprisonment could adequately achieve the		
objectives of sentencing. So having regard to		
these considerations, I have not been presented		
with any other options besides imprisonment.		
Certainly, given Mr. Bernhardt's record,		
sanctions other than imprisonment would not give		
proper effect to the other sentencing principles.		
Turning to those other sentencing		
principles, protection of the public must be the		
primary consideration in this situation.		
Mr. Bernhardt, I do not know that I can say		
anything that has not been said to you before.		
You have heard what I am about to say before and		
likely many times. It does not seem to have an		
impact. You continue to drive while impaired,		
putting the safety of the public at risk. The		
people of Aklavik, Inuvik, Yellowknife, all the		
places where you have consumed alcohol and then		
got behind the wheel of a vehicle, the people of		
those communities of all the communities in		
the North, really, they need to have protection		
from you and people like you. You put their		
lives at risk every time you do this, and you		

27

probably say, "Yeah, yeah, I know. I won't do it

again," but you continue to do it. The reality is that drinking and driving places innocent people at risk and every year there continue to be accidents, injuries, and deaths across Canada because of actions of people like yourself who drink and drive.

Another sentencing principle that I need to consider is deterrence, deterrence of Mr. Bernhardt and others like him who drive when they have been drinking.

Now, Mr. Bernhardt, I do not know when or if the message will get through to you that you should not be doing this, but I do know that the sentences will continue to get longer and longer until you make a change to your behaviour. You are 48 years old. It is time for you to start making that change.

Denunciation is another important principle; that is, expressing society's condemnation of an unlawful conduct and of drinking and driving in particular.

Proportionality is another principle that I must consider. The sentence must be proportionate to the gravity of the offence and to Mr. Bernhardt's degree of responsibility. The ongoing pattern of driving over almost 30 years demonstrates the seriousness of the offence.

Mr. Bernhardt has been told repeatedly about the risks of this behaviour. He has received increasing sentences, but these have had no effect. He continues to persist in this type of behaviour. So his level of responsibility is high.

Mr. Bernhardt has recently begun to address his issues with alcohol and, while this is a recent effort, he is to be commended for that. You should continue to pursue alcohol treatment. So far it has not been successful, as evidenced by your latest conviction, and that is unfortunate, but right now that is not my primary concern. Alcoholism is a disease, and you may be unable to stop drinking right now, but driving while drunk is not, and you have the ability within you to change that behaviour.

Other aggravating factors are the circumstances of the offence. The accused was driving on a Saturday, in the afternoon, on the highway from Inuvik to Aklavik, which is a somewhat a lengthy drive, through Aklavik to the Northern Store, finally getting stuck in the ditch in full view of nearby houses. As I mentioned earlier, the potential for tragedy is heightened every minute you were behind the wheel of that vehicle.

There are also mitigating factors. The most 1 2 significant one is that Mr. Bernhardt has taken 3 responsibility and pled guilty. You waived your preliminary inquiry and made arrangements to re-elect and plead guilty today. You have avoided the time and expense associated with a 6 jury trial. So far in this case, no witnesses have had to testify either at a preliminary 8 inquiry or at a trial. So Mr. Bernhardt should 9 get full credit for his guilty plea. 10 In all the circumstances, it is necessary 11 12 that a substantial period of incarceration be imposed as well as a lengthy driving prohibition. 13 The joint submission is for three years' 14 imprisonment and a lifetime driving prohibition. 15 In the circumstances, taking into account 16 Mr. Bernhardt's criminal record, his prior 17 convictions for related offences, and the offence 18 that is before the Court, I think that this is a 19 20 reasonable sentence. 21 With respect to credit for pre-trial custody, the accused has been in custody for 195 22 days or six months and a little over a week. 23 24 Mr. Bernhardt seeks enhanced credit of one and a

half to one on the basis that he has been unable to take programs and was a well-behaved prisoner. The Crown takes no position on the credit for

25

26

remand time. This is not a situation where the accused has been detained because of his record.

He has been on consent remand since being arrested on the warrant of June 6, 2012.

The information provided by Mr. Hansen, on behalf of Mr. Bernhardt, indicates that he spoke to a Mr. Baisi who works at the North Slave Correctional Centre and is familiar with the accused. Mr. Baisi reports that Mr. Bernhardt had been unable to take any programs while on remand because priority had been given to serving prisoners and there was no room available for him on the programs. He also reports that Mr. Bernhardt has been well behaved and a good prisoner and there is no record of any management problems with respect to Mr. Bernhardt. From this, I can conclude that he would have earned remission if he had been a served prisoner. The Crown does not dispute the information provided by Mr. Hansen. In the circumstances, I am satisfied Mr. Bernhardt should receive credit in excess of the one-to-one mandated in Section 719(3) of the Code. Therefore, Mr. Bernhardt will receive credit of nine months for his pre-trial custody.

Mr. Bernhardt, if you could please stand.

On the charge of impaired driving, contrary to

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Section 253(1)(a), it is the sentence of this 1 2 court that you be imprisoned for a period of 3 three years. I give you credit of nine months' imprisonment for your time in remand; therefore, your remaining sentence is two years and three 6 months. For the offence of possession of property obtained by crime, pursuant to Section 355, the sentence is also three years' 8 imprisonment to be served concurrently. Again, I 9 give you credit of nine months for the time spent 10 in remand. Your remaining sentence is two years, 11 12 three months. Again, concurrent. For the impaired driving, there will also be a driving 13 prohibition. It will be a lifetime prohibition. 14 Given your history, I do not think it would ever 15 16 be safe for you to operate a motor vehicle. The
- risk to the public is simply too high. You may sit down, Mr. Bernhardt.
- 19 Given the sentence I have imposed, I am
 20 waiving the victim of crime surcharge.
- Is there anything else that I need to address, Counsel?
- 23 MS. MILLER: No thank you, Your Honour.
- MR. HANSEN: Nothing that occurs to me.
- 25 THE COURT: All right. Thank you for your
- submissions, Counsel, and good luck to you,
- Mr. Bernhardt.

1	
2	
3	Certified Pursuant to Rule 723 of the Rules of Court
4	of the Rules of Court
5	
6	Tana Damanariah (CCD/A)
7	Jane Romanowich, CSR(A) Court Reporter
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	