## IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

## IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- vs. -

JOHN SIMON ROLAND



Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence of The Honourable Judge R. M. Bourassa, sitting at Yellowknife in the Northwest Territories on Monday, March 1st A.D., 1995.

## APPEARANCES:

MR. D. JENKINS:

Counsel for the Crown

MR. T. McCAULEY:

Counsel for the Accused

(CHARGED UNDER s. 31(a) WILDLIFE ACT) (CHARGED UNDER s. 52(4) WILDLIFE ACT)

1 THE COURT: This is the John Roland matter.

MR. McCAULEY: Good morning, Your Honour.

3 MR. JENKINS: Good morning, Your Honour.

4 THE COURT: The accused pleaded guilty to a charge

of having in his possession a polar bear hide without
having the proper tag contrary to the provisions of

7 the Wildlife Act.

It appears from what was placed before me that the accused is essentially a welder and for the last few years has been supplementing his income by hunts.

The event of the 31st of March, 1994, was a kill of opportunity. The accused was on the sea ice, saw a polar bear, immediately started shooting at it, and only after having killed it did he find that it was accompanied by a cub and then he killed the cub. At no time did he have a proper tag or permit as required by law.

In my view, there are two features of the case that require special consideration. First of all, the protected species:

Polar bear popluations don't number the same as cariboo and the critical need to protect and carefully manage the polar bears that exist in the Northwest Territories, and in fact the world, is clearly set out in the documents and international agreements and in fact wildlife regulations and the regulations under the Inuvialuit settlement arrangments. Everyone is

concerned from a management perspective on the continued existence and viability of the polar bears.

The other aspect of this case that requires consideration is that this was simply an opportunistic kill. The accused knew a tag was required. He knew from the moment that he started shooting at the bear that what he was doing was illegal but he continued, presumably seeing a quick profit. After shooting the bear and cutting off the hide, the next day he attempted to get a tag to retroactively justify his actions.

The issue that I was particularly concerned with is given these features whether or not a jail sentence is required. I am grateful to counsel for the Crown for their submissions and authorities that they provided.

It appears that there recently have been a number of decisions from southern jurisdictions that have resulted in jail sentences for, if I can categorize the offences generally, the illegal shooting of wildlife particularly in cases of poaching.

In my view, the aggravating features here brought the matter to the point where a jail sentence had to be considered.

I take into account that the accused pleaded guilty. I take into account that the accused is apparently remorseful.

I also take into account that the Hunters and Trappers Association, who have the responsibility of distributing the tags, are also equally concerned about this and have indicated in the materials before me that their concern might be translated to some kind of action in terms of increased vigilance or increased care in the future.

I also take into account that this is the first offence that I am aware of with respect to the unlawful killing or harvesting of polar bears.

There have been a number of offences recently with respect to wasting cariboo contrary to Territorial legislation. There was an offence in Coral Harbour a few years ago with respect to harvesting walrus contrary to Federal legislation.

In that decision, <u>R. v. Shimout</u>, Mr. Justice de Weerdt considered a variety of factors in sentencing on charges of unlawfully killing walruses. He upheld a probation order prohibiting the accused from hunting for a period of time as being an appropriate response.

After considering whether or not a jail sentence is required in law, I have come to the conclusion it is not at this time. That is not to say that it wouldn't be applicable under any circumstance but simply not in this case.

It is hoped that the goals of sentencing, denunciation and deterrence, can be met otherwise; and

they may be met by a probation order such as was approved by Mr. Justice de Weerdt in that case.

Therefore the decision of this Court is that the accused pay a fine of \$900, together with a Victims of Crime surcharge. If I can pause there for a moment with respect to the quantity of the fine.

It's my view that the fine has to at least represent more than what can be obtained by the illegal harvesting of a hide. If the fine is less than what the hide is worth, then it makes no business sense to comply with the laws and regulations. That consideration was present in my mind as I impose the fine at that level. Also, I consider the financial ability of the accused.

Secondly, I am going to place the accused on probation for a period of 18 months. He is to keep the peace and be of good behaviour. He is not to apply, hold, or possess any "polar bear tag" or any tag that would authorize him to hunt, shoot, or harvest polar bears. In effect, I am prohibiting him from hunting polar bears for a year and a half.

In default of payment of the fine, there will be a period of imprisonment of three months.

Mr. McCauley, does your client need time to pay the fine?

MR. McCAULEY: My understanding is that he would need time, sir. Given the level of the fine, I am

	l	
	1	requesting four months.
	2	THE COURT: Four months to pay.
	3	(AT WHICH TIME THIS SENTENCING HEARING CONCLUDED)
	4	
	5	Certified correct to the best of my
	6	skill and ability, (Subject to Review of Presiding Judge)
	7	
	8	
	9	Lois Hewitt,
	10	Court Reporter
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	<b>21</b> <sub>t</sub>	
	22	
	23	
	24	<b>→</b>
	25	
	26	
	27	
L		