

Third Session - Fortieth Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
Standing Committee
on
Crown Corporations

Chairperson
Mr. Bidhu Jha
Constituency of Radisson

Vol. LXVI No. 3 - 6 p.m., Wednesday, October 15, 2014

ISSN 1708-6604

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Fortieth Legislature

Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALLAN, Nancy	St. Vital	NDP
ALLUM, James, Hon.	Fort Garry-Riverview	NDP
ALTEMEYER, Rob	Wolseley	NDP
ASHTON, Steve, Hon.	Thompson	NDP
BJORNSON, Peter, Hon.	Gimli	NDP
BLADY, Sharon, Hon.	Kirkfield Park	NDP
BRAUN, Erna, Hon.	Rossmere	NDP
BRIESE, Stuart	Agassiz	PC
CALDWELL, Drew	Brandon East	NDP
CHIEF, Kevin, Hon.	Point Douglas	NDP
CHOMIAK, Dave, Hon.	Kildonan	NDP
CROTHERS, Deanne	St. James	NDP
CULLEN, Cliff	Spruce Woods	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DRIEDGER, Myrna	Charleswood	PC
EICHLER, Ralph	Lakeside	PC
EWASKO, Wayne	Lac du Bonnet	PC
FRIESEN, Cameron	Morden-Winkler	PC
GAUDREAU, Dave	St. Norbert	NDP
GERRARD, Jon, Hon.	River Heights	Liberal
GOERTZEN, Kelvin	Steinbach	PC
GRAYDON, Cliff	Emerson	PC
HELWER, Reg	Brandon West	PC
HOWARD, Jennifer, Hon.	Fort Rouge	NDP
IRVIN-ROSS, Kerri, Hon.	Fort Richmond	NDP
JHA, Bidhu	Radisson	NDP
KOSTYSHYN, Ron, Hon.	Swan River	NDP
LEMIEUX, Ron, Hon.	Dawson Trail	NDP
MACKINTOSH, Gord, Hon.	St. Johns	NDP
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MARCELINO, Flor, Hon.	Logan	NDP
MARCELINO, Ted	Tyndall Park	NDP
MARTIN, Shannon	Morris	PC
MELNICK, Christine	Riel	Ind.
MITCHELSON, Bonnie	River East	PC
NEVAKSHONOFF, Tom	Interlake	NDP
OSWALD, Theresa, Hon.	Seine River	NDP
PALLISTER, Brian	Fort Whyte	PC
PEDERSEN, Blaine	Midland	PC
PETTERSEN, Clarence	Flin Flon	NDP
PIWNIUK, Doyle	Arthur-Virden	PC
REID, Daryl, Hon.	Transcona	NDP
ROBINSON, Eric, Hon.	Kewatinook	NDP
RONDEAU, Jim	Assiniboia	NDP
ROWAT, Leanne	Riding Mountain	PC
SARAN, Mohinder	The Maples	NDP
SCHULER, Ron	St. Paul	PC
SELBY, Erin, Hon.	Southdale	NDP
SELINGER, Greg, Hon.	St. Boniface	NDP
SMOOK, Dennis	La Verendrye	PC
STEFANSON, Heather	Tuxedo	PC
STRUTHERS, Stan, Hon.	Dauphin	NDP
SWAN, Andrew, Hon.	Minto	NDP
WIEBE, Matt	Concordia	NDP
WIGHT, Melanie	Burrows	NDP
WISHART, Ian	Portage la Prairie	PC
<i>Vacant</i>	The Pas	

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON CROWN CORPORATIONS

Wednesday, October 15, 2014

TIME – 6 p.m.

LOCATION – Winnipeg, Manitoba

CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Bidhu Jha (Radisson)

VICE-CHAIRPERSON – Mr. Ted Marcelino (Tyndall Park)

ATTENDANCE – 11 QUORUM – 6

Members of the Committee present:

Hon. Ms. Braun, Hon. Mr. Mackintosh

Messrs. Cullen, Dewar, Mrs. Driedger, Messrs. Gaudreau, Jha, Marcelino, Saran, Smook, Wishart

APPEARING:

*Hon. Jon Gerrard, MLA for River Heights
Mr. Michael Werier, Chairperson, Workers Compensation Board
Mr. Winston Maharaj, President and Chief Executive Officer, Workers Compensation Board*

MATTERS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

Annual Report of the Workers Compensation Board for the year ending December 31, 2012

Annual Report of the Workers Compensation Board for the year ending December 31, 2013

Annual Report of the Appeal Commission and Medical Review Panel for the year ending December 31, 2011

Annual Report of the Appeal Commission and Medical Review Panel for the year ending December 31, 2012

Annual Report of the Appeal Commission and Medical Review Panel for the year ending December 31, 2013

The Workers Compensation Board 2011-2015 Five Year Plan

The Workers Compensation Board 2012-2016 Five Year Plan

The Workers Compensation Board 2013-2017 Five Year Plan

The Workers Compensation Board 2014-2018 Five Year Plan

* * *

Mr. Chairperson: Good evening. Will the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations please come to order.

Our first item of business is election of a Vice-Chairperson. Are there any nominations?

Mr. Gregory Dewar (Selkirk): I nominate Mr. Marcelino, Tyndall Park.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Marcelino from Tyndall Park has been nominated. Are there any other nominations? Hearing no other nominations, Mr. Ted Marcelino is elected Vice-Chairperson.

The meeting has been called to consider the following reports: Annual Report of the Workers Compensation Board for the year ending December 31st, 2012; Annual Report of Workers Compensation Board for the year ending December 31st, 2013; Annual Report of the Appeal Commission and Medical Review Panel for the year ending December 31st, 2011; Annual Report of the Appeal Commission and Medical Review Panel for the year ending December 31st, 2012; Annual Report of the Appeal Commission and Medical Review Panel for the year ending December 31st, 2013; The Workers Compensation Board 2011-2015 Five Year Plan; Workers Compensation Board 2012-2016 Five Year Plan; Workers Compensation Board 2013-2016 Five Year Plan; Workers Compensation Board 2014-2018 Five Year Plan.

Before we get started, are there any suggestions from the committee as to how long we should be sitting this evening?

Mr. Dennis Smook (La Verendrye): I would suggest we sit 'til 8 o'clock and then revisit it at that time.

Mr. Chairperson: Eight o'clock is suggested. [Agreed]

There are any suggestions in—as to what order we should be considering the reports.

Mr. Smook: I would like to see it done globally.

Mr. Chairperson: Okay. The global approach has been recommended. Any suggestions? *[Agreed]*

Does the honourable minister wish to make an opening statement? And would she please introduce the officials in attendance.

Hon. Erna Braun (Minister charged with the administration of The Workers Compensation Act): Yes. I am joined by Winston Maharaj, our president and CEO for Workers Compensation Board; Michael Werier, the chairperson of the board, and staff.

May I continue?

Mr. Chairperson: Oh, thanks. Yes, yes, Minister, kindly continue, yes.

Ms. Braun: Okay, good evening. It's my pleasure to be here this evening in my role as minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board. I am very pleased to be here with the chairperson and president and CEO, and it's been a very exciting time to be involved with the Workers Compensation Board. Following a number of important reviews in 2012, the government released Manitoba's Five-Year Plan for Workplace Injury and Illness Prevention in 2013. Since then, the Workers Compensation Board has been working very hard to bring the goals and objectives of the five-year plan to fruition. The WCB's efforts, along those of Workplace Safety and Health, will help to build Manitoba's safety and health culture and make Manitoba a safer place to work.

Today I announced the amendments to the Workers Compensation Board act that establish a prevention committee and SAFE Work Manitoba as law. This builds on our efforts to make Manitoba one of the safest places to work in North America. The prevention committee will oversee and provide guidance to the Province's new workplace prevention initiative known as SAFE Work Manitoba. They will provide oversight to prevention initiatives, public awareness campaigns and strategic planning and budgeting. Additional compliance measures that were passed as part of Bill 65 will come into force in January. These measures include greater rewards for employers who take action to make workplaces safer, higher penalties for employers who suppress claims and greater clarity around responsibilities for reporting workplace injuries.

Our government is committed to making Manitoba a leader in the workplace health and safety. Manitobans deserve to come home after a day of

work. We have passed legislation to protect workers and have increased fines for employers who put workers' lives at risk. Our workplace health and safety inspections have increased substantially, and we've doubled the number of health and safety inspectors.

Last spring we proclaimed amendments to The Workplace Safety and Health Act that allow safety officers to stop work at unsafe worksites, give workers the right to refuse unsafe work and create a new Chief Prevention Officer and require an annual injury and illness report.

Last fall we passed legislation to protect highway workers in construction zones. That law was in force this spring to protect workers on highways during this year's very busy construction season.

Under The Workers Compensation Act, the WCB has the dual mandate of preventing workplace injuries and helping injured workers to recover and return to meaningful work in a safe and appropriate way. It has become an essential role in helping to ensure that injured workers receive an income to support their families, they receive appropriate care and that they are supported in their return to work once they are able to do so.

Injured workers and Manitoba employers are both central to the WCB's mission, and I am pleased that the WCB continues to focus on innovative ways of providing excellent customer service. It is equally important that the WCB maintain a balanced and financially sound compensation system, and I'm happy to acknowledge that maintaining system integrity remains a significant focus for the organization.

I'm very happy to continue working with the WCB on its important mandates, and at this time I'd like to thank Mr. Werier and Mr. Maharaj and the executive team for being here with me today. I understand that Mr. Werier has some remarks he would like to make as well.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Madam Minister.

Does the critic of the opposition have any opening statement?

Mr. Smook: Yes, I do.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, Mr. Smook.

Mr. Smook: I'd like to thank the minister for her opening statement, as the 'minispr' is—minister is

responsible for the administration of the Workers Compensation Board. Thank you to Mr. Maharaj and his staff for being with us tonight, Mr. Werier for his comments he'll be providing us tonight. I'd also like to thank my colleagues for joining us here tonight.

I know we're all looking forward to the opportunity to pose questions to the minister and to WCB. We also look forward to bringing up any key issues that have been brought to our attention by concerned Manitobans. This committee gives us an opportunity to ensure that there is accountability and transparency in the legislative process, especially when you consider the many Manitobans who have opportunity to engage with the work of WCB.

And, with those few remarks, I'm happy to turn it back over to the Chair, and we can continue with tonight's proceedings.

* (18:10)

Mr. Chairperson: We thank the member.

Does the representative from the Workers Compensation Board wish to make an opening statement?

Mr. Michael Werier (Chairperson, Workers Compensation Board): I'd like to make a few brief comments, thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Werier. Please, go ahead.

Mr. Werier: Good evening to everybody on a beautiful October evening in the 'Peg. I just wanted to make a few brief comments beginning with some remarks about the board of directors itself, which I chair.

The board and its committee set the strategic direction of the board and we oversee decision-making in certain key policy areas. We have a very important mandate to ensure the sound investment of the funds at some one-point-plus billion dollars which we oversee in terms of an investment committee. We have an audit committee, a policy committee and we also have newly established a prevention committee.

What distinguishes our board from some other boards is that we have representatives from—we're a tripartite board. So we have representatives from the business community, representatives from labour and, as well, public interest reps, three from each, as well as an independent chairperson which is myself, and it allows for a very good exchange of views

because we hear from all sides of issues when we have certain debates at the board level. But the board has striven to get input from our stakeholder groups and we have collaboration at the board and it's—to my pleasure it's worked out very well.

I just want to highlight a couple of things that are dealt with in the annual reports which are under consideration that we've been dealing with since 2013. There's a number of changes that were alluded by the minister.

From a financial point of view, we've been able to maintain a stable financial position in 2013. We were fortunate to see positive business investment returns and we have a funding ratio of 134 per cent in 2013.

The time-loss injury rate has remained essentially flat in 2013, but our long-term trend has shown a decrease in the injury rate of 43 per cent since 2000 and we're hoping to get our injury rate down with the prevention initiatives that are being undertaken. Our average assessment rate, that's the amount we charge employers, it remained stable in 2013 at \$1.50 per \$100 of payroll and we're forecasting it to go lower in the coming years. It places our province amongst the lowest of rates of all boards across the country, and we're very cognizant of employers' concerns that rates remain competitive.

We also have been looking at our model that we utilize for assessments. It's the subject of discussion right now. We're looking at our rate review model. We've been getting consultations from various stakeholder groups, the employer community, Manitoba Employers Council, Federation of Labour, and we're in the midst of looking how we can refine the system to make it as good a system as it possibly can be.

In 2013, as part of a strategic planning process, we decided we would try to focus on servicing our customers, being both employers and work-injured workers. Whether it's employers making payments to us, injured workers looking for assistance or health-care providers looking to have their bills paid promptly, we're attempting to put customers right at the centre of everything we do and, as I say, it was part of a new plan that was approved by the board in 2013.

You can see we have a lot of staff people here on behalf of the board. I'd like to acknowledge the work that our staff has done, our executive, the front-line staff, the administration. We're lucky we have many

long-serving staff people in our organization and it was a pleasure to the board that—in 2013 WCB was recognized as one of Manitoba's top 25 employers. So I acknowledge the contribution that's made by the people that work in the organization and I look forward to the discussion this evening.

Thank you.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you, Mr. Werier.

And now the floor is open to questions.

Mr. Smook: Mr. Maharaj, when the WCB released its 2013 annual report on April 15th of 2014, it was noted that many organizational changes taking place in the years ahead. Could you give us a briefing on what some of those changes you see happening? I know the minister had mentioned a few things on—with Bill 65 and that, but could you just give us a bit of an overview of what you see happening in the—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maharaj.

Mr. Winston Maharaj (President and Chief Executive Officer, Workers Compensation Board): Certainly. Actually, we are—the organization is undergoing actually quite a significant change, or even a transformation, over the next couple of years, and it relates back to the comment Michael made about a new strategic plan, a plan that really focuses on putting the customer at the centre of everything that we do. It really highlights also the areas of prevention and of return to work on the compensation side of the system.

So we're looking at things such as business intelligence and data analytics and using that more to be able to really provide some good data and a good understanding of the information needed when we make decisions, and we've developed a business intelligence area. And we continue to invest in significant IT in order to be able to build upon that area.

We are also, of course, looking at prevention in a new way. We have now, as was mentioned, established SAFE Work Manitoba. SAFE Work Manitoba is an arm's-length organization to WCB and really consolidates all of the prevention efforts that were spread out throughout the Province through Workplace Safety and Health, ourselves at WCB, and, you know, there's also prevention being done outside by other providers and it really focuses that effort. So big change happening on the prevention side.

We're also looking at the way we approach our case management and the processes within that area. That is not so much a reorganization as it is looking at to improve our processes and focus on what we can do around best practices in return to work, so that's another critical area.

Also quite a foundational change is the review of our rate model. So, as Michael had mentioned earlier, we have undertaken a consultation process and established a stakeholder advisory group that is looking very closely at how our rate model works, and ultimately that will be determined over the next number of years if there are changes to be made to the rate model.

So those are some of the key pieces that are changing in the organization. Critical to understand is that everything is integrated. So certainly when we start talking about business intelligence and data analytics, return to work, prevention and, I should mention as well, compliance, another area that is being developed and enhanced, they are all interrelated, so that gives you a flavour of what's happening in the organization.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Smook, before I recognize you, sir, I would request you, all of you, whoever wants to raise questions, best will be to raise hands so that I can recognize and that will be simplifying the process. So, yes, Mr. Smook, go ahead.

Mr. Smook: Yes, with Bill 65 we've noticed there's a number of changes coming. The honourable minister had mentioned a lot of changes, but where is this all going to get paid from? I mean, how is this going to be effected, like, without increasing the rates? Like you talk about the rate model, but where is the money going to come from?

Mr. Maharaj: So, in fact, all of the changes that have been announced in Bill 65 and the changes that I have spoke of with regards to prevention and return to work, data analytics, business intelligence and compliance have been forecasted and budgeted within our five-year plan, and the positive news on that front is when you look at page 10 of our five-year plan in the pro forma statement, if we take the most recent document which is the 2013 to 2018 plan, you'll see that the rates are actually projected to come down. Our current rates in 2013, actual rate is \$1.50, and the rates are projected to go down to ultimately 1.33 in 2015, next year, and further a step down in 2017 to 1.23. Those are projections, of course, but I can confirm for you that next year that we are on target in 2015 for seeing the rates

decrease. So we have actually budgeted within our five-year plan for these changes.

* (18:20)

As well, I should mention that whenever we do approach or look at making changes and initiatives, we do a full cost-benefit analysis and we do a business case in relation to that case so, of course, prevention has a business case related to that and, ultimately, it does require seed money up front, but, ultimately, you would see savings that would offset that as prevention—as you begin to see results.

Mr. Smook: On page 25 of the 2013 annual report, investment returns produced an operating surplus of \$78 million. There was almost a hundred million from investments. Could you give us—where that money came from, how it came about, a contributing factor to that?

Mr. Maharaj: So, if I understand, you're asking how did we manage to get a 13.6 per cent return on investments.

An Honourable Member: That—well, that and—

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Smook, kindly address to the Chair, please. Thank you. Go ahead.

Mr. Smook: Yes. Basically, how you are able to come up with an extra \$100 million?

Mr. Maharaj: So there's a couple of factors that would relate to our surplus. You are correct that the main factor contributing to that was the investments that was—came in at 13.6 per cent, as opposed to a budgeted amount that would be somewhere, I think, around 6.5 per cent. But there's also the factors that relate to our experience in our duration that has been dropping and that we are with regards to return to work being a successful program that we've implemented.

Speaking more specifically to the investments: on page 27 of that same report, the 2013 report, we've broken down the returns on the various different investments. And I think the real key to having been successful in 2013 is the governance process that we have related to our investments. So we have an investment committee, a committee that's comprised not only of members of the board but also of external professional advisors that are professionals in the investment industry. They help and advise us on not only our asset mix and our SIP&O but also on other areas, for example, the introduction of infrastructure, ultimately into our asset class. We have expert consultants, as well; we

use Eckler, which will advise us on our managers who manage our different equity classes, as you see. We have a set asset diversification for the—our portfolio which ensures that we are ultimately looking every year to get the maximum return for the minimal risk.

Mr. Smook: What my biggest concern is, and I appreciate that you made money on your investments and you have great investors doing it for you, but for them to be out by such a large amount, I was wondering is that something that can occur every year or will something like that go the opposite direction in some years? It's a large discrepancy from what was budgeted.

Mr. Maharaj: So, actually, to be—absolutely, there's a cycle to investments and returns but we also look at where we fall in our benchmark to our comparators. So, in fact, we're not very different than if you look at large pension funds or large WCBs across the country. You'll see that there are years where the WCBs and the pension funds will outperform what is seen as the average long-term rate. Usually, that average long-term rate which floats somewhere between, in some organizations, anywhere between 5 and 7 per cent, is what's budgeted.

So, in other words, we can't predict the cycle, the variances up above or below but we can mitigate that risk by carrying a reserve which is what we do. So, in other words, in the years where the market may have a downturn and may have a cycle that goes below, we do have a reserve for that purpose.

Mr. Smook: On page 30 of the 2013 annual report it is noted that the accident reserve fund was at \$416 million, a target of 357 was set.

The 2014-2018 five-year plan financials incorporate reductions to the average premium rate in order to dispose of this excess reserve. Has the board started to make these reductions in the premiums, or what's the situation there?

Mr. Maharaj: So the reductions in premiums are as you see on—that I had previously referenced on page 10 of the five-year plan, where you would see a drop starting 2015.

Mr. Smook: Any of the surplus be used to fund new projects, for instance, the hiring or the—of new officers, the investment in the new information that they're putting out, the new safety committee that they're forming? Is that—is any of this money going to be used into general revenue, or is it going to be mostly used to offset premium rates?

Mr. Maharaj: Our budgeting process, really, all of the revenue goes into general revenue. We then go through an annual budgeting process that would look at what's needed for the organization for the year in question, so we're going through our budget process currently. That really is, essentially, a zero-base budget process every year, and from that we assess the needs based on the budget process. So we don't look at allocating or putting a restriction on reserves. We have a reserve target, but we don't specifically allocate a reserve beyond the 100 per cent. We allow the budget process to dictate what's needed.

Mr. Smook: In the minister's opening statement, it was mentioned about hiring new workplace health and safety inspectors. Will these inspectors be paid from WCB?

Mr. Maharaj: I can't comment directly on the incremental increase in inspectors, but I can say that we do fund workplace safety and health. So, ultimately, the answer would be yes.

Mr. Smook: Would you be able to provide us with those numbers? Are they in the books anywhere, or?

Mr. Maharaj: I believe the numbers are available, but I—you know, I can't point to them right now. Maybe I will find out somebody's going to help me and point me to where it is, but we can certainly provide it for you, or I can point you to it shortly.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Smook, are you waiting for the answer, or you want another question?

Mr. Smook: No, no. I'm going to continue on.

Mr. Chairperson: Yes, Mr. Maharaj?

Mr. Maharaj: I'm being pointed to the right page, and it's page 63 of that same report, the 2013 annual report. You'll note in the second paragraph it refers to The Workplace Safety and Health Act.

Mr. Smook: That number is \$0.7 million, correct?

Mr. Maharaj: No. The number I read, it's the second paragraph, the—where it—pursuant to The Workplace Safety and Health Act of Manitoba, the Province may pay the expenses incurred in the administration of the act—I'll skip ahead. For 2013, the amount charged to the operations under this provision was \$9.3 million.

Mr. Smook: Thank you.

Mr. Maharaj, according to page 25 of the 2013 annual report, the 2013 cost of claims of \$268 million were \$12 million over budget as a

result of actuary basics for the benefit liability. Could you explain to me what the change in actuary basic is? Or just fill me—I'm totally lost on that one.

* (18:30)

Mr. Maharaj: So every year our chief actuary looks at the history and experience of our fund as far as claims, and also looks at whether we are estimating the future cost of claims correctly. As part of that process, we also have an external actuarial firm review our projections and, as you know or as you may know, the WCB holds its fund not just for the current annual cost of benefits but also for the future cost of benefits in that there's significant projection of how many wage losses there will be for different categories. There's also projections relating to the way that we might treat, for example, occupational diseases and the cost related to that.

So the reference there refers to the actuary in consultation with an external actuary looking at the way we measure the future costs of those benefits and seeing that we need to increase the amount of funding that we hold for the future cost. I could give you the, certainly, the detail around the specific assumptions that were changed, but I don't have that at my fingertips. But I could, certainly, if you wish, to get that, I could. But that is what that refers to.

Mr. Smook: Thank you for the explanation.

Also, on page 25 of the 2000 annual report, the funded ratio was 134 per cent and aimed to be at 130 per cent. How did it get to be that and how does it impact ratepayers? Like, what is the funded ratio?

Mr. Maharaj: So the funded ratio is essentially saying, do we have enough holding in our fund in order to pay today's claims as well as future claims based on all of those assumptions we talked about that the actuary is making. And how it got to be beyond the 130 per cent, which is our reserve level, is, again, in relation to investments as the main driver combined with our experience on the claim. So, for example, as duration shrinks it means the cost of claims shrink as well, which is a good thing, of course. So the short answer is the—primarily through investments and there's other, I guess, secondary factors such as the experience of the claims and the assumptions made by the actuary.

Mr. Smook: On page 70 of the 2013 annual report, overall claims are down from 2012. Has there been any change in the process in which a claim is filed to account for this decrease in claims, or is it just better management, or what's the reason for it?

Mr. Maharaj: There hasn't been a change to the way that claims are filed and there has been no change to our processing of those claims; in fact, we, if anything, have tried to increase the awareness of WCB and its program as well as increase individual's ability to access easily WCB and make a claim. So, if claims are decreasing, part of that, we would hope, would be attributed to prevention efforts, awareness and better safety and prevention.

Mr. Smook: Mr. Maharaj, what properties are owned by the WCB?

Mr. Maharaj: The WCB owns a significant number of properties through its real estate investment portfolio. I certainly can undertake to get you a listing, if you wish.

Mr. Smook: That would be fine. If you could get me a listing of those properties I'd greatly appreciate it.

Continue with the real estate, what properties are leased or rented by the WCB?

Mr. Maharaj: We do lease space in the building at 363 Broadway. We have offices in that building that we lease, four. We own our own building at 333 Broadway. We lease space in Brandon, I don't have the exact address off the top of my head, and we lease space in Thompson as well—[interjection] And the appeal commission, I'm reminded, we lease space for, which is on, I believe, York–St. Mary. I'm sorry, I haven't been to the appeal commission for a while.

Mr. Smook: Could you provide me with a list of who manages all these different properties?

Mr. Maharaj: Absolutely, we'll undertake to provide that.

Mr. Smook: The newest property that was just renovated, would you have figures on the dollar values and budget of what was spent on that building?

Mr. Maharaj: Spent to—for the renovations? I do have the figures. I believe the renovations on—I should actually undertake for—to get you that information. We've had several renovations, not just for the floor. We've taken one floor for the purposes of our business intelligence and data analytics and to consolidate our IT. But there's another floor that we've recently done renovations with regards, obviously, to SAFE Work Manitoba and prevention. And that number I don't have off the top of my head so I will undertake to get you the full package.

Mr. Smook: With that package, could you provide me with what was spent plus also what was budgeted?

Mr. Maharaj: Absolutely, that's no problem.

Mr. Smook: According to page 50 of the 2013 annual report, as of December 31st, 2013, WCB loans amounted to \$103 million, and that's up from \$97.3 million in 2012. The total collateral pledged to the WC amounted to \$108.7, up from \$102.2 in 2012. Could you give me a list of who were the recipients of these secured loans?

Mr. Maharaj: Our security lending program is through RBC investors services, and they manage all of the WCB's securities lending program. So that—I don't know if you're—that's sufficient for you or if you're looking for an actual list of who they actually lend out to.

Mr. Smook: If you don't control who they lend out to, no, then that list will be sufficient.

Mr. Maharaj: We can—we set the policy and we certainly set the parameters, but, however, we don't select who they lend out to.

Mr. Smook: According to page 5 of the WCB's 2013 annual report, the WCB workforce is made up of approximately 500 people. Could you provide us in detail the exact staffing numbers, including full-time staff, part-time staff, seasonal staff and vacant positions? Like, it seems to be always at that 500 number. Is there a reason that it—like, there's never an exact amount, it's always sort of fluctuating.

Mr. Maharaj: We can certainly provide that number. We have our budgeted FTE count as part of our annual budget process, and certainly it does fluctuate. So, just as I understand it, you're looking for the budgeted FTE amount?

An Honourable Member: Full-time, part-time and seasonal staff.

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Smook, kindly address through.

Mr. Maharaj: I actually have it before me if you'd like. So for 2013 the permanent FTEs was 510.08. The temporary or seasonal FTEs was 15.7. So total FTEs was 526.5. And that was for the 2013 year.

Mr. Smook: Would you be able to provide me numbers like that for the last, say, five years?

Mr. Maharaj: I have it here. I can read it out or I can provide it to you as an undertaking, whichever you prefer. *[interjection]*

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Smook.

Mr. Smook: You could provide it to me, which will be fine.

According to page 5 of the WCB 2013—page 29 of the 2013 annual report, operating expenses increased by \$7 million from 2012, largely due to employees' salary costs and 'benefis'—benefits. Could you explain what were those costs? Was it because of more employees?

* (18:40)

Mr. Maharaj: Our increase in operating expenses was mainly due to a couple of factors, one being, of course, our collective agreement and the increase that was negotiated through that, merit increases that occur for staffing through their scale, and that was certainly one component. But the other primary component was investment in our IT and business intelligent infrastructure.

Mr. Smook: According to a release dated April 15th, SAFE Work Manitoba will consolidate preventive services with WCB and workplace health and safety as the minister had mentioned in her opening remarks. Now, like, when will this process take place? Has it started taking place? What are the expectations as to how long it'll take?

Mr. Maharaj: So we have actually established and launched SAFE Work Manitoba. So the process has already taken place and is in process and under way from the perspective of still growing to the organization that it will ultimately be five years from now. Workplace Safety and Health staff are over and combined with WCB staff that previously worked on SAFE Work, and they are currently under a secondment agreement and are housed at 363 Broadway.

Mr. Smook: Is it—will all of the staff from workplace health and safety eventually be over in your department so they'll be looking after all of the government's workplace health and safety?

Mr. Maharaj: No, this organization, SAFE Work Manitoba, is solely focused on prevention. So I think there was approximately eight to 11 staff that dealt with prevention and focused on prevention through Workplace Safety and Health. Those are the staff that have been identified and moved over. The other

staff that relate to enforcement will not be moved or have any connection to SAFE Work Manitoba.

Mr. Smook: In the renovations that took place in workplace—or sorry, in your buildings, were any untendered contracts let or was everything tendered out for all the different jobs?

Mr. Maharaj: We have a very stringent RFP process at WCB, and I can say, yes. We did tender out and RFP all of the related work.

Mr. Smook: During last year's committee meeting, it was well known Bob Dewar, worker representative for the board of directors, had been suspended from his workplace because of an internal HR matter, but was still a sitting member of your board. Mr. Dewar no longer is a current member of your board, but when was it decided that his services would no longer be needed?

Mr. Werier: The board didn't decide his services weren't needed. He stepped down from the board effective the end of March 2014, provided notice that he was resigning. So as—his resignation became effective then.

Mr. Smook: Does the board have any procedures in place to remove somebody from the board if things aren't working out the way they should be?

Ms. Braun: As was pointed out earlier, the board is tripartite. The employers name their choices for nominations; the MFL does the same; and then there are three public interest members to the board as well. So it is within their purview if the employers or the MFL decides that they will not withdraw someone. It is not within the WCB to remove those people.

Mr. Smook: So the board wouldn't recommend to whoever nominated that person to the board that they would like to see him removed?

Ms. Braun: It is the purview of the MFL and the Manitoba employment council to name those people and they decide who they feel is the appropriate person to be sitting on the board.

Mr. Smook: So, then, I take it there's no type of evaluation of board members being done. It's all done by the people who appoint them to the board?

Ms. Braun: The—those bodies make the recommendations to sit on the WCB.

Mr. Smook: Donations. It has been noted that members of the WC board have made monetary donations to the New Democratic Party of Manitoba.

Would you feel that this is appropriate, that these members are donating to the NDP, given that a work-WCB directorship is a remunerative appointment?

Ms. Braun: I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question? I was thinking of something else.

Mr. Smook: Do you think it is appropriate that these members are donating to the NDP, given that a WCB directorship is a remunerative appointment?

Ms. Braun: I think those are two very distinct things, and I don't see that one has any imposition on the other.

Mr. Smook: Is it just a coincidence that the board members are—donate to the NDP party, or just?

Ms. Braun: I would be interested to see what other members of the committee—or the board also donate to.

Mr. Smook: Public awareness campaigns. What is the WCB's annual budget for sponsoring events and organizations?

Mr. Maharaj: In 2013, we had an actual amount of \$315,446 spent on promotional items, sponsorships and donations.

Mr. Smook: So that budget includes sponsorships and any WCB-branded products or merchandise? That's a total budget for both, or just for sponsorships?

Mr. Maharaj: This budget is—it doesn't relate to SAFE Work campaigns, but it relates to our promotional items, which is the branding items that you are referring to.

Mr. Smook: So, in the SAFE Work campaigns, there's no coolers that have SAFE Work on them, or things like that, promotional items like that?

Mr. Maharaj: Yes. So, there—certainly, there would be, but they would be a different budget line, so when we approach a SAFE Work campaign, which includes advertising, whether it be on a bus or radio or television, it also might include promotional—no, sorry—campaign-type items, material, whether it's printed or events where there might be material handed out or, for example, T-shirts. We did a—we do a youth campaign that focuses on having youth come to our website, fill out questionnaires and the part of the campaign is they receive a T-shirt. That would not fall under this budget. That is an all-inclusive budget that relates to—specifically to the

campaign for SAFE Work Manitoba, so this does not include that.

Mr. Smook: Could you provide me with those figures going back for the last three years or so?

Mr. Maharaj: Absolutely. Yes.

Mr. Smook: From 2011 to 2012, the WCB more than doubled its funding of these events—organizations that was spent in, like, spent in 2013 was more than double from what they had in previous years.

Could you give us a reason for that?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maharaj? Mr. Maharaj, go ahead.

Mr. Maharaj: So, one of the contributing factors was the Downtown BIZ, which we now add in to that particular line. The Downtown BIZ, as you know, is part of the community for the downtown businesses, and Crown corporations do not pay the levy that a private business would pay. In lieu of that, they provide a form of donation and support. That's one of the primary reasons for that increase.

* (18:50)

Mr. Smook: In other years we were able to obtain a list of all the different organizations that received dollars or products from WCB. Would you be able to provide us with that list again?

Mr. Maharaj: Certainly, we can provide you with that list, but I will also mention that we certainly want to be very transparent on this front, and on our website we have our policy around sponsorships, donations and promotions. We have, of course, the application form for an organization that may wish to make application for support, and we also have a full list of all of our sponsorships that have gone out, or promotions. We can provide you through an undertaking, but it also is available on the website.

Mr. Smook: If it's available on the website, that's fine.

When you talk about certain criteria in order to access this funding, when you look at some of those lists there's some questions a person would ask as to why certain things would get funded, like it doesn't seem to have anything to do with safety or workers. Is there—what is—who makes those decisions as to who gets money, the entire board, or is it just one person in WCB?

Mr. Maharaj: The decision is made by administration. The board does not generally—they set the policy; however, they do not actually make the decision on a case-by-case basis.

And, as I said, we have a policy that is established and a guideline, so the criteria would be things such as increasing knowledge of workplace safety and health, promoting injury and disease prevention, enhancing awareness of the WCB and its activities, building positive and productive relationships with stakeholders and the wider community, contributing to the community that the WCB serves and attracting and retaining staff reflective of the diversity of WCB clientele and the general population. So that's an example of the criteria that we use, and we have an assessment process that we go through and that's completed by administration.

Mr. Smook: Did any Crown corporations, arm-length's agency of government receive any funding from WCB? If yes, could you provide us with a list of who did?

Mr. Maharaj: Is this under, just for clarification, under the promotion, sponsorships and donation or funding by a program? I'm not clear.

Mr. Smook: Both.

Mr. Maharaj: Certainly, we can undertake to provide you with that list.

Mr. Smook: A lot of advertising the WCB does—like, WCB is sort of the only game in town—is a—like, how do you justify some of the advertising that's done?

Mr. Maharaj: Certainly, we have two streams of advertising that you might see. One relates to prevention, which, I think, we've all talked about, that the awareness around prevention is critical in order to create a culture of safety and health within the province.

The other stream that you might be referring to is the combination of return to work and the compensation side, and part of that message that we send out is ensuring that everybody within the compensation system understands their roles and responsibilities under the compensation system so that there is also an awareness of what it means to have this compensation system and how each person, whether it's the worker or the employer and health-care provider and WCB itself, has a role to

play. So it really is about awareness and understanding.

Mr. Smook: On page 29 of the 2013 report, on page 29, it shows here 1 per cent Research and Workplace Innovation Program grants, and there's a lot of—like, it seems that's the smallest number, and office supplies, communications and information. Could you explain to me what that 1 per cent research and program grants is?

Mr. Maharaj: Certainly. The board has established what's called the research and innovation work—sorry, the Research and Workplace Innovation Program or RWIP, right, for short, and that program dedicates \$1 million to research projects in the province as they relate to prevention or research projects relating to return to work, and we have recently also added training as a stream that can be accessed. So you will have external organizations, whether they be universities, associations. You will have employers applying. You will have labour groups applying. You will have, really, universities, a cross-sectional of the population, applying to undertake research and be granted via that fund.

Mr. Smook: On the same pie chart, 15 per cent prevention and other, is that all the prevention programs that you administer?

Mr. Maharaj: That would be correct. That would relate to the provincial programs that we have been doing and now are consolidating much of that under SAFE Work Manitoba.

Mr. Smook: Mr. Maharaj, has the WCB received any gifts for major events in Winnipeg, i.e., Bomber tickets, Jets tickets, concert tickets, and, if so, could you provide us with how many tickets were gifted and to what events and who used them?

Mr. Maharaj: In 2013 we received no such gifts.

Mr. Smook: In 2013 or previous years, has WCB purchased any tickets for sporting events, i.e., Jets, Bombers, and what were these tickets used for?

Mr. Maharaj: I would have to undertake the previous years. I can certainly respond to 2013 and, just in relation to your previous question, there were no tickets received for 2013. If you wish to have the previous years, I would have to undertake that. So, again, for 2013, no.

Now, sorry, on your question that you're asking now I'll have to undertake to get you that information.

Mr. Smook: If you can undertake that, if you could get me back for the last three years, if possible.

Mr. Maharaj: Yes.

Mr. Smook: Customer service, it is noted throughout the 2013 annual report that WCB's new corporate vision is to be a trusted partner. As we all discuss further, that WCB's customer service results rarely meet the target, what steps have you made to increase your corporate vision?

Mr. Maharaj: Well, it—certainly, the customer being at the centre of everything that we do is one of the key goals that we've set for ourselves. I wouldn't say that we have been doing poorly on it—I forget, as you phrased it, rarely, we don't meet the target. Actually, our employer satisfaction surveys have seen an increase in employer satisfaction and our injured worker surveys on many aspects are quite high as far as their satisfaction.

But we do look to use our data analytics in a better and—way that we can actually delve down into and understand where our processes can be either redesigned or our approaches can be redesigned and our services can be offered through ways and such, for example, access via Internet, et cetera, to increase that customer service.

Mr. Smook: According to charts from 2013, there's a lot of areas that we've talked about with WCB.

Employment engagement: we want to achieve at least 80 per cent. It's—it was 75 per cent in 2009 and in 2013 it was 67 per cent. WCB service culture: to achieve 80 per cent. It was at 73 per cent in 2009. Now it's down to 67 per cent. Injured worker satisfaction was at 79 per cent in 2009, and it's down to 77 per cent in 2013. Employer satisfaction: 2009 it was 71; in 2013, it's still 71. Worker satisfaction with WCB support for return-to-work support: down. It was at 64 per cent in 2009. Now it's down to 62 per cent. It seems like every chart since 2009 to 2013 is down, and I'm just wondering, like, what are your plans for bringing them back up? We have a five-year plan, but what are the actual plans? What can you do to bring those numbers back up?

*(19:00)

Mr. Maharaj: So, just for clarification, there's a distinction between the first two charts that you've mentioned, which, actually, you have seen a dramatic shift—where it goes down that's probably statistically valid—and those are actually internal employee surveys. So the staff engagement was

measured really for the first time in 2011. Prior to that, in 2009, what was being measured was staff satisfaction.

Employee engagement is a very difficult concept to measure and it's a higher standard to meet so certainly we have stretched ourselves to say we are now going to shift our focus on what we feel is a need to look at employee engagement, not just staff satisfaction. To that end, we've done things such as an innovation initiative which looks at working from the grassroots up where employees will actually be engaged in providing us with solutions and with innovative ideas on where they see that improvements can be made in the organization. We've done things such as having the executive reach out and have more touch points with employees, and we continue to plan and do bigger and better things to see that engagement result increase. But this is actually a new area that the board is moving into and that is internal, looking internally at our employees.

The other graphs that you've referenced, some of those shifts, certainly, I would call them flat. I would say they're not, you know, statistically that valid to be saying that there's a trend down. Having said that, we actually have stretched ourselves and set thresholds that are beyond that and we want to see that increase. So we're doing things like a significant reworking of our case management system where we look at how we actually process the cases, where there might be issues with return to work, why—where those issues or blocks happen in the process and how we can be seamless for our customers, whether they be employers or injured workers.

We're also doing things such as investing in our technology and our systems and—so that we may reach out in ways we've never reached out before. We certainly carry out many surveys, as you probably have seen by reading through the material. We also do focus groups and we're also trying to engage and listen to our stakeholders in ways that we've never done before.

So we're fairly confident that with the investments on innovation, with investments on looking at our processes and our technology, looking at some of the other fundamental pieces of the compensation system that seems to have created some problems such as the rate model, again, what we're doing with prevention and, ultimately, return to work, as well, that we will see those numbers shift.

Mr. Smook: What is the average wait time when a person files a complaint, and what is the—sort of there's an average time but what is the maximum, because as a critic we hear a lot of stories from people phoning in that it's taking so long to get a claim settled.

Mr. Maharaj: So, on page 69 of the 2013 annual report, you'll see that the percentage of claims paid within 14 days of injury date, for the first time, and I'd say we're quite actually proud of this metric, because for the first time in a very long time we've met one of our stretch goals, which is 70.6 per cent of the claims are paid within 14 days.

Mr. Smook: What do you find are some of the longer, because, like, there are cases that take a longer—like, what are some of the longer cases that are out there right now?

Mr. Maharaj: Off the top of my head I can't give you, you know, what would be a longer case. We might see cases go beyond 14 days, and there can be a various number of reasons for that. For example, there might be a scenario where—and often there is—where we are waiting for information either from the claimant or more likely waiting for information from a health-care provider or trying to get back and forth with either the health-care provider or the individual. There could be numerous reasons for delays that take you beyond the 14 days.

Mr. Smook: You just mentioned, like, some of the—so the difficulties—what are the major difficulties that the workman's compensation board finds when working with a complaint? Like, is it—what system are they having the most difficulty with?

Mr. Maharaj: So, I mean, the answer is similar in nature to what I've mentioned. Gathering the information from the various different parties that are involved can take some time, so certainly that's—that can be a challenge, whether it's the individual claimant, a health-care provider, a specialist or the employer. There also—what's pointed out to me is that these are sometimes very complex claims, especially if you look at, for example, occupational disease claims, and because of the complexity and the different parties that are involved, that can go beyond the 14 days.

Mr. Smook: Does the board—sometimes in a case where they're having to wait a long time to see a specialist, does the board outside source any—do they send patients away any place to—for treatment or—

Mr. Vice-Chairperson in the Chair

Mr. Vice-Chairperson: Mr. Maharaj.

Mr. Maharaj: So we do have the ability to do that, arrange for a specialist, for the individual to see a specialist, and we can do that and we have done that, but it would only be after the claim is actually accepted.

Mr. Smook: Would you be able to provide me with some numbers of what types of services you outsource and what types and numbers?

Mr. Maharaj: Certainly. Yes.

Mr. Smook: Fair Practices Advocate—while the number of issues brought forward to the Fair Practices Advocate has decreased over the last five years, the number of those issues being—disagreements with decisions has increased. Can you make a comment on that?

Mr. Maharaj: So, of course, the Fair Practices Office is not a formal part of the appeal process. However, it's, you know, analogous to an ombudsman, where if you feel that there's an issue around fairness or the treatment—the way that you're being treated—that you would approach that office. Certainly, there are individuals in the system and, in fact, I mean, it's the nature of adjudication and the WCB system that there will be decisions and disagreements on adjudication of a claim, so that is what that relates to.

And, at a certain point, we do have a very good appeal process that can be utilized if the person or the individual feels that they still disagree with the ultimate decision.

* (19:10)

Mr. Smook: In 2013, the WCB received 175 disagreements with decisions; 18 per cent of those decisions made by the WCB were found to be wrong and unreasonable. Do you find that number concerning?

Mr. Maharaj: So a couple of factors that I would consider when reading that. We actually have 30,000 claims that go through the WCB. Fifteen—approximately 15,000 are time-loss claims and so, again, the nature of the system is that you certainly will have claims where there is disagreement on the adjudication of that claim and, really, the terminology that's used in that particular category may not be something that I agree with. It really relates to the fact that the system—you will have to have a system that allows for different interpretations of a particular claim or a particular issue, and that's

really what the appeal component of the compensation system is meant to address.

Mr. Smook: Is the Fair Practices Advocate usually seen after all the appeal processes have been used up?

Mr. Maharaj: No. Actually, in fact, it's generally the opposite which is the Fair Practices Advocate not always but usually is seen prior to that.

Mr. Cliff Cullen (Spruce Woods): Thank you for the opportunity to ask some questions tonight.

I want to seek some clarification on some of the new initiatives that were talked about here. First of all, the minister talked about the prevention committee. Can you elaborate on the prevention committee as it relates to Workers Compensation Board and will the Workers Compensation Board be responsible for appointing those people and will the board be responsible for paying that particular committee?

Mr. Maharaj: So the prevention committee is a new subcommittee of the WCB board, and, as a subcommittee of the WCB board, it's comprised of WCB board members from each, one—from each of the three different tripartite groups. So a labour representative, a employer representative and a public interest representative. Both the chair and myself as the CEO sit on that prevention subcommittee. I sit as a non-voting member as I do on all subcommittees of the board. As well, the uniqueness structure of this—the unique structure of this particular prevention committee is it also includes external stakeholder experts in the area of prevention, and those are one individual from the employer component and one individual from Labour and the minister appoints those two individuals. We also have the Chief Prevention Officer as a member of the committee and the Deputy Minister of Labour.

Mr. Cullen: Thank you for that response.

So these—the people, then, will be working, I guess, basically directly for the Workers Compensation Board. So any expenses they will incur or if there's any remuneration required, the Workers Compensation Board, then, will be paying those committee members.

Mr. Chairperson in the Chair

Mr. Maharaj: The only remuneration that is provided will be a per diem that is provided for the external members. So, as is the case with the other

subcommittees, there is nothing provided for, obviously, for the board members, for myself, other than what is provided normally through the board as their per diem, and the government members, being the deputy minister and the CPO, do not provide—are not provided with any per diems.

Mr. Cullen: I was just wondering about the structure of this prevention committee. Is it something that you've seen in other jurisdictions or is this something that's new to Manitoba? Are we looking from other areas to see that this may have been an effective tool?

Mr. Maharaj: So this is absolutely new to Manitoba. It certainly—in Ontario there is a version of this that exists, however, it's structured somewhat differently, but there is still a version where prevention is consolidated and focused as opposed to mixed in with enforcement and compensation.

So this is, you know, different models that could work in Manitoba, but it really is a made-in-Manitoba solution. It's not something that we adopted. We did look across the different jurisdictions to see how it is actually addressed in other jurisdictions, and this is really a combination of various different things that we've seen.

We also, I should say, did consultations on this with—really, quite broad consultations on this, so this is a result of a WCB—a couple of reports: first, a WCB consultation on the infrastructure of prevention in the province; the CPO report, Chief Prevention Officer's report, which was a broad consultation on prevention as well; a Paul Petrie review that was done on the rate model which was done with a focus on how can we better provide incentives in the rate model or utilize it for the purposes of prevention, or to focus on prevention. And, really, those all filtered in and came together for the development of the government's five-year plan on prevention and SAFE Work Manitoba.

Mr. Cullen: So the function of this committee, then, will be to provide advice back to the board, and then the board from there can make decisions going forward. Is that how we'd kind of paraphrase the function?

Mr. Maharaj: Yes. I would say the function would be similar to the other subcommittees, ultimately to provide recommendations back to the board but to do the actual analysis work and, in some cases, oversight with regards to proposals that would come forward in relation to prevention.

So I can give you an example, and that would be for the purposes of safety associations. When we look at one of the gaps that we have in Manitoba for infrastructure around prevention, one of the critical gaps is safety associations. In the five-year plan it's stated as a goal that we want to grow the number of safety associations that currently exist in Manitoba. How do we do that, and what would the model look like? Administration would do research around that, would develop proposals, would develop a paper, would take it to this prevention committee, would have discussions around it, and there would be an iterative process where, ultimately, there would be a proposal that goes forward to the board via the prevention committee.

Mr. Cullen: So how does SAFE Work Manitoba relate to this new committee? Are they going to be kind of the working arm, if you will?

Mr. Maharaj: Absolutely. SAFE Work—really, this committee is working very closely with not, really, just the five-year plan, it's about SAFE Work Manitoba delivering on the goals of the five-year plan.

Mr. Cullen: Well, let me get a little clarity around—you know, you have some workplace health and safety people seconded at the current time, and just trying to get a feel for the relationships there, Workers Compensation Board, workplace health and safety, safe Manitoba, and how this all comes together, and may need some more detailed analysis, if you could provide that to us, in terms of the number of staff seconded from workplace health and safety, kind of what their roles are, just so we get a clearer picture of the number of people and who's paying for what.

Mr. Maharaj: Yes. I can absolutely provide that. There's, as I said, it's eight to 11 people. I don't forget the exact number I can tell you right now. *[interjection]* It's eight. I knew it was eight to 11 that have been seconded, and we can certainly get you something that will outline for you what the roles are. These individuals are all focused on prevention and prevention only, and as far as who's paying, the SAFE Work Manitoba is budgeted under WCB.

Mr. Cullen: The other item you talked about earlier was the business intelligent area. Can you elaborate on that in terms of what that initiative's all about?

* (19:20)

Mr. Maharaj: Certainly. It really goes hand in hand with data analytics. So WCB has a significant

amount of data; however, we haven't always mined that data, utilized it in a way that would help us and inform us on our initiatives and the decisions that we make. So this would relate to, for example, prevention, where we need to really be able to understand the root cause of why we might have a—certain injury rates in certain sectors. So we could really understand the initiatives and focus and target on what we might need to do to bring that injury rate down.

So data analytics and business intelligence is a way for us to actually start to look at that data and build reports and be able to make that meaningful for the people internally that are making decisions but also for our stakeholders, for the people who are working, who we work with. Again, part of our—what we hope to be our future is to partner with the various different people involved in the compensation system and to provide them with the information they need to really focus on prevention and to really focus on the initiatives that they need to do.

Mr. Cullen: So this initiative, then, is fairly new. I was trying to get a sense of where you are in terms of developing that initiative and in terms of how you intend to roll it out and make those kind of connections back to the various stakeholders.

Mr. Maharaj: The initiative is fairly new in this form. In other words, brought together with IT, data analytics, you know, data scientists and those types of individuals that can really build those types of reports and that—and provide you with that type of information and really looking at it from that perspective.

However, we have been building on and doing work with data. And I don't want to leave the impression that, you know, we're quite data rich but that we don't actually look at our data, have reports and use that; this is really just taking that to a whole new level. How it would roll out, it would roll out over the course of the next two years. It's already started; however, these things take time to develop. So, for example, there is things called data warehouses, for example, that are built, where you actually will create modules and develop the data in such a way that it can then be used by the data scientists to respond to questions and to be able to show and measure how you're doing and the progress you're making in certain targeted areas.

Mr. Cullen: I just have a couple of financial questions before I pass it on to other members.

So, on the most recent report, and it's the—detailed on page 62 of the most recent report. In terms of item 16 in the operating expenses, and we did touch on a little bit earlier there, but the salaries and benefits, it's up, you know, about a little better than 10 per cent. And I know you alluded to the fact that you had a new contract in place. Could you provide us maybe in more detail in terms of the percentage increase of that new contract costs in terms of your salaries? And then I know you were going to also look at the actual staffing numbers, too. I think we need a bit of a sense of the staffing numbers there and how that relates to this 10 per cent increase in costs.

Mr. Maharaj: So the negotiated salary increases for that year—actually, the year under question—could I take a moment?

Mr. Chairperson: Mr. Maharaj?

Mr. Maharaj: So I just wanted to confirm.

So the—our negotiated salary was zero per cent in year 1, which was 2013. However, there are merit increases on top of—within the scale. So that really is what—as far as the actual collective bargaining agreement is concerned, it would really relate more to the merit increases on a specific scale.

We did have growth in the area of the, as I mentioned, business intelligence and IT, although it wasn't a huge amount as far as individuals are concerned. The largest expense there is actually related to the pension plan and, as with many pension plans, there is actually an increase in the cost. In that year the increase was \$5 million.

Mr. Cullen: I appreciate that response, though I think, you know, for us to have a closer look at those numbers—to justify those numbers, if you could provide us a little more detail in terms of the financials there, just so that we can reconcile that 10 per cent increase in cost, I think that would be a—could be beneficial for us. If you would, I'd appreciate that.

The other item here that caught my attention was the office supply services and projects, and there's been a fivefold increase on that line year over year, and maybe you could just elaborate on what we're talking about in terms of those supply services and projects.

Mr. Maharaj: I just need a minute. I'm told this is an accounting complicated answer. So I never like it

when I hear accounting and complicated, but I just need a minute now.

So there was a credit in the 2012 year which therefore reduced the 2012 expenditure, which is why it, unfortunately, is represented looking lower than it actually was, and that's why you see the large increase.

Mr. Cullen: Again, if you could provide us some of the details on that, it might help for—again to reconcile some of the differences there. Clearly, keeping control of operating expenses has a bearing on the rates down the road including—we've seen the operating expenses go up substantially, again, in the neighbourhood of 10 per cent per year. What do you have in place—and I don't know if it's an operational thing or whether the board has something in place to monitor the operational side of it and an expense side.

Mr. Maharaj: Well, we do have quite an exhaustive budget process, and that budget process does start from a zero-based budgeting, it goes forward to look at our business as usual, which is what we require to continue to do the work we do today, and it also looks at what new initiatives we're undertaking. So, when we look at our budget for the year, we'd lead that—we link that back to our strategic plan. And really there's a direct cost and linkage back to the initiatives that you might want to undertake in your strategic plan and the cost that you'd have to actually invest in order to see that result. So, at the end of the day, it really flows directly from the strategic plan, and in this case there was a 2013 strategic plan that committed to a number of different initiatives that are fundamental to the system and the investments that you're willing to make for that.

And we keep a very close eye on the operational cost, and, certainly, any increase has to be justified by a specific business case and an understanding as to how that relates back to either what we do today or what we've committed to do in the future and, ultimately, how that will impact and will benefit our customers, whether they be employers or injured workers.

Mr. Ian Wishart (Portage la Prairie): Thank you, Mr. Maharaj. I have a couple of questions, and one goes back to your evaluation by actuaries. And actuaries have the unfortunate pleasure of trying to predict the future statistically, and they talk about emerging injuries in different categories, and some of them are obvious with the change to computers and things like that. But we're seeing quite a shift in

the workplace to workers that are not in good physical health, that are overweight in many cases. How do they account for that, because it is quite a measureable change in the last 10 years alone, and I know the employers are concerned about it. When does it become a health issue for the individual and when does it become your problem?

* (19:30)

Mr. Maharaj: Well, that's an interesting kind of perspective that I hadn't really thought of. But I can tell you actuaries have thought of it because they really try to think of everything. I don't know that they would, when the line is—where they would see that as a trend and they would start to see an actual correlation in their data with—of course they're working with historical data and trying to project into the future as well as with what they might know as far as initiatives that are under way or—and other initiatives that are known, for example, occupational disease and things like of that nature that are known to be coming in the future.

One of the ways that they might look at that is, you know, we are a national system. So we have other WCBs that do similar type of work and similar type of forecasting, and I know that they do talk to each other. We have an external actuary that also does this type of work and looks around at what the trends are and, as you say, what—you know, what may ultimately down the road impact. So they do spend their time sitting back and looking at what the trends are, what the issues are and if there is a way that that might filter into our future assumptions and impact us. How they do that is probably mixed with a little bit of art and science.

Mr. Wishart: Thank you for the answer.

And, I guess, I looked at the trends in terms of weight problems with high school grads, which is entering the workforce as a measure, and 15 years ago it was—serious weight issues were less than 5 per cent. Now they're in the range of 30 per cent, and moving them into the workplace there's going to be related health issues and I guess I am concerned, and I think the actuaries probably will be as well, that that will reflect on our rates in the future and it won't be insignificant because there are a complex number of health issues related to being overweight, whether it's something like along the line of diabetes which is widely known and/or heart issues.

I mean, we were quite happy to accept and probably profit from the reduction in smoking. This

is the other side of the coin with weight problems being a major issue. As the industry tends to claim, sugar is the new tobacco. How are we going to account for that in the future and are you concerned that it will have an impact on your rates in the not-too-distant future?

Mr. Maharaj: Well, I think it's certainly a broader issue than just WCB and there are certainly—my concern around it would be that we partner with the appropriate organizations, associations and industries to try to address this, and I think we do actually see some movement in things such as wellness, for example, in the workplace. And I know that when we talk about prevention and when we talk about things such as occupational diseases, mental health, et cetera, that are now making their way into what it means to really have a healthy workplace, that we do look at that and we do talk about things of that nature, but it's a broader solution, of course, than just WCB.

Am I concerned that it will impact the rates and not well costed in our—by our actuaries? Not hugely, because I believe we have a very good process and very skilled actuaries both internally and externally looking at these exact type of issues along with the more obvious issues.

Mr. Wishart: I appreciate the answer. I know this is an unfathomable, but when you talk about prevention, perhaps this is an area that prevention should be considered.

Just to make that real, I'm familiar with a case where a truck driver had a heart attack whilst driving. So he has an MPI-related claim, there was an accident. He also has a workman's comp claim like that and, yes, it was definitely health related. Now, whose problem does that become and how do you decide in situations like that? Who has the lead and who does the follow up, because he'll get back to work sometime in the future, I hope, but it's not happening quickly. Who's responsible initially and then who's responsible for long-term recovery?

Mr. Maharaj: So, again, these are the complicated cases and the complex—you—we—*[interjection]*

Well, actually, I never see the simple ones, either, so—as they come to my attention, as well, the complex cases, and the board's.

Ultimately, that individual, because it's MPI, would have a choice to make about whether he wishes to go through the MPI system for his benefit or whether he wishes to go through the WCB system.

Let's assume he chooses the WCB system and is adjudicated through WCB. Certainly, this—you're absolutely correct that the issue we inherit in the way of that individual returning to work and us trying to make sure that he returns to health and meaningful work.

Mr. Wishart: Thank you for the answer, Mr. Maharaj.

Moving on from that, I had one slight follow-up question on the properties that you own, the investment properties, not the ones that you are actually using. And I understand how the values are set. They use a—basically a fair-market value for the day. But most of these are, in fact, revenue-bearing properties, rental properties of one form or the other, and that number doesn't tell us whether they're occupied, whether they're, in fact, in the marketplace and vacancy rates have been rising, especially for office space. So I'm just wondering—do you have any idea what percentage of your investment properties are actually in use?

Mr. Maharaj: So we do, in our policy around investments, and these are—certainly, these are a combination of different types of real estate and in our policy we actually do have a policy limit on office space which is, I think, what you're referring to as far as lease rates and vacancy rates being at certain times in a cycle high. So we do stick within that policy and the board actually receives a report and the investment committee receives a report that speaks to what the vacancy rate is in the office space and that will change, obviously, from a quarter-to-quarter basis but we have a very close eye on that and we have asset managers that actually we ensure and push that they have a very close eye on that.

As well as there's other different types of properties, for example, a warehouse that may be a single sole kind of space that's leased to one corporation.

I can get you that information if you like. I don't have it off the top of my head.

Mr. Wishart: I think I'd be interested in that because we—we're seeing some numbers that are causing us for concern.

The guidelines that you referenced, are they set by your investment board or are they set by your advisors?

Mr. Maharaj: They are set by the investment committee and ultimately approved by the board.

Mr. Wishart: And, moving on from there, I have a few questions around the medical services that you use. You contract, I understand, for your own doctors and medical specialists. How is that process done?

Mr. Maharaj: I just need clarification. Are you talking about our own health-care consultants that we use at WCB?

An Honourable Member: Yes. Those.

Mr. Maharaj: So we do actually recruit our internal consultants, just as we would any of our employees at WCB. It could be through ads, it could be through going out to associations, you know, placing an ad in an association newsletter and things of that nature. It's a—just a normal recruitment process.

Mr. Wishart: Being as the rates are usually set for—per consultation, it's not a call for proposal or a tendering process, then. It's a specific we seek this type of expertise and you'll contract directly with that type of expertise for—do you have a—sort of an assumed number of services? Are they on retainer or what are they on?

* (19:40)

Mr. Maharaj: You're right, that is not a tender situation. That would be similar to how we would recruit an employee and it would be specific to their—to whatever their area of expertise is. They would have a contract and the contract certainly would be stipulating a certain service and a certain number of hours.

Mr. Chairperson: Mrs. Driedger—sorry—Mr. Wishart, go ahead.

Mr. Wishart: So you actually guarantee them a number of—a minimum number of hours?

Mr. Maharaj: So we do actually stipulate hours, a minimum of 10, usually a minimum of 10, and it could be generally between 10 and 20 hours per week and we do monitor that to ensure that we do follow that closely.

Mrs. Myrna Driedger (Charleswood): A question about the claims that you see. You were indicating that there are 30,000 that go through WCB in a year. Do you know the percentage of those that would be related to mental health, or are they more physical injuries that you're addressing, or are you also recognizing what you might call a mental-health injury or a post-traumatic stress disorder injury?

Mr. Maharaj: We certainly—I don't have the breakdown of—with me. I might—no, I don't have the breakdown with me right now, but I can get you a—how that's categorized. *[interjection]* One moment, please. So I can get you a breakdown of the claims as far as how many relate to physical and categorize it for you.

In relation to the PTSD and mental health, we do know that over the last, I'm told, approximately five years we had somewhere around 1,000 claims. It averaged approximately 200 per year. So some of those would relate to PTSD, but, certainly, that would not be necessarily the larger component.

Mrs. Driedger: Out of the 200, then, a year, is it a brain injury that is readily recognized or is there, like, an acceptance of a diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder proven clinically? Like, how do you—how does somebody come in with that claim and then it is diagnosed with that claim and do they have to fight in order to be recognized to have a post-traumatic disorder injury?

Mr. Maharaj: No, we—certainly, we ensure that our claims for mental health, whether they be post-traumatic stress or occupational diseases, in general are treated and adjudicated in the same way that a physical claim is treated and adjudicated. So, certainly, it—they don't have to fight, as you have kind of categorized that. They would go through a process no different than if it was a physical claim coming into the system. Generally, they are complex claims, and specifically when you talked about the post-traumatic stress there is a methodology around adjudicating that and we have a special unit that is trained on adjudicating occupational diseases and claims that are—would generally be very complex and difficult.

Mrs. Driedger: Of the 200 you would see in a year, would you happen to know what percentage of those are first responders?

Mr. Maharaj: So I can give you an approximation. I recall having looked at this just recently, and I believe it was somewhere in the neighbourhood of 30 to 35; I believe the number was 32.

Mrs. Driedger: I'm curious, then, if you're seeing 200 a year, and 30, 35 are first responders, where do the—or did I not understand that correctly? Okay.

Mr. Maharaj: Just for clarification, out of the entire 1,000, 30 to 35, approximately 32, are first responders.

Mrs. Driedger: And then the rest of them, where are we seeing a number of people getting post-traumatic stress disorder? Lawyers' offices, health care? Because that's an interesting number that there'd be 200. What professions are we generally seeing that in?

Mr. Maharaj: So it's a variety of different places: social workers; you are correct, you know, hospitals, nurses; corrections, for example, so a variety of places.

And I believe the number of PTSD—if that's specifically, as you mentioned, what you're looking for—is really just a sliver of that 1,000. If I recall, the number was somewhere around 130 of the entire 1,000 related to PTSD.

Mr. Cullen: Speaking of claims, we as MLAs hear about claims when they're not going well, and I'm seeking your advice on this. I know, in fact, I've got a claim on my desk right now, and it's been ongoing for quite some time and this particular person has seen a lot of challenges over the years. So I—if you could provide us with advice in terms of how you would like to see us deal with them, if there's a contact person that we should have or—through the process. How do you see us dealing with people that come to us with issues?

Mr. Maharaj: Well, certainly we know that these are difficult cases. We have—and I see it as well—some cases that can span a very long period of time, can be very difficult to deal with and very difficult to respond to.

I think what you need to know is if you hand that off to us—and certainly we can get you the name of somebody who would be a contact person for you to do that—that we will actually go through, as much as we can, the process to assist that person, and we do whether they come directly to us or whether they come indirectly to us.

Ultimately, at the end of the day, what often happens, it kind of goes back to that category that you were earlier referring to about the disagreement around the adjudication. Often at the end of the day, the ultimate remedy is for that person to enter into the appeal process, and that really is really the best remedy for everybody involved. It is an independent appeal process going through the appeal commission, and that person can certainly have a true, honest and fair review of their file from that perspective.

Mr. Cullen: I appreciate that response, so we will endeavour to pass the file on and see if we can move that ahead.

I want to go back to your comments about the rate review model. I'm sure there's a lot of people in the province that are waiting with bated breath to see where that—what that results in. Can you tell us where things are at and when you expect to make decisions on that?

Mr. Maharaj: So we had engaged Morneau Shepell in order to undertake our review consultation and now review the model itself. That consultation included a stakeholder advisory committee which has met over the course of the last year, has heard the different kind of models and issues that exist with various different models of—rate models across the country. And that has been consolidated into a paper that will go before the board, and from that paper we will be looking at Morneau developing some options around what could be done for changes to the rate model if that's what's approved.

*(19:50)

That would be somewhere—the Morneau results would be somewhere near the end of this year, where we would then take forward to the board potential options for changes to the rate model, all based on the consultations that took place with the stakeholder advisory committee. From there, it would really depend on the board's need for either further work or further consultation, and it would also depend, obviously, on the options that are being brought forward.

So what you will see is maybe more information coming forward in early 2015 on what we heard and what the options are and what the next steps are. Changing the rate model is something that we don't take lightly. We do a significant amount of due diligence around it and, ultimately, the board will have different options to consider, but the one thing that you can be assured is that the stakeholders will be consulted and kept in the loop as the process moves forward.

Mr. Cullen: In terms of that consultation, I assume you've probably heard from a lot of stakeholders. And will you then be following up with those submissions from those stakeholders to answer any questions that they may have put forward or any recommendations they put forward?

Mr. Maharaj: Yes. We have. I think, if you may be referring to this approximately 11, I think, written

submissions from stakeholders that are currently on our website around the rate model, many of those individuals are actually engaged, either through the Manitoba Employers' Council or through our stakeholder advisory committee or through our—as partners, through our regular contact.

So, certainly, we will be keeping them in the loop as to where we're at and we would be following up with them with regards to the actual broader communication of what has come out of this entire process, this review process.

Hon. Jon Gerrard (River Heights): Yes. On page 69 of your 2013 report, there's a graph showing worker satisfaction of 62 per cent. This is in relationship to support to return to work, and the question which, you know, these statistics beg is, you know, why is worker satisfaction on return-to-work issues so low? Why are 40 per cent clearly not satisfied? What research has been done to look into what's the problem here, and what can you tell us about why it's happening?

Mr. Maharaj: The worker return to work, again, and I know I've said this before, is definitely a complex issue, and one of the issues we have around return to work is that there's multiple parties involved, and where you see dissatisfaction in return to work, we do have a lot of data that we have looked at and we are going through to try to understand where that—what that really means, where that dissatisfaction comes from.

So, for example, it could be dissatisfaction with returning to a job that the individual feels—again, there's a disagreement on whether they should be returning to the job, the timing of the return to the job, the type of job. There's a lot of different factors around that.

There's also multiple parties involved in the health care, so you may have the individual having an issue with either their own health-care provider or WCB required them to come in and see a consultant—there may be an issue there. There may be issues around the case management and some of the decisions that were made in that case management process, where the individual may feel that they're not ready to return to work, for example. But one of the various different health-care providers that are involved in this, whether it be a physician, or a chiropractor, physiotherapist, or the whole host of people that may be involved, feel something different.

And all of this leads to say that we certainly do have information that—trying to understand that root cause. One of the things that we are doing about it is we are looking at revamping the way that we approach return to work and really clarifying the role of WCB in that return-to-work process, moving to what we see will be a best practice in return to work. So that is just in the midst of being developed this year and it's one of those projects I mentioned that's taking place in our case management area.

Mr. Chairperson: Dr. Gerrard, now, before I recognize you, sir, we have to look at watches. We have a few minutes left so if we have to wrap up, I'd like you to ask the question and—thank you.

Mr. Gerrard: I wonder if we you could extend it for another 15 minutes. I have several questions here.

Mr. Chairperson: Is that the will of the committee? *[Agreed]*

Go ahead, Dr. Gerrard.

Mr. Gerrard: The fact is that it's been a number of years and clearly not much has been done. In fact, it's, you know, worker satisfaction is actually less, marginally so than it was several years ago, and this is worker satisfaction with WCB support for return to work. It's not related to, you know, the other factors. It's specifically with respect to Workers Compensation Board reports. So, I mean, it seems to me that there should probably be more focus here on making sure that this is addressed.

My second question deals with the workplace fatalities. Now, in 2012 there were 40 workplace fatalities. Approximately three quarters of those were related to occupational diseases. In the occupational diseases category 60 per cent of the fatalities were due to asbestos exposure with the development of mesothelioma or asbestosis leading to the death of the individuals. So that's a pretty high proportion of the workplace fatalities being due to asbestos, and I'm just wondering what investigation has been done as to the source of the asbestos and what's being done to address and prevent this problem.

Mr. Maharaj: Most of those claims, the ones specially that you're referring to with regards to asbestos, have certainly have a, as you would know, have a very long latency period and have taken place, or the exposure has taken place in an environment many years ago when it was certainly a much lesser focus on safety. Those—that same environment does not exist today in the way of those workplaces are not the same workplaces they are

today. So, in other words, we have a much more acute and better understanding of the dangers around asbestos today and it's not the same environment that those individuals are working in today. Unfortunately, for the exposures that took place back with that long latency period, nothing can be done for exposure that took place so many years ago.

Mr. Gerrard: Does WCB have information as to the breakdown in terms of which specific industries or what type of exposures were important in leading to the deaths from as a result of asbestos exposure?

Mr. Maharaj: We do have that information and doctors are involved in these specific claims are very, very good at providing kind of the root cause and any information around the root cause that if there are safety concerns today, we can then use that information to address those concerns. However, you know, as I mentioned, and generally it relates to circumstances that occurred very long ago.

Mr. Gerrard: Since you indicate that you have that information, I wonder if you would be able to make that available.

And my next question deals with the time-loss-to-injury rate. In the latest year in Manitoba, 2013, it was 3.2. That's been really pretty much unchanged for about four years when it's been either 3.2 or 3.3. So you know, any progress is kind of stalled.

* (20:00)

When one compares Manitoba to other provinces, you know, Quebec's latest rate was less than that, at 2.89; Saskatchewan, even lower at 2.53; BC, lower at 2.3; Nova Scotia, 1.86; Newfoundland, half of Manitoba's, at 1.6; Alberta, we're getting close to a third, at 1.34; PEI, the same at 1.34; New Brunswick, at 1.18; and Ontario, at 0.95. We're not really in the same league as the other provinces and, you know, when I've asked this question before there's been one excuse after another as to why we're, you know, not doing as well. And, I mean, it seems to me that, you know, we've stalled out and that, you know, your strategic plan, which was to get it down to 3.0, you know, wouldn't even be as low as any other province, and don't you think you need a better strategic plan and we look at this in order to get it down so that we're in the same ballpark as at least some of the other provinces?

Mr. Maharaj: So I will, actually, there are, I think, two parts to that question. The first part about excuses, I did want to address in that really I would

in no way make excuses for having an injury rate that we feel needs to go lower. We do feel the injury rate needs to go lower in Manitoba; however, what has been said in the past, and I'll repeat again, as an interjurisdictional comparator, the injury rate is not necessarily the best metric to use, that that metric brings into it factors such as the coverage that occurs in the province. So, in other words, are you covering more industries that have higher risk and industries with lower risk, and how does that compare across provinces? It brings into it factors such as the wait time for when—or what you consider to be a time-loss injury and things of that nature that make it difficult to compare across provinces.

So that I will address as your saying that we have excuses. I think they're legitimate concerns around using that as an interjurisdictional comparator and that what we need to do is to look at a balanced scorecard on prevention that uses appropriate metrics that can then be looked at maybe more appropriately across the country.

Having said that, absolutely, we agree, we need to focus on how do we now push our injury rate down to the level that we feel is the next big push. Since the year 2000 we have seen the injury rate drop 40—to approximately 43 per cent. There was good progress made; however, as you've pointed out, in the last number of years, there's been a levelling off of that and it has not dropped further the way we would like to see it. And that is exactly what the five-year plan on prevention now focuses on doing.

The five-year plan focuses on making us a leader across the country in prevention and one of the safest places, if not the safest place, to work in Canada. And we have five years to get there, four years, I think now, actually. So that's exactly what SAFE Work Manitoba is all about, and these are fundamental shifts that need to be made in the system. We're talking about infrastructure around prevention such as safety associations, whereas we have four currently and many of the other provinces such as Saskatchewan, for example, has nine. We need those safety associations. We need those partnerships to get training done. We need certification programs. We need incentive programs around prevention. We need a rate model that focuses on prevention rather than focusing on return to work. You'll note that we actually have one of—we have one of the lowest durations in our injury rates. Our rate model currently focuses on getting folks back to work in the way of providing incentives rather than focusing on prevention.

So these are—if you look at the initiatives that we are undertaking with the review of the rate model initiatives that are outlined in the prevention plan, that is the strategic plan you're talking about. We're going to look at this from the fundamental pieces of the system, and that's how we feel we'll address it.

Mr. Gerrard: You—we may be slightly different in terms of precisely how time-loss-to-injury counted, you know, is counted or, you know, the distribution of industries covered and so on, but it seems to me that I've never been given an explanation that was specific enough to account for the big difference between Manitoba and other provinces. And it still seems to me that if you're going to look for fundamental change, that you need to be doing better than looking at going to—from 3.2 to 3.0, that you should be looking at something considerably better than time-loss-to-injury of 3.0.

Now, one of the things that has already been raised, and by Mr. Wishart, is the fact that, you know, health care, we have currently, you know, close to a hundred thousand people with diabetes; that's double what we had in 2000. And, you know, these are individuals who, you know, could have problems which lead to more workplace injuries. Have you looked at this as one of the reasons for a higher time-loss-to-injury work here in Manitoba?

Mr. Maharaj: So part of the data analytics and the business intelligence that I was talking about is to address and look at things exactly like that so that we can have an understanding of what the root causes are where we see increases in that injury rate, and so we can do the analysis and we can build programming to do exactly that, to address that. And, in fact, I agree with you that our goal has to be a lofty one and has to be a stretch goal, and I believe when we say that we will be the safest place to work in Manitoba, that that is actually that lofty, stretch goal, no longer the 3.0.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

Dr. Gerrard, do you have more questions?

Mr. Gerrard: Yes.

Mr. Chairperson: Go ahead.

Mr. Gerrard: The electronic reporting which you talked about and you're moving to, it seems to me that, you know, most doctors have been having to report electronically for a number of years now to—in terms of billing. Why is the Workers Compensation

Board behind in terms of having electronic reporting?

Mr. Maharaj: The key with the electronic reporting or billing that's done currently, as I understand it, through the health-care system, is that it really focuses on the billing more than the reporting. And WCB has unique needs in that, really, what is important to us is not the billing; it's actually the reporting, that we—where we will get the gains and the value for both the injured worker and the system in general is to really get that information that we need from the physicians, which is the reporting component, faster and in our hands and, obviously, in a clear and effective way. So that is not delivered currently through the current system.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you.

Mr. Smook: One more question.

In the minister's opening statement, she referred to rewards for employees who have safe workplaces. Could you touch on that a little bit, rewards for employers who have safe workplaces?

Mr. Maharaj: So, currently, how that's achieved is through one of the—or two of the safety associations that currently exist in construction, which is through the COR program, and the COR program uses our rate model to provide an incentive for employers that are COR certified by providing them with a discount on their rate. Unfortunately, a model like that is not broadly available for the other sectors and industries. So the plan that we've talking about in prevention needs to have a broader prevention incentive that actually rewards employers for having the investment in prevention and the—true and honest safety systems that will, again, start to address and bring that rate that down. And that's what that refers to.

* (20:10)

Mr. Smook: According to Mr. Wishart's comments, we look at creating safer workers by their health. Will some of those if, say, for instance, some places provide gyms and they provide other activities for people to remain healthy on the job, would some of those features be looked at in safe—as safe workplaces?

Mr. Maharaj: That hasn't been envisioned today. Again, wellness and the general health is a very broad issue, so certainly we can be a part of that solution and maybe in the future we might, I can't really say, but up to today that has not been part of

the vision that—and, I don't think, has been generally part of the best practice in looking at this type of program. It is a broad issue.

Mr. Chairperson: Mrs. Driedger, you wanted to ask a question?

Mrs. Driedger: I just—I have one follow-up question to where I was asking questions before, and if we're looking at 1,000 claims over five years related to mental health, 130 of those have post-traumatic stress disorder, what are the other 870 then related to? What are the diagnoses?

Mr. Maharaj: It's a whole range of things. One example I'm given is depression, so that would be a mental health issue that would relate to that. I think we could probably get some sort of breakdown for you if you'd like.

Mr. Chairperson: Thank you. Time coming close to 8:15, let me ask if we can ask the questions.

Annual Report of the Workers Compensation Board for the year ending December 31, 2012—pass.

Shall the Annual Report of the Workers Compensation Board for the year ending December 31, 2013 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairperson: The report is not passed.

Annual Report of the Appeal Commission and Medical Review Panel for the year ending December 31, 2011—pass.

Annual Report of the Appeal Commission and Medical Review Panel for the year ending December 31, 2012—pass.

Shall the Annual Report of the Appeal Commission and Medical Review Panel for the year ending December 31, 2013 pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairperson: The report is not passed.

The Workers Compensation Board 2011-2015 Five Year Plan—pass.

The Workers Compensation Board 2012-2016 Five Year Plan—pass.

Shall the Workers Compensation Board 2013-2017 Five Year Plan pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

An Honourable Member: No.

Mr. Chairperson: The report is not passed.

Shall the Workers Compensation Board 2014-2018 Five Year Plan pass?

Some Honourable Members: Pass.

Some Honourable Members: No.

Mr. Chairperson: The report is not passed.

Please leave copies of the reports that did not pass on the table.

The hour being 8:14, what is the will of the committee?

Some Honourable Members: Rise.

Mr. Chairperson: Committee rise. Thank you very much.

COMMITTEE ROSE AT: 8:14 p.m.

The Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Debates and Proceedings
are also available on the Internet at the following address:

<http://www.gov.mb.ca/legislature/hansard/hansard.html>