

8:30 a.m.

[Mr. White in the chair]

THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning. I'd call the meeting to order. You have had an agenda circulated. Might we have approval of that agenda? So moved. Is it agreed? It's carried.

The minutes of the March 25 meeting: you have had those circulated. Any errors or omissions? If none, we'll take a motion for it. Julius. Is it agreed? It's carried.

Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, today we have with us the Hon. Murray Smith, Minister of Labour and of all manner of other collective agencies, associations, tribunals, and authorities. Generally, sir, we have very few rules. It's rather informal. But one that we do have is that we are dealing specifically with the Auditor General's report for the year '96-97. The committee are well trained to do the best they can to stay out of policy areas of the day, but they can delve into the policy areas of that era so long as they deal fundamentally with the reports before us. So I'll do the best to hold them back, and I'm sure you'll do the same for yourself.

First, if you could introduce your staff, and then the AG will do his. Then we'll have a dissertation from yourself on the reports as you see them, and then we'll go into questions and answers.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Thanks, Lance. To my far left is Peter Kruselnicki, Deputy Minister of Labour. Next to him and to my immediate left is Gerry Brygidyr, financial planning director. To my right is Dave Renwick, chief financial officer of WCB, and to his right Mary Cameron, president and chief operating officer of WCB.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Auditor General.

MR. VALENTINE: Well, good morning, Mr. Chairman. On my left is Jim Hug, Assistant Auditor General with responsibilities for the audit of the Department of Labour and the Workers' Compensation Board. In the gallery today are three of my colleagues who assist us with the audit of this ministry.

Thank you.

MR. SMITH: One of the things I'd like to do just at the start is indicate that we have the WCB present here. I view the WCB as an employer funded insurance corporation that operates with a government appointed board of directors. They do operate at arm's length from us. The accountability ties through the fact that the WCB is subject to some of the provisions affecting statutory corporations, including scrutiny by the AG's office. Any questions that you may have directly relating to WCB I would refer directly to these two individuals.

As Gene, who's the Member for Edmonton-Mill Creek, said a few weeks ago in estimates, Labour is an important department that does valuable work for Albertans. We focus on the area of customer service and partnership, but we don't forget the regulatory side either. We have 1.5 million workers, employers, and families, and we view them as our customers. What we can do is ensure the environment that allows them to grow: 200,000 more jobs than we had a few years ago, \$17 billion more in gross domestic product than we had in 1993. The Department of Labour is still meeting the needs with about 46 percent less people and about 45 percent less money.

From an accountability perspective we moved from being solely a service provider to more of a service management role. We want to continue to provide Albertans the necessary assurances that important jobs are still being done, which includes the safety code inspections – we tabled the annual report of ABSA yesterday –

elevator safety, and other safety inspections. Employment standards investigations, workplace health and safety programs continue to be delivered by the department.

The year 1996-97 saw much change in the department. Aside from the structural changes in moving the operations of two divisions of the department, supported by a number of corporate groups, we undertook other shifts as well. We completed the privatization of occupational health and safety service laboratories. We outsourced mediation services, with the department providing policy, audit, and quality assurance activities. We transferred the responsibility for propane vehicle conversion to the Alberta Propane Vehicle Administration Organization. We completed the transfer of boiler and pressure vessel responsibilities to the Alberta Boilers Safety Association. There was establishment of a delegated administrative organization for elevator and amusement rides.

We looked at some substantial achievements that I think are reflected in the numbers. The department's annual spending dropped almost \$4.5 million from the previous year. Of that, \$3.4 million was our targeted drop while more than another million dollars in savings was achieved in our actual spending.

Mary, you may want to add some opening comments with respect to the WCB, if you wish.

MS CAMERON: Thank you. We view that '96 financial statements reflect a strong performance by WCB. Some of the highlights. We had an operating surplus of \$118 million. We had several reserves: the rate and benefit stabilization reserve at \$182 million, the occupational disease reserve at \$52 million, and a total fund balance of \$295 million. The premium revenue actually decreased by \$80 million. We provided a \$100 million rebate to employers. We managed to shift the rate to a reduced rate, from \$1.89 to \$1.50. We shifted from lower rated to higher rated industries, and we had an increase overall in insurable earnings. Investment revenue increased by \$20 million because of good investment decisions and strong market performance. Claim costs actually increased by \$158 million. There was an increase in the number of lost-time claims of 4 percent and an actual increase in benefits paid out, a CPP offset of \$31 million, clinical impairment guidelines \$10 million, and a mortality adjustment of \$37 million. We managed through this to reduce the overall administration costs by a total of \$3 million.

In terms of the statement of operations, on the premiums we had a \$90 million reduction, lower than budget. That's because of the \$100 million rebate we paid to employers. We ended up with a 16.6 percent return on the market investments. So overall we think that '96 was an extremely successful year, a year of accomplishment for WCB.

Thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Thanks. Mr. Chairman, that concludes our opening remarks.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Zwozdesky, followed by Mr. Stevens and Ms Olsen.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Thank you. Good morning to you, hon. minister, and your staff and to the new CEO, Ms Mary Cameron, and to you as well, Mr. Auditor General, and to your staff and anyone else who is joining us.

I want to in fact discuss WCB a little bit this morning if I could. Before referencing pages 161 and 162 of the Auditor General's report for that year, I want to know if the hon. minister would table his official report and comment on his findings relative to the special investigation he did when he went undercover in 1996-97, posed as an injured worker and submitted a TTD claim to WCB. How

successful was your claim, how much did you make, and are you still on compensation?

MR. SMITH: Actually, that was something I entertained as a way of enforcing the Auditor General's undertakings. I know that it was a time of great strain and great difficulty in the WCB, and the ability for me to do that without recognition was primarily due to the fact that I, unfortunately, didn't have to purchase a membership card from the Liberal Party because they were available for nothing, Mr. Chairman. It was only by calling myself Eric the Red that I was able to undertake this and bring it to a successful conclusion, particularly in fact when I was able to conclude it on April 1, 1997, as opposed to April 1, 1998, which is where I think we are today.

8:40

MR. ZWOZDESKY: A very solid answer on this special day, April 1. I saw that note of seriousness overtake his face. Make sure you let Mike Cardinal know that I asked that question on his behalf.

Seriously, I do want to discuss WCB, and I want to reference pages 161 and 162 of the Auditor General's report. I'm concerned here, Mr. Chairman, with the investment systems and the procedures that have been flagged by the Auditor General. I think we all understand that the WCB is a very delicately balanced and otherwise extremely busy portfolio, and there are certain guidelines that I would trust have been established to measure the performance of so-called independent managers that are involved in the entire area of WCB investments. Nonetheless, there were inconsistencies pointed out on page 162 of the Auditor General's report. I wonder what has been done to now correct those inconsistencies. Is it an ongoing thing? Are there still some inconsistencies taking place? What sort of progress has the minister or his staff made in that respect?

MR. RENWICK: Thank you. First of all, I'd like to state that we do agree with the recommendation. Some of the things that we have done. First of all, we purchased a new investment accounting system that is currently being installed. We have completed written procedures, and those have been implemented. Reconciliation procedures have been developed to address the reconciliation issues. Fund manager positions now comply with investment policy. We've also developed what we call a fund manager checklist to identify any compliance issues that we may have with our fund managers. We've strengthened internal communications. Position descriptions for the staff have been updated, and we have hired an additional investment accountant.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Are those public documents by any chance? Could things like the fund manager checklist, things like the written procedures you alluded to, even the internal strengthenings you alluded to be brought to the committee for sharing here?

MR. RENWICK: Yes.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Good. So those will come to us through the chair?

MR. RENWICK: Yes.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Thank you.

My other question is with respect to the surplus that WCB has had I think for a couple of years running now. One of the things that I experience, Mr. Chairman, when I deal with WCB is a staff that really does try hard to resolve all the cases, but I suspect that there has been an increase in caseloads over the last couple of years in particular. I'm wondering what that percentage of increase in

caseloads is versus the percentage of possible increases in staff needed to cope with those caseloads and how it is that that surplus might be used somehow to either provide more frontline staff workers or researchers or whatever is required to sort of move some of these applications for WCB compensation through a little more quickly.

If that information isn't immediately available, I would undertake to receive it at some later time. I have a genuine concern on behalf of a number of constituents that are getting more and more concerned with the length of time that some of the processing takes. I've been through every level of appeal and every level of contact with WCB, and as I say, I know they're trying hard. But it just doesn't seem that there's in all cases enough staff there, so I thought maybe that surplus could be employed somehow. I'm wondering if that in fact is reflected in the '96-97 statements: increase of staff versus increase in caseloads.

MS CAMERON: If I may. In '96-97 that was when we did experience significant increases and we actually had some internal movement. A lot of our case managers moved to other places within the corporation, and we found it very difficult to hire and train people in time. So the number of caseloads per manager went up quite significantly. We did recognize that. We made a decision to hire more people very quickly, and we've been doing that. We've actually been able to reduce the caseload per person, but still we've got long delays. We still have a lot of people moving through, and they're not fully trained, because it's a very complex position and it takes a long time before somebody can take on a full caseload. We can provide those numbers specifically to you: how many caseloads we have per caseworker and what we've done in terms of the total numbers. We think we've got the numbers right. Once they're fully trained, we'll notice the difference.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: And is there a commensurate increase in payouts?

THE CHAIRMAN: Hold on here. It's not a discussion, Mr. Zwozdesky. We do have another round of them certainly.

Mr. Stevens, followed by Ms Olsen, followed by Mr. Ducharme.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, Mr. Minister. My first question relates to ministry-reporting entities and deals with a comment of the Auditor General found in his annual report under Executive Council at the top of page 18. The Auditor General comments that Labour did not include in its financial statements "the assets, liabilities, revenues and expenses of entities that are accountable to the Minister and" in the Auditor General's opinion "controlled by the Ministry." Specifically, I understand that these entities are the Safety Codes Council and the delegated administrative organizations. Why has the department not included the financial statements for these entities in the ministry financial statements, and is there any change contemplated?

MR. SMITH: It's not our money. This is the short answer. The entities are at arm's length from the government. The ministry does not have ownership of any of these assets, liabilities, revenues, expenses of the equity side, nor do we exercise strategic control, Ron, over what they're doing. I think we've been around it from a number of perspectives. The outcomes associated with the ministry's goals are included in the ministry consolidated financial statements. It's my understanding that we're not finished the entire discussion. I guess I look at it that if I own the company, if I own the Department of Labour, I don't get any material benefit seeing the Alberta Boilers Safety Association as either a wholly owned

subsidiary or having any tendrils of control to that organization. So in short, that's the answer.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you.

MR. VALENTINE: Mr. Chairman, I should go on record that my opinion is not in sync with that of the minister. The issue is not whether or not control is exercised; the issue is whether or not there is an ability to control. The issue of the completeness of the government's entity is a matter which is ongoing in discussions between my office and that of the Treasury. But I would point out that on page 4 of the annual report of the Ministry of Labour, 1996-97, the top of the page is entitled Entities Reporting to the Ministry of Labour, which in and of itself is some evidence that there is an accountability existing between these organizations and the ministry. We're hopeful that the resolution of the issue of the entity will be achieved in shorter time than longer time, and I can assure you that we're actively working on that with the Deputy Provincial Treasurer.

MS OLSEN: I'd like to direct the minister to the Auditor General's report, pages 156, 157, and 158. I would like to stick with the delegated administrative organizations. I think we walk a fine line when we have government by nongovernmental agencies. However, my concern is more the framework that is or is not in place in terms of the DAOs' accountability and how the minister is determining that. Did the Department of Labour consider during '96-97 the adoption of a performance reporting framework for DAOs to include the following components: the evaluation of risks associated with the entity in performing its delegated responsibilities; accountability information required versus that actually provided by the entity; monitoring considered appropriate for the entity's risk versus monitoring actually performed and complaints received, accidents reported, instances of noncompliance observed or reported? I'm just wondering what kind of framework was put in place to consider those issues.

8:50

MR. SMITH: Peter, do you want to take a run at that?

MR. KRUSELNICKI: I can try and take a stab at that. Well, first of all, the department has accepted the Auditor General's recommendation, and we're working closely with the Auditor General to address the issues that he's identified in his recommendations. To try to maybe give you a general answer to your question, we did have processes in place, audit processes, et cetera, which, as everyone knows, need to be refined and reviewed during the implementation processes, and that's in fact what we're doing right now. We have taken the Auditor General's recommendations along with our own experiences regarding accountability, monitoring, et cetera. I personally have been involved with developing the accountability framework for the DAOs within our purview, and we're setting up the various processes to address all of those things you've mentioned, Ms Olsen.

As far as the information goes – and I think you mentioned monitoring, getting performance information – we are putting processes in place right now. At the time that the organizations were set up, we were relying more on an audit process. We've actually gone to more of a contract monitoring, contract administration process subsequent to that.

I hope that addresses your questions.

MS OLSEN: Then I'll just ask this question: what were the guidelines and procedures established by the Department of Labour during '96-97 relating to the inspection of boilers and pressure

vessels? That's something that seems to be haunting the minister: boilers and pressure vessels.

MR. KRUSELNICKI: I don't have the specifics on the guidelines. Mr. Minister, I can probably undertake to provide what guidelines were established back in '96-97, but I don't have that specific information. So if that's okay, we'll undertake to provide what we can.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would that be through the secretary so as to provide it to all members?

MR. KRUSELNICKI: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine.

MR. SMITH: Can I just finish on the member's question about the Boilers Safety Association? I think the business problem that posed the challenge was the backlog period of economic growth, the fact that the backlog was expanding, and that was combined with the fact that the resources of government that were put towards solving the issue under a government framework was not working. That was the business challenge.

The measurement side and the performance framework, the responsibilities, I think were not dissimilar to articles of association of a company in that they took on the responsibility and they took on the ability to manage their own problem. As you know from continued scrutiny of their business plan and of their annual report, since the Alberta Boilers Safety Association has been established, there has been a four-year workout plan. Backlogs are diminishing. There is also a better reporting format, and most importantly in my opinion, since that has occurred, there have been less incidents and no fatalities.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ducharme.

MR. DUCHARME: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone. My first question is in public accounts, volume 2, page 90, under element 3.3.4. The department overspent the budget for employment standards, going from \$252,000 to \$420,000. Could you please provide me an explanation as to why this overspending of \$168,000 occurred?

MR. SMITH: I think Mr. Brygidyr is kicking at me underneath the chair to answer that one.

MR. BRYGIDYR: Thank you. Employment standards was an operation that was initially planned to become a DAO, and the plan was to just provide partial-year funding for the activity in '96-97, looking at the opportunities to bring it out into a DAO operation. There were changes in plans in '96-97, and the result was that the employment standards operation was going to continue through the Department of Labour. In order to be able to do that for the whole fiscal year, we had to basically add to the budget and to the expenditures of that operation.

MR. DUCHARME: Having brought it into DAO, did that initiative basically improve employment standards' service delivery?

MR. BRYGIDYR: It didn't become a DAO.

MR. DUCHARME: Thank you.

DR. PANNU: Mr. Minister, if I may invite your attention to pages

156 and 157 of the Auditor General's report and recommendation 22. Specifically, if I may ask, what actions have been taken by the department with respect to monitoring quality of services for which the Auditor General expresses concern and makes strong observations on the absence of any information related to monitoring quality of services?

MR. SMITH: Peter, do you want to throw some light on that?

MR. KRUSELNICKI: We've accepted that recommendation. We're working very closely with the Auditor General to address his concerns. We have established a quality and contract management group within the department that's looking at things like quality management plans and establishing effective monitoring activities within the department. As I mentioned before, we are working within an accountability framework which addresses specifically these issues, all the way from contract procurement to monitoring and contract administration. We're also working to implement effective information systems to support our monitoring activities.

DR. PANNU: To follow up on that, on the same page, page 157, in the first paragraph the Auditor General draws attention to the absence of

policy in place governing how, or within what timelines, there should be an audit follow-up to determine whether observed instances of inadequate performance have been corrected.

Now, what specific actions have been taken in that regard? You did give, I think, a general answer. I'm seeking specific information with respect to measures that you have.

MR. KRUSELNICKI: Again, we do have an accountability framework in place right now that we can share with you, if you like.

DR. PANNU: Yes.

MR. KRUSELNICKI: As far as specific time lines, there were time lines before about audits, but we have gone to more of a contract administration monitoring type of approach to address the concerns, and we do have a policy in place within the department to address the accountability issues that have been raised by the Auditor General.

DR. PANNU: So we'll get the information, I guess, through the chair; can we?

MR. KRUSELNICKI: Yes, we can provide that to you, Dr. Pannu.

DR. PANNU: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Johnson, followed by Mr. Zwozdesky and Mr. Yankowsky.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is more of a general nature, and it arises from the section in the Auditor General's report entitled Improving the Financial Administration of the Province. The Auditor General focused his audit efforts in 1996-97 on governmentwide accountability. On page 2 of the report he laid out a five-point accountability framework which includes setting goals, planning how to accomplish those goals, carrying out the plans, reporting on results, and finally, evaluating the results. I'm wondering how Labour measured up in terms of fulfilling its role in relation to this five-point criteria in the accountability framework.

9:00

MR. SMITH: I'm going to ask Peter to continue with the answer in

this instance.

MR. KRUSELNICKI: I've been extensively involved over the past several months with the accountability framework not just within the department but within the government. Overall, I think we've fared well in addressing those issues, specifically with Labour. We're working to improve in a lot of the areas in accountability. Our business plan, for example, focuses on program objectives and monitoring the results. We've reassessed our performance measures to monitor the delegated entities more effectively, and we're developing a framework that monitors our safety services programs and assesses the performance of our accredited agencies and the municipalities through our quality and contract management unit.

We've also adopted monitoring and evaluation processes for all of our other programs to support our performance measures within our business plan. Our internal framework addresses the contracting of services to optimize the value for the dollars that we're spending. Our accountability framework also addresses contracted deliverables and administration and monitoring of contracts, the audit requirements associated with the accountability frameworks, performance assessments, and any kind of follow-up or exit strategies that are associated with the specific contracts or agreements that we enter into.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

DR. PANNU: I would like to ask a question or two from Public Accounts 1996-97, page 90, on item 3.1.1, assistant deputy minister's office, the expenditures there. Estimated were \$644,000. Overexpenditures are \$420,000 over and above that. That's an almost 40 percent increase over the estimates. Mr. Minister, would you be able to explain this? Why these overexpenditures?

MR. SMITH: Gerry Brygidyr.

MR. BRYGIDYR: Thank you. The overexpenditures reflect a little bit of a change that took place during the year. We had some transitional costs associated with DAOs, the required planning for the setups of those DAOs, specifically with regard to the elevators' DAO. We had some reorganization plans and partnership initiatives that we had to organize that year as well through the office, and we provided some additional auditing services. As we were going more into the DAOs, we had to learn a little bit more and expand a little bit more of our audit knowledge and activities, so we had to bring in additional resources for some of those activities as well. Overall, I think it's generally described as being a transition to more DAO activity and the management and planning initiatives that were required through the department to support those.

DR. PANNU: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, my second question is related to the same general item, 3.2.1, occupational health and safety services. There I notice close to 25 percent underspent on that item. I put that information against the Auditor General's observations on page 156.

The extent of monitoring required should be determined by the risk of inadequate performance and the related public safety consequences.

To what extent is there a relationship between the underexpenditures shown in item 3.2.1 and the Auditor General's observations on pages 156 and 157?

MR. BRYGIDYR: Specifically in regard to 3.2.1, there were some savings that we got. The heritage fund grant program for occupational health was reduced significantly, by \$500,000 from the

previous year, so we did have a saving there. Other savings that took place were related to some of the regional service areas in occupational health and safety, from reorganization not from service drawbacks, just from realignment of support services to the operations.

We privatized the occupational health and safety laboratory, so we didn't have that direct cost to cope with anymore as well. That was done by a private service provider. From the standpoint of whether that affected the quality of the services, we think the reorganization just tended to put the focus more onto the frontline delivery and get away from some of the areas that were maybe secondary. For instance, we didn't have to run the laboratory because there were adequate private providers to do that, and some of our administrative services could be better used from a broader regional approach rather than through individual office approaches. So we just tried to bring in some of that effectiveness.

MR. KRUSELNICKI: Just to supplement that, to maybe clarify. The program delivery portion is delivered out of the regional offices. This specific budget element is mainly the policy and technical support areas. So to address your question about adequate program delivery, that portion dealing with industry, occupational health and safety, the officers, the bulk of that would be in the regional services area. As Mr. Brygidyr has pointed out, the savings were as a result of some privatization and some reduced costs, but that's mainly from a technical and policy area. The programs and the actual regulatory portion were in the regional services area.

MR. SMITH: As it applies to meeting the big business goal of the Department of Labour in measuring performance by days lost due to injury, 1996-97 was the second year that we tied the lowest number of days ever recorded in the province of Alberta for days lost due to injury on a per capita basis.

Two things happened out of that. One, we were able to deliver the Department of Labour's occupational health and safety role at a more reasonable price. Secondly, we had the workforce of Alberta, the employers and the employees, achieve new records in terms of days lost due to injury. Then as a corollary, the work that was being done at the WCB with partners in injury – which then started to tie occupational health and safety to cash, to shareholder value in a corporation, to profitability, to increased productivity, to increased wages, to more funds in the pay packet – showed that those kinds of linkages could occur. Those kinds of results could be reported, they could be tracked, and in fact they could be achieved, and it was all done at the same time.

We were able to move this archaic delivery model out of government and realize that an inspector in every trench, an inspector behind every tree, and issuing OH and S inspectors with sidearms wasn't the way to go. What you started to see were results from the business plan perspective that demonstrated it was the industry that, if given the right incentive structure, could deliver better performance with both owner and employees in the workplace.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

9:10

MR. JOHNSON: On page 90 of the public accounts, volume 2, element 2.1.5, the Alberta Fire Training School exceeded their budget by \$827,000, or approximately 55 percent. Can you please comment on the mandate of this school, which I understand takes place at Lakeland College, and why was this area so much over budget?

MR. SMITH: I don't know, but they sure weren't the next year; were they? I'll actually let Gerry talk to the specifics and the numbers.

MR. BRYGIDYR: The Alberta Fire Training School was also looking at, I suppose, privatizing or being outsourced during '96-97. There was an expectation that the operation could be changed or transferred sometime during the fiscal year. We got into negotiations with Lakeland College for the transfer of the school, but in doing so, we had to go with full-year funding to meet the agreement period we had arrived at with Lakeland, which brought it over during '97-98.

As part of the transfer agreement that we reached with Lakeland College, we had to make some transitional funding available to help rejuvenate the operating equipment the Fire Training School had, and there was funding arranged for in the order of \$500,000 to deal with that aspect of it.

Some of the other initiatives. The school took on more international marketing initiatives and expanded some of the client base, essentially for the training courses as well. All of that led up to the agreement to transfer the training school to Lakeland College in Vermilion as of the new fiscal year starting April '98. So we had been operating it on a full-time basis, plus we've made these additional provisions for the transfer of the school to Lakeland College as well.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have Mr. Zwozdesky, Mr. Yankowsky, and Ms Olsen.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I now want to come back to page 161 of the Auditor General's report for the period in question, where there are some comments made with respect to, once again, the systems and procedures with respect to the various investments that WCB has under its charge. I note that there were certain guidelines that were adhered to when these funds were administered by the Provincial Treasurer's department, but now that they've been hived off to WCB, I'm wondering if the hon. minister could undertake to provide some information now or at a later date with respect to how that transition has turned out and how beneficial or not it has been.

[Mr. Johnson in the chair]

I would suspect that it's been a good move from the standpoint of increasing the arm's-length relationship. However, I'm interested to know what the rates of return have been with respect to some of the investments that have been made – cash and short-term investments, bonds, mortgages, real estate, domestic and foreign equities, what have you – and whether or not there is a wider range of investments now possible under this new relationship or perhaps a shorter range. In general, how has it turned out? Have we seen some benefits from that move?

MR. RENWICK: I could respond to that. The legislation was changed in 1995 that transferred responsibility for investments to the Workers' Compensation Board from Alberta Treasury. Currently, about one-third of the funds are with Workers' Compensation Board, managed by external managers. Two-thirds of the funds are still with Alberta Treasury as our managers. That's the fixed income and the Canadian equities. All of the foreign equities are managed by external managers that we've hired, and we have 11 of them.

Your question around rates of return, if I could answer that. Overall for the year we had a 16.6 percent rate of return. You had asked for a breakdown. Cash and short-term, it was 4.6 percent.

Bonds and mortgages, it was a 12.1 percent return. Real return bonds were 13.2 percent. Canadian equities were 28.8 percent. U.S. equities were 22.8 percent. International equities were 11.5 percent. Emerging markets were 8.6 percent, and real estate was 6.4 percent.

MR. SMITH: What was the size of the fund at that time?

MR. RENWICK: The size of the fund was approximately 3 and a half billion dollars.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: You provide an annual report for WCB; do you not? Yes? Every year? I would assume we'd get some detail on this at that stage, so I'll let it go at that. Thank you very much for the comprehensive answer.

But one of the things that may not arise in the annual report is with respect to the components of these fund manager reports, the ones that are submitted by the independent fund managers that you refer to who report to WCB or who act on behalf of WCB. I wonder if you could comment on what those criteria are and comment as well on how often those reports are made and what they're comprised of.

MR. RENWICK: What we do in order to manage the fund managers is we've developed a checklist, and the checklist ensures compliance with the contract that we've entered into with the manager. It goes through and makes sure, for example, that the manager is staying with the mandate they indicated they would be using. We have two manager visits per year. Once per year we will go to the head office of the manager, and once per year the managers will come to our office in Alberta. So twice per year we do a detailed review of their performance.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: So this has been done as requested by the AG then. It's improved considerably, I gather.

MR. RENWICK: That's correct.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Thank you.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yankowsky.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, everyone. I have a question here on occupational health and safety. I refer you to public accounts program reference 3.2.1, occupational health and safety. Here we have a budget of \$2,506,000 identified for spending in the area of occupational health and safety, which is very important. I see that the actual spending here in occupational health and safety services ended up being only \$1.9 million. So my question here is: could you explain to this committee how occupational health and safety was able to save this \$622,000 and yet function effectively in providing occupational health and safety to Alberta workers?

MR. BRYGIDYR: This sort of follows from the previous explanation we provided with reference to the occupational health and safety program. First of all, we have to recognize that the program is really delivered in two of the budgetary units here. Occupational health and safety services is 3.2.1; that's kind of the core program. The rest of it is delivered through the regional offices as well.

As indicated earlier, we've been doing some reorganization and program streamlining by moving away from providing occupational health and safety lab services, for instance, and having that service provided through the private sector. We've reduced significantly the

heritage trust fund grant program that we previously had, in the order of about \$500,000. That activity has sort of disappeared since '95-'96, and we're basically doing that kind of research on an as-needed basis from now on. The balance of the savings would be directly the result of the changes in the service delivery, reorganizing some of the regional resources to be more focused to the front line, and working things with partnerships as opposed to a heavy inspection load, that kind of thing.

MR. YANKOWSKY: My supplementary. As the province is at present experiencing a lot of activity in the industrial sector, I'm wondering how occupational health and safety is coping with this increased activity. Are you going to have to put more moneys into occupational health and safety to keep up with the demand, or is everything okay?

9:20

MR. KRUSELNICKI: Thank you. I'll try to answer the question. Yes, there is a lot of increased activity. As Mr. Brygidyr just mentioned, we have reorganized our occupational health and safety area to specifically address some of those things, and we're working extensively with the various safety associations to address the increased activity in the various sectors. We've also, with the minister's support, been able to allocate more resources to frontline customer service areas in occupational health and safety. So through those two initiatives we are expecting to be able to cope with the increased activity on a very proactive, positive basis, working co-operatively with industry and organized labour and employers so that we have a very safe workplace.

MS CAMERON: I'd like to add to that. We're really pleased this year in working particularly with people in the construction industry. They've identified a dramatic increase, and they're really trying to take some leadership positions to make sure that there is increased safety. We're working closely with the Department of Labour trying to make sure that the programs and the incentives we come up with are going to reinforce what Labour is doing. We're working right now with industry on a new experience rating program that's going to make them even more financially able to benefit if they increase safety in their workplace. It's something that we're noticing across the province, that industry is taking a lead role, and we're really trying to reinforce that with the new programming we're coming up with as well.

MR. SMITH: What's the injury rate analysis for that sector?

MS CAMERON: I'm not sure.

MR. SMITH: There's a bit of an uptake on this side of the market. It gives us little areas of concern. I think that's a function of people migrating from other parts of Canada who've been trained differently in occupational health and safety. Also, a portion of the entrance to the workforce might not be adequately trained in safety practices. It's an area of vigilance at this juncture.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Next we have Ms Olsen, followed by Mr. Stevens.

MS OLSEN: Thank you. I'm going to stick with delegated administrative organizations. The questions I have are: what steps have been taken by the Department of Labour to respond to the comments of the Auditor General that monitoring and auditing performed by the DAOs to date have not been sufficient to provide reasonable assurance that they are carrying out their delegated duties

to the appropriate standards? What have you done to respond to that particular comment by the Auditor General? It's page 157 of the Auditor General's report.

MR. KRUSELNICKI: Well, again we have accepted that recommendation, and we have established our quality and contract management group to specifically work on our accountability framework as it relates to the DAOs. We're working very closely with the DAOs to make sure that they deliver the services they've been delegated. We're, as I previously mentioned, implementing information systems to support the monitoring activities. This again reflects the partnership arrangement that we have with them. So this isn't being done just by ourselves; it's being done in partnership with the delegated administrative organizations.

MS OLSEN: They'll know what the expectations are?

MR. KRUSELNICKI: They completely know what our expectations are, yes.

MR. SMITH: Are you asking the question because you're concerned that an extra amount of monitoring and analysis and accountability – so you're measuring to the third decimal place – would in fact interfere with the creativity of that organization and their ability to solve solutions on a lateral basis, in other words thinking out of the box, and being able to bring new forces, new business solutions to existing issues? Is that part of your concern, that the accountability side with respect to the Auditor General's recommendation might be onerous and costly?

MS OLSEN: No. My concern is that if you're going to have a delegated administrative authority – it has been documented to date or even up to the '96-97 Auditor General's report that those particular functions have not been carried out adequately, and it is not to diminish anybody's ability to do their job or to think beyond the square and come up with other alternatives. But certainly, given that you as the minister have the ability to delegate, delegated authorities have to work by some framework for monitoring and auditing and they have to be accountable in some respect. As a government and as a minister I'm sure you're not wanting to let go of everything and say: you, independent of the government or independent of the Department of Labour, carry on, and every now and then we'll check in, and if there's a problem, we'll check in. I mean, as a ministry we certainly must provide the expectations and the framework for the DAO; otherwise, we'll run into problems with safety concerns. I mean, we can name all the DAOs, the elevator groups and safety inspections and those kinds of things. That's my concern, that there are the appropriate mechanisms in place where somebody is accountable and that the delegation comes from the minister's office and therefore the minister should be responsible to ensure that that's done.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Good points.

MS OLSEN: My second question then. We talked about expectations. What expectations were established by the Department of Labour during '96-97 as related to the quality of service expected of individual DAOs? What do they believe is the quality of service?

MR. KRUSELNICKI: There were expectations established back when the DAOs were established. I believe there were administrative agreements signed with the DAOs which outlined those expectations at that particular time. Since that time, again

going back to our accountability frameworks, we've more clearly laid out what our expectations are of them and what their expectations are of us to ensure that those activities are being carried out in an efficient and effective manner.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stevens, followed by Dr. Pannu.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My next questions relate to the issues management group and arise out of material which is found in volume 2 of public accounts, page 90, at 2.1. Generally I would appreciate knowing what the role of the issues management group is, specifically the role of the assistant deputy minister's office and information services, and some comment as to how the minister was able to save approximately 29 percent on the ADM offices' expended versus authorized expenditures.

9:30

MR. SMITH: When an issue gets resolved to the benefit of government and can be done with dispatch, then the minister takes the credit. If an issue is resolved not in favour of the government and the minister looks bad, issues management is somebody to blame. So that's their function, and they're very busy right now.

On a less light note, it's a bit of a SWAT group. They're there to identify and address emerging trends and issues in the workplace. We use our information services for that as well. Most importantly, they facilitate the improvement of workplace relationships and try to avoid the cost of third-party intervention. They're collaborative; they're team builders. Every time you get into an issue, this group is there to facilitate and mediate on demand. And they have proved to be very helpful on a number of issues. I think most key in '97 would be the work they put forth in the resolution of the United Nurses of Alberta collective agreement. They also have worked diligently in the production of the strategic document People and Prosperity.

The budget is a line item budget that has been shaved and yet still wants to reflect the resources that are there to be able address issues that are unplanned for. So I think the actual budgeting component of that is a bit willful in its nature in that it is subject to variance depending on the level of activity. I would suggest over the last two weeks of this year the budget is going to increase.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you.

My second question relates specifically to mediation at 2.1.3. It's my understanding that mediation services have been privatized. If in fact that is so, I would appreciate it if you could elaborate on how this particular component is now operating, the role of the department and how you deal with the private mediation services.

[Mr. White in the chair]

MR. SMITH: There are 10 contract mediators, and they rotate on a list unless there are specifics; for example, bringing in Andy Sims to work on the Calgary public issue. The '96-97 applications for mediation were 20 percent below the average over the last 11 years. It was a relatively uneventful year outside of the activity from the UFCW. The pricing structure is that the first two days are on us. The taxpayer pays \$850 a day for the first two days of mediation. After that the cost is borne by the two parties involved in the mediation. So it's a bit of a structural device to accelerate some settlement and avoid a costly disposition. It's unlikely that a mediator could actually protract, or extend, the period of time simply for material gain.

So we found that that has, in fact, become one of those nonvisible items at the table, yet it puts a little more pressure on the time clock

for settlement. The success of it over the last 18 months and since the period I've been minister, I guess just short of two years, is pretty positive. I like the approach they take. The mediation issues management group is actually composed of people from both the employer and the employee's side, from both organized labour and noncollective, nonorganized labour. It's a diverse group. A year ago we lost Martyn Piper out of that group, who went to become the business agent for the carpenters and finishing workers. I like the way it's structured. I think sometimes we've put a little too much bureaucracy into that division because of its diverse responsibility, but all in all they give good value to the taxpayer.

MR. STEVENS: Thank you.

DR. PANNU: Mr. Chairman, my question relates to the public accounts, page 92, the revenue side of the department's accounts. What's striking about page 92 in part one of it – fees, permits, and licences – is a dramatic drop in the revenues collected by the department. Overall I guess it's a 270 percent or so drop. Looking at specific items with the exception of “other,” which is the top item there – and I would like to know what “other” means here; there is an increase in revenues. For the rest, the general pattern is quite dramatic drops, sometimes as high as an over 1,000 percent drop in the revenues. I am referring here to item two, electrical protection, and the Elevator and Fixed Conveyances Act item. There's a drop of 10 times, or less than one-tenth of the revenues. And the last item there, the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act: the department has incurred some losses there. I wonder if the minister would elaborate on the specifics as well the general pattern there.

MR. SMITH: I'll ask Gerry to handle that.

MR. BRYGIDYR: Thank you. The fees, permits, and licences are revenue activities that are directly associated with the safety services in the various technical disciplines shown there. As the DAOs and the privatization of safety services became more widespread through contracted agencies, accredited contractors and municipalities, when those activities went to the private sector, the revenue earning entitlements went with them as well. The department was no longer generating the revenues it had previously generated when it was in a direct service delivery. So the decline throughout those various activities, whether electrical, elevator, and all that, is a direct result of the safety services becoming more of a private activity.

DR. PANNU: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, you can repeat some of my questions, because if I do that, I'll lose my second chance.

MR. SMITH: I don't mind. Maybe Raj needs some more clarification. Go ahead.

DR. PANNU: Okay. There was an increase under “other.” As I said, I singled out that item as one where you show an increase, and that departs from the general pattern of decreases which you explained in your answer.

MR. BRYGIDYR: Again, it's consistent with the privatization. The “other” includes a lot of the audit fees that are charged for the delivery of services in the various private areas, so we still have revenues from those. We also have included in there fees from things like the Fire Training School, some of the courses and training activities coming out of there. During '96-97 we still had the full Fire Training School program available, so that was generating revenues in there as well.

DR. PANNU: As part of my first question, Mr. Chairman, the very last item there. I'm very curious about it: revenues shown as losses.

9:40

MR. BRYGIDYR: Okay. Those are simply accounting adjustments for those where we had to revise some of the revenue we recorded to reduce those revenues. It was just an accounting adjustment.

DR. PANNU: Okay.

My supplementary, Mr. Chairman. In the other revenue, which is the bottom part of that chart there, there's the sale of accounts receivables. I guess that's \$53,000 lost there; is it?

MR. BRYGIDYR: No, that's \$7,000.

DR. PANNU: Oh, I'm sorry. I was looking at \$53,000. I guess that's for the next item down, the write down of capital assets. I don't have a question then. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hlady.

MR. HLADY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, the theme this morning seems to be around the performance of delegated entities, Mr. Minister. In regards to the monitoring process, on page 156 of the Auditor General's report, under recommendation no. 22, he recommended that

Labour establish policies and procedures to more effectively monitor the performance of delegated entities based on an assessment of risks.

I'm just wondering: what have you done in the department to address this matter of assessing risks?

MR. KRUSELNICKI: Yeah. This seems to be a popular topic today of DAOs. As I mentioned before, we've developed quality management plans and established monitoring activities and are trying to take a more proactive approach to address those issues raised, and we're working very closely with the Auditor General, as I've mentioned. We also are requiring the delegated entities to submit more performance-based information than just relying solely on audited financial statements. We're trying to address it in a very, very proactive manner and really come up with the proper balance, if you like, to address the recommendations the Auditor General has noted.

MR. HLADY: Thank you.

In a little different area in regards to regional services, I'm on page 90 in the public accounts, volume 2. Under the regional services budget elements 2.2.1 through 2.2.4 reflect a budget underexpenditure of 18 percent. I'm just wondering: why was each region able to operate so far under budget?

MR. BRYGIDYR: The savings we experienced in the regions were very much tied to the safety services. As municipalities, agencies, and corporations started to come onstream into the delegated safety service system, we then were experiencing organizational savings within the department. So while the service levels weren't affected, the budgetary costs were reduced. We had some reductions in our regional operations through our Camrose and Drumheller offices. We were able to downsize those costs and the services out of those areas and provide the service for those regions through the Edmonton and Calgary regional offices.

MR. HLADY: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Zwozdesky and then Mr. Ducharme.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to reference the Alberta Fire Training School program, which is on page 90 of volume 2, item 2.1.5. Earlier this week, as you know, we had the pleasure of attending the exemplary fire service and safety awards given to outstanding individuals across the province at Government House, so fire safety is very much on my mind. I understand there are some excellent programs which the Department of Labour runs. In fact, I was talking to my constituent Don Harke, who received one of these outstanding awards incidentally, and in speaking with him and his wife, he was citing some of the programs that the Department of Labour was perhaps involved in. I notice here there's a rather large overexpenditure in that area of about \$827,000 between the projected and the actual. So I was hoping perhaps some explanation could be given with respect to that overexpenditure and what types of programs it covered.

MR. SMITH: Yes, we will provide some detail for you, Gene. I also was at the fire safety awards in Calgary a week earlier. Some of the guys I played hockey with were also fire guys. They were getting their 20- and 25-year pins, and you started to realize just how old you really are. They, too, also extolled the positive side of the Department of Labour, and of course I couldn't help but agree with them.

The specific part of the training school. I think one of the things we determine with the Department of Labour – we have a core business responsibility in the fire code, the fire commissioner, the investigation component, but we don't have a core business commitment in the training centre. There's a department for that, Advanced Education and Career Development. I think part of making government more responsive to its shareholders is being able to deliver your core services at a reasonable rate and in a nonduplicative manner, with emphasis being placed on performance. We were in the position with this particular entity of managing it from Edmonton while it looked across the highway to Lakeland College. You have two operating entities sitting there, yet they're not handshaking or interacting with each other. So when we decided that (a) it was not a core business and (b) it was a remote facility that we couldn't manage well, we undertook negotiations with Advanced Ed and Career Development to move that over.

The second thing with that business entity is that they're located in an area where they can train out-of-province fire workers for a profit fee from Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and other parts. They're also looking at some of the international opportunities. Particularly with the Saskatchewan market, there was little warmth to having the Alberta Fire Training School certificate of proficiency in training hanging on the wall of the Kindersley fire department. More and more what we found: we were able to take the business expertise of Lakeland, which is training and marketing and those types of programs, and put the Lakeland Fire Training School on that certificate. It gets you over a couple of marketing and business hurdles. So having realized that it didn't fall into a core business and we felt there were opportunities to move it over, we spent about nine months, I guess, going through the negotiation side. We've already seen from the transition an operational saving in some manpower; they've already gleaned some administrative efficiencies. But we did have to buy out the merger with a little bit of a capital expenditure, which I guess will be reflected in 1996-97. That gets it down to the specific dollar detail, and I'll let Gerry supplement that.

MR. BRYGIDYR: Yes. Part of that transition, the agreement we arrived at with Lakeland College, called for \$500,000 worth of

transitional equipment support just to ensure that by them taking ownership of the program, they weren't at a disadvantage in having to restock or rebuild the equipment the next day. So we facilitated that. Also, we had to operate the school for the full fiscal year. We originally went into the '96-97 budget anticipating that the school would be transferred to an outside provider during the course of the year. In fact the deliberations with Lakeland College took us right through to December, and we will be operating the Fire Training School right up until today. Today they formally come within the operating scheme of Lakeland College. So we've had to operate them for the full year despite our plans at the beginning, and we've had to pay more money into it.

9:50

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Thank you. The short answer, I gather, is that it was a onetime transition cost.

MR. BRYGIDYR: It was a onetime transitional.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: And now it's out on its own.

MR. BRYGIDYR: Exactly.

MR. SMITH: I think if you wanted the short answer, you wouldn't have started talking about your fire service awards.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we do need short answers to try and shorten this.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: I had to make it relevant.

THE CHAIRMAN: We've also dealt with former hockey players and your escapades in the dark of the night on April 1 of last year.

MR. ZWOZDESKY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We've done a lot of things.

MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. I was only following the line of questioning brought forward by the hon. member.

THE CHAIRMAN: You were dutifully following the lead. Yes, you were, sir.

Mr. Ducharme.

MR. DUCHARME: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question deals with employment pensions, and I'd reference you to page 90 of public accounts, volume 2, line 3.3.5. Employment pensions exceeded the 1996-97 budget by \$269,000. Mr. Minister, it's not my intent to embarrass in asking this question, but I am seeking the bare facts. Was this overexpenditure of employment pensions possibly due to poor management of the operational and staffing costs?

[Mr. Johnson in the chair]

MR. SMITH: You'll know by noon.

Gerry, why don't you take a run at the cost side, and then, Peter, you'll want to comment, I'm sure, on the management side.

MR. BRYGIDYR: The employment pension's operation was originally, again, one of those cases where it was scheduled to become a DAO during the course of '96-97. Consequently we did not budget for a full year's operation. We anticipated that the operation would be moved out into the private sector, or the

nongovernment sector. The reason for the expenditure therefore exceeding the budget was to reflect the fact that it's operating within the department on an ongoing basis now, and we had to supplement our operating budget to be able to accommodate that.

MR. SMITH: And we made the right business decision. The investigation of DAOizing this particular entity would have only created another layer of bureaucracy in reporting. It would have in fact put more pressure on private-sector funding, and in the extensive consultation this is always carried out by the Department of Labour in determining its business plan directions. There's absolutely no support or wisdom that could be found to sustain DAOizing this particular function.

Peter, do you want to comment on the management side?

MR. KRUSELNICKI: Sure. Back in '96-'97 I had an opportunity to spend I think 10 weeks, and I can mention that the management of that program has been very well undertaken under Gail Armitage and my colleague Mr. Brygidyr. They're doing an exceptional job of delivering a great program service to their stakeholders and industry. They will be coming in under budget, I believe, in the subsequent year. So they're doing a great job, Mr. Ducharme, and I'm very proud of the program they're delivering.

MR. DUCHARME: Thank you.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Mr. White, followed by Ms Olsen.

MR. WHITE: Yes, thank you. It's a rare opportunity that I get to sit in the Minister of Labour's chair here, asking the minister . . .

MR. SMITH: You want to keep the "u" in labour, Lance.

MR. WHITE: Yeah, I'm doing a good job. How's this, Murray? It's tough work over here, Murray.

MR. SMITH: The trick is to make it look easy.

MR. WHITE: Yes. You're watching carefully.

Coming from a relatively dominant blue-collar area as I do and I represent, I have a great deal to do with the Workers' Compensation Board. I've noticed a very marked trend in dissatisfaction starting from a low when I was first elected in '93 to a crescendo last year, the year we're dealing with in these accounts, and then back down actually. It's been getting much better, Mr. Minister, as of late.

As I understand the WCB, it's an accounting entity unto itself, so there aren't any dollars subsidized by the government, and vice versa, there aren't any dollars returned. Well, as I understood your department's remarks earlier, in this period we're speaking of, some \$3 million was saved in operational expenses. There was some \$100 million returned to the stakeholders, the corporations that pay your bills. I recall very vividly that the chief executive officer or the chief operating officer at the time will receive somewhere in the order of three times that which the hon. Premier of our province did for an annual remuneration. I was wondering if there's any tie between reported earnings of that now departed officer and their bonus and that which it cost the workers. As I see it, if you're not paying here, you're doing something else over here. Quite frankly, the feeling in the industry was that the workers were getting short-changed by some kind of unspoken policy direction to the benefit of WCB and the chief executive officer or the chief operating officer. Is that true, or am I off base on this one?

MS CAMERON: I'd be pleased to answer that, because I think that's

quite a widely held misconception. When you take a look at what happened in '96, actually the employers fully funded the WCB, and because of outstanding performance there actually was able to be a rebate to those employers. At the same time, we're leading the benefits that are paid to injured workers across Canada, and we actually increased the benefits that we're providing them.

The management at the time, supported by the board of directors – and I think because of the results it was certainly seen to be the correct decision – decided to pay market rates to the employees and to the CEO. So they went out and they did a market survey. They decided that in order to achieve really challenging goals, really tough measures of performance, they needed skilled and talented people to do it. So they decided to pay market rates, which in fact they did, to their managers, to their CEO; that was contractual with the board at the time. But when you take a look at the actual measures – the continually increasing satisfaction of both employers and workers and the outstanding financial performance of the organization – I think a great deal was accomplished in a short time. Not to say we still don't have some big challenges in front of us. We're continuing to really focus on worker satisfaction and employer satisfaction. As you may know, we're undertaking now the largest consultation in WCB history to make sure our benefit policies are appropriate for the marketplace.

MR. WHITE: That being current policy, perhaps, so I'm not allowed to speak of that. But I'd like to revisit that and perhaps challenge the minister and his staff's contention. Customer satisfaction from the workers' point of view was certainly not up from the front line – albeit anecdotal, perhaps some 75 caseloads per year, and each one of us has the same. But that being aside, what I hear is the contention that the success rate of injuries was down so low in this particular year of accounting that you were able to return \$100 million to the corporations that pay the fees and pay the increased costs of remuneration and still maintain payment to injured workers at a level that was commensurate with every other year in the continuum.

10:00

MS CAMERON: And we can provide the detailed results. But the actual payments to injured workers went up. The reason we could have the rebate was the good performance on the investments and, also, efficiencies that we found through re-engineering and better management practices throughout the organization. It was not done at the cost of the injured workers.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Sorry; the time has elapsed.

MR. WHITE: But there was an undertaking to deliver some information. Would that be forthcoming?

MS CAMERON: Certainly we can provide the measures, yes.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Our time has elapsed, so I'll declare the meeting adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 10:01 a.m.]

