C U1- 10 000

CENTIFIED TRUE COPY OF THE

ORIGINAL

IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

APR 2 1998

- V-

CON EXPLORATION and MIRAMAR CON MINE LTD., a body corporate

Transcript of the Oral Reasons for Sentence of The Honourable Judge R.M. Bourassa, sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories, on the 28th day of January, A.D. 1998.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. A. Regel:

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. N. Daugalis:

Counsel for the Defence

THE COURT: Thank you. Well, I have to sentence the defendant corporation on two counts of breaching conditions of its water license.

I am presented with a joint submission by Crown and defence, both Crown and defence counsel are well-known, well experienced, and have obviously given the matter consideration in light of the various principles that have evolved in dealing with offences such as this.

The Court of Appeal has indicated that a joint submission ought not to be disregarded unless it's unreasonable and I'll say at the outset, I can't conclude that a total financial penalty to the defendant of \$50,000 for the delict that has been described to me is unreasonable.

I have a few comments, however, that I would like to make.

In my view, there is nothing much different here than with Echo Bay Mines or some other cases. The offence is the harm to the regulatory regime that is set up. The regulatory regime has to be obeyed. Surely the defendants here, large experienced companies, are aware of the regulatory regime especially dealing with water. Surely it's not unreasonable to expect that they would have someone designated to ensure statutory and regulatory compliance. It may very well be that no one was harmed

and there will be no harm in the future, but the regulatory regime is there to be obeyed and it's not an optional thing.

I have looked at the photographs and the documents that were submitted with the submissions or the authorities, it's clear that the defendant was anxious and gung ho to address the issue and did so promptly and it appears effectively and properly, but I want to point out that the end does not justify the means.

They required approval from the Water Board. It's in black and white on the license. The license isn't a complicated document - a few pages long - it's not like reading the income tax act. Anyone can understand what it says.

In this day and age it's not enough to have compliance by a nod and a wink and tacit assumptions. Where a license or a directive indicates that written approval is needed, then written approval is needed.

I'm sure that in it's desire to remedy the problem that a week or so would not have destroyed the construction season for the new Taylor Road Dam; a week or so taken to deal with the Water Board on emergency basis.

In so far as the weather goes: yes, there was more rain that April than there had been for a few years, but when one works at the edge of standards -.5 meter freeboard - then in my view it's patently obvious that any variation of base assumptions will cause a

fall off the edge, so a rainfall unexpected but within normal limits over a ten-year period occurs and there is a disaster. The whole point of the Water Board and the regulatory regime and the considerations that go into the regulations is that operators not work at the edge of standards but that with a decent margin for safety given variations of base assumptions and unexpected circumstances.

The only other comment that I would like to make is in looking at the exhibits that were attached to the authorities and in particular Appendix 7, the "Surface Contamination Study" and "Surface Runoff Directions" from the Study Area. Con Mine operates effectively in the middle of the city of 16 or 17 thousand people. provides a lot of employment, it does a lot of good. have nothing before me to suggest that it's anything other than a good corporate citizen, but it's dealing with by-products, heavy metals and cyanide. Look at this map, where is the surface runoff? Right down School Draw Road, right through Rat Lake, right down by the Esso Bulk Fuel Plant towards Joliffe Island and into Great Slave Lake. Little children in the spring time play on School Draw Road making dams in the runoff. There are boaters, fishermen, by Joliffe Island along the edge of Great Slave Lake. Con Mine is dealing with a deadly substance, cyanide, that requires appropriate precautions.

1

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

It's not enough to play or to work on the edge here, certainly not given their location and given the substances, the by-products of their business or otherwise.

Now, I said at the outset that I'don't have difficulty endorsing or accepting the joint submission. I have one reservation; it's suggested to me that the Court make an order requiring the defendant to contribute \$48,000 to the West Kitikmeot Slave Study. I've perused the annual report from 1996 and 1997 and obviously the West Kitikmeot Slave Study Society is well funded and quite active in a variety of areas.

I think I've indicated in the past, and I'd confirm it again today, that in my view when a Court makes orders on environmental offences, there must be some relevancy between the offence before the Court and the order it makes. In my view it's not enough to simply take the money from the defendant and put it wherever is convenient. In my view there should be a constructive element in the contribution of funds, constructive both to the defendant and with respect to reducing the potential harm of the area within which it's working. I don't want to be provincial, but it seems to me the money ought to be spent on something dealing with cyanide in Yellowknife.

I understand - I'm a citizen of this community - that there is a lot of concern with respect to cyanide

levels. There is a lot of concern about cyanide or heavy metals in Yellowknife Bay. As I have indicated in my discussion here, I don't know and I don't imagine the public knows whether there is a cyanide taint to the spring runoff down School Draw? It seems to me that any order requiring the defendant to contribute the funds to some kind of project should be made with that in mind.

Therefore what I'm going to do is I will, and I say that in future tense, I will impose a fine on the first count of \$1,000; a fine on the second count of \$2,000, in my view the delict was more reprehensible, and I will place the accused on probation for a period of months, which counsel can address me on, requiring them to pay \$47,000, and that's where I'm going to stop and require counsel to see what they can do to determine what is available in so far as research study or work having to do with cyanide and the cyanide levels in the water in Yellowknife, Yellowknife Bay, I'm open to anything in that regard. But I don't see that counting caribou on the Coronation Gulf is going to be of much assistance to either the defendant or the people immediately affected by this mine which are the citizens of Yellowknife.

So I can set this aside, counsel, I can hear from you later today or I can hear from you tomorrow, I'm in your hands?

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

```
If I could just have a minute,
       MR. REGEL:
 1
           Your Honour?
       MR. DAUGALIS:
                                 My friend and I were just talking
 3
           about who we need to talk to to try to identify some
           worthwhile project. At the same time which, is my
           probable rather than anyone else's --
       THE COURT:
                                 You've got a plane to catch?
                                 I was hoping to be on an airplane
       MR. DAUGALIS:
           at 5 o'clock this evening, so I wonder if we could
           maybe stand it down for now and then hopefully before
10
           the end of the day we can come back and --
11
       THE COURT:
                                 Sure, all right, I'll set it aside
12
           then.
13
       MR. REGEL:
                                 Thank you, Your Honour.
14
       (OTHER MATTERS SPOKEN TO)
15
       THE COURT:
                                 So we'll recess then until Con
16
17
           Mine.
       (ADJOURNMENT)
18
19
       THE COURT:
                                 It didn't take long to find a
20
           place to spend $50,000.
21
       MR. REGEL:
                                 Your Honour, we quickly realized
22
           that we couldn't do justice to the issue in the time we
23
           have this afternoon or tomorrow and we certainly
24
           wouldn't want to come up with something that was a
25
           useless project just for the sake of accomplishing --
26
       THE COURT:
                                 Well I appreciate that.
27
       MR. REGEL:
                                  -- and I'm sure you wouldn't want
```

1 to endorse that.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

In speaking with Mr. Unrau he noted that the

Department of Environment wanted to obtain some funding

for a study of the Meg Peg Keg runoff system, and again --

THE COURT: The what?

6 MR. REGEL: The Meg Peg Keg Lakes?

7 THE COURT: Oh, okay.

MR. REGEL: Actually the tailings pond area and the runoff system there is something they have been talking about, we don't know what parameters they were thinking of or anything like that. In order to kind of accomplish our goals today and at the same time ensure that whatever project is selected is something worthwhile what we'd be proposing is this; if we could require Con to forthwith deposit the sum of \$47,000 into a trust account for the purpose of funding a study, actually a research study, to determine the presence of and the nature and concentration of contaminants, specifically cyanide and heavy metals, in the water bodies in or around Yellowknife, specifically Yellowknife Bay, which study shall be approved by this Court.

And if we could have a further paragraph there, In the event a suitable research project is not identified within three months of today's date, that counsel shall forthwith make arrangements to bring this matter back before the Court to speak to at that time.

```
THE COURT:
                                 Is that satisfactory to you and
           your client?
 2
       MR. DAUGALIS:
                                 NODS IN THE AFFIRMATIVE
 3
       THE COURT:
                                 Then there is no need for a
           probation order; is there?
       MR. DAUGALIS:
                                 Yeah, no I think that will be
           satisfactory because --
       THE COURT:
                                 Well, you know -- all right.
 8
       MR. DAUGALIS:
                                  -- that will then put the funds
 9
           in trust and some work to see if we can identify --
10
       THE COURT:
                                 All right. Well then on the basis
11
           of those funds being paid into trust then my sentence
12
           on the two offences are as I indicated fines only, and
13
           you can bring the matter back to me within three months
14
           if there is difficulty.
15
       MR. REGEL:
                                 And in order to obtain the Court's
16
           approval would it be sufficient if counsel joined the --
17
18
           endorsed a letter indicating what we think might be
           approved or might be suitable, perhaps identifying two
19
20
           or three options?
21
       THE COURT:
                                 Yes.
22
       MR. REGEL:
                                 Thank you, Your Honour.
23
       THE COURT:
                                 Just so long as something useful
           comes out of this, useful for the defendant and useful
24
25
           for agencies in and around Yellowknife dealing with the
26
           problem of cyanide and water runoff.
27
       MR. REGEL:
                                And we'll focus on that issue,
```

```
Your Honour.
                                 All right.
       THE COURT:
       MR. REGEL:
                                 Thank you.
       THE COURT:
                                 And that sounds satisfactory to
                Is the fine to be paid forthwith?
       MR. DAUGALIS:
                                 So long as forthwith can --
       THE COURT:
                                 Well forthwith -- there won't be
 7
           distress, I assure you, for a couple of weeks anyway.
                                 Yeah, I would think that it will
       MR. DAUGALIS:
           take at least a few days just to get things done.
10
       THE COURT:
                                 All right. That's it then? Thank
11
           you counsel.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
```

1	
2	
3	Certified correct to the best of my skill and ability (Subject to Editing by Presiding
4	Judge).
5	
6	Overly Duns
7	Sandra Burns Court Reporter
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
1	