

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
March 27, 1980

EVENING SESSION

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — LABOUR — VOTE 20 (continued)

MR. CHAIRMAN: — When we called it 5 o'clock we were on the estimates of the Minister of Labour and we were on item 1.

MR. R. KATZMAN (Rosthern): — Mr. Minister, the Saskatchewan Chamber of Commerce made a presentation to your deputy minister on July 17 so my correspondence reflects, and within they express concerns about certain issues of The Trade Union Act, requesting some word changes for clarification and so forth. In their covering letter they use a set of interesting words which I don't think anybody will dispute.

Labour relations legislation should provide even balance between both the interested unions and their members and the interested employer, and to effect a business climate conducive to growth and development.

That's their statement. Then they go on to suggest that parts of the present Trade Union Act are not really, in their opinion, conducive to that particular thought. Therefore, Mr. Minister, did you reply to any of these particular conditions or was it just a submission which you have taken under consideration?

MR. G.T. SNYDER (Minister of Labour): — Mr. Chairman, I think the member would have to agree that fairness and equality are always in the eyes of the beholder. Of course I have representations made to me by different groups — the Chamber of Commerce one I read with a good deal of interest. I think the indication was that there were a number of changes they would like to see made in The Trade Union Act. At the same time, at least on an annual basis, the federation of labour presents their views and has suggested at least two or three major amendments to The Trade Union Act. I find myself unable in some instances to comply with the wishes of either. Our labour legislation is continually under review and I expect we will continue to assess the wishes and needs of all parties, particularly those who are directly affected by The Trade Union Act, and there are not at this point in time any intentions to amend in a major way The Trade Union Act or the provisions that it has contained since 1972.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I think we are all aware there has to be a third option towards the problem we are having in the labor management field today because strikes really hurt the third party. Let's be honest; they hurt the two parties that are in the fight, but they also hurt a third party. Are there any studies — joint, even between unions and management or within your own department — looking at an option in which the third party will not suffer? Have you done any research in this type of area or looked at some of the foreign countries that have legislation along that line?

MR. SNYDER: — I am not entirely sure what the hon. member draws attention to. Obviously, there are always refinements of what we regard as the best system and that is free collective bargaining. I think it has been demonstrated throughout that there is no proper substitute for free collective bargaining in what we regard as a civilized society. I think, obviously, that some of the so-called suggestions to provide easy solutions to complex problems always resolve themselves to one particular point of

view. Either you have free collective bargaining or you have some kind of arbitration, a compulsory arbitration process at the end of the line. There are some refinements in between. Obviously there are things we are attempting to evolve in the province of Saskatchewan, attempts, in a halting way, in terms of putting into place something we refer to as industrial democracy. I think you see some of that at work within the scope of The Occupational Health and Safety Act. There are other instances where perhaps preventive mediation serves a useful purpose in getting the parties together and solving some of the problems prior to the two parties' meeting at the collective bargaining table.

I go back to the original premise that I think there is not a substitute for free collective bargaining and those countries (I don't know which countries you were referring to) . . . I think more particularly of Australia which I've used on other occasions in this House as an example of government attempting to apply the iron hand and solve the problem as the third party of labor disruptions — and it has done anything but that. They have a system of compulsory arbitration where strikes are outlawed and the net result has been they have had a good many more strikes per capita of working people than we have. So it has proven itself to be wholly unsatisfactory. I think we need to operate within the broad framework of the collective bargaining system and update the kind of processes we use within the confines of the free collective bargaining system.

I don't believe there is any absolute choice, but I have to say that in the province of Saskatchewan, where we have some of the best legislation to be found anywhere, we find ourselves with time lost as a result of strikes being a good deal more enviable than a great many other provinces which are more restrictive in the application of their legislation. Accordingly, I can bring myself to believe that any of the so-called magic solutions offered by some other countries and some other provinces are particularly effective.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, there are several other simple — and I say simple ways to assist negotiations. One of them is that negotiations should start on time. As you aware, most contracts end at a certain date and there is supposed to be a letter of transmission between the two parties saying they are going to get back together and negotiate and some of the conditions they want to negotiate. But in most cases there are letters suggesting we'd like additional time, and management usually agrees and there's no argument from either side. Or management says we're into some hard negotiations here; we'd like some additional time till we start with you. But if we had them all starting on time we would not have the 11-month, no-contract type of pressure building up. Hopefully if they started on time, and their proposals at least changed hands on time, we would slowly develop settlements closer to the time when the old contract expired.

That would help some of the labour problems which are developing because there's a game being played out there. Everybody's waiting for the other guy to settle to see what the possible settlements are going to be, rather than going by the contract year. Are you giving any consideration to saying, fellows we have to stop putting it off and let's try to get back to the date you're supposed to start bargaining and start bargaining.

MR. SNYDER: — Well, I think it's rather naïve to suggest that if the Minister of Labour were to suggest to the parties they should not adjourn their hearings, when it's in the best interests of one party or the other or both to adjourn, this would somehow hasten a solution. It's naïve to believe that to be the case, and I don't believe there is anything the Minister of Labour can do in order to demand that the parties sit down and negotiate.

unless they are prepared to sit down and negotiate in good faith and get to the nub of the problem.

I think what you're saying is essentially true, that as soon as a contract expires, or even before the expiry date of a contract, it's useful if the parties can get down and discuss some of the preliminary trade offs and get involved in the process of collective bargaining as early as possible. We encourage that, and in addition make available to the parties a senior conciliation officer in the event he can be of any help if there are roadblocks along the way. But I think an early beginning doesn't necessarily ensure that there is going to be a solution occurring. I agree with you that there is some advantage in getting at it just as quickly as you can after a collective agreement expires, or even before that date. I think there is some advantage in it but certainly not a solution.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I agree it may not be the total solution but we have to start making some inroads to get these people together sooner so we don't have the 11 month no contract, the membership getting very restless and everybody not sure where he/she is going. I think both you and I know, in contracts which seem to be 10 or 11 months old before they are settled, the employee who used to work there — the fellow who left when there were six months without a contract becomes a loser in most cases. The benefits quite often are ignored for him. I don't say that's unfair of the group because he has left; but he was an employee and he should receive the benefits. But unfortunately, in some cases he does not because of the system.

The other thing I would suggest to the minister is when I say, starting on time, is there any way you could suggest tightening up your act — the labour act, or in correspondence between yourself and both trade unions, and management of saying, gentlemen, if we are ever to solve the problem of unrest in the labor field, we would ask your indulgent assistance to try to get together as soon as possible, so that perhaps we will have fewer problems down the road? It has to be a good faith movement by both sides. It cannot be done by force, I agree with the minister, but I would like to see if your good office could assist in that way. If it only helps in two or three cases it is a worthwhile effort for your office. I'm requesting you to attempt it; try it as an experiment; see if it will help.

MR. SNYDER: — I think the member probably believes there is no contact made with the parties and no effort is made until request is made. Obviously that just isn't the case. Our people are attempting to pull together the parties to a collective agreement and hurry it along. I don't know of a particular collective agreement that was stalled for any special amount of time just because the parties failed to get together. There is usually a greater underlying cause. In some instances it will be to the benefit of one party or the other to ask for an adjournment because of another collective agreement perhaps in another corner of the province where the results will have a profound effect on the collective bargaining arrangement which may be entered into by the parties. I can't assure you that we are going to be doing any more than we are now because I think our efforts in getting the parties together and keeping the negotiations current are being well handled. To suggest to you that I would promise to do something more would be an indication that perhaps we are not doing as much as we should, and I'm not prepared to admit that is the case.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I don't want to get into the situation where you and I are into an argument over semantics. I think the only gentleman who loves to argue

semantics is the Attorney General. He is always trying to get into it. As I said to him earlier, if he stayed home this House would run much smoother.

Going back to some press releases again — as you and I agree it is rehashing some old items — but there is an indication that you have suggested in the Star-Phoenix you would consider banning court injunctions in labour disputes. Are you suggesting . . . Labour Department Studying Ban of Court Injunctions . . . Mr. Minister, could you tell us where that particular study is now and if there are recommendations coming down?

MR. SNYDER: — Some time ago, I believe it was last summer, we had on staff a law student who did a fairly comprehensive summary of the use of injunctions as they apply in other provinces. As this point in time, any work that is being done on injunctions is basically internal, with some input by some other people who have a degree of expertise in the whole question; some legal advice is being received from elsewhere. But at this time I can't report to the hon. member that there is anything on the immediate horizon which suggests this kind of action will be taken. Obviously, it is one that deserves a great deal of study and the implications are fairly broad; accordingly, I can't give the member any assurances that anything of that nature will find its way in legislation, because there are too many imponderables and too many unanswered questions, at this stage.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I think each year that I have been involved with the labor estimates I have referred to another document. Before I do, I would like to answer one comment you made earlier that you do not think anybody delays negotiations because of something that happens over here, that affects them — am I quoting you correctly?

MR. SNYDER: — I think what you are referring to is, I said that obviously there will be instances where one party or the other will ask for an adjournment and delay negotiations because of another collective agreement that is being negotiated elsewhere. Obviously this influences their judgment and I think in some instances, it will cause one party at the bargaining table, or the other, to ask for an adjournment, or to delay negotiations until they find out what settlement is impending in any other corner of the province.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, let's put a tag on your statement and we will talk about a union which I know, and which plays the game that we are talking about. It is the Canadian Union of Public Employees — I have spent time at the bargaining table on behalf of some of the employees in that particular union.

Part of the strategy — and I believe it is good strategy, as the minister indicates — is that you delay your section because there may be a more militant group in another area which is smaller and you can afford to pay them to go on strike while they fight the fight, so you can benefit. That's what you are suggesting to me. You are suggesting to me, as far as your department is concerned, that's part of the game and a part of the labor negotiations. If that so happens, that's fine!

Let us assume one local's contract was up on January 1, and the militants' contract is not up until July — you wait the six months so that the militant group can do the fighting because your membership won't. Therefore, you don't want to get too far into negotiations, so you want somebody else to conduct the fight and win the battle, then you ride on their coattails. What you are doing is suggesting this is totally fair, in your

opinion, as the labor department. Am I correct?

MR. SNYDER: — I think you are busily involved in the process of presenting hypothetical situations which I don't propose to comment on. I think you are exaggerating a good deal if you're suggesting that people are prepared to adjourn for six months. I think the exercise is one of exaggeration. I don't doubt that it happens from time to time but I think you're exaggerating a situation out of all proportion.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I wouldn't suggest I'm exaggerating. I would suggest that the case happens. You take your time about sending your letters back and forth. You take your time about your meetings. You happen to have your staff negotiator pretty busy doing other contracts that are also on the line. Before you know, the six months are gone. I suggest it's not hypothetical; it's very easy to arrange for it to happen and be totally legitimate. As far as your argument saying it's hypothetical is concerned, I think you're totally wrong.

Mr. Minister, as I was saying earlier, let's get back to an old argument that you and I like to have occasionally. It's a court case; once again, making a decision . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, not totally; it's Centax. Central Press, I guess. It's a judgment filed for the Attorney General's benefit on February 16, 1977. I'm certain that the Department of Labour, your department, was involved with this corporation suggesting that they hadn't followed the requirements. The judgment came down and part of this judgment, I believe, said the evidence is that the employees considered the new arrangements to provide more favourable conditions and more favourable hours of work than your legislation provides. Therefore, you were wrong or your department was wrong, in starting this particular action which, if I remember correctly, the employees did not want you to do on their behalf but your department did anyway.

If I'm correct, Mr. Minister, as I've suggested before, that decision, if somebody else so wished to use it, would destroy a good part of our present trade union hours of work regulations and so forth. In fact, it even seems to indicate that you don't have to go for an averaging order or those types of things if you make an arrangement which, in the employee's opinion, is better for him than the legislation says. I'm asking the minister (probably for the third or fourth time), does your department realize this is going to be a problem in the future and what consideration are you taking toward this problem which sooner or later will develop into a major problem?

MR. SNYDER: — I think, Mr. Chairman, on a number of other occasions I've made my position rather clear with respect to what has evolved since the Centax decision and somewhat prior to that, the use of what they refer to properly, I suppose, as compressed work week. In some instances people are in a position by mutual agreement to work up to and including a 12-hour day. Perhaps they work three 12's, then are in a position to have a three-day weekend every second or third weekend. I found this to be a step in the wrong direction but I'm inclined to believe at this time with all of the determination of a number of employees . . . I'm think about organized trade unionists; I'm thinking about workers in potash mines; I'm thinking about nurses who, for their own reasons, believe the conditions are more favorable in the event that they work a 12-hour shift. I'm not at all sure that, if this becomes the vogue, the Minister of Labour should be imposing his will on those workers. If they determine that a compressed work week made up, perhaps, of three 12-hour days allowing them a long weekend is in their best interest, I don't agree with them, but I don't think I'm in the position where I should be imposing my judgment on workers who have made that determination. It's been going on in oil refineries. It's going on in the

Co-op oil refinery at the present time. In the Rocanville mine, they are working a compressed work week. There have been numerous other occasions when this has been done, and obviously when a vote is taken among the membership and they indicate their wish to have it continued I'm not at all sure it's the Minister of Labour's prerogative to attempt to reverse a decision taken by the majority of the workers.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I almost detect a movement from the minister; he is slowly shifting to what he just suggested from the other side. Several years ago (if I remember correctly) you were more strongly opposed than you are at present, and you're saying that you're softening or listening to the pressures of the people in the working force. I'm glad to hear that, because if the trade union people wish to work 12 hours a day, work 3.5 days a week, or so forth for whatever reason they think of benefit to them, and if their employer is willing to go along with it, I think that's a good step. Therefore, I would ask you if you are considering something in legislation to make it a little easier, when there is a contract so they don't have to go through your department asking special permission as they used to have to when they wanted to change the 8-hour shift. Are you making it a little easier by order in council or something?

MR. SNYDER: — Well, first of all, I want to say to the hon. member that if he detects there is some movement on my part, there is in spite of the fact I still believe that a 12-hour shift is a move in the wrong direction. I think, for example, for nurses to be working a 12-hour shift in a hospital, after perhaps being up all night with a sick kid, and then going to the ward and working 12 hours . . . I don't think I want that girl giving me a hypodermic after 11 hours and 50 minutes on duty. I just believe there are some jobs which can't probably be handled very well by people on that basis. I think perhaps a person working in the instrument room of a refinery, where he is notified by visual or audio alarms if there's something wrong in the plant and then raises himself and goes about taking care of the difficulties, is one such job. I think there are other sources of concern when you have a person involved in an occupation where he needs to have his head clear and his sense about him at all times. Accordingly, I think there are some occupations that are not well suited for a 12-hour day.

The piece of paper which was just handed to me indicates the procedure for issuing 12-hour day permits, and as a matter of policy the director — not the minister but the director — may not issue permits for shifts in excess of 10 hours, and the criteria which must be met before permit is granted are as follows: it must be approved by the employer, approval by the trade union or 80 per cent of the employees in an unorganised work place, desirably a continuous process operation, and prior approval of the occupational health branch.

For the sort of reasons I'm setting out, I think there are some instances where it might be recognized to be a fairly major kind of a hazard if 12-hours shifts are to be worked. Perhaps I needn't say anymore about that except that I see the emergence of a number of instances where 12-hour shifts are becoming an accepted fact. I'm not warm to the idea. I believe it to be a step in the wrong direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order please. I wonder if I could beg the indulgence of the House to allow the member for Regina Wascana to make an introduction of some guests.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. C.O. WHITE (Regina Wascana): — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce to you and the

other members of the House 63 cadets from the field artillery cadet corps, together with three of their officers — Major Jorissen, Lieutenant Tweten, Lieutenant Bright, and there's also Mr. Secuur with them. They will be in the gallery for half an hour or so observing proceedings, which I hope they will find both interesting and informative. They were to meet with Mr. Shillington after they leave the gallery. I will be meeting them on his behalf, since he cannot be here tonight. I'm sure everyone here would like to welcome you.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the opposition I would like to join with the member for Regina Wascana in welcoming the officers and the cadets of the 10th field artillery here tonight. I hope you can enjoy the proceedings and the estimates from the Department of Labour and see how this House operates. Welcome here and have a good time.

HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE — LABOUR — VOTE 20

Item 1 (Continued)

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I share some of your personal beliefs when you suggest that in certain jobs lengthening the hours of work may be hazardous to either the workers or the people they give service to. I think there are some studies in some areas of employment where we have to be very careful. I was glad to hear you suggest the occupational health people would have a say in it, because of the exact statement I made earlier. And because it is a joint group from both sides, they go to your people to ask permission. Your people have some basis; I have a considerable amount of faith in your particular director of occupational health, and therefore I am glad to see that is tied on. Once again, we are going to have problems with Robert before the evening is over — he may not be able to get through the door.

Mr. Minister, moving off that subject to another: you are aware, I am certain, that presently decertification or changing bargaining units from say the steel workers to allied food workers or some other one — there is considerably more of that happening in this province today than used to happen. My question to you, Mr. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I believe we could do with less assistance from both sides of the House while the members are speaking. If you find it is necessary to talk please keep it to a whisper.

MR. KATZMAN: — The decertification problem is rearing its head more and more often lately. The only head that I know that is a little ugly. Mr. Fellow who made that comment, is his own. I won't identify the member. Mr. Minister, the decertification problem is, as I said earlier, getting bigger and there is a new problem developing where people have carved into a union; they are a small portion of a major union now but a certain section would like to carve out now. Is there any consideration being given to allow what is called a special interest group, within a major unit, which feels their interests are not being served best by being in a major union and because of these special problems they should be in their own. Is there any consideration being given to assist them?

MR. SNYDER: — Well, I think the member will know The Trade Union Act is implicit in

giving authority to the labour relations board to carve out what they deem to be an appropriate unit. If the member is suggesting this is something we should be encouraging or fostering, I say to him what that brings about in a number of instances, I would fear, would be a fragmenting of a number of bargaining units to the point where I think we would have not one collective bargaining agreement within an institution but two or three or four, with the possible risk of a work stoppage and a picket line affecting the members that were in the original unit. I think the member is also operating from a false premise if he is suggesting that more and more decertification applications are being heard because I don't believe that the statistics will prove that to be the case. You will know that over the past number of months there has been some interunion rivalry between two of the trade unions which have been, I guess, vying for the support of the same membership in a number of institutions. And there have been what is commonly known as "raids" between those two unions, but I don't think that necessarily suggests that any new legislation is necessary I think the existing legislation is adequate for whatever purpose is required. Where a union chooses to move in and raid another organization, another trade union, the majority then makes that decision. It's all part of what has to be regarded as a pretty democratic process in making that determination.

MR. KATZMAN: — Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the minister clearly spoke about the problem — as you say, the raiding. I understand one of the major newspapers in the past while has decided to get rid of its union and go the other route. But my concern, Mr. Minister, is that sometimes within a union there is a professional group and they may be a small area of a group. If I remember correctly, there was one involved with pharmacists. There was a lot of concern that they should be separate from the major union which were the non-professionals. This is the type of problem we're seeing and I'm wondering if your department is noticing anything and making any recommendations on maybe a better way to handle it. I don't like the idea of seeing unions, as you suggest, breaking up.

MR. SNYDER: — As I indicated earlier, I think it has to be said that The Trade Union Act is complete enough or has given enough power to the labour relations board though that statute, indicating in section 5:

The board may make orders determining whether the appropriate unit of employees for the purpose of bargaining collectively shall be an employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or a subdivision thereof or some other unit, but no unit shall be found not to be an appropriate unit for reason only that the employer of the employees in the unit claims that it's a complement of employees not at full strength.

So I think from that you've got to conclude that the authority given by The Trade Union Act to the labor relations board provides for all of the things you're suggesting. Furthermore, The Trade Union Act was amended in 1972 to delete a clause in The Trade Union Act that prevented professionals, so-called professionals, from being members of a trade union organization by virtue of a professional certificate which they carried in their pocket. We thought that to be unwise and an inappropriate way of judging whether a person was in a trade union or not The judgment should be made on the basis of whether they form an appropriate unit, not on the question of professionalism.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, one other portion of The Trade Union Act. I believe it's 3(b) of The Trade Union Act, 36 I think, and it refers to what we could best call the closed shop. In some cases obviously for the better workings of an employee and

employer relationship, this particular item says (I may have the wrong section, but I think the minister will know what I'm talking about) that you must become a member within 30 days or 60 days, whatever the union contract calls for. What happens to an employee who, because of (we'll start out with the easy question) . . . take religious concerns or something saying, I don't belong to trade unions, therefore I wish not to play along. But this is a closed shop. I don't want to be fired. What do I do? What's the obvious answer? Would you give me the steps he goes through to protect himself so he doesn't have to be removed from the job site or from the employer?

MR. SNYDER: — I'm not sure I got the question in its entirety. But I think, once again, the act is clear on the method by which a person, who can be referred to as a conscientious objector, may make a designation of an equivalent amount of money to what he would normally provide as dues to his union, and allocate it to a charity of his choice — providing he demonstrates to the labor relations board his wish to do is for religious reasons. My understanding is that the labor relations board makes that learned judgment as to whether the member in question refuses to participate for religious reasons or others.

Your reference to the closed shop — it is not a closed shop. After 30 days the requirement to join makes it a union shop arrangement rather than a closed shop. It's a play on the English language, if you like. That judgment is made by the labor relations board in the event that employee chooses to opt out for that reason.

MR. KATZMAN: — I'm glad the Minister chose the first one — the religious argument. I suggest that in this day and time there are not only religious arguments, but other arguments for why they would not wish to be within a trade union. If they are willing, let's assume, to give their equal amount of funds to a charity or whatever, maybe those types of people, not on religious grounds, should be allowed the same right. If I remember correctly, that is not (one case I know of) open to them. They just would not want to belong to a union. They would agree to any decision the union made and would not break it — if there was a strike they would not report to work. They did not wish to be part of the union; therefore, they gave up the right to be opposed or in favor. The right wasn't there to stay on employment.

MR. SNYDER: — I have to tell the member that I disagree with him totally. I don't believe a person should be in a position to engage in an operation and enjoy the benefits which have been won by the trade union organization without paying his share at the toll gate. If he is willing to forego the benefits and the advantages bestowed upon him because of this membership in the trade union organization which has negotiated superior wage and working conditions, then perhaps you might have an argument for excluding him.

It strikes me the member is putting forth the right-to-work argument, the worse misnomer that's come across the country in a long time, and I want to say I disagree with him totally and wholly and completely. Right to work has no other connotation than a right to freeloader on your fellow members. It's a bad principle and if that's the side of the fence you're on, then I say welcome to it. You're sitting on the right side of the House if this is the way you feel.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I enjoy watching you attempt to put words into my mouth. I did not indicate anything of what you just indicated. I suggested to you there was a problem. I asked you if you were prepared to do anything about it. I did not suggest where my own leanings were, and if you want to get into one, I would suggest that your

department needs quite a bit of cleaning up. Hopefully, in three years we'll be doing that for you, so that the betterment of the employer and the fairness to both the employer and the employee is there, and there is no argument out in the boondocks which says this government goes one way and this government goes the other way. The referee must be fair and both you and I know that's the best way to handle labor negotiations and to keep harmony in this province. So if you want to get into one of these disputes, I don't mind getting into it. Let's remember we're all here for the betterment of the province of Saskatchewan. Harmony between employee and employer is what's important. Therefore, there will be fewer days of work loss. The province will benefit because of more taxation being paid as employees get a chance to make a little more bread and improve their standard of living. Lets not get into the right-to-work argument and so forth, which is not even involved in the topic.

MR. P.P. MOSTOWAY (Saskatoon Centre): — Mr. Minister, mainly because I am not sure that under occupational health is the right place to bring up the next topic, I am bringing it under item 1 because it does vary and wander a little bit. The uranium industry in the province of Saskatchewan is a growing industry which has many unknown and many known factors to all of us. The thing that concerns me is, if I remember correctly, uranium is a federal issue, not a provincial one. By neglect or doing nothing about it, the federal government have sort of forgotten about their responsibility — and I say shame to them for it — within the labor working area. Robert's going to get another swelled head, for his department has moved in to pick up some of the slack to protect the worker. My concern is — have we got an agreement of some type? Have we got a letter that we will now step into that area and be able to put teeth into it or will we start to do something and the federal government will say — hey, fellows, that's our issue, get out?

MR. SNYDER: — Our arrangements and dialogue with the federal government have been good. Canada labor has agreed with us and allowed us to present ourselves at Eldorado Nuclear. We have had reasonably good success in the enforcement of provincial labor standards. You will know the surface lease signed with Amok provided that Amok would live up to the terms and conditions of the environmental health, occupational health and safety regulations of the province. Accordingly we exercise our jurisdiction at Amok in the same way as though it were under provincial jurisdiction. I think in general terms, the relationship has been good in the continuing dialogue with the Canada labor people and our occupational health people. It has proven itself to be a good arrangement and worthwhile and to everybody's benefit.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, the problem that's bothering me is very simple. You say that Canada labor has sort of agreed to allow you — in the next statement you say it's part of the conditions given to the mine in their contract before they were allowed to proceed, that they will live by the occupational health standards or act as it applies at the time or as it applies. The wording I ask is important; if the act is changed because we discover something, will they have to comply? So is it as applied at the date they agreed or as it changes they must continue to apply?

MR. SNYDER: — Changing times and changing circumstances. We have the opportunity I am told to not only enforce the regulations that were in place at the time the surface lease agreement was signed but any changes in that surface area, in the regulations, or radiation levels, or whatever, are enforceable by our occupational health and safety people, in the event new terms and conditions are applied elsewhere. It is not just a matter of observing the regulations as they were in effect at the time the surface lease was signed, but any new conditions are also a requirement for Amok to

live up to at the same time.

MR. KATZMAN: — The uranium industry is an industry which really is new. I realize we have been involved in it for some 30 years in the province, but really it is new to us. The problems we are going to develop for occupational concerns are new to us and they must be monitored almost — as the saying goes — daily.

My concern is that it is so far away and sufficient manpower may not be available to do the job that is required at the start, because the conditions will change as we open up the holes, as we take off the cover — the peat moss or whatever it is that is covering the uranium and, therefore, will cause new problems in the area. I am not sure, with what the Minister of the Department of the Environment said earlier, I can have the faith he will look after the employees, the workers, up in the North. Therefore, I am turning to your department to hopefully continue the good work which has been done and the proven experience in your department rather than to go with his proven experience.

I ask, will that department be allowed the movement it needs in the day one set-up of protection starting for that type of employees? Because, we did not know about the problems we started 30 years ago and we must be on top of this from the start — at all times. It is a massive thing and we have to be ready and we have to have the back environment and the past history to prove whether we are right or wrong.

I am asking: do they have sufficient funds under your estimates to do the job that is required? Is the federal government assisting in part of the funds, because you are doing part of the federal government's work? So, it is a twofold question really.

MR. SNYDER: — Well let me say, first of all, yes we are on top of the situation and we intend to continue to monitor carefully and apply the resources and the manpower necessary. We are going to do this in the kind of way that is required and a kind of way it wouldn't be done if you boys had your way. You would have this thing in the hip pocket of private enterprise. You have said that over and over again; you are not opposed to uranium development, but you are opposed to the government's involvement. By being in it we are going to be in it and we are going to monitor and there won't be anybody who has the opportunity to cover up because of the involvement by government, and that is going to continue.

We have in this budget made provision for an additional two mining engineers. We have provision, in this budget, for a radiation health physicist to be added to the department to increase the surveillance in radium mines. So there is an additional move. In addition to that, our determination has been manifested in a number of other ways through the grant programs that we have available for the research on low radiation with the purposes of conducting research on the effect of radiation on workers and to establish effective methods of monitoring radiation — a grant of some \$53,500; in addition to that there is a study — a sputum cytology study, related directly to the effect of exposure to radiation on miners. That is an important part of the program. Another grant to the Montreal institute of cancer for the purpose of funding for the continuing of sputum cytology study of uranium miners at Uranium City, Saskatchewan. These are things that are being done and are being done much better with the intimate knowledge that the government is going to have because of its direct involvement in that particular program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — In the budget for health — in the estimates which you just passed over, grants for research on low level radiation — there is a grant here in the amount of some \$200,000 that was not in the budget last year. So if you say we are not doing our share, not monitoring carefully, not providing the manpower and resources, then you're a far cry from dealing with the facts accurately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, it seems like we've hit a nerve on that side. You're suggesting that the only way you know what's happening in the game is if you're both the referee and the player. That sounds like a strange bit of fiction. It seems strange that your department, and I can only use my personal experience again, when it was involved with a municipal government, in one case that I can refer to, had one of the poorest concerns for the employees' health. I don't totally agree with the minister when he says that the only way of being totally in charge and knowing what's going on is if it's government owned and government regulated, and if government is also the inspector. Government is so involved so nobody else knows, because what happens is you hide the facts from the citizens of the province. When a private enterpriser does something wrong you stomp all over him both publicly and privately. When you do something wrong it's kept quiet, so nobody knows about it.

It was interesting to note this morning the Minister of the Environment — and as you know, my desk mate and the minister have been having a running dispute on something called PCBs — how many trucks it takes to haul them away and so forth. That's a private enterpriser you should have stomped on with both feet, because the problem that started four years ago is not cured yet.

From past experience, we see from you boys on that side in Crown corporations and other areas, where you say to us we won't tell you that because it's not in the public's interest. Is it really in the public's interest for you to be the double player, being one team and the referee? I noticed that none of you would like to go into a hockey game where all the players were wearing blue sweaters and so were the referees, because obviously you would lose . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . that's right, the Attorney General's hit it right on the nail. If he was wearing the blue sweater that's the way he'd like it, but he's not worried about the citizens of Saskatchewan and the protection of the worker by having an independent body there, as occupational health is supposed to be, to make it better for the employees with a joint board of both employees and employers and a referee who is not an interested player on either side. If the minister wants to get into that argument I think that we can spend about a week or two on that one with no problems at all. But let's get back to the minister's estimates . . .

MR. SNYDER: — I'd like to comment on your statement before you go on. You can ask your question but I think this is the most incredible exhibition I have seen in along time, with the member standing there and saying how kindly and thoughtful these free enterprise bodies are, and how much concern they have for the health and welfare of their miners, like the people in the asbestos mines of Quebec where they killed them off by the dozens. We have miners all over the place dying with black lung because there has been, over many years, no government with a concern or the intention to do anything about it, sitting on the sidelines and not concerning themselves one iota. This government has not shown any favorites in terms of providing for occupational health and safety within its own circles, within the Saskatchewan Power Corporation. Ask some of the people down at the Saskatchewan Power Corporation how we moved in on them because of some mercury contamination that wasn't being cared for properly.

Ask the people at the SPC whether we showed them any favor or not. You'll find that certainly isn't the case. The T.C. Douglas Building which you attempted to involve yourself in directly — we were on top of that situation monitoring the air and making sure that place was fit for human habitation. We showed no quarter and we asked none, but I'm telling you this. If you do expect to get that kind of co-operation from private industry when their main concern is generating a profit rather than looking after the best interests of workers in hazardous conditions, then you are very, very naïve and I don't take you to be that. There are other descriptions but I don't say you are naïve.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. KATZMAN: — Let the minister's words speak for themselves. He started out by saying, you. I take that as a personal attack and I think that the minister's deputy assistant, Robert Sass, will agree that my own personal record, while I was involved in occupational health, is a good one and that I fought many a battle for the worker long before I came to this House. I think that accusation is totally wrong if you want to get into a personal argument on that one. As far as what you say, what you did in this province, there are lots of grain operators, elevator agents whom you weren't out there working for. I realize there's a bit of an argument here that they are a federal area but you've gone into other areas where the federal people were not looking after it and cleaned it up and you could have tried it in this area as well.

MR. SNYDER: — Grain elevators are under federal jurisdiction. We have been working closely with the authorities in an attempt to provide whatever expertise we can and whatever assistance we can and we have been successful in some measure in establishing some levels for that particular industry. Once again, you know full well when you raise that question that it falls not under provincial jurisdiction but under the federal authority by virtue of the grain act, the Federal Grain Act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Again, I think both sides have been a little freewheeling here. I think it is an unfortunate exhibition in front of the citizens of tomorrow. However, it's parliamentary. If that's the way you want it, that's the way you've got it. But I can tell you this — I would like to get back to item 1 and I would like to draw your attention to the fact that I know it is always the custom to cover fairly well in item 1 many of the things in the total estimates. We have a place for occupational health and occupational health and safety — education and research. I would hope that you don't intend to bring that up again at that time.

MR. P. ROUSSEAU (Regina South): — It is interesting to see the minister's blood pressure rise whenever he talks about free enterprise, and it's his attitude towards free enterprise that's creating the situation we have in this province today — that's why they are leaving the province and why the population is where it is today. No, your attitude towards it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You asked for that one. I want to ask the minister a question. Maybe he can give me the answer. Can you tell me how many SGEA members have been suspended from the union as a result of the recent strike in December and how many have been disciplined and have been reinstated and so on?

MR. SNYDER: — I really couldn't tell you. Larry Brown doesn't keep in close contact with me at all. I really couldn't give you any figures that would even remotely resemble an accurate count.

I want to remark about your assertion that people are just fleeing this province because of something or other, and I want to suggest to you that if Sterling Lyon had that kind of problem he would be overjoyed. He would be overjoyed with those kinds of difficulties.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: — He has only had that problem for a few short years; you've had it for 30 years. You still haven't resolved it, and I don't think in another 30 years you will resolve that problem. I'm absolutely astounded you don't know something like that. Several of my constituents are civil servants; several of my constituents belong to the SGEA, and they are concerned. In fact some of them have been disciplined; some of them have been suspended without a hearing, without any fair play whatever. And you are telling me tonight that you don't have a clue; you haven't been in touch with any of these people; they haven't corresponded with you about their suspensions. Are you saying that?

MR. SNYDER: — Yes, I'm saying that. I do know of a couple of lawyers who were suspended — one of them in Moose Jaw some time ago — but the law society never reported to me; they didn't tell me what kind of disciplinary action they were taking against that learned member of the legal fraternity. I know of a doctor or two who have been suspended from their practice of medicine by their disciplinary body. They didn't report to me. I don't think they reported to the Minister of Health. Those are internal working organizations, and those bodies do not report to me, nor do I attempt to foist my will upon them, nor should I.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well I hope you understood my question, Mr. Speaker. I asked you very specifically if any of these people had corresponded with you, and you said, no. Do you stand by that?

MR. SNYDER: — No. No, I didn't.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Check it tomorrow. That's the question I asked. I'm coming back with the same question. If that isn't the question you understood, then I will reword it. I'll word it so that you don't misunderstand me. Did any of these people who were suspended correspond with you, or have they been in touch with you?

MR. SNYDER: — I have had a correspondence with a number of people. I could probably search my file, and I can probably identify correspondence with people who have been disgruntled with the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association. I have on file a number of other letters from people who were disgruntled for other reasons and were critical of the public service commission at the same time. I have no way of knowing among those people how many have been suspended, nor have I made it my business to find out. I do not believe that to be within my sphere of operations, nor should it be. I do not know how many, and of those letters that I have received I have no way of knowing whether people have been subsequently disciplined, suspended or reinstated.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Stop your witch hunt under the SGEA.

MR. SNYDER: — That happened last fall with you people. I was going to use another word; I was going to . . .

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, some of these people are quite concerned. Do you intend to intervene in any way, shape or form to assist? Have you corresponded with them yourself? Have you been in touch with them in reply to their correspondence? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Do you mind if I finish my question? Who is the employer? I don't think it is an unfair labor practice when the correspondence is directed to the minister. Now, the Attorney General knows better. If it is, then stand up and correct me.

But have you any intention of intervening with respect to reinstating these people within the SGEA? There is a concern, and let's not get facetious. Let's stop playing around. I want to know if it is your intention, or the intention of your department to help, to assist in any way, shape or form to see these people are treated fairly, since the strike was illegal and since they didn't do anything illegal. I will give you several reasons why. Will you answer my questions to begin with?

MR. SNYDER: — No, I think I can tell the member quite precisely, quite sincerely, it is not going to be my prerogative to interfere with the internal operations of that trade union organization or any other. The arrangement that is necessary if those people are aggrieved is to seek redress from their trade union organization, or if there has been any unfair labor practice then the labor relation boards will adjudicate as to whether they have been unjustly dealt with, and the terms and conditions of the legislation will take care of that. But basically this is an internal union matter and it would be highly improper for me to involve myself, and I think I would be directly subject to an unfair labor practice if I were to do that. I think I would be subject to unfair labor practice for interfering or attempting to coerce or do whatever could be referred to, I think properly, as an unfair labor practice. I do not intend to intervene.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Even in the case where you've been directly requested to do so, you won't take action? Would you mind telling me what course of action . . .

MR. SNYDER: — Who suggested that I had been directly contacted and had a request issued to me for assistance?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Right here. I have a copy of a letter that was sent to you. If you want me to read it I will. That was a direct request from an SGEA employee, directed to you. If you want to get into that, Mr. Minister, I will. But the point is that I'm saying to you that you have been . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, you have the letter. This is a copy. It was written to you. Now, I am saying to you that even in the case where an employee has asked you, you don't intend to do anything about it. All right, if that's your answer. If it isn't, say so.

My second question is what course of action will these people have?

MR. SNYDER: — Members of a trade union organization have the grievance procedure through their own organization and they have a constitution by which that organization operates, and it is not the prerogative of the Minister of Labour in the province of Saskatchewan or Alberta or anywhere else where they have a labor relations act, or an industrial relations act, or a trade union act as it's called here, to interfere in the internal operation of a trade union organization. If they seek redress, they have the vehicle with which to do that, and it is not the prerogative nor is it the job of the Minister of Labour to interfere in such a case. If you're suggesting that it is, then state your examples where other ministers of the Crown in other provinces believe that it is their prerogative.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, you're twisting the situation around. I'm not talking

about other ministers of the Crown in other provinces; I'm talking about you. And I'm not suggesting interference; I'm suggesting coming to the aid of a person who has asked you to come to his aid. Now that's a totally different matter. The letter has been sent to you. The letter asked you to do something. You're saying you're not going to do anything in spite of the fact you were asked to. And then you tell me the recourse they have is through their union. When their union refused to allow them to attend their meetings, refused to table the letters sent to them, where else can they go? Can they go through the labor relations board? Can they lay an unfair labour practice charge against the union through the labor relations board? Please answer that? I don't know. I'm asking you to give me some direction.

MR. R.J. ROMANOW (Attorney General): — Mr. Chairman, if I might just intervene in the debate for one minute. First of all, I think the hon. member does not fully understand the workings of The Trade Union Act. I don't mean this in any partisan way. But it seems that the questioning reveals a basic lack of understanding about the act. Under The Trade Union At, if a group of employees get together and form themselves into a trade union and have the majority's support and are certified as such by the labour relations board, that organization is empowered to do the negotiating and to represent the workers of that particular unit vis-à-vis the employer.

The Minister of Labour has no statutory or legal power to interfere. The question was, what can he do? And my answer is, legally, he can do nothing. In fact, if he were to do something he would likely be liable for a charge of an unfair labor practice because The Trade Union Act clearly sets out that an employer, or what could be represented as a member of the employer class, the government, ought not to interfere in the internal management of a union. That is the law. Accordingly, if that is the position, it is left to the union members themselves to take the remedy in their own hands by elections of officers, by subsequent changes of the constitution at appropriately called conventions, by as obviously happened in this case a private law suit against the union and the officers of the union to declare the strike illegal. The hon. member shakes his head. O.K., if you disagree with me, then I invite you to tell this House under what statute or under what authority the Minister of Labour of anybody else could act to help this person that you raise. Tell me that.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I have no intention of telling you anything. I am asking. That's the idea of this exercise. I'm asking. You haven't answered the question, Mr. Attorney General. You have made no attempt to answer it at all. You have told me about The Trade Union Act. I know enough about it; I've been involved with it before. I'm aware of what The Trade Union Act is. My question is this. The minister hasn't answered my question. I'm going to go back to the minister and have him answer my question.

We have a situation of an individual who has been suspended from the union, and not being allowed to take her case back to the union for reversal of the decision (for reinstatement) has written to the minister personally asking him to intervene, to suggest he do something to help out in whatever way possible. Now, you're telling me the union member cannot go and talk to the minister because he can't interfere. The member cannot talk to the union, obviously, because the union has told him to get out. They're saying you have ways of resolving the problem. Tell me what that way is. I'm asking. He hasn't told me anything.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I say to the hon. member — I don't know if this is a way out — but if the suspension of that member was because the member walked across the picket lines during the course of a dispute, which dispute has been ruled

illegal and which people might argue and therefore makes the suspensions questionable, the remedy may be for that individual to take private action against the union . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, maybe. I'm not advocating it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Some protection for people.

MR. ROMANOW: — Hold on. All right, that's another issue. You can argue that but I'm only saying when you say to the minister, do something . . .

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I asked.

MR. ROMANOW: — All right. What can you do? You asked, what can you do? I give you the answer as to what he can do. He can answer the letter. He can take note of the complaint. He may want to examine The Trade Union Act. But he cannot say to that individual, I am going to do this to get you reinstated because the very essence of The Trade Union Act in Saskatchewan, the most progressive trade union act in all of Canada, is based on the democratic principle that the workers within the union are free to organize and handle their own affairs without any interference from the government.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, The Attorney General obviously doesn't understand what this individual's problem is. I'm aware the union is there to whatever. But they have chastised and thrown that person out and refused to have a hearing to determine whether or not that person is, in fact, guilty or not guilty; they have arbitrarily thrown that person out of the union. The member has gone to the minister to ask for assistance, to ask for direction. The minister says, there's nothing I can do. I'll ask the minister a very simple question. Have you at least replied to the letters written to you respecting these suspensions?

MR. SNYDER: — You're quoting from a letter. You haven't given me the name. You haven't given me the date of or the circumstances. You are expecting me to bring into play total recollection and I think we have an exhibition, in this House already, of the hazards of attempting to do just that.

Now, I have had a number of letters and I have had letters — some which were critical of the Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association and some which were critical of other actions which came about as a result of that work stoppage. But for you to wish me to have total recall of every piece of correspondence that has gone across my desk, or how this person would resolve her difficulties at this point in time, I think you are asking something more than you have any right to expect. I am happy to have a look at it. I don't know whether I responded to it. I can't recall a letter which you won't identify for me, nor the circumstances under which this lady has been suspended. If it was for crossing a picket line the redress may very well be as the Attorney General has suggested. She may have to seek redress in a court of law, or there may be some other method by which she can seek redress. I would appreciate having, at least, the name and the date on the letterhead and that might be of some use for me to examine it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I will accept your answer. I may come back to it a little later on because I want to check something out on it.

Mr. Minister, Let me ask you this question. Would the member be allowed to lay a charge of unfair labor practise against the union? Is that a possibility? It isn't? So what is good for the union isn't good for the member. What the union can do is a one-sided story. The union can turn around and lay an unfair labor practise charge, or the government can,

but the individual who is involved cannot. Is that what you are telling me?

MR. SNYDER: — They have their own constitution within which they operate. I don't have a copy of the SGEA's constitution and the mechanism set forth in that constitution for an aggrieved member to grieve to his union. I don't have it and it is not my prerogative. I don't keep each union's constitution on file in my office. But that is their proposition and it is their prerogative to work within their own constitution to seek redress. I fully expect there is a mechanism there for that member.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one observation if I can, that is the member's attempt to distinguish the union and the member. If you want to strike those words it would be like saying — so you are telling me hon. member, that what's good for the Kiwanis Club is not good for the member of the Kiwanis Club. Surely the theory of Kiwanis Clubs or trade unions, or law societies, or medical societies is that the executive reflects the wills and the intentions of the membership. If it doesn't, the membership takes the appropriate action to change the executive, the directions and the objectives. That is the objective and anything less than that means in effect, the destruction of trade unionism. It means the destruction of trade unionism, because then you might as well be negotiating with 14,000 employees.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Just one point I would like to get clear on this. The Attorney General refers to a Kiwanis Club as being a similar situation. Are you saying — and I ask you again now — an individual by association through an organization of any kind whether it be union, or service club, or anything else loses his rights? Does that individual lose his rights because he belongs to an association? That is pretty well what you said and I would like you to clear that.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of a service club, but I have been asked to address a lot of them. I bet you there isn't a service club around that doesn't have a constitutional provision which says if you miss three meetings in a row, you are out. You are out! That's the constitution. Don't tell me what the reasons are; you missed three of them and you are out of the club — I am not going to name the club. Now there are differences. I am not saying it is a parallel situation, there are differences. But the principle is that if that constitutional provision is too harsh, the membership can at an appropriate convention, change its constitution. That's the nature of the game; that's the nature of the game in The Trade Union Act. That's the basis of how the union is organized. Now if the person has a grievance, a wrongful suspension or whatever, what better remedy than to be able to go to court? What better remedy?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — It doesn't cost him anything to go to the labor relations board. It costs a lot of money through courts. There's a difference, Mr. Attorney General.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, if we take a case similar to what the member for Regina South was referring to (but let's assume it is not a government employee or government union and the government is not the employer in any way) then would you be able to do a little more than you are able to do now? The way I read what the Attorney General has been suggesting is that because there is a quasi-argument you may be part-employer (because SGEA works for government) that if it was a non-government union, take your choice, you would maybe be able to investigate a little more than you are in this case?

MR. SNYDER: — I'm inclined to be a little forgiving of the member for Regina South because I don't think he had any more than a brief flirtation with The Trade Union Act when he was in violation of it himself. I don't accord you the same kind of leniency

because you're a member of the trade union organization.

If the Minister of Labour in your dispute with the city of Saskatoon intervened with CUPE (Canadian Union of Public Employees) and attempted to do something that you, as a member of that organization disapproved of, I think you would have every right to come down on me with a ton of bricks. It's not my business to interfere in trade union organizations. You're supposed to be adult people. Sometimes you don't act that way but you're supposed to be adult people in an organization which is democratically elected. You have an opportunity to change your officers, to vote on your constitution. To suggest the Minister of Labour, by some remote method, should be in there interfering in your internal organization, is something which is unforgiveable for a person that's had more than a brief flirtation with the trade union movement. I can't forgive you because you're not doing it out of ignorance; you're doing it out of malice or for whatever reasons — I'm not quite certain.

MR. KATZMAN: — I think if the minister would check the statement I made, I suggested the Attorney General seemed to indicate if it wasn't a government area, you may be able to. That's what the question was so we could lay it clear. I agree with what the minister just said but the Attorney General seemed to lay the idea there that just because you could be inferred as the employer, you had to be more careful than if you were somebody else. So I thought I'd lay that case out because of the way he laid his case out and see what your argument was. If you want to drop your ton of bricks, I suggest the Attorney General should have them dropped on him.

Let's get back to your estimates, Mr. Minister. The fire safety unit — if I'm in the wrong area and you suggest it's another vote, fine, but I cannot point out which vote it would be. The fire safety unit, the fire fighters' training programs and fire prevention and investigations — are you finding (as has been indicated first of all in your investigations) . . . We were hearing in Saskatoon more from their inspectors about arson becoming more and more of a problem. If I'm correct, somebody was charged in the school burning in Prince Albert in the last few days Is your department doing the investigations in most of the areas or just in the areas not within the cities or do you co-operate with the cities?

MR. SNYDER: — In answer to the hon. member 's question — the involvement and enforcement of The Fire Prevention Act — the involvement of our provincial fire marshall in investigations revolves around in a general way. Investigations where there is a loss of life or where there is suspected arson, and that of course includes the city of Prince Albert. It includes anywhere within the eleven cities, and elsewhere even though they may have a full-time fire fighting unit of their own. We become involved when there is a loss of life or suspected arson.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, just to make sure I heard you — where there is a loss of life or where there is arson, suspected. O.K., Mr. Minister, in this one particular area — and I think you are aware because I assume it put more pressure on your department — I believe either Municipal Affairs or Urban Affairs, or wherever the grant comes from there is a grant for voluntary fire departments and so forth that are developing throughout the province. Am I correct that the fire fighter's training program and so forth is in your department? And could you give us any indication of the growth of voluntary fire departments within the province of Saskatchewan? I know of some. I'm wondering if the growth is as large as I think it's becoming?

MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Sheasby indicates to me that from early in the spring until late in the fall — until the snow flies in the fall — the instruction unit within the department is busy with volunteer fire departments particularly throughout the smaller urban areas of rural Saskatchewan, demonstrating and working with some on the use of new techniques and new equipment. That continues for the entire spring, summer and early fall — into the early part of the winter. That's a continuing program, one that I think has been exceedingly valuable to those smaller urban areas where they have volunteer fire brigades.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I agree with you that it is a valuable program. I'm not sure if you can answer this question. You may have to turn to the Minister of Revenue to help us out, so if I can get Wes' attention for a minute . . . fire equipment bought by these volunteer fire departments . . . I understand from the city of Saskatoon that because they are not licensed the vehicles themselves are not taxable. Now the reason I am asking this question here is, if I'm wrong I'd like your department to make some presentation to the minister to make them when he does his tax changes. If that's correct, then I would like to know. Nobody seems to know the answer out in the boondocks.

MR. SNYDER: — I couldn't begin to answer any questions. I will provide a little additional information while I'm on my feet though with respect to the fire fighting training schools for volunteer fire fighters. They were conducted in 29 towns and villages and of the 2,564 registrants at these schools, 635 student firemen completed training courses and received certificates. Number of schools conducted and persons registered below — you'll find that in the annual report, page 21.

MR. KATZMAN: — I realize my other question was more of a plea for you to pass along to the Minister of Revenue rather than a question directed to you. I realize your department suggests fire fighting training and measures for fire prevention. Let me indicate to the minister that I was involved in acquiring a fire truck in the area in which I live, on a committee of the area, and it was a very interesting experience and very enlightening. We had to go to a retired fire marshall out of the province for a lot of assistance. I am wondering if you are in a position to assist a volunteer department which is planning a to acquire equipment by suggesting methods, what type of equipment would be most suitable, what options they have and so forth. Because for some strange reasons, either lack of knowledge of the R.M. council I was involved with, or something, we didn't seem to know who to go to in your government. Other than I assumed labor and someone suggested to me they didn't know of anybody there except the fire-fighting instructors.

MR. SNYDER: — I would be awfully surprised if any overtures were made to the fire commissioner and the ultimate in co-operation was not extended; because they would regard this as one of their primary functions and had they been approached I'm sure they would have been more than happy to provide any assistance they might be able to offer.

MR. KATZMAN: — I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that's probably very true because I have found in some areas your department is excellent in co-operation. I am suggesting, because of the enormous growth I think is developing in volunteer fire fighting all over the province, if your people have a small booklet suggesting points to be considered that you could give to some of these towns so that people know to look to your department for assistance in this because you have some expertise. Let me first of

all make the comment that the people I have spoken to who have taken the fire fighting training course have appreciated the effort put forth by your people when they come out to a rural area to suggest to them how to look after it.

Am I correct that there is protection for volunteer fire fighters? Is it through this division — or is it through municipal and they are covered by their town or something?

MR. SNYDER: — People tell me first of all that they'll be covered by workers' compensation in the event of an accident or injury when they are in the process of fighting fire. Whether the individual municipality takes out additional coverage for them, that's between the volunteer fire fighters themselves and the municipal body responsible for the volunteer fire-fighting unit. They are covered by workers' compensation.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, can you give me an indication — a very short one — of what the coverage would be. I realize they are volunteers and part-time so it would be pretty tough to base it on their incomes as a volunteer fireman. How do you base it in this case if they were injured fighting a fire as a volunteer?

MR. SNYDER: — Yes, we can get that answer for you if you'd hang tough for . . . If you go on to the next question, we can get you an answer on how they establish what the volunteer fire fighter's wage would be in order to establish what he would receive in the way of benefits if he were injured.

MR. KATZMAN: — On January 17, 1980 there was a news release from the labor department — there is no signature on it so I don't know . . . It says Labour Minister Gordon Snyder today announced the awarding of a number of grants under the women's project grant program 1979. In the listing it gives several organizations which are obviously covered by the women's division. I assume these grants are either under an order in council for any over \$10,000 and the remaining group are all under \$10,000 and therefore produced under the minister's signature only. Am I correct?

MR. SNYDER: — Well, there won't be very many of them over \$10,000 because the total figure for the grant program was in the order of \$40,000. They were provided to a number of organizations . . . I'm not sure I have the question. Were you asking me to list the organizations which received grants?

MR. KATZMAN: — No, Mr. Minister. This is why I'm having trouble with it — there is a women's division; there is a grant to organizations — there are two areas in your estimates. That is why I am asking it here. Are you suggesting there is a \$40,000 grant within the women's division you let the release out on or is it under grants to third parties? I'm concerned with that and if it is grants to third parties, I assume it is grants under \$10,000. Is it item 6 or item 10? I'm not sure where you want me to go.

MR. SNYDER: — The \$40,000 figure for grants to women's organizations you can find under subvote 19 — \$120,500 and for the previous year the \$40,000 was to be found in that figure — \$74,500. There was an additional \$40,000 with respect to the women's grant program, which was added, I believe, after last year's budget. After the budget of last year, there was a \$40,000 figure added. At the time the decision was made to reduce the size of the advisory council on the status of women and add a limited grant program in order to compensate for the limited size and reduced budget of the advisory council on the status of women. So at that time an additional \$40,000 was added to that \$74,500, which you will see under subvote 19 for the 1979-80 fiscal

year.

MR. KATZMAN: — If I understand correctly, what you are saying is last year there was \$110,000 under vote 10. I think we are talking about, subvote 19, item 10 and now it's moved up to \$120,500. That's what you're saying to me.

MR. SNYDER: — \$114,500 should have been the figure for last year, with the additional \$40,000 added sometime mid-term.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I'll get to the grants when we get to that area. Is there any other area on vote 17 to add vote 19 that you give out grants other than the one figure?

MR. SNYDER: — All the grants, I am told, are found under subvote 19, the \$120, 500 figure. That will be all of the grants for this fiscal year.

MR. G.S. MUIRHEAD (Arm River): — Mr. Minister, I'd like to ask this question. When your department was first made aware of the PCB spill at the Federal Pioneer, what precautions and what measures of safety did your department take for the laborers who were on staff at that time?

MR. SNYDER: — You may recall that when the PCB spill was discovered the occupational health people from the Department of Labour were on site directly and were responsible for monitoring and ordering a medical for each of the employees. A short while later by virtue of a ministerial order over my signature, provisions were put in place which required the management people not only to provide medical examinations and monitoring for an extended period of time for the employees who were currently working in the plant but also for those employees who had left the employment of Pioneer Electric in the interim. That ministerial order is still in effect. Although some employees have moved from the province and some difficulty is being encountered in finding all of them, concerted effort is being made to locate all of them. A medical will be provided to them and a monitoring of whatever health effects may conceivably have resulted from that PCB spill. At this point in time I believe the results are favourable and we haven't found the PCB spills to have affected those people, even those who were working in close proximity, so we're quite encouraged by the medicals returned for those people who were directly exposed.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Did I understand you correctly? At this point in time those who are still on staff on who were there at that time, are still receiving medical examinations?

MR. SNYDER: — Monitoring is still continuing, but the medicals have ceased. An attempt is being made to locate the final number who were on the payroll at Pioneer Electric at the time that happened who are now in some other part of the world or some other part of the country. There is a limited number of them but an attempt is being made to find them and make sure they have a complete physical examination also.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — I'm not saying that your department didn't do its job. I just didn't know. I just want to relate a story of a minor spill at Proctor and Gamble in Alberta. There were only 450 gallons spilled, but the people who were on staff did get it on their hands. It got into the water system, and they didn't know what to do so they contacted Environment Canada, and they couldn't tell them what to do at this immediate time. Proctor and Gamble contacted their headquarters at Vancouver and they contacted the largest PCB spill known at that time, in the rice fields of Japan. The orders were that day for no one to leave the site until all clothes were taken from the people. The clothes are still stored now at Edmonton in a vault. The people weren't allowed to leave that Proctor

and Gamble factory until they were re-examined. They were all scoured, under the fingernails, the scratches on their bodies. These people no matter where they are in Canada are still called back. If you're trying to keep these people in contact that have left, well then that's fine. I just wanted to bring it to your attention.

MR. SNYDER: — If I just might add a word or two to what the member said. It should be remembered that the PCB spill at Pioneer Electric was underground. It wasn't in any way similar to the one we are acquainted with. With respect to the Japanese one there was actually I think, a contamination, and employees were actually sprayed with the residues of PCB.

I wonder while I'm on my feet if I could provide the answer the member was asking with respect to volunteer fire fighters and their coverage. They are covered by workers' compensation. They're covered through towns and villages at no charge. There's no assessment levied to the towns and villages, but the volunteer fire fighters are awarded benefits on the basis of actual wages if they were an earner. On coverage of \$8,080 if they are not an earner, that is to say, if they are volunteer and unpaid, their wages are referred to as \$8,080 if they are not earner. This is the same arrangement apparently that covers emergency measures organizations workers and mine rescue workers — the same service is provided for them.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I'm not sure I heard all of your comment, so if I missed the first part I apologize if I'm on the wrong list. You said \$8,080 is what is considered if they're not earning a salary?

MR. SNYDER: — If they are not on the payroll, if they're not earning then their wages are covered as if they had been earning \$8,080 annually, and there's no premium paid by the municipality on their behalf. It's coverage that's extended without a premium by the workers' compensation board.

MR. KATZMAN: — Just to make sure I'm totally informed, let's assume the fellow is getting \$50 or something for a fire; that's not the important part, but they all have other jobs where they make their living. Now let's assume — I'll take two fellows for point of argument — one who is a farmer basically self-employed, therefore getting no wages elsewhere, and one happened to be the Sask Tel man in the area. He happens to work out of the town and if there's a fire he runs and helps too — as all volunteers do. So he has a wage that's coming (it doesn't have to be Sask Tel, take any employer) of say \$20,000 a year. Are you suggesting the benefits to the two men will be different?

MR. SNYDER: — Yes, the chairman of the board indicates to me that in the event the worker were employed by Sask Tel and earning a given wage, we'll say \$20,000, then he would be insured for that figure. If he were a farmer and were not insured through the board — you can self-insure as you know, as a farmer through the board — for whatever coverage he elected. Then he would be covered on the basis of the coverage he had elected as a farmer. Otherwise he would be covered for a minimum of \$8,080 annually — that would be his minimum coverage.

MR. KATZMAN: — That brings me to one other question and it's on compensation, seeing that we're into it for a minute. I've got to be careful here because my definition may not be exactly correct. I use a case which happened several years ago, where a fellow was riding a caboose. I think the Attorney General is aware of the case I'm going to refer to. The caboose being pulled by the train was hit by a gravel truck and he was injured. Somewhere along the line somebody said, because they were both in a certain

classification, they cannot sue; where if he had not been in the same classification, he would have been able to choose whether he sued or was covered by workers' compensation. Am I off on the wrong track?

MR. SNYDER: — I think you're confusing the situation a little bit. The employee has no opportunity to sue the company. I suppose it was CN or CP.

MR. KATZMAN: — No, he'd be suing the trucker who hit the train but because they're both in the same classification of work somehow, he couldn't do it. If it had been some other type of classification the trucker was in, he could have sued. Now, as I say, I could have the facts a little twisted here.

MR. SNYDER: — The employee doesn't have the option to sue. He was an employee of the railroad so obviously he's not in the position where he can sue anyone. He collects the workers' compensation benefits and CP or CN is in a position where they have the option of suing the trucker or the owner of the truck or the trucking firm which struck the caboose and injured the worker. The option there is not for him to sue but for the employer who paid premiums or assessments on his behalf. They have the option of suing the third party.

MR. KATZMAN: — That could be the area where I have some problems. But somewhere along the line I understand that CPR or CNR could not sue the trucking company because they fall in the same area under compensation and that's the part I'm a little confused on.

MR. SNYDER: — The fellow who was driving the gravel truck was also an employee of CP rail and if it was a CP caboose he was on, then of course they could not sue each other. That's the understanding I get here. I'm informed that if the caboose is hit by a gravel truck the worker can't sue if it's another employer or another worker involved.

MR. KATZMAN: — Can I have that one more time?

MR. SNYDER: — You can't sue — it's not possible to sue . . . O.K., I think I have it straight. In this particular set of circumstances it wouldn't be possible for the injured worker to sue another employer or another worker if they were covered under the act. If it were a private citizen, then he could seek redress and could sue that private citizen who was driving his gravel truck or his grain truck, but if it's another employer or another employee covered under the act then it's not possible. O.K?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I would like to pursue that earlier discussion on this SGEA problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Table the letter.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — The minister has a copy of the letter. In fact he has the original . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Do you want the opportunity of firing the person? Is that why you want the letter tabled? Is that why you want the letter tabled, so that you can, once you know who it is, have the opportunity of firing that person? Is that what you're saying? I have asked the Minister of Labor and my reason for pursuing it is very simple. This is a concern of one individual, but it's also the concern of several people who have been treated in this manner and it could be the concern of several other people involved in unions who could be treated as such in the future. I will quote from some parts of the letter to indicate what is happening:

I am frightened that the manipulation, the flagrant flouting of the law and the lack of protection of members' rights for the SGEA. I am concerned that members of SGEA have no protection in the association against unjust disciplinary measures other than using the courts, and this is a costly and time-consuming procedure for the individual. In the present system, the provincial executive disciplines you, then hears your appeal. In fact, the discipline may begin before you have even had an initial hearing (This is the question that is directed to you, Mr. Minister.)

I would like to know when a government intervenes to prevent the denial of person's rights after being tested in the courts, including an appeal, those which held a 1979 SGEA strike to be illegal, suspended members have not been reinstated, and we are told more members will be suspended.

That is frightening to an individual. That is. It is their livelihood we are talking about. To be blacklisted from a union can be a very dangerous situation for any individual, and I am sure you share my concerns in something like this. In this case, the unions have refused to consider the plights of these individuals. They have refused to reinstate them. A person is now appealing to you; others will probably appeal to you. Will the government intervene to see that justice is carried out or are you just going to turn it back over to the unions to let them decide how it's going to be done? Meanwhile all these suspended people have no opportunities to defend themselves, to be heard and to be reinstated. Mr. Minister, it's a concern and I think a very just, responsible request on my part to represent these people. Some of them may be my constituents; some of them may be yours. Someone has to act in this respect in this matter to see that justice is carried out.

MR. SNYDER: — I think, once again, Mr. Chairman, the thing that is referred to as justice by the hon. member opposite may not necessarily carry that connotation when the full facts of the case are examined in detail. I am not in a position to adjudicate as to whether there has been a miscarriage of justice or not, but I suggest to you that the opportunity for redress does not lie with the Minister of Labour in a set of circumstances such as this where I would, by your instructions, probably be involved in making judgment calls and determinations as to whether the union acted improperly or properly. That just does not fall within my sphere of influence, nor should it. Once again I will stray from this particular jurisdiction in Canada where the Minister of Labour takes upon himself that kind of authority. I think the redress is there. The constitution of the organization surely provides for some redress and the courts of the land provide the opportunity in the event the constitution of the SGEA does not provide for that sort of redress.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, the minister says justice may well be — and I can't recall your exact words — totally different when the case is heard, once a case has been heard. How can you decide that? How can you determine that when the case will not be heard? When they refuse to hear the case? We have a catch 22 situation — where does the person go? You say they have redress. Where do they have redress other than the courts, which is very costly and time consuming? Why, if the labour relations board is there to serve your justice, can they not serve it to an individual as well as the union, or the employer? Your answers are not answers to my questions.

My question and the question the individual is asking — when justice isn't being done

by the union, when justice is not available through the labour relations board and only through the courts of the land — is there any reason at this point why the government cannot intervene to help out? Not to make the decisions; not to decide the justice or the right or the wrong of it, but to see to it that a hearing is held; to see to it they have the opportunity to be heard. It is the right. Why should an individual lose his or her rights because they belong to an association or to a union? It is exactly what the Attorney General was indicating earlier.

I just cannot accept that explanation or that philosophy — that an individual should lose his or her rights because they have joined an association, a union, organization, or whatever.

MR. ROMANOW: — I want to make it absolutely clear that nothing I said should be construed to say a member loses his or her rights in a union — nothing. In fact, I say the contrary.

That individual has the right to go to the courts of the land to seek redress. What better right could be there be? You shake your head as if you don't have confidence in the courts, in the legal system. Well, if you have confidence in the court system, that individual who has written a letter has the choice to do it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Would the Attorney General pay the bill, is what the member says. Should I pay the bill for any and every civil dispute that arises in any trade union matter or any non trade union matter? Is that what you are advocating?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes, if the situation, is as in this case today, where justice does not seem to be available, and the recourse they have is not available because it is refused to them — I say yes, yes, certainly.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member continues, either purposefully or negligently, to misrepresent the facts.

You say there is no recourse available to this individual. I say that this is wrong. The individual has the recourse of going to the courts of the land if that suspension was done arbitrarily or not according to the by-laws, or not according to constitution, or not according to the laws interpreted by the courts. That is where the recourse of that individual lies.

The Trade Union Act is designed to arbitrate disputes between employers and trade unions representing the employees that are certified.

Look at what you are calling on this minister to do. You are calling on the minister to intervene, applying his yardstick of judgment.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, no.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, whose yardstick would he apply?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, the Attorney General doesn't want to be misinterpreted. Neither do I. I said I want him to intervene to see to it that a hearing is held — not to make the judgment. I don't want him to make the judgment. Certainly not. I want him to see to it that recourse is available to the individual. It isn't now. You two should be getting together. He says the recourse is there. You say, well if it isn't there, go to court. I say if that recourse is there, through the union to begin with and then

through the labor relations board, and if it's not available because they refuse to do it. I think it's the duty of the Minister of Labour to see to it that it becomes available in that respect. It's like saying to me, if I can't get a proper settlement or I'm afraid I may get the wrong settlement or something in a court of law, I go to the Supreme Court immediately. No, I say, that the beginning of this hearing starts at the union level where the hearing should be held to begin with. That's what the individual is asking for. That's what the person is saying. I can't get a hearing. Now, I say if they can't get a hearing then that's when the minister should be intervening and seeing to it that you do have a hearing for these people you have suspended. If the decision is that they still are suspended after that, fine, then they have to go to court but I say that they're missing the point to begin with. That's what I'm trying to make you understand. You're trying to skip the recourse that's there to begin with. The recourse is, according to the Minister of Labour, that hearing in the labor union. But, if it's refused, I say he should intervene and see to it that that hearing is made available, is there for that individual to appear before it. Then, if the decision isn't satisfactory to the individual they have recourse to a higher court.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, I say again to the hon. member he is asking the Minister of Labour to play the role of a judge.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — No.

MR. ROMANOW: — Yes, because you are saying that one individual or group of individuals allege there's been a denial of a fair hearing or a denial of justice.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, no.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, what else is there but — just let me finish . . .

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Not a fair one — a denial of one at all.

MR. ROMANOW: — Who says so? Who said so? That's right. What happens if the union says no, you're wrong.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Then, they have the recourse to go to a higher court.

MR. ROMANOW: — No, you're saying the Minister of Labour gets in there and says, you have to hold that hearing notwithstanding the fact that you may be right. That's what you're saying.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — No.

MR. ROMANOW: — Well, look at it. What else can you be saying? Either he is arbitrating the dispute between individual employees and the trade union on the question of whether there was a fair hearing or not, or he is . . .

MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, I'm not saying that at all. I didn't think I'd been talking French all night. Would the Attorney General please listen to what I'm saying.

MR. ROMANOW: — I wish you had been. I'd have understood you better.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'm saying that they refused to have a hearing. I'm not saying it's . . .

MR. ROMANOW: — Who said that?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — The individual who has been refused a hearing.

MR. ROMANOW: — And what if the union said that they'd been given a hearing?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Then the person's lying to me.

MR. ROMANOW: — The whole world is full of people who have disagreements as to what the facts are. That's what courts resolve.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — All I am asking the Minister of Labour to do is to inquire if, in fact, there has or has not been a hearing. If there has been one, then I'm off base, if you wish. My case is totally different to what I've been presenting. All I'm saying is that in fact this person is saying he has been denied a hearing, and I'm asking the Minister of Labour to intervene and see to it that there is one. It's as simple as that — not to ask him to make a decision right or wrong. Not to ask him to decide whether the union is guilty or not guilty. All I'm saying is, have the case heard. Heard! I'm not asking you to go to a court. I'm not asking you to go to a judge and say make the decision or I'll make it for you. Tell the judge not have the hearing. That's all I'm saying. Have I gotten through to you? Thank you.

MR. ROMANOW: — Mr. Chairman, by the same token, presumably, if a member of the construction association, contractors, said there was no hearing by the construction association on a particular bargaining position you would similarly give the Minister of Labour the power to come right in on the construction association on any other employers' organization and direct that it do a certain thing. Is that what you're saying? Or does it only work one way by your argument? What way does it work?

Look, people who say there has been a denial of justice — that's what you're saying when you say there has been no hearing. That's a denial of natural justice. That's a principle in law when there has been no hearing. If there has been no hearing, a denial of natural justice, the remedy is to the courts. Otherwise, if you want to put it into the Minister of Labour's hands to be used at his discretion in his determination of the facts or because some person has written a letter saying there has been hearing — there may or may not have been in this case, I don't know. What kind of a system of justice is that? That's pure, raw, political intervention. It may work O.K. with this Minister of Labour but what happens if we have a Minister of Labour of another political party of another stripe, on your yardstick of resolving his issues, who abuses that power? Surely there can't be any more safeguards than the courts in that area. Surely you're not saying the Minister of Labour of a political party who happens to be the government of the day, on a letter written to him, should have the power to come right in and order . . . (inaudible) . . . He should have the power to ask whether there's a hearing? Yes. That's what you're saying. And he should have the same power to ask with respect to the construction association? You agree with that?

MR. ROUSSEAU: — On the same situation can you break the rule?

MR. ROMANOW: — On the example I've given you, you say the Minister of Labour should have equally that power as well. Is that what you're saying? Surely you can't be saying that. Surely if you're saying that, what's the sense of having a trade union act which tries to order the relationships between trade unions and employers? What's the sense of having a court system, if there's been denial of justice? If that person has

been denied a hearing, surely we don't look to the to the politicians to resolve that. Surely that's a legal process when we put confidence in the courts. You're not saying that it should be otherwise. I don't believe you can be saying that. What's the sense of asking if you can't follow up with the results? I'm saying if this is the Tory position . . . (inaudible) . . .

Maybe it isn't the Tory position then, but if it is the Tory position that the Minister of Labour should ask an individual organization whether certain yardsticks have been followed, where does it stop? And if it goes for trade unions, the next question is, does it go for employer organizations? The next question is, does it go in non trade union matters, to other organizations, law societies? A lawyer writes to me and says I didn't get a hearing. What am I to do? As the Attorney General of the province, you'd have me say, follow the law society or the Minister of Health . . . with the doctors or education teachers . . . Then you've got the entire thing in the pure political ball park. As I say, if that's the Tory policy — I don't believe it is — but if it is, I tell you, heaven help the organizations whom we believe act basically by the principles of a fair system. If they don't, the courts are there to correct them. Heaven help them because it's then in the hands of the politician to ask and presumably take some remedial action.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I have been completely misquoted and misunderstood. I take it as a logical conclusion . . . you indicate four or five other departments . . . I say if there is something wrong with the jurisdiction of that department . . . We've asked the Minister of Health to intervene in certain cases. We've asked other ministers to intervene because problems are existing. I'm not suggesting the Minister of Labour should rule, as you put it. That is not what I said. I suggested the Minister of Labour should see to it the rules are followed, as laid down by his department. It's a simple as that.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, as you are aware, during the last short while there have been some potash mines that have shaken a little near Saskatoon. For the same reason I have asked several questions on — I'm not sure which quote — I would ask the Minister if besides what we hear on the news media about special people being called in and a machine being placed down in one of the mines to keep track of it, are we monitoring this very closely. Obviously, if we have a ground shift we could have a very dangerous situation. I must say we all have to compliment the mine safety people for the excellent job. We can refer back to a mine accident that happened just a short while ago with a fire. We have no argument, but I'm a little concerned that we should know what is happening with this area.

MR. SNYDER: — My people tell me Walter Skelly, a mine inspector, was on the scene almost immediately and checked it out to assure himself — it was the Cory mine that was involved — there was no danger as a result of that tremor. It was not a large tremor but one that was recorded.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, if I may ask a question of you? I am prepared to start moving down the list now, but if something should develop, that comes back up, if the Minister agrees to let me slip back to it if something we didn't cover starts. I would be prepared to start moving down the order.

Item 1 agreed.

Item 2

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, if it will help you just read the number and the total if

that's the minimum requirement. A question to the Minister. I should have asked it under item 1. I would ask it for all the votes. If you remember correctly last year we asked you for a breakdown of your top staff. You can send it over in writing later. It doesn't have to come across the table now.

MR. SNYDER: — Just so we understand what you mean by a breakdown, you're talking about the directors of the particular division of what is it that you want — the wage scale and the incumbent's name — or what is it in particular that you are asking for?

MR. KATZMAN: — The out of scope personnel . . . If I remember correctly, last year you gave the top three in each area, if there was out of scope in those areas. For an example, I assume that Mr. Sass and Mr. Mitchell will be out of scope and will be in the top — one of those 27.

Under the policy planning, is there any . . . One other question. Would you also identify in any of these votes, where you have what is called . . . the 27 people for an example are permanent employees within the department and I assume that other personnel services may have casuals in there, and I assume that you would prefer to give them in man-years, which is the way you preferred to give them last year. Would you indicate if there are any man-years in the other personal services or other expenses?

MR. SNYDER: — It's under other personal services —that's \$42,420 represents the equivalent of three person-years.

MR. KATZMAN: — You can present that after — the whole works; it doesn't have to be now.

Item 2 agreed.

Item 3

MR. KATZMAN: — Is this where Sig Walter and those people are covered? Is this their department?

MR. SNYDER: — Yes, that's right. They included also the workers' advocates.

MR. D.G. TAYLOR (Indian Head-Wolseley): — I'd like to know the salary of Mr. Sig Walter and Mr. Ron Duncan. It seems during the strike Mr. Walter was working an awful lot of hours. Was he paid overtime or what benefits does he get?

MR. SNYDER: — Mr. Walter is paid \$2,673 a month and he earns every nickel of it. He doesn't receive overtime. No other industrial relations officer does in light of the fact . . . I guess because of the peculiar nature of the kind of work they do, like some others who work unregulated hours, they accordingly are not covered by the hours of work provisions.

The salary of Mr. Duncan, the director of industrial relations is \$3,400 a month. He also receives no overtime.

MR. TAYLOR: — Are these the only two industrial relations people you have or are there others in that department? These are the ones I hear about on the radio and so on.

MR. SNYDER: — Additionally, there is one who is stationed in La Ronge, a senior industrial relations officer in La Ronge, Howard J. Lucas at \$2,252 a month and Clifford Hagen in Regina, \$2,561 a month.

MR. KATZMAN: — If I remember correctly, last year, Sig Walter in whom I have much confidence and I know the minister has — I understand we had a possibility he was leaving the department to go into law. I hope by that indication we are not losing him. Is that the indication I'm hearing?

MR. SNYDER: — No. He's back and I trust he is here to stay. I'm hoping that is the case.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, from this side of the House, I think we all remember some of the work Sig has been pressured through — most of us who were here prior to the last election remember the bell ringing ceremony which he lived through which was rather hectic. We hope he continues the good quality work he has been doing for your department.

Item 3 agreed.

Item 4

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, one question here. This allotment of funds is for your staff; there is no allotment here for the individuals who are taking apprenticeship programs. Am I correct?

MR. SNYDER: — Yes, that's right. The moneys provided for living allowances and things of that nature are provided through Canada Employment Service, Canada Manpower.

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — I notice in this vote you have exactly the same number of employees you had a year ago and yet we see an increase in this vote of about 20 per cent. Could you give us a breakdown of that high increase?

MR. SNYDER: — Basically the reason for the increase relates to a reclassification that took place arising out of the amalgamation of apprenticeship and standards. They were separate divisions before and the employees are now serving a dual role. This was done primarily for purposes of efficiency and to ensure that an apprenticeship inspector would not be travelling on the heels, if you like, of a labor standards officer who investigated or took part in auditing of books and things of that nature, of a particular employer. In some instances there would be almost a duplication, and with the amalgamation there was reclassification of employees and that accounts in a major way for the increase that's shown.

MR. SWAN: — When you say there's a reclassification of employees, are they different employees, the same employees just classified upward or what happened here?

MR. SNYDER: — Basically the same employees with an upgrading of their skills; 25 apprenticeship and standards officers were reclassified and upgraded, and took on additional responsibilities.

MR. SWAN: — When you say additional responsibilities I would assume that you are not working them more hours, but rather just different responsibilities. Say there was a need for . . .

MR. SNYDER: — Taking on responsibilities as an apprenticeship officer as well as a labor standards officer, doing additional work and receiving additional remuneration as a result of that.

MR. SWAN: — How many extra hours in a week do we see for the money that we're paying? Is it a considerable number of hours, or are they indeed getting a 20 per cent increase?

MR. SNYDER: — My information is that they will probably not be working additional hours but will be doing more demanding work because of the dual responsibility they carry as both apprenticeship officers and labor standards officers.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, just to clarify that a little further. What you're basically saying is that their job has been reclassified and re-evaluated, and the re-evaluation has caused them to have more points, therefore more money. Am I correct?

MR. SNYDER: — Right.

Items 4 and 5 agreed.

Item 6

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, the other positions and other expenses are both down in this vote. Is that because of some change in the department or what particular reason?

MR. SNYDER: — Reduction of one person. There's a deletion of one person, but additionally — look over on the right side of your page under other expenses, \$186,230 that represents also the \$40,000 that is now under grants, and it was under the women's division last year so that reduction from \$186,000 down to \$145,000 represents that \$40,000. It has to be found elsewhere this year.

MR. KATZMAN: — What about the other figure of \$15,000 that was \$32,000 last year? The second item — this year it's \$15,250, last year \$32,000.

MR. SNYDER: — A similar explanation applies here. The \$32,590 includes the honorarium that was paid to the advisory council on the status of women and that's also found in grants and so this \$15,250 will represent the other personal services which will be temporary help.

Item 6 agreed.

Item 7

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, occupational health, as far as I am personally concerned, could use twice as much money as it presently has in your budget — that's my own personal feeling. I would hope that the minister can keep putting pressure on the budget board to increase the funds, but it was interesting to note earlier that you indicated there were funds coming from other sources — the \$200,000 — now I realize it's not for occupational health but it will be doing assisting studies that affect them. I think you refer to one under health, the Montreal study, and you referred to another amount of money — I think it was \$5,000 from another source. Could you indicate how many other funds indirectly — because I can't think of another word to use—will be

assisting occupational health and assessed by the study done by the health department or a study done by somebody else that will assist the betterment of the employee?

MR. SNYDER: — I think the question was, what additional moneys are coming to the department from other sources?

MR. KATZMAN: — That's not totally correct. What other moneys are assisting in studies, as for example the \$200,000 from health that will better the employee? I know it may be tough to find because it may be in four or five departments other than yours that you may get benefits from

MR. SNYDER: — Well, the \$200,000 that we received for research programs into low-level radiation. This is under the direction of the health and research board and is to commence in 1980. So, the \$200,000 there is the direct one — I suppose we get direct advantage from that \$200,000 grant. That has to represent the figure that you are attempting to get, I expect.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, are there are other areas you are aware of? I think I heard a figure of \$5,000 somewhere else, for something else, earlier this evening. It might have been from your grant portion.

MR. SNYDER: — I think perhaps, you confused money we are giving from the department to the other agencies for the sputum cytology test, not money we were receiving. I think there has been a confusion here. I gather what you were trying to get was money we were receiving from somewhere else. That \$200,000 is the only one that represents money received by the department for low-level radiation studies, while the other moneys I drew attention to were moneys provided by the department or the cancer research in Montreal and the low-level or the sputum cytology test and things of that nature. I think those are the moneys given by us, not received by us.

MR. KATZMAN: — I see those will all appear under Vote 19. Am I correct?

MR. SNYDER: — Right.

MR. KATZMAN: — Okay, I will handle those at Vote 19. Mr. Minister, I would like to comment about one particular issue that concerns myself and many employees in the province. For the benefit of the Attorney General we will finish this estimate this evening.

The labelling of hazardous projects — I refer to paints and other things like that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You are very tempting Attorney General. It is very tempting to get into a debate with you this evening, but of course, I will stay with the Minister of Labour and we will do our estimates.

Is there any possible improvement in the situation in the labelling for the protection of the working man and employees in the obvious end run, over what we had one year ago?

MR. SNYDER: — Well, you know that over an extended period of time we have been lobbying with the federal government in Ottawa in an attempt to have them do some of the work you are drawing attention to — the labelling of hazardous products. To this point in time we haven't been particularly successful. It obviously has to be done by the federal agency that has some control over products imported into Canada, because we

are in a very difficult position in attempting to control any products flowing over provincial boundaries. A good deal of the hazardous material is shipped in from elsewhere.

I have a copy of a release from the Leader-Post of March 26, 1980, where it draws attention to chemicals that may be assessed before being imported or sold in Canada. So we are sort of getting the impression they may be moving in that general direction. Environment officials of the Government of Canada are, I think, assessing the possibility of doing this. We will continue in our efforts to press upon them the importance of it.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, just a comment that I am glad to hear the federal government is maybe planning to move. I hope your associate deputy continues to speak very loudly, on this particular issue as he has made a habit of doing in the last few years.

I think that this is one of the few cases, as I said earlier, where more funds should be made available to your department. It is in the occupational health of the employee that we leave a heritage of health workers in retirement. Therefore, because we are leaving a legacy, we should not be scared in this case to ask the heritage fund to assist us in the heritage of leaving a legacy, we should not be scared in this case to ask the heritage fund to assist us in the heritage of leaving good, safe, healthy workmen when they retire to enjoy their livelihood.

I'll make this comment and then we can move to the next estimate. I think, Mr. Minister, that we are fortunate in having Dr. Sass in this province who is recognized . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I realize I put his job in jeopardy every year when I say good things about him but he is recognized world over for his success. Your department should be given a bouquet world over for his success. Your department should be given a bouquet for this endeavor which you tried. It has become a very successful endeavor and is being followed in many parts of the world. On those comments I would suggest that hopefully next year when we come back on this particular item, we will have good things to say and I won't have to dump a load of bricks on him because he forgot how to do his job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: — Hear, hear!

MR. SNYDER: — I just agree with you entirely for everything you said on this special occasion.

MR. H.J. SWAN (Rosetown-Elrose): — I would like to have a breakdown of other expenses under that one. There is quite an increase. Could you just tell us why and what's involved here?

MR. SNYDER: — The additional moneys you are drawing attention to I expect is the increase of some \$57,600, from \$229,000 to \$286,000. This is directly related to the new positions; two new mine inspectors and a health physicist. The bulk of the money here could be broken down in this way for those additional positions, travel and sustenance for new positions and rate increases — \$27,090; laboratory and scientific equipment, increase for purchase of radiation monitoring equipment — \$22,800; the province is also to host the Canadian mines' rescue competition this year and we have set aside something in the order of \$12,000 for that purpose; miscellaneous contractual services in the order of \$12,000; computer services — \$10,7000; and printing \$4,130 — for that complete total, that increase of \$57,600 to the additional positions of mines inspectors.

Items 7 to 9 agreed.

Item 10

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, on this particular vote, would you be prepared to supply me at your convenience within reasonable time, an idea where the funds are to be spent. You've indicated where \$40,000 is to be spent approximately. Could you indicate where the rest . . . I'll accept it later. It doesn't have to be now.

Mr. Minister, there was an offer made to me by your department which I think we should put on the record to make sure the people involved are totally knowledgeable. I hope the offer is still extended to me — that when you make a tour of the North and there happens to be an extra seat on the airplane, I would be allowed to come along to have your inspectors explain to me first-hand the occupational health programs and the types of inspections you are doing in the North re the uranium area you have picked up. I hope that offer is still available to me, I would like to put it on the record, if I may.

MR. SNYDER: — Yes, that's agreed. In the event the opportunity presents itself and there is room on the aircraft if it's a fly-in operation, then there is no problem in that connection.

MR. KATZMAN: — I thank the minister and his staff for the answers we received and the answers I am going to be receiving later. Thank you kindly.

Item 10 agreed to.

Vote 20 agreed.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:47 p.m.