1	IN THE SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA		
2	(Before the Honour	abl	e Mr. Justice Dohm)
3	No. 24496		Terrace, B.C.
4	Prince George Registry		12 January 1994
5			
6	BETWEEN:)	
7	ROBERT BRUCE JACKSON)	REASONS FOR JUDGMENT
8	Plaintiff)	OF
9	AND:)	THE HONOURABLE
10	COOPER PHILLIP GUNANOOT)	MR. JUSTICE DOHM
11	Defendant)	in the second se
12			
13	D. BYL, Esq.		appearing for the Plaintiff
14	G. CRAMPTON, Esq.		appearing for the Defendant
15			
16	THE COURT: (Oral) The pla	int	iff, a 45-year-old Gitksan
17	artist, claims damages	fo	r injuries he received on
18	July 22nd, 1992 when the vehicle he was driving near		
19	Hazelton came into collision with a logging truck that		
20	he was passing, the co	11i	sion occurring as a result of
21	the defendant, Cooper Gunanoot, driving his vehicle		
22	out onto the highway where the plaintiff's vehicle		
23	and the logging truck were located. To avoid a head-or		
24	collision with Gunanoot's vehicle, the plaintiff turned		
25	right into the moving logging truck and thereafter into		
26	a ditch located on the left side of the highway where		

his vehicle came to rest.

The accident occurred in daylight. The plaintiff's vehicle was a write-off. At the time of the accident, the plaintiff was on his way, together with an employee, to a meeting at which the allocation of the annual salmon catch was to be made between the various participants in that activity.

Liability for the accident is admitted by the defendant, Gunanoot.

The plaintiff's complaint is that of a soft tissue injury to his neck and back, which his counsel describes as a moderate whiplash injury. The plaintiff claims for pain and suffering, loss of amenities of life, loss of profits due to his inability to participate in the fishing activity of his Gitksan family, a loss of revenue from his inability to work as an artist and for loss of opportunity, a loss in the future.

Part of the exhibits filed here is a biographical sketch of the plaintiff, which he confirmed at trial.

It reads as follows:

"Robert Bruce Jackson, whose Indian name is

Negwaa, has a very personal affiliation with

the Port Edward cannery village. He was born

in House #99 in the Port Edward cannery village

on July 12, 1948 to the gist-gaast (fireweed) clan.

'It (the Port Edward cannery village) was my home

for about 15 years of my early childhood. My

father was a commercial fisherman for Nelson

Brothers Co. and my mother was a net woman (the best!) who hung nets for the same company for many years.

'During that time when I was able to visit

Prince Rupert with my parents, I often admired the

large Haida totems that were situated at the CN Park

and also at the Salvation Army Park. I often dreamed

of someday carving one of those majestic poles; at

that age, however, it was just a dream - which over

the years became reality.

'As children we made our own toys which we carved out of wood. That was the beginning of all things.

From there, imagination and skill developed into this day of 1992.'

Robert took his first art training in Gitanmaax (or 'Ksan) School of Northwest Coast Art in Hazelton, B.C. in 1973. He has gone on to participate in group exhibitions throughout Canada and around the world.

Major exhibits include Canadian Indian Art '74 at the Royal Ontario Museum (Toronto, Canada), Art of the Salmon People at the Museum of Northern B.C. (Prince Rupert, British Columbia), 'The Legacy: Continuing Traditions of Northwest Coast Indian Art', Edinburgh International Festival, (Edinburgh Scotland),

Contemporary Indian and Inuit Art, Art of Canada, organized by the Department of Indian and Northern

Affairs which toured the United States and Canada and

exhibitions at the Inuit Art Gallery in Vancouver, British Columbia.

His pieces have been collected by the Department

of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Ottawa, Canada), the Museum of Civilization (Ottawa, Canada) and the Museum of Northern B.C. (Prince Rupert, British Columbia). He also has works in private collections in Germany, Holland, Australia, Mexico, the United States, Canada and in the Buckingham Palace in Great Britain."

In addition to the biographical sketch is the fact that the plaintiff has done work for Her Majesty the Queen Elizabeth II and also for former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau.

I think that there is little doubt that the plaintiff is an accomplished artist who, as a result of this accident, has been unable to carry on in his work, and this inability I think has not only affected him financially, but also psychologically. That said, I think the evidence is clear that he is anxious to return to his work as an artist. I do not think it can be said that he has enjoyed the last sixteen or so months of his life.

The complaints made by the plaintiff are the usual for this type of injury; headaches, stiffness, sore back, sore neck. There is no doubt on the evidence that, even though he was wearing a seat-belt, the resultant collisions, both with the logging truck and the ditch, would have provided a golden opportunity for the plaintiff to have received the

injury which he speaks about and which is confirmed by the medical evidence here.

The plaintiff says that these complaints have persisted, that he takes Tylenol on a regular basis for his headaches, that he has been unable, by reason of his soreness and pain, to participate in his work as an artist at all in the first six months after the accident and thereafter on an on-again off-again basis.

The plaintiff says that the difficulties he has incurred since the accident are ongoing, but that there has been improvement in the last few months. I do not intend to review his evidence in any detail in that regard. I think it is suffice to use the medical evidence of Dr. Dunne particularly and his letter dated October 28th, 1993, page 4 until the end of that letter:

"Systemic review is unremarkable. He used to smoke, but quit, doesn't drink alcohol, has no allergies. He did initially take Ibuprofen and now takes Tylenol on occasion.

PHYSICAL EXAMINATION: On examination, he was a well-built man. His skin was normal, lung fields were clear, heart sounds were normal and his blood pressure was 130/80. He had good neck musculature and had full range of movement of his neck, except for lateral flexion, which was limited by about 25 degrees to the left and to the right. He had tenderness over the left paravertebral muscles and the left rhomboid and

M.V.A.

trapezius trigger points. He had pain on movement against resistance. His forearms were normal and arms were normal. He had full range of movement of his shoulders. There was no muscle wasting, no sensory deficits and the reflexes were present, his grip was normal. He was able to bend over and touch his toes, but it was painful. He had pain on straightening his back and on hyperextending it. He had good lateral flexion and rotation and had no muscle weakness, no radicular features and no muscle wasting.

IMPRESSION: MULTIPLE SOFT TISSUE INJURIES - POST

His X-rays didn't come today, but the X-ray report suggests no significant abnormality. He has evidence still of limited range of movement of his neck and some trigger points, suggesting a regional myofascial pain syndrome. He also has some stiffness and pain in his back on flexion and extension.

I believe all of these to be mechanical as there is no underlying bony or neurological injury.

It is about a year since his accident now and it was a fairly high impact injury and it is not unusual for the symptoms to last this long. He is showing some degree of chronicity because of the myofascial pain involvement.

I think if he goes on a reconditioning program over the next three to four months, this should

significantly improve the function of his neck and back and should improve his muscle strength and therefore diminish his pain and probably diminish the number of headaches he is getting.

I have given him a set of exercises to do for his neck and he knows the ones to do for his back. If he has trouble with these, however, he should re-do them under the auspices of the physiotherapist in Smithers. I would expect him to be significantly improved and eventually relatively asymptomatic in another three to four months if he follows this program and that he should have no long-term sequelae to his injury."

During the trial, the plaintiff not only described, but

demonstrated how he carried on some of his work. His work is that of a wood carver and an engraver and manufacturer of jewellery, both in silver and in gold. Looking at the work which he has done in the past, at least in part, there is no doubt that his work requires dexterity and, above all I think, concentration and the physical strength to carry the work out. All of those characteristics are necessary, and indeed there are others, but so far as these reasons are concerned, those three characteristics are of prime importance.

As I said, for the first six months after the accident, the plaintiff was unable to participate in any of his profession and thereafter from time to time as he felt able to do so. Work which would have taken perhaps a day before

the accident took him four or five days after the accident to complete.

The plaintiff, I think, must be free of pain in his back and neck and he must have the strength and muscle power to carry out his work effectively. He has been robbed of those features by reason of the accident and it is for this reason that perhaps this plaintiff has suffered somewhat more than many others by reason of the soft tissue injury, which I would place at mild to moderate. In order for the plaintiff to do his work effectively, it is, I think, necessary for him to be able to concentrate. I think that characteristic by itself has been missing and one can understand why. Headaches, pain in the neck and back can be, and no doubt were and continue to be, debilitating so far as the plaintiff's ability to perform his artistry is concerned.

The plaintiff has little faith in the medical fraternity. It stems from something which occurred in the family to his brother involving a doctor. It is clear here with the lack of the large number of medical reports which we sometimes see in these cases, plain and simple, the plaintiff did not go to doctors very often as a result of this accident.

Dr. Dunne's letter, from which I have quoted earlier,
I think says all that can be said about the plaintiff and
his past and future as a result of this accident.

I do not question the plaintiff's motives in perhaps

not following precisely the medical advice he received, but I think to some extent it poses a difficulty for me in being able to accurately access portions of his claim, and I think this will be clear shortly.

So far as his general damages is concerned, I think that this case falls in the category of somewhere between \$20,000.00 and \$25,000.00 and I fix the amount at \$22,500.00. The reason that I am assessing it at that point and not something lower -- and I had in mind somewhere around \$18,000.00 I think as I heard the evidence -- is because of the possibility Dr. Dunne raises in his letter when he speaks of the plaintiff showing a degree of chronicity because of the myofascial pain involved. This factor alone I think distinguishes this case from many others and I fix general damages at \$22,500.00.

So far as the loss of income from his profession is concerned, I think the evidence would support a finding that the plaintiff's net income from his work as an artist is somewhere around \$2;000.00 per month. I recognize that his income has fluctuated, but that is inherent in his work. There is certainly no evidence to indicate that the \$2,000.00 figure is not a safe one and a fair one.

Associated with this portion of the claim is the plaintiff's allegation that he lost \$10,000.00 as a result of his inability to participate in the annual fishing which he proposed to undertake on behalf of his family in

the Gitksan tribe. Unquestionably, the plaintiff made preparations in July and August to participate in the fishing activity. Indeed, as I have already said, he was on his way to a meeting involved in that activity on the day of the accident. I think the preparations which he made clearly show that this was not to be a flash in the pan, that indeed he was serious about involving himself and his immediate family in the activity. Steps were taken and, but for some three to four days work, he was ready, as were his employees, for the fish.

I do not intend to quarrel with the figure produced by the plaintiff that his loss in 1992, during July and August, was \$10,000.00. I allow that portion of the claim. I note, though, that the activity took place, not over one month, but over a period of two months and therefore during July and August he would not have been able to participate in his usual work of carving and engraving and manufacturing jewellery.

So far as the season in 1993 is concerned, I have some real difficulties. I do not think it can be said from the evidence that the plaintiff was as prepared in 1993, and by that I mean this: there is no evidence -- indeed the evidence is to the contrary -- that the plaintiff took any steps to participate in the fishing activity. It is not enough for him to say, "I was too sick to do so," or "I did not have the strength to do so."

It seems to me in a claim of this nature that he, as a

minimum, ought to have tried it. He says he did not and I think that has to be held against him, not to the point where I would wipe out the opportunity to make profit from the activity, but to lessen it by 50 percent. I fix his loss for his inability to fish in 1993 at \$5,000.00, and I think, with respect, that is being generous on the evidence.

With respect to the loss of income, I would provide for a loss in the months of September to December of 1992, for the months of January 1993 to June 1993 and for the months of September 1993 to December 1993 at \$2,000.00 per month.

with respect to the future and determining the risk and possibility of a continued problem for the plaintiff, I am prepared to provide for a period of six months. It is hoped during that time that the plaintiff will take greater steps to rehabilitate himself and to use that time to get himself more involved in his artistry. The year suggested by his counsel is, I think, excessive in the circumstances, having in mind that the plaintiff perhaps did not take all the steps that were reasonably required of him in the past sixteen or so months to rehabilitate himself so that he could carry on, on a full-time basis, with his profession.

I understand that it is not an easy process, but I

think if the plaintiff uses the next six months to ease
himself back into his profession, that at the end of June of
this year he ought to be back to his position prior to the
accident and to a position that he himself wants to be at.

Special damages are allowed at \$1,024.00 and costs will be on a scale 3.

I want to make one other comment, and this is directed at Mr. Jackson, that your counsel did an exceedingly good job in this case. He was very thorough and no criticism can be levelled at him for the figures which I have arrived at. Those are my problem. But so far as presenting the case, it has been a long time since I have had one presented as well.