IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

2

1

3

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -

FELEC SERVICES, INC.

Transcript of the Oral Sentencing delivered by His Honour Chief Judge J.R. Slaven, sitting at Yellowkoife in the Northwest Territories, Thursday, March 23rd A.D. 1989. MAR 31 1989

APPEARANCES:

MR. T. HUMPHRIES

Counsel for the Crown

MR. J. FORAN

Counsel for the Defence

MS. S. MacPHERSON

(Charges under Section 6(1) & 6(2) D.G.A.)

NWT 5349/0687

THE COURT: Well, in this case, Felec Services Incorporated, which has had a Canadian presence for many years in its occupation as a contractor for the U.S. Air Force in operating and maintaining radar equipment at D.E.W. Line sites in Canada, has plead guilty to offering for transport, sealift, dangerous goods without providing their description and also without displaying safety marks on them as required by The Dangerous Goods Act and regulations there—under.

This came about with the replacement of a great deal of equipment on the D.E.W. Line sites during which unwanted and outmoded equipment had to be -- or at least, in any event, happily was being removed from the sites. The preparing for shipment of the goods was left to the individual supervisors at the various sites across the Northwest Territories who were inadequately trained. As a result, at both Lady Franklin Point and Hall Beach, equipment containing PCBs were loaded without displaying proper markings on them and without being properly described by the manifest. Also, at Hall Beach and at Long Staff Bluff the same deficiencies occurred with reference to inflammatory materials and asbestos.

Felec Services Incorported has, in effect,

pled guilty at the first opportunity. Crown counsel agrees
that they have provided their wholehearted cooperation in
this matter since it first came to light. I am assured by
counsel that they have taken steps to ensure that this

never happens again; that training programs have been prepared and are even now ongoing; that their experience in this matter to date has already been a very expensive one.

Mr. Humphries points out the Acts and regulations are of a preventive character to ensure that people handling goods know what they are handling, and, accordingly, that they handle it in the proper way. In the case of the inflammatory and asbestos in open containers, they should have to know that it is for their own safety. I suppose I could compare, however, PCBs with asbestos twenty or thirty years ago, and I believe later since then an insulating material called polyurethane or something, which along with asbestos certainly was a great discovery for insulating and other It provided greatly to the prosperity of Canada, reasons. in Quebec particularly, but after a time it came to light that those working in the mines and processing the asbestos were suffering from its harmful effects on their health, and latterly that asbestos was having a deleterious effect on the health of people in buildings that were insulated by asbestos, just as with polyurethane. Hundreds of millions, or even billions, have been spent in the past few years removing these materials from structures.

With PCBs, the danger has come to light more recently. There could well be a greater danger, a more insidious one.

We are only learning now how it persists in the food chain and is ending up in the bodies of Northern people, particularly because of their diet largely consisting in some places

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

of what we call country food, and certainly with the Inuit, in seals and other food from the seas. Flying across this vast territory through the years it is sometimes hard for me to imagine world over-population or even pollution when I look at the millions, I guess, of small lakes and streams. But we certainly have been finding out despite the immense size of our Territories and the small population, nonetheless, things like PCBs accummulate where they can do the most harm. Throughout Canada, certainly in the last year or two, there have been other occurrences with PCPs sufficient to bring it to the attention of everybody as to what a great danger they are.

In this case, counsel have made joint submissions as to what they would feel are appropriate fines. Regarding the failure to provide a description of the dangerous goods, contrary to Section 6(2) of the Act, the maximum fines for a first offence, as these are, proceeded with summarily, is \$10,000.00. For the failure to comply with subsection 6(1) and not to display the markings, the maximum fine on each occurrence is \$50,000.00. There is filed a joint submission of counsel, which is not a usual thing, certainly a most unusual type of submission in Courts in the North. Generally, not even counsel on one side would suggest an exact appropriate sentence. The joint submission suggests that for the subsection 6(2) offences I should fine \$5,000.0 ϕ each, for the subsection 6(1) matters, \$10,000.00 each. The Agreed Statement of Facts points out that it has already

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

cost the Defendant a great deal of money and will continue to cost it, or its contractor, a great deal of money to handle the remaining PCBs properly.

I am inclined to think that I don't have to go higher than the fines suggested to deter Felec Services Incorporated from re-offending. Accordingly, I don't feel any probation order is called for in this matter. But I do feel that I have to have exemplary punishment in mind because of the great danger of PCBs and to show others who may be handling them that it is not a matter to be trifled with, not a matter to be gambled with as simply another expense of doing business. I may say before I go further that I feel that the \$5,000.00 fines under the subsection 6(2) matters are quite adequate, being one-half of the maximum fine provided. I feel, however, the \$10,000.00 fines on the 6(1) matters are inadequate where they refer to PCBs.

On count one, an offence against subsection 6(2) the 8th of August, Lady Franklin Point, I direct the Defendant pay a fine of \$5,000.00. Count two, the same date at the same place, offering unmarked PCBs for transport, contrary to subsection 6(1), I direct the Defendant pay a fine of \$25,000.00. Count three, at Hall Beach, an offence against section 6(2), I direct the Defendant pay a fine of \$5,000.00. Count four, offering PCBs for transport without displaying safety marks at Hall Beach, I direct the Defendant pay a fine of \$25,000.00. For the remaining five counts, I agree with the joint submission. On count five the fine will

1 be \$10,000.00. Count six, the fine will be \$5,000.00. Count seven, a fine of \$5,000.00. Count eight, a fine of 2 \$10,000.00. Count nine, a fine of \$5,000.00. 3 4 Gentlemen, I followed your joint submission on seven of the counts in the indictment, but on counts two and 5 four I have imposed fines of \$25,000.00 rather than the 6 \$10,000.00 recommended. Ninety-five thousand dollars. How much time would be appropriate to allow for payment on the 8 fines? 9 MR. FORAN: It's necessary, Your Honour, to process the 10 cheque and send it in. 11 THE COURT: Three months. 12 Oh, I don't think so. One month would be MR. FORAN: 13 adequate. 14 THE COURT: I will make it two months in case the airlines 15 or the post office or something goes astray. Is that all, 16 gentlemen? 17 MR. HUMPHRIES: Thank you, sir. 18 19 20 Certified a correct transcript, 21 22 23 MacDonald, Court Reporter. 24

NWT 5349/0687

25

26