



STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 24 — May 1, 2019



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-Eighth Legislature

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. Trent Wotherspoon, Chair
Regina Rosemont

Mr. Don McMorris, Deputy Chair
Indian Head-Milestone

Hon. Lori Carr
Estevan

Mr. Todd Goudy
Melfort

Ms. Lisa Lambert
Saskatoon Churchill-Wildwood

Mr. Warren Michelson
Moose Jaw North

Ms. Vicki Mowat
Saskatoon Fairview

Mr. Randy Weekes
Biggar-Sask Valley

[The committee met at 09:00.]

The Chair: — Well good morning, folks. We'll convene the Standing Committee on Public Accounts this morning. Welcome to Deputy Chair McMorris, Mr. Goudy, Mr. Michelson, Mr. Weekes. I see that or I know that Mr. Pedersen is substituting for a while here for Ms. Mowat. I'd like to introduce our officials from the Provincial Comptroller's office. We've got Terry Paton, Provincial Comptroller; Chris Bayda, assistant provincial comptroller. Very fine tie that you have on there today, sir.

And at this time I'd like to table documents: PAC 75-28, Provincial Auditor of Saskatchewan: Third quarter financial forecast for the period ending December 31st, 2018; PAC 76-28, Provincial Auditor of Saskatchewan: Fourth quarter financial forecast for the period ending March 31st, 2019.

Environment

The Chair: — I'd like to introduce our Provincial Auditor, Judy Ferguson, thank her for her presence and her work, and her officials of course. And I welcome Deputy Minister Gallagher and officials from the Ministry of Environment. We'll have a presentation briefly from the auditor and then we'll turn it over to you for a response and, when you do so, if you can introduce your officials at that time as well. So at this point I'll turn it over to the Provincial Auditor.

Ms. Ferguson: — Thank you very much, Chair, Deputy Chair, members, and officials. Good morning here. With me this morning I've got Mr. Kelly Deis. Kelly is the deputy that leads the environment division and is responsible for the ministry, and assumed that responsibility just last fall. And behind him is Mr. Jason Shaw, and Jason led some of the work that we're chatting about this morning. And Ms. Lowe sends her regrets. She is unable to make it.

So before we launch into this morning, just to remind the members, these are two follow-ups. There's no new recommendations in the two chapters. We'll present each chapter. Mr. Deis will present the chapters. We'll pause after each and allow for a discussion of the committee here. So before Mr. Deis dashes into that, I just want to extend my thanks to the ministry for their co-operation in these subject matters. I think what you'll find is that these are areas that the ministry has moved along in, and us as an audit office are quite pleased to see the progress that's been made.

Mr. Deis: — The Ministry of Environment is responsible for regulating landfills and monitoring landfills based on the results of environmental risk assessments. Chapter 18 of our 2018 report volume 1 on page 233 to 239 reports the results of our second follow-up of management's actions on seven outstanding recommendations originally made in our 2013 audit.

Our 2013 audit volume 2, chapter 29 concluded that the Ministry of Environment did not have effective processes to regulate landfills. By August of 2015, the time of our first follow-up, the ministry had implemented two of the nine recommendations. At December of 2017, we found the ministry implemented four of the seven outstanding recommendations and made progress on the other three.

The ministry moved to monitoring landfills based on the results of environmental risk assessments. It required owners of landfills with assessed risks to monitor groundwater. In addition, the ministry actively confirmed new constructions, expansions, and landfill closures were done in accordance with its requirements and approved plans. It worked with owners that did not comply with requirements or plans until they achieved compliance, or issued sanctions. As of December of 2017, the ministry needed to finalize and approve guidance for a landfill design and operation. Without consistent guidance for landfills, landfills may not be built and operated to the required environmental standard.

Also the ministry needed to finish their renewal of landfill permits to include requirements for groundwater monitoring. Since 2016 the ministry requires operating landfills to monitor groundwater when it renews landfill permits. By December 2017 the ministry required, through permits, nearly half of the 229 operating landfills in Saskatchewan to conduct groundwater monitoring. Not monitoring groundwater at landfills increases the risk that groundwater may not be detected in a timely manner.

Lastly the ministry needed to conduct inspections on the landfills as scheduled. At December 2017 the ministry was behind schedule on inspecting landfills. It was not inspecting landfills consistent with its priority-based inspection strategy. In 2017-18 the ministry expected to inspect about 85 landfills of the 265 landfills that were due for inspection. It did not have a plan or strategy to address its growing shortfall of inspection activity. Timely inspections determine whether landfill operators adhere to landfill permit requirements and the law. Permit requirements and laws exist to keep the environment and people safe. And that concludes our presentation.

The Chair: — Thank you for the presentation and the work. Thank you as well to the ministry for the status update that's been provided to the committee. At this time we are tabling the status update, and I'll table PAC 77-28, Ministry of the Environment: Status update, dated May 1st, 2019. I'd ask Deputy Minister Gallagher to introduce her officials, provide whatever responses she wants to in a brief way on the front end, and then we'll open it up to the committee for questions.

Ms. Gallagher: — Thank you. So thank you to the Chair, members, and officials. Before I start I will introduce Wes, assistant deputy minister, environmental protection division; Veronica Gelowitz, who's behind me, assistant deputy minister, corporate services and policy division. We have Ash Olesen, executive director, environmental protection branch. And also for the next, I'll just introduce them now for the next. We have Brant Kirychuk, executive director of fish, wildlife and lands branch. And we also have Cheryl Jansen here, our director of budget and financing.

Before I get into the comments on the findings, I'd like to thank Ms. Ferguson for her work and the work of the full team. The Ministry of Environment really does welcome the advice of the Provincial Auditor's office as a way to help the ministry to improve our operations.

In regards to regulating landfills, the Provincial Auditor, as mentioned, issued the nine recommendations to the ministry.

And six were identified as implemented by 2018, and we still have three that are partially implemented.

We believe we've made significant progress on implementing the remaining recommendations since the reviews. The first recommendation is to adopt guidance on landfills from the proposed environmental code as operating practice. Guidance material has been developed, with further materials to be developed once the solid waste management strategy that we are working on right now is finalized.

The second outstanding recommendation is to amend operating permits for all high-risk landfills to ensure they require appropriate groundwater monitoring. Beginning in 2016, permits now require all landfill owners to conduct groundwater monitoring unless they obtain sign-off from their engineering consultant certifying that the site-specific conditions identified through a formal assessment do not warrant it. Landfills are given up to five years to have groundwater monitoring in place. All permits are expected to be updated by 2021 to include groundwater monitoring if it is applicable to them.

The remaining recommendation is to perform landfill inspections in accordance with the ministry's established frequency requirements. The ministry is further refining risk evaluation of landfills to develop a true risk-based, on-site, specific criteria for the purpose of informing inspection planning for the '19-20 season and will be implemented for '20-21. The ministry will continue to put a priority focus on the higher risk landfills and will adjust our compliance plans to align with assigned resources and compliance assurance targets that we have.

And that's the end of my comments, and we'd welcome any questions you might have. Thank you.

The Chair: — Thanks for the report and for all the work. I'll open it up to committee members for questions and also welcome Ms. Lambert, who I think I neglected to welcome before. Mr. Pedersen.

Mr. Pedersen: — Thank you. So in the Provincial Auditor's report there was a note that the ministry was falling behind in basically its inspections. I was wondering what the plan is to get caught up.

Mr. Kotyk: — Thank you for that question. Maybe just as a bit of background, part of the reason why there are needed adjustments throughout the year is that when we do inspections, if we find non-compliance items, that requires extra attention on those facilities to bring them into compliance and work with them. So those efforts that we do on that take away the ability to carry out additional inspections.

So at the beginning of the year we always develop a compliance plan. We identify the number of high-risk facilities, the number of facilities that are due for inspections, and we look at the resources that we have as well as the number of non-compliance issues that we're following up on. So we are continually adjusting that, and as we move year to year our numbers and our ability to address those are improving.

Mr. Pedersen: — So I guess I'm trying to figure out . . . You're saying it's improving, but as I understood the auditor's report is,

you're actually falling behind. And I guess I'm wondering what, you know, when comes to inspections, of course, if you're not getting to the inspections, you can't even identify the non-compliant ones. I definitely understand that when you find non-compliant ones, that takes more work. But if you're not even getting to the inspections you can't even figure out which ones are non-compliant.

Mr. Olesen: — Thank you for the question. And you know, it's understood that the auditor's report, of course, flows from 2013 at which point in time the management of landfills was transitioning to the environmental protection branch from the then municipal branch that migrated to the Water Security Agency. So all that to say, at the time of the audit in 2013, the inspection frequencies were dictated under a different policy, which effectively was high, medium, and low risk. But high-risk landfills were basically based on size as opposed to the geology, the hydrogeology, the proximity to ground water, is the ground water potable, etc., etc. So that recommendation is a little dated, and of course that's why we're actively trying to get it addressed.

But to your question, notwithstanding the fact that the inspection frequency being asked to or spoken to by the auditor is dated, here is some numbers to reflect what the ministry is doing in terms of trying to deal with that recommendation.

So number one is we have assigned a junior environmental protection officer to the landfill section to help bolster the inspections being undertaken. And to that end, if you looked at operating landfills, in 2017-18 the number of inspections was 21. Relative to end-of-year 2018-19, the number of inspections at operating landfills was 62. Closed landfills went from 24 to 26 inspections and operating transfer stations went from 25 to 66. So the number of inspections, in fact, year on year are very much increasing, partly because, of course, we're trying to allocate resources to address this.

Concurrent to that, we're trying to come up with the second recommendation, which is this notion of conducting inspections based on the risk of the landfill. And again to that end, risk needs to be defined not on the size of the landfill, because the reality is some landfills, like the major urban centres, are of less risk than some of our smaller, less managed, and just by virtue of the geology and proximity to groundwater, therefore, more high risk.

But to come up with that list, you know, based on site-specific geology requires environmental site assessments. Is there a sandlands? Is there somebody using a potable aquifer at 10 metres below grade? All those types of things need to be considered. And that's partly why this is taking some time.

Ms. Gallagher: — And I would just add one more point to the . . . that this is a comprehensive approach to landfills. You know, there's the one piece around inspections, but we're taking a very fulsome look at how we manage waste in the province. That's why we're doing the waste management strategy.

And so for example, we're reducing the number of landfills and working actively to that. We had more landfills per capita than any jurisdiction in Canada. So, you know, there are 409 operating solid waste management facilities now. We've got 481 closed facilities. So in addition to the work that Ash and Wes's groups are doing, we're also looking at the full picture, so what we can

do to have our landfills better represent what would be appropriate for the province.

[09:15]

Mr. Pedersen: — So as I understand it then, currently there's not a complete list of the risk assessment based on criteria other than size, and that's still in process.

Mr. Olesen: — That's right.

Mr. Pedersen: — What sort of progress are we at on that?

Mr. Olesen: — Right now we're targeting to have basically all of the site assessment work done for all operating landfills by 2026. But that means, though, of course as operating permits are renewed, of course we are saying we'll have all those operating permits renewed by 2021 to require groundwater monitoring where required, but they get that five-year window to actually get it in place. So I could potentially amend that last permit in 2021 saying you need to do groundwater monitoring, but you've got a five-year window to get it in place. So that's why the answer to your question, the conservative answer to your question, is 2026.

Mr. Pedersen: — And so the way that this full, complete list of the site-specific criteria that identifies, you know, which ones are more risky than others is basically through the renewal process of their operating permit.

Mr. Olesen: — Right. Right. Which in turn would require . . . Let's say you're landfill operator ABC and we renew your permit in 2021 to say that you do in fact need to conduct groundwater monitoring but you have five years to put it in place. You still would need to hire a qualified professional, come out, drill the wells, install the piezometers, understand the stratigraphy, you know. And that of course takes time and money.

Mr. Pedersen: — But that would take the operator's time and money as opposed to the ministry's time and money.

Mr. Olesen: — That's correct.

Mr. Pedersen: — Okay. In terms of the delay in getting the complete list of risk assessment is really about how fast the ministry wants to push the operators?

Mr. Olesen: — To some degree. Some operators are understanding that this is in their best interests and do it proactively.

Mr. Pedersen: — Thank you. We can move on to the next chapter.

The Chair: — Is there further questions here? Mr. Michelson.

Mr. Michelson: — I'm just curious. When you do an inspection, what is that all involved?

Mr. Olesen: — Well yes, the first thing it involves is for an environmental protection officer to review the permit to operate. And the permit to operate will speak to things like the frequency with which compaction needs to occur, the frequency with which cover material needs to be placed, the fact that the facility is

fenced, the fact that there's security at the facility to prevent people from just dumping illegally, the fact that there's a dedicated area for white goods — so refrigerators, appliances, etc. for recycling — a dedicated area for tires, etc. So a very comprehensive review of the permit to operate. And then of course the environmental protection officer comes to the facility, and based on the numbers I just cited, 66 times there was an inspection done in 2018-19 at an operating landfill.

Let's pretend I'm the environmental protection officer and you're the operator. We would sit, we would review your operating permit. Then we would put on our boots and we would begin to walk around the landfill and we would talk to the various conditions of the operating permit. So do you in fact have a white goods storage facility? Do you have a dedicated area for your waste tires? What about waste oil or is all your tankage appropriately permitted? Does it have the appropriate signage? All those types of things.

And then we would do that jointly and we would review it in the context of your permit. And of course it would be, you know, I'm sorry, you don't have this, or you do have that, or what you do have isn't quite good enough and here's why. And the tenor of the exchange between you and I is very much educational. It's very much changed from that notion of, you know, I'm the environmental protection officer here to tell you what you're doing wrong, as opposed to I'm the environmental protection officer here to tell you how we can work together and how your interests will be better served if you do A, B, and C.

And to that end, I would then write up the areas that you had challenges with respect to compliance. And that would be filed and it would be referenced for the next time I came to visit you.

Mr. Michelson: — And there would be time limits on when they would need to come into compliance? Yes.

Mr. Olesen: — There would be recommended or suggested timelines for execution.

Mr. Michelson: — Thank you for that explanation.

Mr. Olesen: — You're welcome.

Mr. Michelson: — Thank you.

Ms. Gallagher: — I just have one more point, is that we also do compliance audits of all of our operations throughout that we regulate as a ministry. And so for example, last year we did the compliance audit of the Regina landfill. And I was fortunate we have a mentor-me, mentor-you program, so you can select to go with the deputy minister for a day, and then I go with them for a day and participated in the city of Regina audit. And it's very thorough, you know, all of the things that Ashley checked on but enhanced review both of the performance management for the city of Regina as well as all of the on-site. So it was very interesting if you ever get a chance to do that kind of activity.

Mr. Michelson: — I can imagine. Thank you.

Mr. McMorris: — Just real quick, you mentioned operators. When I think of landfills I think of municipalities, and you're using the term "operator." What's the difference? I mean, I know

that there can be a group of municipalities that will have a landfill and then you call that the operator, but are they not all governed necessarily through municipalities?

Mr. Olesen: — Not necessarily. We do have some private industrial landfills that we're also responsible for. But to your question, it's very much a generic term, and the lion's share of the work is municipal government.

Mr. McMorris: — Okay. Good.

The Chair: — Any other questions? Certainly this is important work and so thanks to all that are involved in it, and certainly those operators, the majority I think being, you know, municipalities. It's very important to continue the work on this front. So thanks to all those that are involved.

I will welcome a motion to conclude consideration of this chapter.

Mr. Michelson: — I so move to conclude consideration.

The Chair: — Mr. Michelson. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — That's carried. We'll move along to chapter 31 from the 2018 report volume 2, and I'll turn it over to the auditor.

Mr. Deis: — The Ministry of Environment is responsible for preventing the introduction or spread of aquatic invasive species in the province such as invasive zebra and quagga mussels. Chapter 31 of our 2018 report volume 2, on page 225 to 230, reports the results of our first follow-up of the ministry's actions to implement five recommendations we made in 2016 about preventing the entry and spread of aquatic invasive species in Saskatchewan.

By June 2018 the ministry had implemented one of the five recommendations made in our 2016 audit. The ministry, along with its key partners, developed a long-term strategy to prevent the entry and spread of aquatic invasive species. This strategy provides a foundation to further improvements. The ministry needed to use its long-term strategy to implement the remaining four recommendations.

As of June 2018, while the ministry had increased activities related to inspecting watercrafts, it had not developed or followed a risk-based watercraft inspection strategy. A risk-based water inspection strategy would help it make informed decisions about where and when to focus its inspection activities.

Similarly it had not formalized a risk-based strategy for sampling Saskatchewan waters to look for the existence of aquatic invasive species. Using a risk-based strategy helps to determine what types of monitoring to complete, how much sampling to do, which water bodies to monitor. No adult invasive mussels were found from over 120 samples taken from about 30 water bodies in 2017-18. The ministry needed to complete and test a rapid response plan. A good response plan would aid the ministry in minimizing the impact and spread of aquatic invasive species if detected.

Lastly, the ministry needed to use the measures it developed to assess effectiveness of its aquatic invasive species education and awareness campaign. Periodically evaluating the success of its education and awareness efforts ensures it targets its resources on worthwhile activities. And that concludes our presentation.

The Chair: — Thanks for the presentation and the important focus of the work. I'll turn it over to the deputy minister for a brief response and then open it up.

Ms. Gallagher: — All right. Thank you. And we in the ministry, we recognize the importance of preventing aquatic invasive species in the province. Regarding the first outstanding recommendation around formalizing a risk-based watercraft inspection strategy related to AIS [aquatic invasive species], we are using data collected both from the ministry and our partners in this initiative.

During the previous three years of watercraft inspection, a formal risk-based strategy is currently being developed with plans for implementation during the 2019 watercraft inspection season. The ministry is also planning to establish a new permanent watercraft inspection station on Highway 1 in response to gaps identified in the draft strategy, and this is in addition to mobile units that we have deployed throughout the province.

The second outstanding recommendation is to establish a risk-based strategy for sampling Saskatchewan waters for AIS. Data has been collected since 2016 relating to traffic and destination of high-risk watercraft coming to the province, water quality requirements for establishment of several AIS, and water quality as it relates to establishment of AIS in water bodies across Saskatchewan. Compilation of the data and formalization of a draft risk-based strategy for AIS sampling will be completed and implemented ahead of the 2019 sampling season and will be finalized ahead of the 2020 inspection season.

The third outstanding recommendation is to complete and test a formal rapid response plan to mitigate the spread of aquatic invasive species in Saskatchewan waters. We've made this a priority, and the ministry is working with other Western Canadian jurisdictions, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, and the provincial government and non-government partners to develop a coordinated and interjurisdictional response plan.

And I would just add that I was just at the FPT [federal-provincial-territorial] for Canadian fisheries and oceans ministries. That was a big part of the discussion that we had had because we're the next Western province to fall, and we believe that there needs to be national assistance to us to prevent it moving further west.

A draft early detection and rapid response plan has been developed and now includes a finalized crisis communications plan. We are currently incorporating a formal incident command system into our strategy with plans to test our responses for the fall of 2019. The ministry is planning to coordinate and test multiple AIS introduction scenarios in 2019 through the early detection and rapid response draft plan. And following the test, the ministry will draft a lessons-learned document that will contribute to the finalization of an early detection and response plan for early 2020.

And I would just say that, you know, we feel this is important for us from the standpoint that if we are able to have our partners and everybody aware and we're ready to go once detection . . . we're not scrambling to figure out what is the right approach here.

So the remaining outstanding recommendation is for the ministry to measure the effectiveness of its aquatic invasive species public education program and awareness campaign regularly. Questions concerning AIS awareness were incorporated into the 2015 angler survey, and we have been using electronic watercraft inspection form from 2016 and developed a survey of watercraft users in the provincial parks.

Saskatchewan.ca is regularly monitored for its hits on the invasive species web page. And we will continue to survey for education and awareness through the watercraft inspection program in 2019 and we'll continue to monitor traffic on our online AIS-related publications. We also plan to utilize the organizations on the AIS task force to survey their stakeholders that they represent in 2019 and use the data in our analysis. We plan to complete a formal review in 2019 on the overall effectiveness of the program, and we're committed to addressing each of these recommendations.

So with that, I would welcome questions. Thank you.

The Chair: — Thanks for the attention and work on this front. Certainly it is really important and, you know, Saskatchewan certainly really is at risk on this front as well. I'll open it up to committee members. And I'll also mention that Ms. Mowat has joined us. Mr. Pedersen looks like he's going to say something.

Mr. Pedersen: — Yes. Yes, thank you. So in 2017-18 it said there was 90 water bodies that were sampled. That's got to be a pretty small sample of the number of lakes and rivers that we have in Saskatchewan, wouldn't it be? A pretty small portion I guess.

[09:30]

Mr. Kirychuk: — Yes, there's close to 100,000 water bodies in Saskatchewan. There's different risk levels depending on the chemistry and the volume of boat traffic, predominately high-risk boat traffic.

We've increased the number of water bodies sampled each year. We rely heavily on partners, and our education process has helped with that. You know, we get a lot of inquiries — hey, you should do something in our lake. We'd say, hey, did you know that sampling is very easy? Could you collect the samples for us? So we're seeing exponential increases in sampling.

And part of our strategy will be to really focus on some of the high-risk water bodies. We've got a great program happening at Lake Diefenbaker, which is a high-risk water body, because of a lot of volunteers there. So we'll see that increase as time goes on.

Ms. Gallagher: — We have been working nationally. So when we say sampling is simple, there's a DNA [deoxyribonucleic acid] test for the water, so it's not having to examine the full water body. And you know, to date we have had no hits in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Pedersen: — So for example, on a lake the size of Lake Diefenbaker, if you were to sample at Coteau Bay, presumably that wouldn't necessarily be indicative of, you know, if there was zebra mussels at Riverhurst or Sask Landing or . . .

Mr. Kirychuk: — That's a very good question. Diefenbaker's a great example. A water body that size is, you know, difficult to monitor. So you monitor in the high-risk locations — boat launches, marinas, those kind of locations. That's where we set priority for our monitoring.

Mr. Pedersen: — And so when we think about that, like how many on a lake the size of Diefenbaker — which would be a priority — are you getting multiple samples done, you know, on those high-risk lakes?

Mr. Kirychuk: — Yes, Lake Diefenbaker is interesting. We have a volunteer group; it's called the Lake Diefenbaker task force. They're very motivated to protect their lake, so they've got an extensive monitoring program which we help them with. They've actually got a volunteer inspection program there. So they ask at main marinas that — they've got volunteers there — hey, can we take a look at your boat to provide some information to the boat owners? And if it's a high-risk boat then they call our conservation officers. That's kind of an expansion of your question.

Mr. Pedersen: — So I see that the report here is identifying whether the strategy has been formalized and, like this is sounding like it very much relies on an ad hoc volunteer effort, you know. So is there a kind of a formal ad hoc strategy which has incorporated those volunteer efforts?

Mr. Kirychuk: — Yes. That's again another good question. We've got the overall strategy finalized. We've got a sampling strategy that's going to be based on high-risk watercraft and . . . the volume of high-risk watercraft and the water chemistry. We'll try and identify, you know, where we have gaps based on where our volunteers are sampling and try and address those gaps either through volunteers or through the program ourselves.

We also have in the province the aquatic invasive species task force which is made up of, you know, government, non-government organizations, and they've been very good at being able to, you know, share education, motivate groups to work with us. So we, as part of this strategy, the sampling strategy which we aim to have in place by . . . well, we'll be testing it this year and have it formally in place for the end of the fiscal year, and identify those high-risk water bodies that we don't have sampling on and then determine a way forward on sampling them.

Mr. Pedersen: — Is part of that strategy making sure that there's, say, appropriate signage up at all those high-risk locations?

Mr. Kirychuk: — We've already made significant progress on that. You'll notice the signage on our major and even some of our minor highways, a lot of boat launches particularly in provincial parks along Lake Diefenbaker, our high-access areas. Either we've put up signage or we've got signage available when, say, cabin-owners' groups say, hey, we'd like some signs at our launches; we make the signage available to them. The signage is

an important part of the education process for sure.

Mr. Pedersen: — I noticed in here that there was reference to waiting for some survey results. I think that was from the federal government. What other, I guess is there non-voluntary survey data that you're also collecting? Or is it just kind of a voluntary angler survey that you're . . . Is that your sole data set that you're relying on?

Mr. Kirychuk: — There's several sources we use. The federal government every five years does an annual angler survey. It's very comprehensive. It's very valuable. They have not compiled the data as of yet unfortunately, so we use various tools. We're evaluating our communications plan right now to see how effectively we are communicating to stakeholders. We're formally doing that as part of the recommendation out of the audit. We do collect information when we do stop boats for compliance. There's a form that's filled out, you know, ask various questions about their knowledge. We had more than 2,900 compliance checks last year. Provincial parks, they do a similar thing, both in compliance and non-compliance situations. So it's a combination of methods that we use.

Ms. Gallagher: — And I'll add on to that, is that in addition to signage we also, as Brant talked about, our education program. So we work around survey work with our high-risk activity groups like wakeboarders, fishing derbies. We make sure that we work directly with whether it's an organization or whether it's an individual group to make sure that they have an understanding of the risk potential. So anywhere where boats are moving, we also have education. And we're going to be working through survey work with those organizations to ensure that their members understand the risk of when you're transporting a boat, that's when the risk occurs.

Mr. Pedersen: — So I notice in here that on the watercraft inspection strategy that there were watercraft found as a result of inspections. But obviously if the strategy is not in place, then presumably we're not inspecting every boat either. So what's the timeline for actually getting the strategy in place and actually getting to a point where we're catching more watercraft?

Mr. Kirychuk: — Yes, and there's two subsets of the overall AIS strategy that we're working on. One was the water body sampling strategy which we just spoke about, and the second is the inspection strategy. In fact the draft inspection strategy is in place right now, as of May 1st. We're doing inspections right now. And we've used that on traffic volumes. We've got traffic volumes where vehicles are coming across, be it the US [United States] border, our eastern border, types of watercraft that are coming through, where the ones from high-risk areas are coming through, and seeing where they're funnelling through and even figuring out what times of day that they're travelling.

So our strategy was based on that. And the first piece of our adjustment to that strategy was the establishment of the permanent inspection station at Moosomin, at the weigh scales there, because it is a high-traffic area. And then a very powerful tool is our mobile inspection stations, and we move those around to, you know, lesser high-risk areas but areas where we, at certain times of year, are expecting boats from high-risk areas to come through. And also we send our mobile stations to things.

Another high-risk area is particularly the big fishing tournaments where we get boats from out of province and out of country. Fortunately some of those are some of the most educated folks though as well in regards to AIS.

Ms. Gallagher: — And then in addition nationally, we're working with CCFAM [Canadian Council of Fisheries and Aquaculture Ministers] to say that we need some additional support at the borders. So we actually have been training border officers so that they can identify them with the new policing program that we have in the province. The RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police], we are also going to be training them in addition to our conservation officers, the other folks that are out there on our roads. The RCMP officers and the highway officers will also be aware and be able to identify high-risk boats. And we are encouraging Canada to enhance their regulation so that it's, the transport along the Trans-Canada Highway where we're at greatest risk is where somebody who's uneducated and transports a boat into our province.

You know, I would say last year we did 2,922 watercraft inspections, and we could increase that multiple-folds but it won't address it because, you know, it just takes one boat to slip in. And so that's where I think we need this very multi-faceted program to address the problem.

Mr. Pedersen: — Is there any consideration or discussions happening to get information from the federal government about when somebody is importing a boat, you know, that they've purchased say in the States or somewhere out of province? Because I know you don't have any involvement in registering those, but the feds certainly do.

Ms. Gallagher: — And that's where we are encouraging the federal government to have stronger regulations that will help the provinces and territories in preventing the input. They have some regulations but they're not as strong as they need to be. I don't know if you have anything to add.

Mr. Kirychuk: — Yes. The CBSA [Canada Border Services Agency], particularly last year and continuing this year, have been excellent to work with on the Saskatchewan border. Their border agents have been trained in identifying high-risk boats coming across our southern border, and they're a very important agency for referring high-risk boats to us. And that's why we have the Estevan decontamination station. In fact we don't do a pile of inspections there. We do a lot of decontaminations. And they have been quite open and have proved fairly good at recognizing high-risk boats. In fact the other day we got one coming across with mussels on it.

Ms. Gallagher: — I would just say, we feel though that Canada needs a stronger regulatory piece. Because while we have regulations that we can charge an individual who transports zebra mussels within the province, there isn't that same regulatory requirement for if you're out of Canada. So you know, we need it to be across Canada. And that's where we work with the CCFAM to ensure that it's not each province just having to set up their own protection, but that nationally it will become an infraction to transport a boat with zebra mussels.

Mr. Pedersen: — I noticed in here that it talked about Duck Mountain and Estevan already having aquatic invasive species.

Was that talking about other species other than mussels? Or am I misreading that?

Mr. Kirychuk: — The reference there is in regards to our . . . those are our two permanent inspection stations. Last year those were high-risk areas because of boat traffic coming from high-risk areas. So now we're going to have one at Moosomin this year as a permanent inspection station — not necessarily because there's invasive species in a particular area. It's based on boat traffic from high-risk areas.

Ms. Gallagher: — And so while there hasn't been a hit in Saskatchewan, Duck Mountain, Manitoba did have a hit. It's turned out that they didn't have a . . . for some reason the genetic hit came across at Duck Mountain but it didn't show that there was a zebra mussel population in the lake. But with the co-operation that we have, as soon as the hit was found at Duck Mountain, Manitoba, we put in the permanent station. We worked with parks, our park system to make sure that we had good protection, because many people at Duck Mountain, both Manitoba and Saskatchewan side, will move their boats back and forth.

And then the other thing that Manitoba did was they took out any boat launches in the lake that had the genetic hit so that they couldn't . . . no boats would be moving around. So we, so far we're safe, but that was very close and something that, you know, why we put the priority on having an emergency response. Because we were I think very fortunate Manitoba found it before it got any further than it did.

Mr. Pedersen: — Thanks. I'll be done with mine.

The Chair: — Just a couple observations. It seems that we really are at risk when basically we're surrounded with the presence of these invasive species, with Manitoba, North Dakota, Montana to the south and, you know, systems that are still being developed and urges to the federal government to take certain actions here as well. So prevention really seems critical because once the invasive species is established, I can only imagine how difficult it is to eradicate it.

[09:45]

And so I guess that's my question as I hear about all the . . . Like so the reporting is important, and the assessment. So it's very good that we're working with volunteers; we're getting that reporting. But it's really bad news the day that someone comes back and has found the invasive species. I noted that there was some mention of a rapid response team to then mitigate or deal with the invasive species. How effective can we be and what does that look like? Once we've found an invasive species, what's the potential or the likelihood or the process to eradicate it? Or is it possible? Is it management after that?

Ms. Gallagher: — I'm a biologist so that's, you know, sort of my interest. But that's why a rapid response . . . And where we talked about different scenarios. So it does really matter what water body it comes into. If it comes into a moving system like the South Saskatchewan River, it will be very difficult to manage. There are things that you can do. You can go in and dump, essentially, a chemical in that, you know. Sometimes it's potash or other chemicals that will actually eradicate the zebra mussels.

It also can have impact on other aquatic species. So it, you know, I think it would depend on the water body. If it's a closed water body like the one at Duck Mountain, you can shut it down and prevent something getting out of the water body. If it's, you know, a big massive system like Diefenbaker or the Saskatchewan River system, we'll have a different response plan.

It's important that we have our communities understanding what a rapid response means, what that could have impact onto fisheries or something else, depending on what our response is. And so we are putting a lot of priority on prevention. And you know, I think there's very few examples where once an invasive species — whether it's terrestrial or aquatic — has gotten into a system that we have been able to eradicate it.

The Chair: — Right, so thank you. It's so important on the prevention side. Certainly the assessment's important and then control. It seems like we're lucky right now that we don't have, you know, the species there.

Just a question on a practical end. I spend a lot of time around lakes and waters and water and boats. Once a boat is dry, is that . . . I know it's "clean, drain, dry" is sort of the process here, but if a boat is dry, is something simple like a canoe, for example, is there still a risk there or does it need further cleaning?

Mr. Kirychuk: — The risk goes down as you follow . . . that starts the reduction of the risk process by clean, drain, and drying. As the boat is out of the water for a longer period of time, generally 30 days, we know we're fairly certain that there's no aquatic invasive species on it. It depends a lot on the situation in that particular boat and the age of any potential contaminant of why there is a range of time period, but definitely just by taking out your boat, pulling the plug, making sure there's no standing water in there and everything's dry, you've reduced the risk significantly. Lots of hiding spots in a boat though is the challenge.

The Chair: — Yes. Okay, a canoe is simpler. It dries out. But I think of my boat. I mean it's pretty rare to have not, you know, a little bit of moisture down in that, down underneath the engine, you know, on the inboards anyways and certainly on the outboards it's similar. I guess is there right now a requirement, an onus put on boat owners that are transporting boats to go through a process if you're over to Manitoba or if you're down into North Dakota and you're coming back? So whether you've purchased one or whether you're just transporting and using your boat, what's the requirement right now on the boat owner?

Ms. Gallagher: — So by regulation it's illegal to transport zebra mussels in the province of Saskatchewan, so the boat owner is educated to, as Brant's outlined, the correct procedures for making sure that your boat is safe. And then the individuals are also made aware that if they are concerned, they can go to an inspection station and have their boat inspected. So like we have regulations that puts that responsibility onto the owner of the craft.

The Chair: — We talked about potash, obviously, or some sort of solution that can help control or kill the invasive species, and obviously we don't want that dumped into Last Mountain Lake or Diefenbaker. So is there a possibility of having a tool kit, with a requirement on boat owners to utilize that on their own

watercraft?

Ms. Gallagher: — Have you seen . . . Like our watercraft decontamination units have high pressure and high heat, and so I don't know that a boat owner could do that themselves. And I think that they would need to be able to have access to a decontamination centre. But you know, maybe if you're in a car wash or something like that and then you allow the boat to dry, you would be able to safety your boat from zebra mussels.

Mr. Kirychuk: — And we are, as part of our education program . . . If they come through our south border, we're in pretty good shape because CBSA has been directing the high-risk boats to us if they come through a southern border. Some of the other provinces, that doesn't necessarily happen, or with our eastern border.

So part of our communications is to advise of our ministry 1-800 number and say, hey, if you're coming into the province, we're willing to do an inspection of your boat. Call the number and we'll arrange for one of our staff to meet you at a mutually agreeable location. So that's part of what we're trying to do, and do demos, you know, like in provincial parks where we have high-use public areas.

Because decontamination, as you mentioned, it can be tricky in a fishing boat or something like that where you've got a lot of gear. If you've seen one of our inspections, all the life jackets come out. All the oars come out. Everything comes out there. You're looking for anything that may be attached or any standing water. There's a lot of difference between, say, a canoe and a fishing boat.

The Chair: — I'll leave it there because I think I'm at risk of breaching the mandate of the committee and getting into a lot of policy field areas. But it does seem to me that there maybe needs to be consideration of greater onus or a responsibility placed onto the owner of a watercraft, and the knowledge if you're coming in from jurisdictions at risk. So I think it's fair enough that someone can be held liable but I'd suspect there's . . . I don't think the education is out there. And I don't know that the onus isn't there on the, you know, the requirement that if you're fishing across the border in Manitoba and then bringing that boat back over, what is it that you're required to do? It's great to extend resources that you can voluntarily phone this number and possibly have an assessment, but I'll leave that for a policy field committee area. Ms. Lambert.

Ms. Lambert: — Thank you. I have watched some videos that have been posted online about particularly Manitoba and affected water bodies, and it's startling to see that, you know, what it looks like. What's the status with Alberta? I really haven't heard much about the invasive species in Alberta. What are they dealing with?

Mr. Kirychuk: — Alberta, they're similar status to us. No, they have a fairly . . . They have a very extensive program as well. We do collaborate with Alberta and Manitoba, BC [British Columbia], and Yukon on a common Western strategy and also the West 911 network where we notify other jurisdictions of high-risk boats coming through our jurisdiction.

Ms. Lambert: — Thank you.

The Chair: — Not seeing any other questions, thanks so much to the Ministry of Environment for their time here today and their focus on these chapters and the continued work. Certainly it's very important. I would welcome a motion to conclude consideration of this chapter. Moved by Mr. Goudy. All agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — That's carried. We'll move along with our final chapter here today and shift our attention to Tourism Saskatchewan. We'll take a brief minute recess.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

Tourism Saskatchewan

The Chair: — Okay, we'll move on with the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, reconvene it here this morning. We turn our focus to Tourism Saskatchewan at a time that . . . Well of course tourism's great in this province year-round but it's a special time of the year, May 1st out there, beautiful day.

It's an honour to have the CEO [chief executive officer], Ms. Mary Taylor-Ash, join us here today. I'll have her introduce her official briefly and respond briefly to the report of the auditor, but at this point I'm going to turn it over to the auditor for their presentation.

Ms. Ferguson: — Thank you very much, Chair, Deputy Chair, members and officials. I just want to introduce it really for the officials. Mr. Kelly Deis is with me along with Jason Shaw and they were both involved in the work that is before us. And I'd like to extend my thank you to Tourism Saskatchewan for the co-operation extended to our office during the course of this work. It was the first work that our office had done on social media and we found it quite interesting, and as you can see that things have moved forward on this frontier. So without further ado, I'm just going to turn it over to Mr. Deis to present.

Mr. Deis: — Tourism Saskatchewan is responsible for developing and promoting tourism in Saskatchewan. Tourism Saskatchewan uses social media channels extensively to fulfill its mandate. Chapter 32 of our 2018 report volume 1, on page 303 to 306 reports the results of our follow-up of management's actions to implement five recommendations originally made in our 2015 audit. Our 2015 report volume 2, chapter 41 concluded that Tourism Saskatchewan had effective processes to manage its use of social media except for five recommendations made. This chapter reports that by January of 2018, Tourism Saskatchewan had significantly improved its management of use of social media. It had implemented four of the five recommendations and partially implemented the fifth.

Tourism Saskatchewan established a social media strategy and a performance measure and target for its use of social media. It required its staff that uses its social media to annually agree to its social media policies. Also it made available its terms of use to the users of its social media. We found Tourism Saskatchewan regularly updated senior management and the board of directors of the usage of its social media.

Although Tourism Saskatchewan had social media policies, it needed to better mitigate risk associated with the use of social

media by finalizing a risk assessment and incorporating the assessments into its policies. Not having comprehensive social media policies increases the likelihood that identified risks may not be addressed when posting on social media. And that concludes our presentation.

The Chair: — Thanks for the presentation, the focus of the work, and thanks to Tourism Saskatchewan for all the work on this front and for the status update. It's nice to see all the recommendations implemented at this point. But I'll turn it over to Ms. Mary Taylor-Ash for her comments and then open it up.

[10:00]

Ms. Taylor-Ash: — Okay. My comments are very brief and that is not always the case. Good morning, everyone, I'm pleased to be here. And along with me is my colleague Jonathan Potts, who is our executive director of marketing and communications and responsible for all of our marketing area. And as was just presented, we were the first in the Saskatchewan government to have a social media audit, in 2015. And there were a number of recommendations and some were implemented immediately and by 2018 we really just had one outstanding recommendation that was partially implemented. And I'm pleased to report to everybody today that all recommendations, including a social media risk assessment and comprehensive internal policies, are now complete.

We all know that advances in technology have rapidly changed the way travellers get inspired to visit a destination, collect information before they travel, and essentially how they plan their trip. So social media is a highly effective marketing tool that is used by tourism marketing destinations as a cost-effective and interactive way of reaching travellers and potential visitors.

Tourism Saskatchewan maintains a robust social media program to promote Saskatchewan as a tourism destination in line with our organization's mandate. Last year Tourism Saskatchewan's audience on social media channels grew more than 22 per cent to almost 300,000 followers. We believe the implementation of the Provincial Auditor's recommendation made our social media program more structured and secure. So Jonathan and I look forward to answering any questions you may have about the implementation of these recommendations. So thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you very much and thank you for the work again. At this point I'll table the status update that was provided: PAC 78-28, Tourism Saskatchewan: Status update, dated May 1st, 2019. And I'll open it up to the committee for questions. Ms. Mowat.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you, and thanks for providing the status update as well. I'm wondering which social media platforms are you using and has that changed since 2015?

Mr. Potts: — Thanks for the question. So we are on, I guess, the obvious ones. Facebook, Instagram are our two strongest ones. We are on Twitter. We are on YouTube. And I feel like I'm . . . We actually are on eight channels, but we really are actively on those ones. And, yes, that's the primary focus of a lot of our marketing activity.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. And you mentioned that you grew

to 300,000 followers. Were you referring to a specific platform when you were talking about that?

Mr. Potts: — That's a combined total. So between all of our different platforms that we're on, we're up to 300,000.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. And I see that it was included in your annual plan to, as a performance measure, to increase the number of followers by 25 per cent. Does this number reflect that? Or you know, how is that going?

Mr. Potts: — Yes, it reflects that. So that was really a stretched target, and I will say that my team was quite aghast when I put that number out there to them. But hitting 22 per cent is pretty good relative to that target, so we're happy with it.

Ms. Mowat: — Thanks. I'm curious about the risk assessment, and how it has been incorporated into the policies.

Mr. Potts: — Sure. So that was the one outstanding piece from the original auditor's report. What we did is we took our team, sat down on a number of occasions and went through every risk that we could think of, you know, likely or unlikely, and identified what the probability was, what the impact, what the risk would be. So I think we came up with 12 risks that we identified. We've incorporated all of them in our social media policy. So in the event of any of those things happening, we're ready for them.

Ms. Mowat: — Thanks. And can you give an example of what sorts of risks were identified?

Mr. Potts: — Sure. So some of the things would be inappropriate posting. So you know, a public . . . As everyone in this room, I think, would appreciate that sometimes if there's something out on social media, the public may respond in an inappropriate way. So we have . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Exactly. So we have policy to, you know, hide an inappropriate post or to take the conversation off-line, etc.

But it may also . . . And I think we've done a really good job making sure that we don't have any inappropriate posts from our own staff, but we have three different sort of eventualities of, if we have an inappropriate post from our own staff, what we would do. So those are some of the things we've looked at.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. And on that note, since it was the last recommendation to be implemented, I'm wondering, you know, what the challenges were in terms of getting that risk assessment complete, and sort of what took it a little bit more time than the others in developing the policy and so on.

Mr. Potts: — Honestly I think it was a misunderstanding on our part. So when we initially got the risk assessment tool from the Provincial Auditor, we used it but we didn't actually use it on a formal basis. So once we understood that the intent was to use the tool, use the chart that was provided to us and then transfer all that into the policy, it wasn't a problem. But it was just basically a misunderstanding. Otherwise we would have done it in the first place.

Ms. Mowat: — Thank you. Can you speak to how the social media strategy is linked to key business objectives a little bit

further?

Mr. Potts: — Absolutely. So in the last two or three years in particular, and certainly over the last five years, we have basically completely transformed our marketing approach. We've gone from very traditional advertising — you know, television, print, and so on — to very much a digital and social focus. So our social media objectives are central to our overall objectives in achieving our outcomes.

So like Mary said in her opening remarks, we know that almost everyone, when they look at . . . want to be inspired about where they want to travel, and when they want to make decisions about where they want to travel, they're going online. They're trusting sources that may be, that certainly include us but are much broader than us, and we seek to influence all those different channels that people use.

Ms. Mowat: — And are there different considerations . . . Like there's different users of different social media platforms in terms of demographics, age, and so on. Are there different considerations that are being made in that respect?

Mr. Potts: — Absolutely. So again as part of the work that we've done over the last five years, we've done a ton of segmentation. So beyond demographics, well into psychographics. So looking at the values of the people that come here or could potentially come here. So we've divided our segmentation into five segments, likely markets, for Saskatchewan.

On top of that we've created three personas which are basically like avatars of the type of people that will come here. So it's a very complex process but it's highly detailed. So when we go out . . . You know, we have a segment called minivans and memories, right? So you can imagine what that looks like. It's parents with kids, looking to keep them busy and get them engaged in different activities. So we have very specific social posts and other types of digital advertising for them.

Ms. Mowat: — Great. Thank you. I don't have any other further questions, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — Any other questions? Ms. Lambert.

Ms. Lambert: — So you mentioned that you've moved away from traditional advertising. Are you not doing TV, print, radio at all anymore?

Mr. Potts: — We are doing a small TV buy-up this year. We recognize the power of the Roughriders brand and the CFL [Canadian Football League] brand, so we advertise during Roughrider games and during Stampeder and Eskimo games in Alberta because it hits our core market and it's the one type of TV advertising we know that they're watching. They're not PVRing [personal video recorder] it. They have to sit through the commercials. So we hit them with those ones.

We do print, but we used to print a 400-page guide and we've reduced that now to about 40 or 50 pages. People just were not using it, and for the amount of money and time that we were investing in it, it wasn't worth it.

Ms. Lambert: — Okay. Because older adults who have the time

and hopefully the means to be able to travel — my background is media — and still very much they're attached to television. So I wondered if you were focused on that.

Mr. Potts: — Yes. Frankly if we had a substantially larger budget it would be a bigger part of the mix. But with the budget that we do have, it's far more cost effective, far more targeted marketing to reach people through social media channels and digital advertising than it is through television.

Ms. Lambert: — So would Facebook be your main digital presence at this point?

Mr. Potts: — I wouldn't say main. It's a big one, for sure.

Ms. Lambert: — Yes.

Mr. Potts: — So Facebook, you know, we do things like Google AdWords, which isn't social media per se, but that's a big one. So if somebody's googling, you know, camping, Western Canada, maybe they're in Ontario or wherever, you know, we make sure that we come up high on their search listings. Right? So Facebook's big. Instagram, Tourism is very Instagram friendly because it's very visual. So that's why in my previous comment I mentioned that that's a big one for us.

Ms. Lambert: — Well I'm confident I've shared some of your posts. Yes, well done.

Ms. Taylor-Ash: — I will just make an additional comment. Jonathan had mentioned we do a lot of market segmentation now and we have a lot of data and we use it very much to target the type of visitor that we know is travelling in the province. So we're very much matching what medium they are using. So if we're talking about . . . One of our personas is a woman we affectionately call Val. And Val is a person who is the keeper of the family memories and so she likes doing the same things all the time, or pretty much, but she likes some additional activities and she likes doing it with her family. And so you know, how we approach her and what platforms are important to her . . . So you were talking about the importance of Facebook. I'm suspecting Facebook is quite important to Val because she's watched what the grandkids are doing and all of that kind of thing.

So one of the benefits we have these days is that we have a lot of data and we can really know. Rather than thinking of visitors like ourselves, we remove our own bias and we're able to say, okay, we know what this visitor is looking for. And I'm sure you've all, when you're on social media, you've sometimes been caught by surprise with the kinds of things that come in to your purview when you're doing things that are, oh, how did they know I'm interested in kayaking or how did they know I'm interested in shoes or whatever. So that's what we really maximize that kind of data to really target our approach.

Ms. Lambert: — Thank you.

The Chair: — Thanks so much. Any other questions? You said her name was Val. I think her name was Faye because I think that's my mom you were describing there. So for anyone that's watching, go to @Saskatchewan, Tourism Saskatchewan. Your Twitter handle and what you share there is often stunning. I just retweeted the sunset at the 70 Mile Butte in Grasslands National

Park, an amazing picture and I know I'm going to be down there before the end of May for one day. But thanks for all the work and thanks to all those partners and parks and businesses and all those that provide all the amazing offerings across the province.

And at this time, I'll ask somebody to move that we conclude consideration of Tourism Sask. Mr. Weekes. All agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — That's carried.

Ms. Taylor-Ash: — Thank you.

[10:15]

CCPAC-CCOLA Conference

The Chair: — We're going to move along with our considerations here this morning. We have the annual CCPAC-CCOLA [Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees-Canadian Council of Legislative Auditors] conference. It's an annual event. It brings together the auditors from across the audit community from across Canada as well as the Public Accounts Committees and the legislatures and the Clerks, that community, once a year. It's coming up in August. We send folks out to contribute and develop and make sure that we're as strong as we can be as a committee. I believe we have a motion from Deputy Chair McMorris.

Mr. McMorris: — Thank you. Yes, I would like to move:

That the Standing Committee of Public Accounts authorize the Chair, the Deputy Chair, one government member of the committee, and one opposition member of the committee to attend the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees and Canadian Council of Legislative Auditors annual conference to be held in Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario from August 18th to 20th, 2019; and further,

That if the Chair or Deputy Chair or opposition members cannot attend, they be authorized to designate another committee member to attend in their place.

I so move.

The Chair: — Moved by Deputy Chair McMorris. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — That's carried. At this point I'd welcome a motion to adjourn. Moved by Ms. Lambert. All agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — This committee stands adjourned until the call of the Chair.

[The committee adjourned at 10:16.]