



Public Service Staff
Relations Act

Before the Public Service
Staff Relations Board

BETWEEN

CLAUDE SAINT-AMOUR

Grievor

and

**TREASURY BOARD
(Fisheries and Oceans)**

Employer

Before: P. Chodos, Deputy Chairperson

For the Grievor: Derek Dagger, Public Service Alliance of Canada

For the Employer: Harvey Newman, Counsel

Heard at Victoria, British Columbia,
September 30 and October 1, 1997.

DECISION

The grievor is employed as a Marine Controller at the Rescue Coordination Centre in Esquimalt, British Columbia. He has grieved the imposition of a three-day disciplinary suspension, subsequently reduced by the employer to two days, as a result of an incident which occurred on June 27, 1995. Mr. Saint-Amour had also grieved the denial of union representation; however, during the course of this hearing, the grievor's representative advised that Mr. Saint-Amour was not pursuing that matter.

The Rescue Coordination Centre (RCC) is part of the Canadian Coast Guard function, and is responsible for coordinating marine search and rescue activities along the west coast. The Centre operates on a seven-days-a-week, twenty-four-hours-a-day basis and is staffed at all times by two Marine Controllers, as well as a Military Officer. On the evening of June 26, 1995, Mr. John Riddle, who was designated as the Senior Controller, was on shift, as was Mr. Saint-Amour. While on duty, Mr. Saint-Amour received a call from a police dispatcher in Vancouver. All calls are taped, and a transcript was made of this call, the relevant portions of which read as follows (Exhibit E-6):

0529Z 27 JUN 95

P: *"A caller said that he had originally called in advising that there was, uhh, a boat that seemed to be in trouble, uhh, by the first concession stand by English Bay, if you were looking at it that way. And by this time the fellow is...there is a boat out there looking...Coast Guard out there."*

SA: *"Well, Miss, we had something off, umm, ahh, ahh, Stanley Park."*

P: *"OK, well maybe it's the same thing."*

SA: *"That was quite a while ago."*

P: *"Well, this guy is still calling from Locarno, Locarno Beach, so he still sees the boat out there as well as the Coast Guard. Uhh, he says that this boat is now, uhh, by the western most, uhh, concession stand. It's tied up to a mile post in the water. I guess he's got the tide charts just uh, he's managed, uhh...to tie...to tie the boat up to a mile post."*

("P" refers to Police; "SA" refers to Saint-Amour)

According to the grievor, he examined the relevant charts to determine the location of the mile post, and checked the weather for the area; he then inquired of Mr. Riddle if Mr. Riddle was aware of anything going on at that location. Mr. Saint-Amour contacted the Vancouver Rescue Centre to determine whether a rescue craft based at Kitsilano in Vancouver had been sent out to the area (i.e. English Bay). At approximately the same time, Mr. Riddle contacted the Kitsilano Base. This conversation was also transcribed and the transcription was submitted in evidence as Exhibit E-8. The following is a record of that conversation:

0532Z 27 JUN 95

KB: *"Good Evening, Kits Base."*

JR: *"Ya, it's Jack at Rescue."*

KB: *"Right."*

JR: *"Are you guys back at base?"*

KB: *"Yup."*

JR: *"Were you looking for a boat out there?
Vancouver City Police said something about, uhh, the
boat that you're looking for is tied up to a mile post at,
uhh, in English Bay."*

KB: *"... a mile post?"*

JR: *"Locarno Beach...we didn't know anything about it, so I
thought I'd call phone and find out what...you didn't
know anything about it either?"*

KB: *"No. No, we weren't out looking for a boat."*

JR: *"No, no, I didn't think so."*

KB: *"But, uhh..."*

JR: *"But I'd thought well, I'd just check, in case, uhh,
nothing else is happening that we hadn't heard
about?"*

KB: *"So apparently she's tied, tied up to a mile post
somewhere?"*

JR: *"Ya, Locarno Beach or wherever it is."*

KB: *"Hmmm, interesting. Here, I'll let you talk to Kelly, just a sec here."*

JR: *"OK."*

JR: *"Kelly, it's Jack."*

KY: *"Hi Jack."*

JR: *"How are you doing?"*

KY: *"Pretty good, thanks."*

JR: *"Good. No, uhh, City Police called up and said something about somebody's calling from shore saying that the boat you're looking for is tied up to a mile post at Locarno Beach there and uhh..."*

KY: *"Lacana Beach?"*

JR: *"Ya, and I thought well, I don't know..."*

KY: *"Oh, Locarno."*

JR: *"Ya, Locarno, yes."*

KY: *"OK."*

JR: *"And I said I don't know anything about that but..."*

KY: *"Neither do I...where [sic] we supposed to be out on a call?"*

JR: *"Not that I know of. Not that I know of. So anyway, I thought I'd just, you know, check with you to see, make sure that uhh, ya know, we're on the same wave length and so on."*

KY: *"Sounds like they...they, they saw a boat tied and made the assumption that uhh...looking for them."*

JR: *"Ya...whatever, I don't know. Nothing to worry about, I just wanted to make sure you guys weren't out or City Police hadn't called you out or something and we hadn't had [sic] heard, ya know..."*

KY: *"OK Jack."*

JR: *"No problem guy."*

KY: *"Good. Fair enough."*

JR: *"Take care."*

KY: "Thanks."

JR: "Bye."

***NOTE** KB indicates Kits Base, JR indicates Officer Jack Riddle and KY indicates Kelly at Kits Base is speaking.*

Apparently nothing further was done in response to the police dispatcher's call, and no reference was made to that call in the RCC official log book (Exhibit E-3). According to Mr. Riddle, the controllers were aware that the mile post in question was a short distance from shore, in very shallow water, and, at the time in question, that is early evening, it was low tide and, therefore, the water would be approximately two feet deep. Mr. Riddle testified that it was his conclusion that the operator of the boat could easily, and without any danger, walk to shore from the mile post. Mr. Riddle, who had worked at the Centre for 12 years, and before that was an RCMP Sergeant in charge of the Marine Division, observed that, while it is contrary to the *Canada Shipping Act*, it is not unusual for boaters to tie up at mile posts. Mr. Saint-Amour testified that in his judgement, this did not constitute a distress situation and consequently, he concluded that no further action needed to be taken.

Approximately two hours later, a call came in to the Centre from a person named Neil, from Sewell's Marina, a commercial rental operation. This person reported that a man by the name of Jeff Kingsmith had rented a 15-foot boat, which was overdue. It was believed that the boat had been heading in the direction of Howe Sound. In response to this report, a number of Search and Rescue resources were tasked by RCC to search for the missing vessel. Both the Osprey, the rescue boat located at Kitsilano Base, as well as an hovercraft, among other facilities, were engaged in the search effort. After a fairly extensive search of the waters north of Vancouver over a period of approximately four hours (Exhibit E-4), Sewell's Marina reported that Mr. Kingsmith had called from his home and indicated that he had beached the boat on Spanish Banks. It was ascertained that this was the same boat that had been reported as being tied up at the mile marker at Locarno Beach.

Mr. John Palliser is the Supervisor at the RCC in Esquimalt. Mr. Palliser works from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. When he reported for work on the morning of June 27th, he received a call from a Mr. John McGrath, the officer in charge of the Coast Guard Hovercraft Base in Richmond, British Columbia, one of the

craft that was involved in the Search and Rescue effort the night before. According to Mr. Palliser, Mr. McGrath told him that prior to that search, the RCC had information about the vessel they had been searching for, and had not done anything about it; he had asked Mr. Palliser to look into this matter. Mr. Palliser then examined the log sheet and the incident log for June 26 and 27; there was no indication that the controllers had been alerted earlier about the vessel in question. He then contacted Kitsilano Base; it was confirmed that there had been a conversation between Kitsilano and RCC earlier that evening, prior to the search, about a vessel which was subsequently ascertained to be the vessel that was the subject of the search. Mr. Palliser then reviewed the tapes of conversations the Centre had on this matter and had transcripts made of those conversations (supra). He concluded from this information that the Centre had received information that had not been acted upon. This was of concern to him because it is his duty to ensure that Search and Rescue is handled in a prompt and efficient manner. Mr. Palliser maintained that every incident needed to be analyzed and a determination should be made as to what resources should be used. Mr. Palliser testified that the controllers' failure to check out the report from the police could have had serious consequences. In his view, upon being notified that a boat was in trouble, the controller should resolve this by finding out what the trouble was. The controller should have obtained more information from the police about the nature of the call; they could have requested the police to check out the boat from a nearby road; they could also have directed the Coast Guard radio station to put out a general broadcast to determine if anyone had noticed a boat in trouble there. Mr. Palliser also maintained that Kitsilano could have been directed to send out a vessel to check out the report, which would only have taken a few minutes. Mr. Palliser maintained that neither the personnel at Kitsilano Base nor the controllers apparently took this matter seriously.

Mr. Palliser also noted that the grievor had sufficient training to understand what to do in these circumstances. He referred to Exhibit E-9, the controllers' training manual which is completed by all controllers; in particular, paragraph 5.1 emphasizes the need for a speedy response in order to reduce the danger to survivors; furthermore, the longer the delay, the more resources are needed to search a necessarily expanded area. Mr. Palliser stated that, while controllers have discretion as to which of three progressive phases they should go to, where there is

apprehension regarding safety, they are immediately to proceed to the second, that is the alert phase. As a result of his concerns, he went to the Centre on Saturday, July 3rd, when both Mr. Riddle and Mr. Saint-Amour were on shift. He indicated that he wished to speak with them privately about the incident of the other day. Mr. Riddle responded that there was nothing to discuss and that whatever he wanted to talk about should be said out in the open. According to Mr. Palliser, when he indicated what he had discovered, Mr. Riddle responded that they had done nothing wrong. Mr. Palliser concluded that the two controllers were not prepared to agree with him, so he left after indicating to them that he regarded that this matter warranted disciplinary action. Mr. Palliser then wrote to the Director of Operations of the Coast Guard in Vancouver outlining the incident and his concerns (Exhibit E-10). He then discussed the question of disciplinary action with his immediate superior, Mr. Peter Golden, the Superintendent of Rescue, Safety and Environmental Response, as well as the Major in charge at the RCC and staff relations personnel at the Coast Guard.

Mr. Golden testified that he agreed with the imposition of the disciplinary action, as he concluded that, with the information the controllers were provided, they had not taken all the actions that they should have and, in particular, did not act in accordance with the Standing Operating Procedures, nor with the training that was provided to them. In his view, they had made too many assumptions that everything was fine.

In cross-examination, Mr. Palliser observed that for the last year he has not been working at the RCC, but rather had been on a special project. He acknowledged that he was the subject of a harassment complaint emanating from Mr. Saint-Amour and that, in a case report prepared by a Public Service Commission employee, it was concluded that the complaint was founded in part and that the Harassment Policy had been contravened (Exhibit G-2). Mr. Palliser maintained, and Mr. Golden concurred, that his assignment to the special project had nothing to do with the harassment complaint, nor did he receive any sanctions in respect of that complaint. Mr. Palliser noted that he received the Public Service Commission case report on June 14, 1996.

Mr. Palliser maintained, in cross-examination, that it was erroneous to assume that nobody was in trouble because the boat was tied up in shallow water. He also

maintained that it was not common for boats to be tied up at mile markers at Spanish Banks. He acknowledged that Mr. Saint-Amour had his on-duty training interrupted when he went on Injury-on-Duty leave for a period of 21 months, from which he returned in May 1995. Mr. Palliser also acknowledged that he had made comments to colleagues of Mr. Saint-Amour which they interpreted as meaning that he thought Mr. Saint-Amour was an alcoholic.

Mr. Saint-Amour testified that he first met Mr. Palliser in 1977, at the Hovercraft Base in Vancouver. He stated that his relationship with Mr. Palliser was not very good. Mr. Saint-Amour has been with the Coast Guard since 1969, starting with a four-year program at the Coast Guard College in Sydney, Nova Scotia. Following a number of other assignments, he moved to the RCC in 1993; in April of that year he went to the Marine Controllers' course and began working at the Centre, until the end of July 1993, when he went on Workman's Compensation for 21 months. He returned to the Centre in May 1995, at which time he received four days training. It was his understanding that he was supposed to have one month's training; however, he was told that Mr. Palliser wanted him to start immediately, without further training. He remained at the Centre until the third week of August. At that time, Mr. Saint-Amour left work in an ambulance; he apparently is suffering from very high blood pressure and was told at the time that he has post-traumatic stress syndrome, which he attributes to the mental stress emanating from his relationship with Mr. Palliser. Mr. Saint-Amour has not returned to the RCC; he has been seconded to the Regional Operations Centre which is currently located in Victoria.

Mr. Saint-Amour referred to a letter he received from the Director, Investigations of the Public Service Commission which stated that: "*... Mr. Palliser has been re-assigned for a one year period and will be attending a Harassment in the Workplace workshop being held in the new year.*"

Mr. Saint-Amour noted, with respect to section 5 of the Manual, that a boat adrift is an entirely different matter than a boat that is secured; in this instance, the boat was secure. He stated that, if there had been a second call, they would have taken further action, but, once they were advised that the boat was secure, there was no need to take action. He indicated that it was not unusual for boats to tie themselves up to mile posts to avoid putting down an anchor.

Mr. Saint-Amour also testified as to his recollection of the encounter he and Mr. Riddle had with Mr. Palliser on the Sunday morning following the incident. He stated that Mr. Riddle and himself discussed the matter and he advised Mr. Riddle that he was not going into Mr. Palliser's office because of his past problems with him. He noted that Mr. Riddle did all the talking, that Mr. Palliser had lost his temper and advised them that they were going to be suspended.

In cross-examination, the grievor identified Exhibit E-2, a letter of reprimand dated August 31, 1994 concerning an incident involving a man falling overboard from a B.C. Ferry; the letter refers to: "*Your failure to follow standard operating procedures or to notify the senior controller at the time was a very serious dereliction of duty and cannot be tolerated.*" Mr. Saint-Amour acknowledged that he did not grieve this letter of reprimand. Mr. Saint-Amour insisted that it is quite common for the police to relay calls concerning marine matters; in effect, the police passed on information from a caller that a boat was secured.

Mr. John Riddle also testified on behalf of the grievor; Mr. Riddle had received a written reprimand as a result of the incident in question. Mr. Riddle has been employed at the RCC for 12 years and is currently a Senior Marine Controller (GT-5). Mr. Riddle noted that controllers record in the log 2,000 to 3,000 incidents a year; however, they receive approximately 15,000 calls a year; they record only those they feel are relevant, based on the Manual, weather considerations, etc. They would also take into account the location of the vessel. In this instance, the vessel was located at Spanish Banks, which is very shallow; he stated that, in other areas, where it is very rocky, they would react to a call very quickly. Mr. Riddle maintained it is quite common to get calls about boats tying up at markers. He said controllers are required to consider all the circumstances such as weather, tides, and whether there was somebody signalling for help; in this instance, there was no indication of that, nor were there any other calls, notwithstanding that there are known to be many people in the area of the shoreline in that location. He stated that controllers would not send out boats only because someone was tied up at a marker; they would first have to be satisfied that the vessel that was tied up is in some difficulty. In his view, the police call did not indicate that there was a distress situation. Mr. Riddle stated that controllers cannot send out people for every call that they receive; he is paid to make his best judgement as to whether it is necessary to send out a vessel. He did not

connect the boat tied to the marker as being the boat that was overdue; however, he does not believe that he should have done anything differently.

Mr. Riddle recalled that, on one occasion, Mr. Palliser had told him that Mr. Saint-Amour cannot be trusted, and had to be watched as he had an alcohol problem. Mr. Riddle stated that he had never had a problem with Mr. Saint-Amour and had no problem trusting the grievor.

In cross-examination, Mr. Riddle stated that, as the more senior controller, he is there to provide guidance; however, he was aware that Mr. Saint-Amour had some knowledge in this area and relevant experience. He agreed that it would have been possible to send a car over from Kitsilano Base to Spanish Banks. He indicated that he was familiar with Locarno Beach and knew where the mile marker is located. He stated that he called Kitsilano because Vancouver Radio could not confirm that the Osprey had gone out at that time. He acknowledged as well that he did not know what kind of trouble, if any, the boat was in at the time of the call from the police. He made a guess that the boat was not in trouble. He maintained that controllers cannot check thousands of calls that come in a year, and he believes that he did not make a mistake with respect to his dealing with this incident. He did observe that, in hindsight, he could have found out earlier that the boat which was overdue was in fact tied up at the marker.

Mr. Richard Hendrickson also testified on behalf of the grievor. He has been a Marine Controller at the Centre for thirteen and a half years and has been designated as a Senior Controller. He had had a discussion with Mr. Palliser concerning this incident, and had listened to the tapes. He expressed the view to Mr. Palliser that it was common for boats to tie up at the markers. In his opinion, this incident was not a distress situation. He noted that, in these circumstances, which were during the busiest period of the year, when many calls come into the Centre, he would do nothing beyond what was done by Mr. Riddle and Mr. Saint-Amour. He maintained that it is not part of the mandate of the RCC to task resources for boats that are tied up in shallow waters.

Mr. Hendrickson also referred to a conversation he had with Mr. Palliser in May 1995, at which time Mr. Palliser told him that Mr. Saint-Amour was a serious alcoholic and Mr. Hendrickson should watch him constantly.

In cross-examination, Mr. Hendrickson stated that he had been a shop steward for the last five years and, in that capacity, had occasions to present the union's views to management. He referred to the reference, in Exhibit E-6, to the police stating that: "*Oh...well, apparently there is...*"; he is fairly certain that, on the tape, the word "is" was in fact "was". He reiterated that he believed the controllers had acted correctly under the circumstances.

Mr. Leo Shew had been for several years Captain of the hovercraft located at Sea Island, near Vancouver Airport, until March of 1997, when he retired. He identified Exhibit G-3, a letter addressed to the union and signed by four hovercraft captains. He stated that he was aware of the circumstances of the June 27 incident and, in his view, the controllers acted appropriately. He also stated that he has observed boats tied up at mile markers 40 or 50 times.

In cross-examination, Mr. Shew acknowledged he had never been trained as a marine controller, and was not familiar with the transcripts or the logs. Mr. Shew recalled an occasion when Mr. Palliser had referred to Mr. Saint-Amour as Claude "hear no more", referring to the possibility that Mr. Saint-Amour would not be returning to work. He had reported this incident to Mr. Saint-Amour, notwithstanding that he does not consider him to be a friend.

Counsel for the employer submitted that the issues in this case are simple and straightforward; these issues have nothing to do with any harassment complaint, but relate exclusively to the events referred in the letter of discipline of July 7, 1995 (Exhibit E-1). Mr. Newman maintained that Mr. Palliser had real concerns about Mr. Saint-Amour's job performance; he noted for example the earlier letter of reprimand, which Mr. Saint-Amour did not grieve.

Counsel for the employer submitted that the *raison d'être* of the Marine Controllers is to protect life and, accordingly, the highest degree of diligence is required in the performance of their duties. While nobody is expecting an absolute standard of perfection, nevertheless, the grievor's actions on June 27 fall far below

any acceptable standard. Mr. Newman maintained that it was not routine to receive a call from the police. Clearly, the police made a judgement that the calls they had received were significantly serious to warrant contacting the Coast Guard. When they receive such a call, the controllers have an obligation to verify the situation. While the controllers did react, they did so only to a limited and unsatisfactory extent. They made assumptions that a boat was not in any danger, without doing any verification; their reaction was capricious and nonchalant. It appears that their only concern was whether the Osprey had been sent out without their direction; they demonstrated no concern for the possibility that there were passengers on the vessel who might be in some difficulty. Accordingly, their actions fell so far below any reasonable standard of performance of duty that it amounts to misconduct. While they did not entirely brush off this matter, they were negligent in not following proper procedures and, in Mr. Saint-Amour's case, this was not the first time. Under the circumstances, management's response was very lenient and the penalty is appropriate given that it was the second offence of the same nature. Mr. Newman also suggested that Mr. Hendrickson's testimony should be accorded little weight, in light of the fact that he is a shop steward. As for Mr. Shew, Mr. Newman observed that he was not a controller and did not know all the facts.

Counsel for the grievor responded that it is important to consider that this incident is being examined with the benefit of hindsight. If, in the exercise of their discretion, the controllers determine that there was a boat in distress, and then did not take the actions enumerated in Exhibit E-10, it would be a different matter. However, the grievor has to respond to phone calls and make determinations in order to avoid sending out resources needlessly every time a call comes in. To do otherwise would be putting other boaters at risk. Mr. Dagger maintained that a call relayed from police does not give that call *per se* a greater urgency. He also submitted that there was absolutely no evidence that the controllers were in any way cavalier, or that they did not take their job seriously.

Mr. Dagger referred to Exhibit E-6, the transcript of the call from the police. He noted that the police dispatcher stated that there was a boat that seemed to be in trouble; that is, the police only made a presumption that there had been trouble, but then they received information that the boat was in fact tied up to a mile post. There was no reason to assume, in these circumstances, that the operator of the boat

continued to be in any distress. Mr. Dagger noted that the Manual refers to a boat adrift in the water, not a boat in calm water, at low tide, tied up to a marker.

Mr. Dagger submitted that the controllers are required to examine all the factors before tasking limited resources. He noted that there is the uncontradicted evidence of four witnesses to the effect that this was a sensible exercise of judgement. There is no valid reason not to accept the testimony of Mr. Hendrickson and Mr. Shew.

Mr. Newman replied that the controller's discretion must be based on proper information, nor merely speculation and assumptions. In this instance, the basic misconduct is the failure to check out a report that a boat was in trouble; a judgement was made that was based on no facts, when those facts could have easily been determined.

Reasons for Decision

I agree with counsel for the employer that the issue in this case is reasonably straightforward: did the grievor engage in an act of misconduct in respect of his response to the call (reproduced in Exhibit E-6) from a police dispatcher? I would also note that the merits of Mr. Saint-Amour's complaint against Mr. Palliser need not be addressed here.

It has generally been recognized by arbitrators that, in the absence of culpable misconduct, errors in judgement *per se* do not warrant disciplinary action (see Brown and Beatty, *Canadian Labour Arbitration*, 3rd ed., at para. 7:3510, and the cases cited therein). It is acknowledged by counsel for the employer, and indeed common sense could not suggest otherwise, that absolute perfection of judgement cannot be expected of mere mortals; consequently, not every erroneous exercise of judgement, if indeed this is what we have here, constitutes an act of misconduct.

Did the grievor's actions amount to a dereliction of duty or an act of negligence? In answering this question it must be kept in mind, as both counsel have acknowledged, that there is an important element of discretion and judgement in the exercise of the marine controllers' responsibility. In this regard I would note Exhibit E-11, which was submitted by the employer's counsel. This document,

entitled “*Marine Search and Rescue in Canada*”, contains a subheading referred to as “Unnecessary Use of the SAR System”, where the following statement is found:

Safety at sea is a personal responsibility. If all other methods of preventing an accident are unsuccessful, the SAR system is available as a last resort.

...

Some cases involving use of the SAR system are clearly preventable or unreasonable. These cases cost the taxpayers of Canada, but more importantly, they involve resources that may be needed for genuine SAR and place the rescuers in unnecessary danger. Currently, the Canadian Coast Guard is looking at ways to prevent these types of cases from occurring.

It is implicit from the above-noted document, as well as the testimony of the witnesses, that the marine controllers are not expected to direct the utilization of SAR resources in response to every call that comes in. The uncontradicted evidence of Mr. Riddle is that approximately 15,000 calls are received per year, of which only 2,000 to 3,000 are regarded as constituting an incident worthy of recording. In this instance, the grievor and Mr. Riddle, who was the more senior controller, upon receiving the call in question, checked the charts and weather conditions, and then contacted the Kitsilano Base, including the master of the Osprey (i.e. Mr. Kelly). Apparently, neither Mr. Riddle, Mr. Saint-Amour, nor the master of the Osprey concluded that this was a distress situation; the same view was evidently shared by others with considerable experience in these matters. Indeed, their conclusion appeared to be correct, given the fact that the operator of the boat tied up to the mile post simply walked ashore.

It is a well worn cliché that hindsight is 20/20. Had Mr. Riddle and Mr. Saint-Amour taken further action, it is likely that the Coast Guard would not have had to extensively utilize resources for what amounted to a wild goose chase. In light of all that they know now, it may well be that they would have proceeded somewhat differently. On the other hand, that is probably no less true of Mr. Palliser and his communications to others concerning Mr. Saint-Amour. Even adjudicators sometimes would like the opportunity to revisit a decision from the vantage point of hindsight. However, taking into account the facts noted above, I am not prepared to conclude

that Mr. Saint-Amour had acted so irresponsibly, in making the judgements that he did, that his actions can be said to constitute a dereliction of duty or negligence. I find therefore that disciplinary action in this case was unwarranted and, accordingly, the grievance is upheld. The employer is directed to restore the grievor's lost pay and benefits.

**P. Chodos,
Deputy Chairperson.**

OTTAWA, November 4, 1997.