IN THE TERRITORIAL COURT OF THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

IN THE MATTER OF:

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

- v -

PTARMIGAN MINES LIMITED and TREMINCO RESOURCES LTD.

Transcript of the Reasons for Sentence
held by The Honourable Judge R. M. Bourassa,
sitting in Yellowknife, in the Northwest Territories,
on Wednesday, the 3rd day of March, A.D., 1999.

APPEARANCES:

Mr. A. Regel:

Counsel for the Crown

Mr. J. Posynick:

Counsel for the Defence

THE COURT: The accused were charged and promptly pleaded guilty to an offence under the Mine Health and Safety Regulations of not keeping a magazine securely locked at all times contrary to Section 39 of the Mine Health and Safety Act.

The circumstances of the offences involves
numerous other offences which the Crown has withdrawn.
Of course, I am not sentencing on them, such as not
keeping proper records of explosives, not keeping
logbooks, not having explosive magazines under proper
care and control but in any event, those are by the
board at this time.

The two magazines in question were both available and accessible to nonmine personnel. On one of the properties, Mr. Varkonyi and Mr. Horne, mine safety inspectors carrying out their obligations, found a detonator magazine and explosives magazine at the Ptarmigan bone yard. "Bone yard," as I understand it, is a term of art I suppose for a junk yard or so called recyclables. The magazine was locked with a chain and pad, but the door could be opened far enough to see inside the magazine and 90 sticks of Geldyne explosives were in that magazine.

On another site at the Tom Mine site, an explosives magazine was found. The door was unlocked as the padlock had been cut with a torch and inside were 50 sticks of dynamite, all in a deteriorated

condition. No one was at the site. No one was in charge of these magazines.

When the accused indicated to the Chief Mines
Inspector, Prevention Services, that they were going to
close the mine temporarily or as they call it,
temporarily suspend operations, there were discussions
which are noted on Appendix 2. Ptarmigan and Tom spoke
to Len Palmer, the mine manager, re closure, and
required them to do and report to us after completion
(1) close all entrances for Tom Mine; (2) close all
entrances to Ptarmigan Mine; (3) remove all explosives;
(4) update all plans and sections; and (5) deactivate
all stationary and mobile equipment.

Then on the 15th of July, 1997, Mr. Palmer the mine manager wrote to Mr. Wong the Chief Mines

Inspector: "Just a note to confirm that all explosives, blasting caps and detonating cord were removed from all surface and U/G magazines by July 5...."

That was a lie. It did not happen or if it did happen, it was done in such a slovenly manner that the explosives referred to in the agreed statement of facts were missed by the clean up crew.

Clearly, the Crown has the right to choose who it is going to prosecute and on this occasion, it has chosen to prosecute Treminco Resources Limited and Ptarmigan Mines Limited. They could just as well have

prosecuted the mine manager. The mine manager has overall responsibility for operating the mine and is answerable up the chain of command to the board of directors, and they are responsible for his actions. That chain of command and responsibility was clear in R. v. Panarctic Oils. It is clear in a multitude of cases. It is not enough to say that the mine manager defaulted on his obligations or the mine manager was poor at his job.

I move now to the danger that it posed: I reflect for a moment of children and how incredibly ingenious, devilsome, and mischievous some children are. I have no doubt that some young boys or children, on an afternoon of exploration at an old mine site so intriguing, could have found a way to extricate the sticks of dynamite and Geldyne from these magazines. There is a public park not too far away.

Surely this is the kind of danger the legislation is designed to protect against. It is the kind of danger that has been recognized in the common law and in legislation for years. In law school, we study cases of attractive traps that are left unprotected and the liability that a person has, whether it is a hole in the ground or a partially built house. These are considered to be traps and inducements to children. It is hard to think of something more exciting for a young band of boys than to explore an old mine site and all

the neat things in the bone yard. I beg to disagree with defence. In my view, there is a high danger here. These are explosives. It does not matter whether it is 100 yards or 400 yards from the road. That distance may protect the cars, but it is not going to protect some young child who picks up a stick of dynamite and finds a way to try and explode it. It will only take one stick.

The obligation on the board of directors is to hire carefully and to supervise. One cannot just hire someone and shrug one's shoulders and at the end of the day say, we hired carefully but he did not do his job. There is case law to that effect.

What the inspectors found could have been cleaned up in two or three hours. I do not have exactly before me how long it took, but it was not that much, maybe a day at the most by one or two men. It was a simple matter to clean up, yet it was left. There was a total absence of any kind of plan or follow-up with respect to removing the dynamite or the explosives and little or no effort to comply. Those are the aggravating features of this case.

The other comment I would make with respect to the law is that it seems that just about every court that has dealt with health and safety public regulations has indicated that deterrence is a factor.

Another way of putting that is "cost benefit." It

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

has got to be made clear that it will be worthwhile to spend the money in advance than to wait for court action. When the financial analysts and prospectors or prospective mine operators are planning a mine, they have to take into consideration the regulations that are set out to protect all of us, the obligation to comply with them, and in a plain and simple cost benefit analysis conclude that it would be cheaper to comply than not.

This is a regulatory scheme or regime. There was no harm done and no one was actually injured. In R. v. Echo Bay, Judge P. Ayotte said that the whole point of the statutory regime is to prevent problems and when the statutory regime is ignored and not complied with, it suffers. My obligation is to reinforce the statutory regime and, as I said, ensure that it will be followed and complied with.

The defendants have no prior convictions for any kind of offence. The Corporate Secretary is present in court and has testified as to what is transpiring here. He has cooperated fully and immediately which are all matters to be taken in mitigation.

I should look at the corporations' financial situation. What is before me indicates that the corporations have no money. It is a concern and it is a concern that is voiced often enough when mines are opened in the Northwest Territories. Millions of

6

dollars of material are taken out. The shareholders who have bought and sold the shares and made money, the operators who have made money, everybody leaves and the mess is left to the Northwest Territories to clean up. Here, just estimating the cost of gold or the price of gold at \$300 an ounce for the period the mines were in operation indicate that the mines produced something in the neighbourhood of \$40 million worth of gold. Now, that is a gross figure, I acknowledge. I know they have costs of production that have to be subtracted from that and taxes and the rest of it; however, that is a lot of money that they have made from the ground here in the Northwest Territories. What is left? Abandoned magazines with dynamite and Geldyne in them and no money. I just do not see that as a positive situation.

Defence argues for either a suspended sentence or a very low fine. Crown asks for \$20,000. In my respectful view, that is low especially when one looks at how simply it would have been to prevent this.

Just to clarify, Mr. Regel, are you asking for 20,000 against each?

MR. REGEL: I had indicated, Your Honour, something in the range of 20,000 globally.

Trying to balance the factors are responsible.

26 Trying to balance the factors as best I can before me 27 and paying particular attention to the submissions of

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

27

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1					
	1		able counsel, I am go	oing to impose fines of \$15,000 in	
	2		each case.		
	3		Is that everything, counsel?		
	4	MR.	REGEL:	It is, Your Honour.	
	5	THE	COURT:	Thank you, gentlemen.	
	6				
	7		·	Certified correct to the best of	
	8			my skill and ability.	
	9				
	10				
	11				
	12			Dora Daylor:	
	13			Tara Taylor, CSR(A), Court Reporter	
	14				
	15				
	16	• ,		1	
	17				
	18				
	19				
	20				
	21				
	22				
	23				
	24				
	25				
	26				
	27				