

1 **COGEMA Resources Inc.:**
2 **Application for an amendment**
3 **to the McClean Lake Operation**
4 **Uranium Mine and Mill Operating**
5 **Licence to allow open-pit mining**
6 **and milling of the Sue E orebody.**
7 **05-H19.1B**
8 **Oral Presentation by**
9 **COGEMA Resources Inc.**

10
11 **MR. POLLOCK:** Thank you.

12 Good morning, Madam Chair and Members of
13 the Commission.

14 For the record, I am Bob Pollock, Vice-
15 President Environment Health and Safety for COGEMA
16 Resources Inc.

17 Also present today on behalf of COGEMA
18 Resources are Jim Corman, General Manager of McClean Lake
19 operation, to my right, and Dale Hoffman, Manager of
20 Special Projects and Radiation Protection, to my left.

21 There are also other COGEMA staff at the
22 CNSC office in Saskatoon.

23 We are here today to support our
24 application to amend the Uranium Mine Operating Licence
25 for McClean Lake operation to allow COGEMA Resources to

1 mine and process uranium ore from the Sue E open pit.

2 This slide outlines today's presentation.
3 After this introduction, Jim Corman will provide a brief
4 update on the status of the summer preparatory work
5 conducted at Sue E and then I will provide some comments
6 on the intervenors' submissions.

7 Jim?

8 **MR. CORMAN:** Thank you, Bob.

9 For the record, I am Jim Corman, General
10 Manager of the McClean Lake operation.

11 Given the short summer season in Northern
12 Saskatchewan, the Commission gave consideration to an
13 earlier application for weather-sensitive preparatory work
14 for the Sue E mine, in July of 2005.

15 Approval by the Commission has allowed
16 COGEMA to proceed with this work, which is reversible, as
17 being conducted at our own financial risk, understanding
18 that the earlier decision by the Commission does not
19 prejudice consideration to the amendment for the full Sue
20 E project, which is the subject of this hearing.

21 I would like to briefly update the
22 Commission on the preparatory work which is listed on this
23 slide.

24 This slide shows the road from the Sue C
25 mining area to the Sue E. The roadways required to

1 transport materials from the Sue E pit are now in place.
2 As can be seen, an initial snowfall has already occurred
3 at McClean Lake.

4 This slide shows the assembly of the HDPE
5 piping used to pump water from Sils Lake to Sue C. The
6 pipeline is now installed and has been functioning since
7 mid-September.

8 This slide shows the shallow Sils Lake,
9 which is immediately adjacent to the Sue E development.
10 As can be seen, the pump and pipeline are installed and
11 functional.

12 This slide shows the stripping of
13 overburden material at Sue E which commenced in early
14 September. A separate consideration for the preparatory
15 work activities has allowed COGEMA to advance this work as
16 previously described and approved.

17 I will now turn it back to Bob.

18 **MR. POLLOCK:** Thank you, Jim.

19 Bob Pollock, for the record.

20 I would like to briefly note several points
21 on the intervenors' submissions. I will proceed in the
22 order that the submissions are listed in the agenda,
23 starting with CMD 05-H19.2.

24 COGEMA appreciates the participation of
25 McClean Lake workers in this hearing through the Canadian

1 Nuclear Energy Worker's Council and the Communications
2 Energy and Paperworkers Union, Local 48S and their support
3 of our application to mine Sue E.

4 We agree, as Local 48S states, that the
5 capable and experienced workforce is a key factor in the
6 success of McClean Lake operation. Their dedication to
7 safety and environmental protection is vital and we look
8 forward to maintaining and strengthening the processes
9 which facilitate their active participation in continuing
10 to improve to our collective benefit.

11 The second submission, CMD 05-H19.3, is
12 from the Northern Saskatchewan Environmental Quality
13 Committee, or EQC.

14 The EQC operates as a communications bridge
15 between communities of Northern Saskatchewan with 31
16 represented and the uranium industry and the regulatory
17 agencies. We appreciate this unique role played by the
18 EQC in bringing forward questions or concerns from
19 northerners and taking back information gained from the
20 interactions with the regulatory and industry
21 representatives.

22 We understand that the EQC mandate has been
23 recently renewed by the province. We look forward to
24 continuing and enhancing this effective means for dialogue
25 with northern representatives.

1 The third submission, CMD 05-H19.4 is from
2 the national level of the CEP Union. It identifies
3 several concerns of a general nature and not specific to
4 the Sue E licence amendment. COGEMA believes that the
5 existing licence framework and approved programs and
6 practices have led and will continue to lead both to high
7 levels of safety and environmental protection being
8 achieved and to the implementation of appropriate studies
9 without additional orders or licence conditions from the
10 Commission.

11 We appreciate that that national office of
12 the CEP Union has drawn their concerns to our attention
13 through this submission and would welcome the opportunity
14 to communicate information in response.

15 We also wish to ensure that we understand
16 the underlying basis so that further resolution could be
17 pursued if needed. We have written to the union. I have
18 attached a copy of our letter as Attachment A to this
19 submission, seeking to include the national office in
20 future discussions.

21 In conclusion, COGEMA Resources Inc.
22 requests an amendment to the CNSC operating licence for
23 McClellan Lake operation to allow mining of the Sue E open
24 pit and subsequent processing of the uranium ore at the
25 JEB Mill. Mining the Sue E orebody and processing the ore

1 represent a continuation of the type of activities already
2 approved at McLean Lake.

3 These activities have been successfully
4 carried out with high levels of protection for workers and
5 the environment. We believe this will continue to be the
6 case with the existing programs and practices as updated
7 for this requested approval of Sue E.

8 We would be pleased to answer any questions
9 which members of the Commission may have.

10 This concludes our presentation.

11 Thank you.

12 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

13 I understand that there is not a
14 supplementary CMD from staff, but the CNSC does have --
15 staff do have some comments to make via overheads.

16 Is that correct, Mr. Howden?

17 **MR. HOWDEN:** Barclay Howden speaking.

18 Yes, that is correct.

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Therefore, I will then
20 turn to Mr. Barclay Howden who is the Director General
21 responsible for this licence.

22 The floor is yours, sir.

23 **MR. HOWDEN:** Thank you.

24 Good morning, Madam Chair and members of
25 the Commission.

1 For the record, my name is Barclay Howden.
2 With me today are Mr. Kevin Scissons, Director of the
3 Uranium Mines and Lands Evaluation Division; Mr. Rick
4 Forbes, Project Officer for the McClean Lake Operation and
5 the rest of the CNSC's compliance and licensing team for
6 the project.

7 COGEMA has applied to amend the McLean Lake
8 Uranium Mine and Mill Operating Licence to allow them to
9 proceed with mining and milling of the Sue E orebody.
10 This presentation contains a brief update on staff's
11 recommendation for the amendment of the licence.

12 I will now ask Rick Forbes to present an
13 overview of the information and recommendations prepared
14 by CNSC staff for today.

15 Thank you.

16 **MR. FORBES:** Good morning, Madam Keen and
17 Commission members.

18 My name is Rick Forbes. I am the CNSC
19 Project Officer for the McClean Lake Operation.

20 This presentation will provide a brief
21 overview and update and we will restate our conclusions
22 and recommendations.

23 This slide summarizes the recent licensing
24 activities at McClean Lake. The licence was renewed in
25 2005 including permission to construct the JEB Mill

1 expansion that was required to be able to mill the Cigar
2 Lake ore in the future. The licence was effective May
3 19th, 2005.

4 The first amendment was for the Mine
5 Equipment Development Test Program. The designated
6 officer decision was issued as an amendment on June 10th,
7 2005.

8 The second amendment was for weather-
9 sensitive preparatory work for the proposed Sue E open-pit
10 mining. The Commission panel held a one-day public
11 hearing on July 13th, 2005. The reason for decision was
12 issued on July 21st, 2005.

13 We are, therefore, before the Commission
14 for the third amendment.

15 The requested activities in this
16 Application are open-pit mine the Sue E orebody, including
17 the mining and disposal of the clean waste and special
18 waste; the mining of the ore, the storage at the Sue E ore
19 pad and the re-handling to the JEB Mill for processing;
20 the associated services including the dewatering of the
21 proposed pit, water treatment; the maintenance and service
22 facilities at the Sue site.

23 There has been one scheduled Type 2
24 inspection and one unannounced Type 2 inspection since the
25 Day One Public Hearing. The inspections showed compliance

1 with no significant issues found in either inspection.
2 Work is progressing on the concrete foundations for the
3 JEB Mill expansion; the Sue A pit waste rock stripping and
4 dewatering of Sils Lake including a road access for
5 overburden stripping.

6 There were no radiation protection
7 regulatory or reportable administrative level exceedences
8 since the Day One Public Hearing. There were no
9 environmental regulatory or action level exceedences nor
10 any dangerous occurrences.

11 There was one lost time accident in the
12 mill from a slip and fall. For the remaining safety areas
13 there has been no change.

14 Based on CNSC staff's assessment in the CMD
15 05-H19, CNSC staff still conclude that the proposed
16 activities have already been included in the recently-
17 approved environmental assessment.

18 COGEMA is qualified to carry on the
19 activities including the requested activities that the
20 proposed amended licence will authorize.

21 COGEMA made and is expected to continue to
22 make adequate provision for the protection of the
23 environment, the health and safety of persons and COGEMA
24 made and is expected to continue to make adequate
25 provision for the maintenance of security and the

1 implementation of international obligations.

2 To conclude, CNSC staff recommends that the
3 Commission proceed with a course of action consistent with
4 paragraph 21(a) of the CEAA. That course of action would
5 be consideration by the Commission under the NSCA of the
6 Application by COGEMA to proceed with open-pit mining and
7 milling of the Sue E orebody; accept CNSC staff's
8 assessment that the Applicant is qualified to carry on the
9 activities that the amended licence will authorize and
10 will make adequate provision in carrying out those
11 activities for the protection of the environment, the
12 health and safety of persons and the maintenance of
13 national security and measures required to implement
14 international obligations to which Canada has agreed; and
15 amend the current Uranium Mine Operating Licence, UMOL
16 Mine Mill McClean 02 2009, to allow the mining and milling
17 of the Sue E orebody to proceed and to update the
18 Appendix B documents.

19 I would now like to turn it back to
20 Mr. Howden.

21 **MR. HOWDEN:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

22 That concludes our presentation and staff
23 is prepared to respond to questions.

24 Thank you.

25 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

1 The floor is open for questions.

2 Dr. McDill, would you like to start?

3 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

4 With respect, it wasn't presented today but
5 it is in the previous -- how is your schedule going for
6 the site preparatory work?

7 Are you going to have finished everything
8 by the end of quarter four and are you ready to go into
9 quarter one of 2006?

10 **MR. POLLOCK:** Bob Pollock, for the record.

11 I believe the short answer is "yes". I
12 would ask Jim to confirm and then, perhaps, elaborate a
13 little.

14 **MR. CORMAN:** Jim Corman, for the record.

15 Yes, we are on target with our schedule to
16 complete the overburden stripping and the preparatory work
17 by the end of this year and move our mining crews pending
18 approval by the Commission from the completion -- after
19 the completion of the Sue A mining into Sue E early next
20 year.

21 **MEMBER McDILL:** And the dewatering of Sils
22 Lake?

23 **MR. CORMAN:** The dewatering of Sils Lake is
24 complete.

25 We have removed the 100,000 cubic meters of

1 water, which we had anticipated required movement. That
2 has been transferred to the Sue C pit and then
3 correspondingly transferred to the water treatment plant
4 for processing.

5 **MEMBER McDILL:** Has it all been through the
6 treatment plant then?

7 **MR. CORMAN:** We are pumping from the Sue C
8 pit to the water treatment plant on an ongoing basis, so
9 the water that we have removed from Sils goes to the Sue C
10 pit and then forwarded along.

11 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

12 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. Barnes?

13 **MEMBER BARNES:** I just had one question on
14 Mr. Pollock's presentation on page 9, the first main
15 paragraph referred to his hope of:

16 "... continue to work with the two
17 unions that were specified above and
18 look forward to maintaining and
19 strengthening in the processes that
20 facilitate their active participation
21 in continuing to improve ..."

22 I guess health and safety --

23 "... our collective benefit."

24 So since we have the unions represented
25 here today, Madam Chair, I wondered if it would be

1 appropriate to ask the unions if they felt that the
2 existing processes were adequate and if they saw any
3 particular ways in which these could be substantially
4 strengthened, working with COGEMA.

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** I wonder, Dr. Barnes, if
6 what we could do is leave that until their ---

7 **MEMBER BARNES:** Yes, sure.

8 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** --- after their
9 presentation ---

10 **MEMBER BARNES:** Right.

11 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** --- and if you could just
12 reply to that question at that time and then we will go
13 back and forth on that.

14 **MEMBER BARNES:** Yes.

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Would you mind?

16 **MEMBER BARNES:** No, no.

17 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Okay, anything further?
18 Mr. Graham.

19 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Thank you.

20 As a follow-up to Dr. McDill's questions, I
21 take it then the dike is completed across Sils Lake, where
22 you are isolating part of Sils Lake for placing the
23 overburden; is that correct?

24 **MR. POLLOCK:** Bob Pollock, for the record.

25 The final design actually has us moving the

1 fill outwards from -- effectively from the shore, on a
2 moving face, out into the lake.

3 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** It is not a dike.

4 **MR. POLLOCK:** In the final design, the dike
5 was not actually required.

6 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** So you have started -- have
7 you started to move some of the overburden that was in the
8 preparatory work out into the lake?

9 **MR. POLLOCK:** Yes, we have.

10 Jim Corman can provide a brief update on --
11 that we are proceeding as per the approved design.

12 **MR. CORMAN:** Jim Corman, for the record.

13 As Bob has mentioned, the approved design
14 had us just moving the overburden radially away from the
15 pit crest, what would be the pit crest in Sils Lake.

16 We have started the placement. We have
17 built a ramp upwards, so that we are placing in a singular
18 15-meter high lift, displacing the sediments under the
19 lake so that we are getting good -- we are getting a roll
20 moving ahead of the placement of the till.

21 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** What is the composition of
22 the bottom of the lake? Is it quite -- is it quite muddy,
23 or is it nearer to rock?

24 **MR. CORMAN:** It is a combination.

25 It is a silty, loose organics on the

1 bottom, a very thin veneer of loose organics and silt at
2 the bottom of the lake and then into the till material.

3 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** I am pleased to hear -- I
4 was going to ask a question with regard to lost time
5 accidents, or reportable events, and CNSC's presentation
6 reported on that, that the only lost-time accident was at
7 the mill, not at the Sue E.

8 My two questions though that I -- other
9 questions I have is with regard: if this amendment is
10 approved, when do you expect to be at orebody, to reach
11 the orebody in Sue E?

12 At what time? Next year, or the following
13 year, or so on?

14 **MR. CORMAN:** The current plan has us
15 accessing the ore towards the end of 2006.

16 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** So all of the overburden,
17 all of the sub-base -- before you hit the ore, you expect
18 to have that all excavated before the end of 2006; is that
19 correct?

20 **MR. POLLOCK:** We will be down to the ore
21 horizon.

22 There is clearly some amount of waste rock
23 that is sort of external to the orebody as you continue to
24 go down. So we need to segregate materials as we go.

25 But we will be down to the ore horizon by

1 around the end of 2006.

2 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** My next question then is:
3 If you are at the ore horizon at the end of 2006, when do
4 you expect to bring ore -- two questions -- when do you
5 expect to bring ore to the surface to put on pad and,
6 secondly, when would you expect to start milling that ore?

7 **MR. CORMAN:** Jim Corman, for the record.

8 Once we access the ore in the pit, we will
9 bring it to surface and put it on our transfer pad and it
10 will be used almost immediately, as part of the blend for
11 the mill feed to the plant.

12 **MEMBER GRAHAM:** Approximate time you expect
13 to bring ore to surface?

14 **MR. CORMAN:** The end of 2006.

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Mr. Taylor?

16 **MEMBER TAYLOR:** I have no questions, thank
17 you, Madam Chair.

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. Dosman?

19 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, I wonder if I
20 might ask the Licensee: On what day did you start the
21 preparatory work?

22 **MR. CORMAN:** Jim Corman, for the record.

23 Some of the work started within a week of
24 receiving the approval from the Commission.

25 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** ... pending licence approval

1 and so on result in expansion of the workforce on site?

2 **MR. CORMAN:** The Sue E work will be a
3 continuation of the mining force that we currently have
4 that is working in our Sue A pit.

5 So we will essentially be moving that
6 complete crew and equipment into the mining of Sue E.

7 There will be a couple of additional
8 operator positions required for it.

9 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** So I take it that the
10 commencement of one will coincide with the completion of
11 the other, is that ...

12 **MR. POLLOCK:** Bob Pollock, for the record.

13 Yes, that is the plan that we will just
14 move smoothly from finishing the mining of Sue A to mining
15 of Sue E without an interruption in between.

16 I might point out that we actually had
17 interrupted the open-pit mining operations at McClean for
18 some time. We had quite a large stockpile of ore after
19 the mining of the original pit at the Sue area, the Sue C
20 pit.

21 So, although Sue E did not directly result
22 in an increase in the workforce, we increased by something
23 close to 70-75 people when we resumed the mining
24 operations earlier this year.

25 And we, obviously, wish to continue that

1 over the next two to three years.

2 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** And may I ask, Madam Chair,
3 does this phase, the taking off the surface rock and so
4 on, involve any health and safety risks that are different
5 from the previous operation?

6 And, if so, are there appropriate training
7 programs in place to mitigate such risks?

8 **MR. POLLOCK:** Bob Pollock, for the record.

9 I believe it is fair to say that the -- you
10 know, the potential hazards are -- or the hazards and the
11 potential risks are very similar. It is the same type of
12 open-pit mining.

13 We have also been able to hire back a
14 number of the people that were previously employed at
15 McClean Lake in open-pit mining, so that there is a fairly
16 good body of experience with the workforce.

17 We have also carried out training, both as
18 refresher for people and for new employees.

19 I believe Jim mentioned last time, for
20 example, that we actually brought a heavy equipment
21 simulator in, so that we could get the better level of
22 training for, you know, potential malfunctions of things
23 like large trucks.

24 You do not really want to do that type of
25 training live, so to speak. You want to use a simulator

1 to simulate various -- you know, actual failure of a motor
2 on a -- or the truck carrying a load up the grade, or
3 other types of things that could go wrong, so that you
4 have a better sense within the crew that they have
5 actually seen this, or been in a simulated situation to
6 improve their ability to deal with things that might not
7 happen very often, but could.

8 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** How do the workers respond
9 to this training, to the simulation and so on? Do they
10 have the patience to embrace this activity?

11 **MR. CORMAN:** Jim Corman, for the record.

12 Yes, the simulator training has been very
13 well received by the workforce. It is the first time that
14 we have used it at McClean Lake, or at any of our
15 operations and it is extremely well received.

16 And, certainly, the people doing the
17 training were very capable and they use this machine
18 throughout all kinds of mining applications. And they
19 were suitably impressed with the capabilities of some of
20 our operators as well.

21 So it was good to get kind of that feedback
22 from them, knowing that they have been exposed to
23 operators around the world and rated our operators very
24 high.

25 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** And just one last question.

1 That is, on the lost-time incident in the
2 mill, resulting in lost time on the part of the workers,
3 is there any lessons to be learned?

4 Is this an indication of any kind of
5 breakdown in the safety management at the plant -- and I
6 might ask CNSC staff.

7 **MR. FORBES:** Rick Forbes, for the record.

8 You do not want to see any lost-time
9 accidents at any point in time.

10 This one was a slip and fall on a wet area
11 and, even in our inspections, we do note that the
12 housekeeping is very good and we expect to see that not to
13 happen very often.

14 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** For the company: Was the
15 incident potentially preventable?

16 **MR. CORMAN:** Jim Corman, for the record.

17 All incidents we believe are preventable.
18 This incident was unfortunate. It was, as Mr. Forbes
19 mentioned, a bit of a follow-up to our housekeeping issues
20 that we were hosing down an area and cleaning an area up
21 which, correspondingly, made the floor a little slippery.

22 We have investigated it. We have looked at
23 boots that are being worn and precautions to be taken.

24 This lost-time accident is our first
25 incident on site at McClean in over two years, a record

1 that we are quite proud of. But, certainly, again as Mr.
2 Forbes mentioned, any lost-time accident is too many and
3 we strive for zero.

4 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you.

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

6 We would now like then to move to the
7 interventions.

8 A number of the intervenors have been with
9 us before and we welcome you back.

10 Just to mention that your more detailed
11 written submissions have been distributed in advance to
12 the Commission Members and have been read and will
13 certainly be duly considered for the decision and for the
14 reasons for decision.

15 So, in light of that, we have allotted
16 about ten minutes for each oral presentation and then we
17 will be opening the floor for questions after that time.

18 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** So, with that preamble, I
19 would like to move then to the first oral presentation by
20 the Canadian Nuclear Workers' Council and the
21 Communications, Energy, Paperworkers Union, Local 48S, as
22 outlined in CMD Document 05-H19.2, and we welcome the
23 President of the Canadian Nuclear Workers' Council, Mr.
24 David Shier with us.

25 Sir, welcome again, and the floor is yours.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

05-H10.2
Oral Presentation by
the Canadian Nuclear
Workers' Council and
the Communications,
Energy, Paperworkers
Union (CEP) Local 48S

MR. SHIER: Thank you and good morning,
Madam Chair and Members of the Commission.

As indicated, my name is David Shier. I am
the President of the Nuclear Worker Council. With me
today, I have two representatives from the local site
union at the COGEMA site.

On my right is Mr. David Pingert. David is
the local president of the local union and, on my left, is
Doug Nesbet. He is a local union official, the local
trustee, and he is also the CNWC rep for the mining group.

What I would like to do is maybe clarify
something here, up front, seeing there is another
intervenor from the union national office.

First of all, the local 49S (sic) is a
local union at the site at McClean Lake and it is also,
naturally, a member of the national union.

1 The Canadian Nuclear Worker Council, our
2 membership consists of -- it is basically a coalition of
3 local unions that are at the specific nuclear sites across
4 Canada.

5 In most cases, the national unions are not
6 members of our Council, it is the local unions, the worker
7 groups that are directly involved in the industry.

8 So our joint presentation here is -- we are
9 specifically looking at the -- and addressing the concerns
10 around the amendments to the operating licence to allow
11 the open-pit mining and milling of the Sue E orebody.

12 So ours are specific to that.

13 I am not going to go through our written
14 submission. I would just like to highlight a few things
15 there and then we would actually be willing to take
16 questions.

17 So at the outset, the Canadian Nuclear
18 Worker Council and the local 48S are in support of the
19 application to mine the Sue E orebody.

20 As our submission addresses safety issues
21 as such and both of the gentlemen here with me have been
22 long-time miners in the industry and a lot their
23 colleagues, a lot of experience in this type of industry
24 and they believe, from their experiences, that this --
25 there will be some new challenges -- but, from their

1 experiences, safety will definitely continue on.

2 Also, they believe that, from their
3 experiences, that the environmental needs are also being
4 met.

5 The other submission you will hear will be
6 a little more on the broad-based issue than ours will be.

7 Just following up on that, there is one
8 change -- it is always -- we put these submissions in and
9 then a month later we have some changes. So on the first
10 page, just to highlight one change that the local Joint
11 Health and Safety Committee, since our submission has gone
12 in, there has been some changes there.

13 There has been a bit of reorganization.
14 The local president is no longer on the Committee. We are
15 looking at -- they decided to restructure the Committee
16 and have a path forward to make the Committee more
17 effective and more productive in the future. And you may
18 hear more about that later on.

19 So overall, again, we reiterate that both
20 the Nuclear Council and the local union are in support of
21 the application.

22 Thank you.

23 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

24 I would like then to go back to Dr. Barnes
25 for his earlier question and we will start with

1 Dr. Barnes.

2 **MEMBER BARNES:** Well, I just repeat, on
3 page 9 of COGEMA's formal presentation they look forward
4 to, quote:

5 "Maintaining and strengthening the
6 processes that facilitate their active
7 participation in continuing to improve
8 ..."

9 I think it means Health and Safety:

10 "... to our collective benefit."

11 So I would appreciate knowing how the
12 unions, their feel about the present degree of cooperation
13 and whether you see opportunities to significantly
14 strengthen the present processes.

15 **MR. NESBET:** For the record, Doug Nesbet,
16 CE 48S.

17 What we are basically doing now is, we are
18 restructuring our Occupational Health and Safety
19 Committee. Our union executive has left the Occupational
20 Health and Safety Committee so it would be less political.
21 And we are promoting other members of the group -- and
22 some of the group that may not be -- in past have not been
23 maybe adequately represented.

24 We have received confirmation from the
25 Department of Labour that they will help us by giving some

1 training. And a real objective is to have a real good
2 working Occupational Health and Safety Committee that is
3 representing everyone and that we can look forward to
4 basically -- going forward, rather than working on past
5 experiences.

6 We basically believe that there is areas
7 that we can improve. And we are receiving confirmation
8 from our members that this is the direction and path they
9 want to go.

10 And that is how we plan to do it.

11 **MEMBER BARNES:** Could I ask you: Is this a
12 union Health and Safety committee, or is that the one that
13 we would see in the organizational chart for COGEMA?

14 **MR. NESBET:** Doug Nesbet, for the record.

15 We believe that we will -- at present, our
16 union executive is on the Occupational Health and Safety
17 Committee.

18 So I agree with you, there is some
19 confusion there, whether it is a union, or whether it is a
20 company Occupation Health and Safety Committee.

21 By removing the executive from the
22 Committee, it allows the executive to work and represent
23 the union and to have union members act as part of a
24 committee to look into some of the areas that we would
25 like further investigation.

1 **MEMBER BARNES:** Again, I am not quite sure
2 -- as part of a committee, part of a union committee, or
3 part of COGEMA's Health and Safety Committee?

4 **MR. NESBET:** Okay.

5 **MR. PINGERT:** Dave Pingert, for the record.
6 The Committee is made up -- the
7 Occupational Health and Safety Committee is made up of
8 equal amount of members of COGEMA management and union.

9 And it is a joint committee and the goal is
10 to move forward and strive for a safer working
11 environment, if that helps.

12 **MEMBER BARNES:** Yes, so it reports both,
13 back to the union and to the company?

14 **MR. PINGERT:** That is correct.

15 **MEMBER BARNES:** And how often would it
16 meet?

17 **MR. PINGERT:** I can meet ---

18 **MEMBER BARNES:** Or planning to meet?

19 **MR. PINKERT:** We meet -- the whole
20 Committee is made up of 12 members.

21 As you know, we have a seven-in, seven-out
22 flight rotation. So at all times, we try to maintain
23 three union and three management on site at all times.

24 Twice a year we meet as a joint committee
25 of all 12 and once a month, the three and three meet and

1 do the worksite inspections.

2 I guess our major goal is that we want to
3 -- we want to make our committee much more effective and
4 we feel that -- and myself felt that, you know, we have
5 some -- myself being an executive of the Union, and we
6 have some executive -- other executive members of the
7 Union on the Committee, and some of the senior management,
8 that it was our feeling that sometimes the Committee was
9 stumbling because of politics between the two, and we
10 thought if we could get together and remove that from the
11 Committee, we could put together a more functional
12 committee, with less political in-fighting, because the
13 main goal is safety, safety, safety.

14 **MEMBER BARNES:** Thank you.

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Further questions, Doctor
16 Dosman.

17 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, I wonder if it
18 would be possible to ask Saskatchewan Labour, who I
19 understand the representatives are standing by in CNSC
20 office in Saskatoon, for their views on the way that the
21 Occupational Safety and Health Committee is evolving.

22 **MR. BECKER:** Go on?

23 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Yes, please.

24 Dr. Dosman, repeat the question, please.

25 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, I'd like to

1 invite the representatives of Saskatchewan Labour standing
2 by at CNSC office in Saskatoon, for their view on the
3 manner in which the Occupational Safety and Health
4 Committee onsite is evolving.

5 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Yes, Mr. Becker.

6 **MR. BECKER:** Ernie Becker speaking.

7 Yes, we are -- have been monitoring the
8 Occupational Health Committee. We have been in there
9 training the Committee's -- our Chief Inspector of Mines
10 was -- spent some time this summer training all the
11 frontline supervision in their duties.

12 The Committee, as it stands, is meeting all
13 the legislated requirements, but the legislated
14 requirements provide only the minimum standard and
15 cooperation, and frank and open discussion is something
16 that is very difficult to legislate.

17 In my opinion, it has been -- the Committee
18 has been functioning at a -- give them maybe a 'C+' but,
19 of course, we want to see them operating at an 'A+', and
20 we have been in discussion with the Union and with COGEMA
21 Management, and we are going to take further steps to
22 improve the level of cooperation.

23 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you.

24 Madam Chair, would it be appropriate to
25 invite COGEMA and CNSC staff to comment on the issue?

1 If so, I'd appreciate such comment to
2 COGEMA and CNSC staff.

3 **MR. POLLOCK:** Bob Pollock, for the record.

4 Certainly, we're pleased to see any
5 initiative that should strengthen the operation of the
6 Joint Management Worker Occupational Health Committee.

7 I make it clear that the *Occupational*
8 *Health and Safety Act* in the province does not prescribe
9 whether or not Union executives should or should not be on
10 the Occupational Health Committee. That's obviously a
11 decision for the workforce to make as to how they wish to
12 select their representation.

13 From our point of view, we need to be able
14 to work and go forward with however the workforce wishes
15 to organize it.

16 Certainly, we will be taking a look. Our
17 management representatives have in many cases been on this
18 Committee for quite some period of time. So we think that
19 probably some turnover on the management side would also
20 be productive. So we will be looking at that.

21 We welcome -- I think the word "training"
22 was mentioned in terms of training people to ensure that
23 they are fully cognizant of the responsibilities and the
24 roles of the OHC and the people on it.

25 Certainly, I concur fully with that, and we

1 look forward to a forum where everyone has a common
2 purpose and common focus on safety. And there is,
3 obviously, from time to time, industrial relations issues,
4 which do need to be settled and where, in fact, it is
5 probably fair to say that the Union and the company may
6 not have a common view, at least not initially, of the
7 issues and that is also a natural circumstance in the
8 workplace.

9 So I think it's -- to us it provides a good
10 opportunity to have a forum where we can deal with the
11 industrial relations issues as industrial relations issues
12 and where we can have a common focus on safety where, I
13 guess I've used the phrase, everybody is trying to row the
14 boat in the same direction.

15 Certainly, we believe that the training
16 programs and development programs that come from Sask
17 Labour in terms of developing people in that role, both
18 Union -- or both workforce, workers and the management
19 reps, will help us get that launched.

20 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you.

21 I'm just wondering, Madam Chair, if I might
22 hear from CNSC staff on this issue.

23 **MR. FORBES:** Rick Forbes, for the record.

24 First, I'd like to make note that the OHC
25 is a requirement from Sask Labour.

1 However, we certainly encourage it. We
2 encourage an increased cooperation and communication
3 between the Union and management. We, as inspectors and
4 project officers, use a representative from OHC on our
5 inspections, so we get feedback from the workers.

6 I would also like to point out on our
7 inspections we do check out the five-point safety cards,
8 which the workers turn in daily, safety huddle minutes and
9 the OHC minutes, to see if there are any issues and that
10 the issues are being timely addressed and we were
11 satisfied that they were.

12 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Sir, may I ask, in your
13 view is the -- are the steps that are being taken, in your
14 view, will they contribute to optimal health and safety
15 management at the site?

16 **MR. FORBES:** Rick Forbes, for the record.

17 I certainly do and I certainly encourage
18 it. It will improve things.

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Any further questions?

20 Well thank you very much for joining us.
21 We do appreciate your contributions and your coming all
22 this way.

23 Our next presentations and oral submission
24 by the Northern Saskatchewan Environmental Quality
25 Committee, outlined in CMD document 05-H19.3.

1 We are very pleased that you have decided
2 to join us here in Ottawa and we welcome Mr. MacDonald to
3 represent the Committee, and, sir, the floor is yours.

4
5 **05-H19.3**

6 **Oral presentation by the**
7 **Northern Saskatchewan**
8 **Environmental Quality**
9 **Committee**

10
11 **MR. McDONALD:** Good morning, President Keen
12 and Members of the Commission.

13 My name is Felix McDonald. I'm from Fond
14 du Lac, Northern Saskatchewan.

15 My task here today is to bring to this
16 hearing a perspective of Northern Saskatchewan
17 Environmental Quality Committee on Licensing of the Sue E
18 pit on McClean Lake mining facility.

19 We would like to begin by acknowledging the
20 work of the Commission in its approval of the
21 environmental assessment for this project.

22 I indicated in our intervention for the one
23 day hearing, we are comfortable with environmental
24 implications of the proposed development.

25 From our August 10th visit to the McClean

1 Lake facility, we observed that the site continues to be
2 well operated. Safety procedures developed from the
3 original mining at the Sue E site are once again being
4 utilised in the mining operation at the Sue A pit. This
5 has been proven to be a successful procedure and it would
6 only make sense that this system would be used again.

7 While there is a great deal of activity
8 currently going on at the McClean Lake site, it would
9 appear to be well-managed from the perspective of defined
10 areas of responsibilities and good communication among the
11 various projects.

12 We have also observed that several of the
13 Northerners who originally mined the Sue C orebody have
14 returned to McClean Lake to continue with the next phase
15 of the open-pit mining.

16 To us, this would further indicate that the
17 operation is well-managed and respected in -- employees.

18 While this may not be a topic of the
19 hearing, it is certainly a measure of success for us. You
20 may also want to consider it as an indicator of good
21 management. Few people, will -- are willing to return to
22 a site that is not considered to be a healthy work
23 environment.

24 At the 2005 hearing for the operating
25 licence of the McClean Lake facility, it was noted that

1 there were some questions raised by the Commission
2 regarding the Radiation Protection Program. At the
3 hearing, COGEMA identified the various programs that it
4 implements. We are very aware that this is an ongoing
5 challenge for COGEMA to ensure that all employees are
6 properly trained, and it is also a challenge for the
7 employees to be sure they remain correct in all the
8 procedures.

9 Some of us are Atomic Energy Workers and we
10 know how difficult it can be to get excited about one more
11 radiation protection training opportunity. Once again, we
12 thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission.
13 We recommend the amendment of the McClean Lake licence to
14 include the mining and milling of the Sue E orebody.

15 Thank you.

16 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, Mr. McDonald
17 for your presentation and for coming all this way today as
18 well.

19 Are there questions from the Commission
20 Members? Dr. Dosman.

21 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Madam Chair, I wonder if I
22 might ask Mr. McDonald: In your view, how is the company
23 doing on the number of Northern people that are employed
24 at the site?

25 Am I allowed to ask that kind of question,

1 Madam Chair?

2 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** You can ask it; it's
3 whether it has any pertinence to the licence and may not
4 be reflected in the reasons for decision.

5 But it's an appropriate question.

6 **MR. McDONALD:** Ongoing for the licence --
7 not the licence -- the more ---

8 **(SHORT PAUSE)**

9 **MR. McDONALD:** For the record, the more the
10 mining increases, we have more people -- workforce from
11 our communities which is good for the North and plus the
12 environment is being well-managed. So that's my position.

13 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** May I ask Mr. Pollock to
14 comment on the number of Northerners employed at the mine?

15 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Again, this will not be
16 part of the reason for decision because it is not the
17 clear mandate of the Commission.

18 **MR. POLLOCK:** For the record, Bob Pollock.

19 Certainly, when we resume the mining
20 operations, this provides opportunities to bring both back
21 and to add where we don't have returning people, in terms
22 of areas like equipment operation. The workforce is very
23 heavily Northern.

24 We also have areas such as mill operations
25 where the workforce is basically drawn from the North and

1 trained on the job.

2 One of the issues that not just our company
3 but, I would say, generally the uranium mining industry
4 faces, together with other stakeholders, is how to develop
5 more Northerners into some of the skilled trade jobs, for
6 example, welders or electricians.

7 We still have not a high participation rate
8 in areas like skilled trades or engineering, things like
9 that; probably a reflection that it's only in recent years
10 that the school system in the North is starting to catch
11 up to the types of opportunities that have been available
12 for a long time in the school systems in the South.

13 Certainly a broad issue for the effect of
14 the Government of Saskatchewan so that we are, by no
15 means, the only sector that faced the challenge of how to
16 provide a broader range of opportunities for
17 Saskatchewan's Aboriginal population and the workforce at
18 large. It is a major challenge over the next few years.

19 But maybe, to answer your actual question,
20 I believe our last statistics were -- if we looked at the
21 people that are COGEMA workers plus long-term contractors,
22 I believe the precise number was 57 per cent out of
23 approximately 300.

24 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you very much.

25 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Dr. McDill.

1 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

2 The intervenor mentioned the excitement of
3 yet another radiation protection training opportunity.
4 Perhaps I could ask, roughly, how often there's a
5 formalized training and perhaps where informal training
6 comes and perhaps I'll ask COGEMA and then, perhaps, the
7 Unions could respond afterward.

8 **MR. POLLOCK:** Bob Pollock, for the record.

9 I will ask Dale Hoffman to provide a
10 response to that.

11 **MR. HOFFMAN:** Dale Hoffman, for the record.

12 As far as formalized training, there is an
13 initial indoctrination radiation protection training that
14 happens once people arrive on site before they go to work
15 and, as a follow-up to that, there is what we call an
16 "Advanced Radiation Protection Training" that occurs
17 usually within three months of their starting, once they
18 have some context to build on.

19 And we hold refresher training on that
20 advanced training approximately every three years for the
21 workforce.

22 Now, I do appreciate Mr. McDonald's comment
23 about his enthusiasm for yet another Radiation Protection
24 Training Course. And something that we have been doing or
25 a couple of things that we have been doing that relate to

1 that are trying to engage people on an individual basis
2 and one vehicle for that has been some dose reduction
3 studies that we have been carrying out throughout the mill
4 where we go -- the Radiation Protection staff work
5 directly with operators to look at the activities that
6 they do, sort of quantify where they are getting their
7 dose from in activities and look at ways to reduce their
8 dose in their job. So that has been quite successful.

9 Another way is with the expansion of our
10 mill, we have been doing -- we've had information sessions
11 with all employees to take a look at the design of the
12 mill and walk them through the various radiation
13 protection features that we have incorporated into the
14 design and, in addition to that, get their feedback on --
15 especially from the Operations personnel -- get their
16 feedback on where they will be spending -- how they will
17 be operating these circuits and spending their time, so we
18 can consider that.

19 So two examples of trying to engage people
20 directly and in a much more informal manner.

21 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

22 And the Unions?

23 **MR. PINGERT:** Dave Pingert for the record.

24 I am glad he answered that first because I
25 came up with the same thing that was, once you arrive on

1 site, they have the initial training; then they have the
2 advanced training after about three months, and it seems
3 that about every -- through the years, they do a re-
4 advanced radiation training program and then the Union
5 also, at our meetings and when we are out on the job site,
6 we are constantly preaching to each other and to the
7 operators about cleanliness; especially the mechanics and
8 stuff because we are the ones that open up the pumps and
9 stuff.

10 So, you know, keep the area wet, wash it
11 down, you know, keep that stuff flushed away.

12 So I think that part is pretty good.

13 **MEMBER McDILL:** One more question for the
14 Northern workers and other workers who have returned after
15 being away, are they retrained or just depending on how
16 long they have been gone?

17 **MR. CORMAN:** Jim Corman, for the record.

18 Any worker that returns to work after an
19 absence in excess of -- I believe it's a year, Dale --
20 goes through the complete package again as being
21 considered as a new employee on site.

22 **MEMBER McDILL:** Thank you.

23 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

24 Yes, Dr. Dosman.

25 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Mention was made of a five-

1 point safety card.

2 Would someone be willing to just describe
3 what that card is and how it works?

4 **MR. POLLOCK:** Bob Pollock, for the record.

5 It's a well-established type of system for
6 identifying and responding to potential hazards in the
7 workplace. I believe it actually originates out of the
8 Ontario Mining Industry, but I will ask Dale to provide --
9 Dale Hoffman to provide a bit more detail in terms what
10 the card actually calls for.

11 **MR. HOFFMAN:** Dale Hoffman, for the record.

12 Certainly, as Bob mentioned it's been a
13 well-established method in the mining industry since the
14 '40s to have sort of five quick points that look at --
15 that ask you to look at the conditions of your workplace
16 and the activities that you are conducting in the
17 workplace to identify hazards on the job now.

18 We formalized this system by having five-
19 point safety cards, which are actually a little form that
20 each employee fills out each day that they are on the job,
21 where they take a look at the conditions in their
22 workplace and are they working properly and do they have
23 the resources that they need to conduct the job.

24 And, also, to identify whether they have
25 safety concerns that they can flag on these cards. These

1 cards are collected, reviewed by supervision on a daily
2 basis and it's a key component to our safety system
3 onsite.

4 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Is the cooperation from the
5 workers quite good on the use of these cards?

6 **MR. HOFFMAN:** Dale Hoffman, for the
7 record.

8 The cooperation is very good. We actually
9 keep stats on how many of these cards are expected versus
10 what gets returned and also on "Have the supervisors
11 reviewed these cards and done their part?" and we have
12 compliance ratings in the high 90 per cent level for this
13 program.

14 We also require that our contractors on-
15 site adhere to this system as well.

16 So in answer to your question, yes, we have
17 very good compliance.

18 **MEMBER DOSMAN:** Thank you very much.

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Would the Union
20 representatives like to comment on this?

21 **MR. PINGERT:** Dave Pingert, for the record.

22 Yeah, the five-point safety card, as you
23 know -- change to anybody is, you know, creating more
24 paperwork and stuff.

25 I think the Union did a lot of push also to

1 the Members. I know I had lots of Members come to me
2 complaining that how useless these cards were.

3 They are not useless; they are a good tool
4 and what I -- I think the reason to get most of the
5 Members to fill them out was I said: "You've got two
6 things on that card that are really good. Number one, is
7 an act of safety to make you think of doing something safe
8 that day; and the other one is, when you've got a safety
9 concern and you write it down, it is documented." And I
10 said: "That's paramount".

11 And I think it is a good system. It is a
12 little more time consuming, but it is really good.

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you very much.

14 To go back to the intervenor, I would like
15 to congratulate the Committee on its renewed mandate from
16 the Province of Saskatchewan.

17 I think this is reflective of not only the
18 good work that you have done, you and your colleagues,
19 Mr. MacDonald, but also the fact that we think the
20 industry looks like it is going to expand even further.

21 It is certainly growing and so I think it's
22 a reflection that the Province really does know the
23 valuable work and we are certainly very appreciative of
24 not only the ongoing work that you have done that we don't
25 always see -- you know, we don't always see that -- but

1 the Commission, the presentations that you have done
2 before us here but also when we were in Saskatchewan last
3 year. So we are deeply appreciative of that ongoing
4 contribution that you make.

5 I would also like to comment that,
6 actually, the returning of employees actually is a
7 measure, I think, of health and safety because these are
8 trained workers.

9 And so I think that people that have been
10 trained in health and safety do know their job and do know
11 the environment around there is, actually, I would submit,
12 an important contribution to health and safety as well.

13 So not so much the employment, but I think
14 it is important you brought that to our attention and the
15 questions around that because it is -- people that are
16 coming back who are trained and, as you said, have made a
17 decision to return to that work site and they wouldn't do
18 that if they didn't feel it is a good job to have.

19 So, thank you for pointing that out to us.

20 Other questions for this intervenor?

21 I would like then to move to the next
22 presentation, which is an oral presentation by the
23 Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada,
24 CMD 05-H19.4 and I understand Mr. Manning is with us in
25 the Saskatchewan Offices.

1 Mr. Manning, the floor is yours, sir.

2 Thank you for joining us.

3 **O5-H19.4**

4 **Oral presentation by**

5 **Communications, Energy and**

6 **Paperworkers Union of Canada**

7

8 **MR. MANNING:** Thank you for having me.

9 For the record, my name is Walter Manning. I am a
10 national representative with the Communications, Energy
11 and Paperworkers Union, which represents about 150,000
12 members from one end of Canada to the other and our
13 National Office is situated in Ottawa.

14 I am not going to go through my whole
15 presentation here, my submission. As you can see, we have
16 been calling up on the CNSC to place some conditions on
17 the licence, and I want to say for the record that in
18 recent discussions with Management of COGEMA, we have
19 mapped out or come up with a plan, if you will, as to how
20 to go forward on some of the issues and concerns that we
21 had.

22 However, I don't want to leave here today
23 without drawing your attention to the Medical Monitoring
24 Program, which is mentioned in this submission.

25 For the record, I am going to go read

1 through it. The Workplace Medical Monitoring Program is
2 something that the National Union believes in and have
3 talked about it in other workplaces and, in particular, in
4 places where the mining and producing of hazard materials
5 such as uranium and the long-term effects that that would
6 have on workers long after they have, you know, worked
7 there for years and gone into retirement and so on.

8 "So medical monitoring includes any
9 program to survey the physical or
10 mental health of workers..."

11 and I am just going to briefly touch on it.

12 "Medical monitoring examinations and
13 procedures are by their nature
14 intrusive and evasive of workers'
15 privacy. Honesty and trust are the
16 crucial underpinnings of a Workplace
17 Medical Monitoring Program. Workplace
18 Medical Monitoring Programs must be
19 established for the benefit of workers
20 to gather information that will
21 eventually aid in the prevention and
22 elimination of occupational illnesses,
23 injuries and fatalities. The primary
24 stakeholder is the worker. All of the
25 stakeholders and professionals

1 involved in programs must never forget
2 that workers bear the burden of
3 exposure and the risk to health that
4 accompanies that exposure. Should
5 they err in their endeavours, it
6 should always be on the side of the
7 worker. Worker participation must be
8 voluntary and to be relevant and
9 respectful of the rights of workers, a
10 Workplace Medical Monitoring Program
11 must include the following conditions:

- 12 • The employer has shown a prior
13 commitment to prevention through
14 the removal of control of the
15 workplace hazards at the source.
- 16 • The employer has first
17 implemented a comprehensive
18 program to characterize and
19 improve the workplace environment
20 including occupation hygiene,
21 monitoring and ergonomic hazard
22 analyses.
- 23 • The exact list of examinations or
24 procedures is agreed to, their
25 purpose, sensitivity, accuracy,

1 validity and relevance to
2 potential occupational diseases
3 is established and their
4 harmlessness to workers' health
5 is proven.

- 6 • Individual informed and non-
7 coerced consent.
- 8 • Provisions are made for job and
9 income security and related
10 protections for workers who have
11 participated in the program,
12 regardless of the results of
13 their medical examinations and/or
14 tests.
- 15 • If medical removal is a
16 possibility, all procedures for
17 handling such a situation must be
18 agreed to in advance.

19 The Workplace Medical Monitoring
20 Program must be developed, implemented
21 and maintained jointly by the employer
22 and the Union; provide for the
23 independence of doctors and other
24 professionals; disclose medical
25 findings first to the worker and allow

1 the worker request re-testing for
2 verification; allow workers to access
3 their own files at any time; provide
4 for the strict confidentiality of the
5 information and ..."

6 and I won't go on here.

7 But I think the main theme of what we are
8 trying to say here today is that we want joint
9 participation and full -- and meaningful participation and
10 you heard some mention about the OHC Committee earlier
11 from others and the OHC Committee -- I am glad that Bob
12 Pollock said that there was some management people there
13 as well that would be changed out because, for a minute
14 there, it sounded like it was just the union people that
15 needed to be changed out.

16 We agree that we need to restructure that
17 Committee so that there is more meaningful input from the
18 union, as far as I am concerned.

19 And, as I said, we have come to an
20 agreement that we are going to work on that.

21 So, in conclusion, full worker
22 participation in all of these decisions is essential. We
23 are not prepared to surrender decisions about our future
24 to others, but demand to be included in the decision-
25 making process.

1 If we truly believe that we must build a
2 sustainable economy, we have to integrate our
3 understanding of workplace issues with broader
4 environmental, economic and social issues.

5 We must meet today's needs without
6 compromising tomorrow. This is the challenge we face.
7 This is the opportunity before us.

8 And I want to say that we support the
9 application for the licence, but that does not mean that
10 we support that without raising the concern about the
11 health and safety of the workers.

12 Thank you.

13 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you.

14 Would the Licensee like to comment with
15 regard to this specific issue of monitoring of workers?

16 **MR. POLLOCK:** Bob Pollock, for the record.

17 Yes, probably from two perspectives.

18 One is that I think it is important to
19 recognize that there is actually two types of monitoring
20 that can be contemplated or carried out.

21 One has to do with, essentially, monitoring
22 that looks at what in effect is peoples' fitness for work,
23 which clearly is an ongoing thing. We are all interested
24 in people not only being fit to do the job that they are
25 hired to do, but to maintain that through wellness

1 programs and, where appropriate, through ensuring that
2 there is no deterioration in health.

3 For example, something like a hearing test
4 if people work in environments that are noisy, to ensure
5 that the hearing protection program is adequate.

6 So that is one part.

7 I think that it is -- you know, I looked
8 through or listened to Mr. Manning. I have read through
9 the submission and much of what he says I do not think we
10 have any dispute with.

11 There is certainly areas where we need to
12 exchange viewpoints, exchange perspectives and find a way
13 forward.

14 I would welcome the opportunity to do that
15 through an avenue which I guess I would describe as a
16 cooperative approach to problem-solving as necessarily
17 something that -- it is not clear to me that raising that
18 through the collective bargaining process, for example, is
19 the most productive way to move an issue like that
20 forward.

21 I think we would like to take a look at it
22 from what we would call a "cooperative problem-solving
23 perspective."

24 I think there is much in common all around
25 the table and perhaps only a limited number of things that

1 we need to find a way forward that is mutually acceptable.

2 The other type of medical monitoring or
3 collecting of medical information -- it is not so much
4 monitoring as it is collecting information -- is, if one
5 is doing an epidemiology study where one is looking for
6 some type of -- whether or not there has been some type of
7 health effect and whether it has an association with some
8 type of substance present in the workplace, radiation dose
9 or exposure to some potentially hazardous substance.

10 In those studies, one will generally need
11 to collect quite a lot of information to assess whether or
12 not various other factors, so-called "confounding
13 factors," are present and if they are relevant.

14 Those studies are -- in the first place
15 they are subject to being developed by all of the
16 stakeholders who wish to be involved and that certainly
17 extends to both, workers and companies, as well as
18 professional experts in the field.

19 At the end of the day, these studies are
20 also subject to review by -- essentially, by an ethics
21 committee which looks at the ethics of the proposal.

22 And the focus, I would say right from the
23 beginning, is on voluntary participation. If people do
24 not wish to participate, then that is their prerogative.

25 So I think it is important to differentiate

1 between these two sort of broad areas. The considerations
2 are slightly different going forward in one versus the
3 other.

4 Certainly, from our company's perspective,
5 we welcome the viewpoint and perspective from all
6 directions.

7 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Would the CNSC staff like
8 to comment?

9 **MR. HOWDEN:** Barclay Howden speaking, for
10 the record.

11 We have reviewed the submission, as well as
12 what the intervenor said today and what we see is, in the
13 area of medical information, what we see it applies in our
14 area is more dose information which is collected and then
15 maintained at the National Dose Registry and one of the
16 concerns here is privacy -- well, the *Privacy Act* covers
17 that information -- but that is really the only
18 information that we get involved with, with the workers.

19 In terms of fitness for service, our focus
20 has been on trained and qualified workers. Sask Labour
21 may have some comments on fitness for service and I would
22 recommend you go to them for comment.

23 The last thing was on the epidemiology
24 studies that had been raised, a feasibility study was done
25 last year and the decision regarding it was presented to

1 the Commission last year and that was to do with a
2 potential study on modern miners and the decision was not
3 to go forward.

4 The work on the historic miners is
5 continuing with a report expected later this year. And we
6 have made a commitment to the Commission to come back to
7 you, to brief you on that.

8 So that is all I can say on the
9 intervention at the moment.

10 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Yes, I am aware and I
11 just wanted to point that out to Mr. Manning that there
12 will be a presentation to the Commission -- I think at the
13 next session -- on this and I will ask the staff to
14 undertake to ensure that you receive copies of that
15 submission.

16 If you wish to tap in via the web link as
17 well, that is probably very possible as well to view it,
18 or to hear it.

19 I would like to go to Mr. Becker from
20 Saskatchewan Labour, if you are there, sir, in terms of
21 your comments on this particular matter.

22 **MR. BECKER:** Ernie Becker, Saskatchewan
23 Labour.

24 I am sorry, but you have been breaking up
25 and I am not quite sure all of what was said.

1 I can tell you that, in 2003, we revised
2 the Mines Regulations and that was a tripartite committee
3 involving the companies, the unions and the government.

4 At that time, the union spoke out strongly
5 against medical monitoring. We had provisions in the
6 Mines Regulations before that, but the unions wanted it
7 removed and it was removed at that time.

8 So right now, our regulations have minimal
9 requirements for medical monitoring.

10 I said before this was done primarily at
11 the request of the unions but, of course, our legal people
12 raised all sorts of privacy issues as well.

13 So between the legal people advising on
14 privacy issues and the unions' request, we removed those
15 requirements.

16 On the matter of the epidemiology, I think,
17 if I understood you correctly, you are going to have that
18 discussion later on.

19 But I will say that there was a group
20 consisting again of the companies and the unions and the
21 province and the CNSC and we reviewed the feasibility of
22 an epidemiology study and the unanimous recommendation
23 from that group was that it was not feasible.

24 I also have talked to Walter Manning and we
25 have agreed that we will meet -- and I will also meet with

1 his Health and Safety representative from Ottawa -- and we
2 will discuss both, the medical monitoring and epidemiology
3 and anything else that the union wishes to discuss.

4 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you, sir.

5 I think you really did get the gist of it,
6 so that was very appropriate.

7 Are there other questions or comments from
8 the Commission Members with regards to this intervention?

9 Thank you very much.

10 **MR. LEBLANC:** This completes the record for
11 the public hearing on the matter of the application by
12 COGEMA Resources Inc. for an amendment to the McClean Lake
13 Operation Uranium Mine and Mill Operating Licence to allow
14 open-pit mining and milling of the Sue E orebody.

15 The Commission will deliberate and will
16 publish its decision in due course. It will be posted on
17 the CNSC website and will be distributed to participants.

18 Merci.

19 **THE CHAIRPERSON:** Thank you all very much
20 for attending today.

21 Thank you.

22

23 --- Upon adjourning at 12:20 p.m.

24