

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

BENEDICT RALPH CORRIGAN

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence by The Honourable
Justice L. A. Charbonneau, sitting in Hay River, in the
Northwest Territories, on the 13th day of May, A.D., 2015.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. M. Lecorre: Counsel for the Crown

Mr. P. Harte: Counsel for the Defence

Charges under s. 235(1) & 236(b) Criminal Code of Canada

Official Court Reporters

1 THE COURT: On June 27th, 2012, Benedict
2 Corrigan killed Carol Buggins and Garfield
3 McPherson. In doing so he ended the lives
4 of two people and he changed forever the lives
5 of many others who cared for them, miss them
6 deeply now, and have to go on living with the
7 terrible knowledge of what happened to them.

8 The circumstances of these offences are
9 violent, disturbing and difficult to talk about
10 and hear about, but I must refer to them again
11 this morning because anyone reading my decision
12 in the future needs to know the facts of what
13 happened because it puts everything else I am
14 about to say in context.

15 Mr. Corrigan and Ms. Buggins had been in
16 a relationship for about seven years. He had
17 on occasion been violent towards her, he had
18 been charged and convicted of offences for this.
19 He had been put on conditions that limited the
20 contact that he could have with her. He was
21 found guilty for not complying with those
22 conditions on some occasions.

23 The most recent conviction had been for
24 an assault he committed on her on April 5th,
25 2012, after he found her and Mr. McPherson in
26 bed together. He was sentenced for that offence
27 on May 11th, 2012, and one of the probation

1 conditions that was part of the sentence imposed
2 that day was that he not have any contact with
3 Ms. Buggins unless she agreed to it beforehand.
4 That probation order was in effect in June of
5 2012 when the crimes I am sentencing him for
6 today were committed.

7 Based on the agreed facts it appears that
8 despite those recent events, as of June 27th,
9 2012, Mr. Corrigan was of the belief that he and
10 Ms. Buggins had reconciled. It is also part of
11 the admitted facts that in June, 2012, she was in
12 fact going out with Mr. McPherson. That evening
13 Mr. Corrigan went to a party at Mr. McPherson's
14 apartment at the High Rise building here in Hay
15 River. He had a confrontation with Ms. Buggins
16 and with Mr. McPherson. Mr. Corrigan now
17 believes that it was at that point that he
18 learned that his relationship with Ms. Buggins
19 was over. He struck Mr. McPherson during that
20 confrontation and yelled very derogatory things
21 to him about Ms. Buggins which I do not need
22 to repeat now.

23 Mr. Corrigan was kicked out of the party.
24 He was angry. He went to another apartment in
25 the High Rise, he had a nap in that apartment.
26 He later took a knife from that apartment and
27 left. He returned to Mr. McPherson's apartment.

1 He knocked on the door and Ms. Buggins answered
2 the door. Mr. Corrigan immediately attacked her
3 with the knife. Without going into more detail
4 than is necessary it is important to note that
5 he did stab her a total of 25 times in various
6 parts of her body, and those injuries were fatal.
7 Mr. McPherson grabbed a knife to try to defend
8 himself, but Mr. Corrigan put him down on the
9 ground and stabbed him seven times. These
10 injuries were fatal as well.

11 In the hours that followed Mr. Corrigan
12 walked around Hay River and admitted to several
13 people that he had killed two people and at times
14 identifying who they were. At 4 a.m. he went to
15 the hospital and spoke to a nurse and told her
16 that he had killed Ms. Buggins and Mr. McPherson.
17 The nurse called the RCMP.

18 Mr. Corrigan was arrested less than an
19 hour later. He provided a statement to the
20 police. He said, among other things, that he
21 left the party angry, that he killed Ms. Buggins
22 so that no one else could have her, that he was
23 aiming at her heart because he wanted to kill
24 her, and that he killed Mr. McPherson because
25 he got in the way.

26 As both counsel said yesterday, no sentence
27 imposed by this Court can ever make up for the

1 loss that this crime has caused for the many
2 people who were close to and loved Ms. Buggins
3 and Mr. McPherson. The victim impact statements
4 that were filed, many of which read in court
5 yesterday, and the two that were read into the
6 record again this morning, demonstrate the depth
7 of this loss. It is a loss that I am sure will
8 forever be felt.

9 For those affected by these terrible events,
10 and I know many of them are here today, the Court
11 can only hope that the conclusion of the criminal
12 proceedings will assist in the long journey
13 towards healing. Obviously the court process
14 cannot undo the harm that was done. And the
15 court process is not about vengeance.

16 Some of the people who have prepared victim
17 impact statements have expressed the wish to
18 see justice being done. "Justice being done,"
19 of course means different things to different
20 people. In deciding what to do on this case
21 I have taken into account everything I have
22 heard yesterday, and also this morning, and
23 I have attempted to arrive at a fit sentence
24 for these crimes because that is the Court's
25 duty at any sentencing hearing.

26 In sentencing any offender the Court's duty
27 is to impose a sentence that is proportionate

1 to the seriousness of the crime committed and
2 the level of blameworthiness of the person who
3 committed it. Doing that requires taking into
4 consideration the circumstances of the offence
5 and the circumstances of the person who committed
6 it, as well as applicable sentencing principles.

7 Often times the range of sentence available
8 for an offence is very broad. In this case
9 though the Criminal Code says that there is
10 a minimum penalty of life imprisonment for the
11 crime of second degree murder, and so the only
12 discretion that I have in imposing sentence is to
13 decide how long it will be before Mr. Corrigan is
14 eligible to apply for parole. The minimum period
15 for that is 10 years and the maximum is 25 years.

16 On that issue the Crown says that the parole
17 ineligibility period should be between 15 and 17
18 years, and the defence is not really disputing
19 that range. The defence is asking me to impose
20 an ineligibility period at the low end of that
21 range. I have given what the Crown and defence
22 have said serious consideration, and I will say
23 now that I do not think that the range that is
24 being proposed is unreasonable. The question is
25 where within that range the parole ineligibility
26 period should be.

27 Of course, there will also be a sentence

1 imposed today for the killing of Mr. McPherson.
2 For manslaughter there is no minimum punishment,
3 but because the other sentence will be life
4 imprisonment, any sentence I impose for the
5 charge related to Mr. McPherson's death has to
6 be served concurrently with the life sentence.

7 Section 745.4 of the Criminal Code says
8 that in deciding the parole ineligibility
9 period the Court has to consider the character
10 of the offender, the nature of the offence and
11 the circumstances surrounding its commission.
12 The Supreme Court of Canada explained in the
13 case of R. v. Shropshire [1995] 4 S.C.R. 227,
14 that the decision about parole ineligibility
15 requires, like all sentencing decisions, taking
16 into account the various sentencing principles
17 that are set out in the Criminal Code. Really,
18 it is part of deciding what a fit sentence
19 is for the crime. This means considering
20 aggravating and mitigating factors, as is
21 required in any sentencing, and it means, of
22 course, taking into account the circumstances
23 of the offender.

24 On that note I have the benefit of a very
25 thorough pre-sentence report that gives me a
26 lot of information about Mr. Corrigan's personal
27 circumstances, family history and overall

1 background. I am not going to quote from
2 the report in detail, but I have considered
3 it carefully. I also have the benefit of
4 the submissions of Mr. Corrigan's counsel,
5 who said everything that could possibly be
6 said on Mr. Corrigan's behalf.

7 Mr. Corrigan is 55 years old. He was born
8 in Saskatchewan and his family relocated to Hay
9 River when he was about six years old. He is of
10 Metis descent. I heard that in Saskatchewan the
11 family spoke Cree frequently, but that stopped
12 after they moved to Hay River and he no longer
13 speaks that language.

14 Based on interviews with Mr. Corrigan
15 himself and some of his siblings, which were
16 conducted by the author of the pre-sentence
17 report, he does not appear to have had a
18 particularly unhappy or dysfunctional childhood.
19 The family faced certain issues and his parents
20 did separate a few years after they moved to
21 Hay River. The children remained with their
22 mother. They did not have a lot of money, but
23 despite these challenges they had a happy life.
24 Mr. Corrigan does not recall being the subject
25 of abuse or violence. His brother has a similar
26 recollection of their childhood. His sister
27 seems to remember things differently and noted

1 that there was an issue with alcohol abuse in
2 the home which made life difficult.

3 It is difficult to know what to make
4 of these different accounts, but certainly
5 overall the pre-sentence report suggests that
6 Mr. Corrigan was not subjected to many of the
7 dysfunction and unhealthy environments that
8 we often hear about in court in sentencing in
9 general, and in sentencing aboriginal offenders
10 in particular in the context of the Court's
11 special obligations when sentencing aboriginal
12 offenders.

13 Mr. Corrigan was in a relationship for
14 many years with a woman, he had children with
15 her. There does not appear to be any indication
16 that there was violence in that relationship.

17 Mr. Corrigan acknowledges having developed
18 a serious problem with alcohol. This became more
19 of an issue for him in 2006 when he started to
20 drink daily, but it also appears to have been a
21 long-standing issue. He went three times to the
22 treatment program that was then offered at the
23 Hay River Treatment Centre, but was only able to
24 complete the program once. In 1997 he attended
25 a treatment program at Poundmakers Lodge and
26 reports that he found that program more helpful
27 and useful to him than others that he had taken.

1 As I have already mentioned he was in a
2 relationship with Ms. Buggins for approximately
3 seven years, which would place the commencement
4 of that relationship around 2005 or 2006. For
5 periods of time they lived together. Sometimes
6 he lived elsewhere. It looks as though they
7 separated and reconciled on a few occasions
8 during that relationship.

9 Mr. Corrigan experienced significant loss
10 in 2012 when both his mother and his younger
11 brother passed away within a few months of
12 one another. I heard that this caused him
13 to suffer from severe depression and that
14 he was on antidepressants. It also resulted
15 in him increasing his alcohol consumption.
16 There are suggestions that this all contributed
17 to his actions in June of 2012.

18 Mr. Corrigan has a lengthy criminal record.
19 There are isolated entries, one in 1977 and one
20 in 1984, but then a fairly regular pattern of
21 convictions through the 1990s and the 2000s.
22 I agree with defence counsel that most of the
23 convictions on that record are for crimes that
24 are not particularly serious. Many were dealt
25 with through fines. When jail was imposed it
26 was for short periods of time.

27 Mr. Corrigan reports that almost all of his

1 convictions were related to the consumption of
2 alcohol and I do not doubt that this is the case.
3 There are a few convictions for assault, but they
4 do not appear to have involved serious violence
5 given the sentences imposed, and many convictions
6 are for property offences.

7 The portion of the criminal record which
8 is most relevant to this sentencing are the
9 more recent entries from the year 2010 onward,
10 not because Mr. Corrigan received particularly
11 long jail terms for offences he was convicted
12 for, but because some of those convictions
13 demonstrate a pattern as far as what was
14 transpiring between himself and Ms. Buggins.

15 There were some issues with the record
16 that were raised yesterday, and as I mentioned
17 at the outset this morning, the records from the
18 Territorial Court relating to those convictions
19 are helpful in clarifying things. What those
20 records show is a disturbing pattern of criminal
21 conduct involving crimes committed against
22 Ms. Buggins over the period of time that
23 preceded her murder.

24 On my review of the relevant record the
25 sequence of events in that regard is as follows:
26 On the 9th of October, 2010, Mr. Corrigan
27 assaulted Ms. Buggins. On the 3rd of January,

1 2011, he breached a term of an undertaking that
2 said he was not to have any contact with her.
3 He was sentenced on these two charges in January
4 of 2011, he received a 30-day jail term for the
5 assault and he was placed on probation. One of
6 the conditions of that probation order was that
7 he not have contact with her if he had been
8 drinking in the past 24 hours. Presumably this
9 was a response to a submission inviting the Court
10 to try to accommodate the continuation of the
11 relationship while offering some protection
12 to Ms. Buggins from Mr. Corrigan when he is
13 drinking.

14 On March the 8th, 2011, Mr. Corrigan
15 breached this no-contact order and was sentenced
16 on May the 31st, 2011, to 30 days in jail for
17 that.

18 Then on the 23rd of July, 2011, he committed
19 mischief by damaging some household property
20 belonging to Ms. Buggins. On that same day
21 he was convicted of breaching the probation
22 condition that required that he not have contact
23 with her if he had been drinking during the
24 previous 24 hours. On July 26th, 2011, he
25 assaulted Ms. Buggins and again was in breach
26 of that no-contact order. For those offences
27 he was sentenced on October 24th, 2011, to a

1 total of five months in jail.

2 On April 5th, 2012, he committed the
3 assault on Ms. Buggins when he found her with
4 Mr. McPherson, a conviction I have already
5 referred to. For that assault he was sentenced
6 on May 11th, 2012, to 37 days imprisonment deemed
7 served by the time he spent in pre-trial custody,
8 and he was also sentenced to another year of
9 probation. The no-contact condition in that
10 probation order, as I have already said, required
11 him to not have contact with Ms. Buggins unless
12 she agreed with it beforehand. That was a more
13 restrictive condition than the one imposed in
14 the earlier probation order, and it is completely
15 understandable considering that he was continuing
16 to commit offences against her and the earlier
17 no-contact conditions had failed to protect her.
18 It was a month and a half after this sentencing
19 that Mr. Corrigan killed Ms. Buggins and
20 Mr. McPherson.

21 This sequence of events is very disturbing,
22 and in my view unfortunately representative
23 of what frequently happens in abusive spousal
24 relationships. Because of that I feel compelled
25 to make some comments about that aspect of this
26 case.

27 The problem of domestic violence and spousal

1 abuse is rampant in this jurisdiction and it is
2 also a major problem elsewhere in this country.
3 It crosses geographical and cultural boundaries.
4 Every week the Courts in this jurisdiction, more
5 often the Territorial Court than this Court,
6 hears cases and sentences people for assaulting
7 their spouse. Some cases are more serious than
8 others, but the prevalence of these types of
9 offences cannot be denied.

10 We understand more now than we once did
11 about the dynamics of abusive relationships.
12 We understand that there are many factors at
13 play, many things that make it hard for victims
14 of this type of violence to report these crimes,
15 to follow through, to testify against their
16 spouse or to leave the abusive relationship.
17 We know that the solution to these issues is
18 not simple.

19 Often, but not always, alcohol is a factor
20 in the commission of these offences. Often
21 we hear during sentencing hearings things like
22 "the abuser is not violent when sober" or that
23 "the abuser is not a violent person by nature"
24 or that "the issue is really the alcohol."
25 In other words, the issue is more circumstantial
26 as opposed to being directly related to the
27 offender.

1 This case, in a sense, is a good
2 illustration considering some of the comments
3 in the pre-sentence report. Mr. Corrigan
4 is reported as saying that this is totally
5 out of character for him, that it was
6 spur-of-the-moment. There are references
7 about Ms. Buggins' infidelity, about the fact
8 that Mr. Corrigan considered her the love of
9 his life; that "he was upset with her being
10 in another relationship" and that "he loved
11 her dearly and was possessive of her."

12 Unfortunately, these comments illustrate
13 very well the profoundly unhealthy dynamics
14 that are often part of spousal relationships
15 that involve abuse. Without doubt the level of
16 violence in this case is significantly different
17 from anything Mr. Corrigan had done in the past,
18 and in that sense perhaps it is out of character.
19 But it was not out of character for him to be
20 violent towards Ms. Buggins. He was convicted
21 of assaulting her more than once. He was
22 convicted of damaging her property.

23 I also note that this pattern started
24 before the losses that Mr. Corrigan suffered
25 in 2012, before he was on antidepressants, and
26 before Mr. McPherson was even in the picture.
27 So those factors may have contributed to the

1 extremely violent events of June, 2012, but
2 they do not explain the whole pattern or
3 sequence of events here.

4 Similarly, Mr. Corrigan is reported
5 telling the author of the pre-sentence report
6 that he has no problem following probation
7 orders. Again, that may be true for conditions
8 that do not relate to Ms. Buggins, but it
9 is clearly not true as far as the conditions
10 that were crafted to give her some control
11 and protection. Those probation conditions
12 were breached several times in a relatively
13 short period of time, especially considering
14 that for parts of that period of time
15 Mr. Corrigan would have been in custody.

16 In the submissions made yesterday about
17 the issue of excessive alcohol consumption and
18 the role it may have played in the deterioration
19 of Mr. Corrigan's control over his life and his
20 general conduct, mention was made of the very
21 high tolerance for excessive alcohol abuse in
22 our communities and the impact that it has on
23 individuals and families.

24 It would be difficult to disagree with
25 those comments. Every week in our courts we
26 hear about the ravages of alcohol consumption
27 in this jurisdiction. We hear it leads to

1 child neglect, to violence, and to sexual abuse
2 of epidemic proportions. But again, the high
3 tolerance to excessive drinking is not where,
4 in my respectful view, the focus for reflection
5 should be. It is without doubt a problem and
6 may well have been a factor here, but it is
7 not at the heart of what led to the deaths
8 of Ms. Buggins and of Mr. McPherson. The
9 best evidence of that is that Mr. Corrigan
10 has struggled with alcohol for many years
11 but had never displayed anywhere near this
12 type of violence.

13 In my view, what is at the root of what
14 happened here in fact is an unhealthy and an
15 extreme sense of possessiveness of Ms. Buggins,
16 uncontrollable possessiveness and jealousy,
17 and a desire to exercise control over her
18 at all costs. That was at the heart of
19 what happened here.

20 There was reference in submissions yesterday
21 that Mr. Corrigan has struggled with the question
22 "why did he do this?" Sadly, very sadly, I think
23 the answer to that question can be found in his
24 own words when he spoke to the police that night,
25 having at that point a clear recall of what he
26 had done and why. What he said then was that
27 he killed her so no one else could have her.

1 Which leads me to the next point.

2 Yes, there is high tolerance for alcohol
3 abuse in our communities, a normalization of
4 it almost, but there is also a high tolerance
5 for spousal violence. As I said, every week the
6 Court deals with cases involving spousal violence
7 of various levels of seriousness. Every week
8 the Courts try to address the prevalence of
9 this problem in part through the sentencing
10 practices, but it is not a problem that the
11 Courts can solve.

12 The overall problem of spousal violence
13 in this jurisdiction is relevant to this case
14 because in my view what led to the death of
15 Ms. Buggins and Mr. McPherson is part of a
16 much larger problem and has its roots in some
17 of the same dynamics as the spousal violence
18 that takes place every day in our jurisdiction.
19 This case is simply an extreme and very dramatic
20 manifestation of it, and the cases filed by the
21 Crown show that this happens more often than
22 we would like to think and it happens, all over
23 the country, and to people from all walks of
24 life.

25 That violence is everyone's problem.
26 Everyone should be concerned about it and try
27 to support those who are trying to address it

1 and help people deal with it. Things will only
2 change if entire communities decide they want
3 things to change. Until and unless that happens
4 it is inevitable that there will be more cases
5 like this one.

6 The role of this Court is to continue to
7 emphasize general deterrence and denunciation
8 as the paramount sentencing factors in these
9 cases, as has been the direction from appellate
10 courts for many years, including in the case
11 of R. v. Brown [1992] A.J. No. 432, which
12 was decided by the Alberta Court of Appeal
13 in 1992. It talks about the principles that
14 apply in dealing with sentencing for domestic
15 violence cases, and is a case that is every
16 bit as relevant today as it was more than
17 20 years ago.

18 As I already mentioned, the Criminal Code
19 says that in setting the parole ineligibility
20 duration Courts must take into account the
21 circumstances of the offence, the character of
22 the person who committed it, and the sentencing
23 principles. There are many factors here that
24 justify a period of parole ineligibility much
25 longer than the minimum 10 years. The first
26 is the criminal record, and in particular the
27 pattern that it shows as far as behavior towards

1 Ms. Buggins. This includes the important fact
2 that Mr. Corrigan was on probation for an
3 assault on her and bound by a condition not
4 to have contact with her without her prior
5 consent. Whatever ambiguity may have existed
6 in Mr. Corrigan's mind that day, it is clear
7 that once he was kicked out of Mr. McPherson's
8 apartment he could not have been under any
9 mistaken understanding as to the status of
10 things.

11 The second is that these killings arose
12 in the context of a spousal relationship which
13 had come to an end. This is highly aggravating
14 and underscores the need for a denunciatory
15 sentence for reasons I have just been explaining.

16 I must also take into account as part of
17 the overall circumstances the other extremely
18 serious offence committed during the same set
19 of circumstances. I agree that the reasoning
20 of the Alberta Court of Appeal in the case
21 of R. v. Tran [2009] A.J. No. 994, is very
22 persuasive in that regard. The killing of
23 Mr. McPherson, even though it is the subject
24 matter of a separate charge of manslaughter,
25 can and must be taken into account in setting
26 the parole ineligibility period in sentencing
27 Mr. Corrigan for Ms. Buggins' murder.

1 I also consider it aggravating that this
2 particular second degree murder case fits fairly
3 high on the overall scale of seriousness that
4 can underlie this type of charge. A murder,
5 by definition, is always a serious offence.
6 But still, as with everything, there are
7 things that increase the seriousness even
8 more. Here I find that there are such factors
9 present: The violence of the attack, the number
10 of times Ms. Buggins was stabbed, in addition
11 to the repeated stabbing of Mr. McPherson.

12 I would also add this: By accepting a
13 plea to second degree murder on this matter
14 the Crown has conceded it could not establish
15 beyond a reasonable doubt the elements of
16 planning and deliberation which would be
17 required to make out a charge of first degree
18 murder, and I am not here being critical or
19 second guessing in any way that decision.
20 But recognizing that, the fact remains
21 that the circumstances here do not involve
22 a completely spontaneous spur-of-the-moment
23 act either. Mr. Corrigan left the apartment,
24 went somewhere else, slept for a bit, armed
25 himself with a knife before going back to the
26 apartment, and immediately attacked Ms. Buggins
27 when she opened the door. So as far as possible

1 circumstances that would make out a second
2 degree murder charge, this is not at the
3 "most spontaneous" or least serious end
4 of the spectrum, to the extent that these
5 things can be compared.

6 I must also consider factors that militate
7 in favour of reducing the period of time for
8 parole ineligibility, and the main one here is
9 Mr. Corrigan's guilty plea. It did not come
10 early because it has been almost three years
11 since these offences were committed, but
12 the Court's record shows that shortly after
13 Mr. Corrigan was committed to stand trial
14 he gave indications through his then counsel
15 that he was intending on pleading guilty.

16 Mr. Corrigan's first counsel was instructed
17 to ask that the sentencing hearing not proceed
18 right away so that he could try to gather certain
19 evidence and information that may be relevant
20 to the sentencing hearing. Eventually a date
21 was set for entering the pleas, but on that date
22 Mr. Corrigan's counsel had to get off the record
23 because of a breakdown in the solicitor/client
24 relationship. But it was not very long after new
25 counsel took over that the indication was given
26 that the matter would in fact resolve without a
27 trial. So although it has been a long wait for

1 the victims' families and loved ones to see the
2 conclusion of these proceedings, Mr. Corrigan's
3 plea does show remorse and his words in court
4 yesterday also show remorse. I accept that
5 he is sorry for what he had done.

6 The guilty plea, even if afforded
7 its maximum mitigating effect, in my view
8 falls far short of counterbalancing the many
9 aggravating features I have talked about.
10 But for the guilty plea I think a much higher
11 period of parole eligibility, much closer to
12 the maximum available, would have been required
13 to reflect those aggravating features.

14 In my view, the upper end of the range
15 suggested by counsel makes ample allowance for
16 the mitigating effect of the guilty plea and for
17 other aspects of Mr. Corrigan's circumstances.
18 I want to make it clear I have also taken
19 into account the fact that he is an aboriginal
20 offender, but I simply do not find in this case
21 that this is a factor that justifies reducing
22 the parole ineligibility period having regard
23 to the overall circumstances.

24 Mr. Corrigan's counsel has asked me to
25 take into account Mr. Corrigan's age and the
26 prospect that the higher end of the range, as
27 far as parole ineligibility, might mean that

1 he would finish his days in jail. I have given
2 that submission some thought. The difference
3 between one end of the range and the other of
4 what is being proposed is two years. Whether
5 that two-year difference will mean in fact the
6 difference between Mr. Corrigan finishing his
7 life in jail or having an opportunity to be
8 released before the end of his life is really
9 speculative at this point. Ultimately I have
10 concluded that the overarching concern here
11 has to be proportionality, and for all of the
12 reasons I have been talking about I think the
13 higher end of what the Crown is seeking is in
14 fact the very minimum that can be imposed given
15 the many aggravating factors that are present.

16 The Crown has sought a number of ancillary
17 orders and the defence does not take issue with
18 them. So there will be a DNA order. There will
19 be a life-time firearms prohibition order. The
20 victims of crime surcharge will be waived. Any
21 exhibits seized as part of this investigation
22 will be returned to their rightful owners if
23 that is appropriate. Otherwise, they will be
24 destroyed at the expiration of the appeal period.

25 Mr. Corrigan, stand up, please.
26 Mr. Corrigan, for the murder of Carol Buggins
27 I sentence you to a term of imprisonment for

1 life and I set your parole ineligibility date
2 at 17 years from now. For the unlawful killing
3 of Mr. McPherson I sentence you to a term of
4 imprisonment of eight years, which will be
5 served concurrently with the other sentence.
6 You may sit down.

7 I want to conclude my remarks by borrowing
8 some of the words that I heard yesterday from
9 Ms. Lepine, who read her victim impact statement
10 in court. One of the things she said was this:
11 "No one can ever measure the loss of a beloved
12 person, no one can ever say if there is a
13 punishment suitable enough to atone for that
14 loss." As I said at the beginning, I know
15 this is true. Measuring any punishment
16 I impose against the loss suffered by the
17 victims' families and loved ones is not
18 really possible, and I realize that.

19 Ms. Lepine also said "It is my hope that
20 the person who is responsible for this will
21 know what loss we have experienced and will
22 take responsibility to heal in prison."
23 That is the Court's hope as well for you,
24 Mr. Corrigan.

25 Finally, Ms. Lepine said "Make this event
26 be of some value for the family members and the
27 community. It is not too late." Those I think

1 are very wise words and I thank Ms. Lepine for
2 them. Thank you. If these tragic events were
3 to spark real change, perhaps it might help make
4 them seem less senseless for those who were most
5 affected by them.

6 Have I overlooked anything, counsel?

7 MR. LECORRE: I don't believe so, Your
8 Honour.

9 MR. HARTE: No, Your Honour, thank you.

10 THE COURT: In closing I want to thank
11 counsel for their work in resolving this case,
12 for the reasonable positions that they took,
13 and their approach and for their very helpful
14 submissions. Close court.

15 -----

16
17 Certified to be a true and
18 accurate transcript, pursuant
19 to Rules 723 and 724 of the
20 Supreme Court Rules.

21 _____
22 Joel Bowker
23 Court Reporter