IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- and -



BOREALIS EXPLORATION LIMITED

Transcript of the Sentence delivered by His Honour Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories, on the 3rd of March, A.D., 1993.

APPEARANCES:

MR. B. WEBBER:

Counsel for the Crown

MR. R. COX:

On behalf of the Defendant

CHARGE (x 2) UNDER SECTION 7(1) OF THE TERRITORIAL LANDS ACT

THE COURT: I have to sentence the defendant on two counts. On Count 1, failure to remove equipment, materials, and fuel drums from the land use area; and Count 2, failure to restore the land use area. The counts cover a period of 75 days and the maximum penalty is \$5,000 a day.

The defendant has been convicted of similar offences in October of 1990. At that time, there were a number of convictions entered for identical offences with Fines totalling \$14,000. It is unknown to me if these Fines have been paid or not.

The problem, if I can call it that with respect to the continuing presence of these illegal items and the failure to restore the property, has been an ongoing one from what I can gleem from the evidence before me. The permit expired in March of 1990, that's three years ago.

Since then, there has been, as I have already referred to in my judgment, some limited cleanup. Some items have been taken apart but the area is generally in a state of disrepair.

The president and executive officer argues that he needs time to make arrangements to effect a cleanup. In that regard, I refer to two exhibits, 10 and 11 in the trial. One is a letter to Keith Sharp at Rankin Inlet and the other is a letter to a person at Whale Cove. Both of these letters are "offers". I have

nothing before me that would in any way indicate that 1 there is a contract with the addressees as argued by the defendant. With respect to the letter to Sharp, it is an

offer to pay for the removal of the barrels and to effect payment in some way other than from cash from the company. At most, a surrender of salvage value.

All the barrels go with a \$30 deposit. MR. COX:

THE COURT: The other one is an offer to the hamlet of Whale Cove to sell them the four crew trailers from the site. I know the people in Whale I have been there on numerous occasions, and I Cove. express some surprise that they are so in need of those run-down trailers that they would consider the \$175,000 for them, but that is neither here nor there.

The letter of December 27, 1992, is only an offer. I'm assured that the people in Whale Cove have a great interest in this but neither of the two offered letters assist me with what is really the basic That is the fact that the place isn't problem. cleaned up and no concrete plans are in place.

I can't address that. Mind you, if the defendant had taken extraordinary steps over the past few months, I would have to take that into account, but he hasn't. I can't address that.

My obligation is to impose a penalty, and somewhat wryly as the defendant points out, I note that a

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

\$5,000 Fine may hurt and \$375,000 may be past the point of hurting.

Well, I appreciate that but the Fine, the penalty, has to reflect the situation. It has to be applied in accordance with ordinary legal principles. In this regard, the corporation has prior convictions for the same kind of offence; the corporation has been in default of its legal obligations for three years.

It may very well be, and I don't doubt Mr. Cox that the corporation has no money and he is trying hard and he can't bring it together. I don't doubt him or criticize him in any way, but the defendant has known that the situation out there is illegal. As he stated, "All I need is a storage permit to make it legal".

My obligation in applying the law is to make it clear not only to this defendant but to all other defendants that the law, this law, has to be obeyed and especially when it comes to land. It's a very sensitive issue and that has to be respected and taken into account by all. That's why the law is there. It has to be obeyed.

The site has to be cleaned up and the contractors and developers are going to have to recognize that whether they come from Europe or the United States or Canada. If they can't live with that, well then I don't really think they're welcome.

In terms of penalty, as I stated, the defendant has prior convictions for the same thing and this outstanding matter is three years old with really very little concrete efforts and with very little achieved in terms of cleaning up or restoring the site.

The only evidence that I have before me is the

The only evidence that I have before me is the defendant is impecunious, with little or no money. \$1500 in the bank account. Well, if that's the case, it remains a significant matter to send a message to other developers that they must obey the law especially when it comes to land use permits.

I am satisfied on the law that I can impose a penalty for each of the 75 days and I intend to do that. It must be a penalty that is meaningful and it must be a penalty that, as I say, will make others conscious of their obligations.

I have to take totalility into account and I do. There will be a Fine of \$2,000 a day for a total of \$150,000.

I'll direct that, subject to the expiration of the appeal period, the documents submitted by Mr. Cox be returned to him. Should he require photocopies in the interim, I will have the court staff make those available to him.

Is that everything then, Mr. Webber?

26 MR. WEBBER: Yes, Your Honour.

27 (PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED)

Certified a correct transcript to the best of my skill and ability, (Subject to Editing by Presiding Judge) Court Reporter