rile: 123699. IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN VS JERRY DOYLE ROGERS --- Before HIS HONOUR CHIEF JUDGE J.R. SLAVEN at Inuvik, Horthwest Territories, on January 26th, 1987. APPEARANCES: Counsel for the Crown. BRIAN BRUSER JOYCE LILLEGRAN Counsel for the Accused. Decision of His Honour re application under Section 98(1) 

N.W.T. 5349-80/0284

MARITAL STATUS: <del>ainal</del>e marrie Criminal Code. December A.D. 19 86

Anthon Robert RANDALL T.3.2%

2. Registrar of Motor Vehicles 3. Police Copy 4. Crown Attorney 5. Defence

DISTRIBUTION: 1. Clark of the Judge's Court

Inuvik

A Judge or Justice of the the Northwest Territorie

IMINAL CODE FORM 2 (Sections 455, 455-1 and 723) T 1961/0885

Justice of the Peace

I have considered the cases to which counsel have referred me: R. v. Weyallon, the NWT Court of Appeal; 60 A.R. 79; also R. v. Weyallon, a decision of Mr. Justice Marshall,47 A.R. 360, August 15th, 1983; also R. v. Tobac, 60 A.R. 253 the NWT Court of Appeal; the cases of R. v. Ratt, 16 C.R.R. 12 (Sask. Prov. Ct.) and R. v. Herman, 1986 1 C.N.L.R. 72 (Sask. Prov. Ct), both being decisions of Provincial Court judges, referred to me by Counsel for the Defence.

I have heard the evidence of the accused and Mr. Lennie, a long-time Director of the Hunters and Trappers Association and a respected figure in the Mackenzie Delta, and I am satisfied that the accused is a serious trapper and hunter. He has trapped right from the time he was old enough to learn how to trap. Mr. Lennie explained how he started at a very early age, and Mr. Rogers' uncle stated how both he and the accused would have become adequate trappers about the age of 14.

Mr. Rogers, the accused, will be 27 next week, and since he was a young fellow, through his teens, has been mostly involved in trapping, some incidental hunting or even more than that, I suppose, since muskrats are shot and not trapped, and also hunting whales. I was referred to R. v.Ratt, and I think Judge Farfard puts it very well on page 14. He states that the accused's traditional occupations are all interrelated; take the hunting component out of it and the whole thing comes apart.

I find that this applies to Mr. Rogers' case.

His trapping career has been interrupted at times by jail

terms, and he has also had a certain amount of wage employment, particularly in the oil play in the Beaufort Sea, and even then, during the period he worked for Esso in the Beaufort Sea, he supplemented his livelihood and his home life by the proceeds of his trapping and the bringing home of wild meat which he prefers to meat bought in the stores.

I find that having his firearm with him when he is trapping is an integral part of his lifestyle, and the carrying of a firearm is interrelated with his trapping, and together they form his way of life, and I accept what Mr. Lennie says, that this accused would never work at a yearround job in the wage economy. I find that if I take away, pursuant to Sub-section 1 of Section 98, his right to bear firearms. his way of life would fall apart, and he, his wife, and family would very likely end up on welfare for all or a greater part of their time. The opportunities for employment in the Mackenzie Delta area have been steadily reduced during the last year or more because of the downturn in employment in the oil patch. There is some ray of light, according to the newspapers last week, that Gulf will continue with one well, but that will not result in enough employment to bring it back to near where it has been in the last 5 years. So to take away his right would relegate him to being on welfare most of the time.

I make that finding of fact in his individual case, and following the reasoning of Judge Farfard in R. v. Ratt, and also for the reasons applied by Provincial Court Judge Moxley

1

2

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 R. v. Herman, and in this case I find that Sub-section 1 of Section 98 of the Code is inoperative against the accused.

I think I would like to let it go at that for the moment and sentence him in the morning. I might hear further submissions regarding firearms and a probation order, and so on. Is that all right?

MS. LILLEGRAN: Yes.

THE COURT: I would like to put this over until 9.30 tomorrow morning.

MR. BRUSER: That is satisfactory.

MS. LILLEGRAN: Yes.

---Whereupon the further proceedings were adjourned at 6.10 p.m. on January 26th, 1987, until 9.30 a.m. on January 27th, 1987.

Certified correct

(G. Mitchell - CSR RPR - Court Reporter)