

STATES OF JERSEY
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
BLAMPIED ROOM, STATES BUILDING

TRUST PORT REVIEW

Present: **Deputy Gerard Baudains (Acting Chairman)**
 Senator Jean Le Maistre
 Senator Vibert
 Deputy Phil Rondel
 Deputy Bob Hill

EVIDENCE FROM:

MR B. McPHEE
(Union Convener Jersey Harbours)

on

Thursday, 23rd September 2004

(14:32:07 - 15:05:17)

(Digital Transcription by Marten Walsh Cherer Limited,
Midway House, 27/29 Cursitor St., London, EC4A 1LT.
Telephone: 020 7405 5010. Fax: 020 7405 5026)

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Good afternoon, Mr McPhee. I have to read you the Riot Act, of which
 you have a copy on your desk in front of you. It is important that you fully understand the

conditions under which you are appearing at this hearing. You will find a printed copy of the statement I am about to read to you on the table in front of you.

Shadow Scrutiny Panels have been established by the States to create opportunities for training States Members and officers in developing new skills in advance of the proposed changes of government. During the shadow period, the Panel has no statutory powers and the proceedings at public hearings are not covered by Parliamentary privilege. This means that anyone participating, whether a Panel Member or a person giving evidence, is not protected from being sued or prosecuted for anything said during hearings. The Panel would like you to bear this in mind when answering questions and to ensure that you understand that you are fully responsible for any comments you make.

Welcome to this hearing on the trust port status. We have received your submission. Are there any comments you would like to make to further expand on what you have written?

MR McPHEE: The only thing I would say is that there is a document circulating which, if you read it, you will see why there was not so much resistance to a port trust originally. We had a comfort statement from the President of Harbours & Airport and I believe it was signed off by the President of the Committee, but with the full backing of the then Chief Officer, right? (**Same handed out**)

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Thank you, okay.

SENATOR VIBERT: We have been told in the further submissions that in fact the union membership, one of the reasons they didn't go ahead with the trust was that the union didn't agree with it and didn't want it to happen. Could you just give us your view on whether that is the case?

MR McPHEE: Originally the union members within the Harbours were totally against a trust, but what happened was that the then President issued this letter, which was quite considerably comforting to the membership, and they said "Well, when it's like that, they can go ahead and look at it and come back to us."

SENATOR VIBERT: So this gave you a feeling that your position, of all the people working there, would be protected?

MR McPHEE: Yes. It speaks for itself. It says it will stay as it is.

SENATOR VIBERT: Have you received a similar letter relative to a company?

MR McPHEE: No.

SENATOR VIBERT: So at the moment I take it your view will be in a state of limbo about what's likely to happen in respect of this?

MR McPHEE: At the moment, I think, with regards to a company, the workforce would feel that this letter would cover it. I mean, possibly it doesn't, but the feeling within the workforce is that the principle of this letter would apply.

SENATOR VIBERT: In strict legal terms, it does talk about "*Jersey Harbours have agreed to staff that any plans to form a public trust port*" etc and it gives you the protection, but if they were to change their position and make it a limited liability company, would you be happy that this letter would stand?

MR McPHEE: It doesn't hold water in a court of law, I know that. I mean, I think everyone in here knows that, but I think we would expect politicians to honour the previous President's commitment.

SENATOR VIBERT: On the trust port, can I just ask a couple of questions? We had a submission to us on a trust port proposal given by David Clifford from the Port of Tyne and, apparently in October 2002, he actually had a meeting with Jersey Harbours and made a presentation to States Members on the advantages of a trust port status for Jersey Harbours. I wonder whether you could have a look at that and let me know whether you were actually part of any discussions relative to that? **(Same handed to Mr McPhee)**

MR McPHEE (after a pause): I have no recollection whatsoever of seeing this. I don't remember any of it, so I'm assuming I haven't seen it.

SENATOR VIBERT: You didn't go to a presentation where it was all outlined, to the best of your knowledge?

MR McPHEE: No. The only report on trust port status I recall was a Fischer Report, which was done some years ago. I'm afraid I've shuffled those about.

SENATOR VIBERT: It's okay. If you leave it there, that is good enough.

MR McPHEE: Leave it there, okay.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could I just ask you on this question, we have been told this morning that all stakeholders involved have had full consultation with them. Do you feel that the consultations you have had with the Committee on it, that you have the feeling that you were a full partner in the discussions or did it fall short of that?

MR McPHEE: Is this for the port trust or for the incorporation?

SENATOR VIBERT: The port trust to start with.

MR McPHEE: No, we didn't have full ... we felt as though what they were doing was playing with words here. They would talk to the union reps and then they would issue a statement saying "We have discussed this with the union", giving the impression that there had been agreement when there hadn't. That is really what they were up to.

SENATOR VIBERT: So in fact the feeling in the union membership is that the statement that all stakeholders involved were involved in full consultation wouldn't be accurate as far as the union is concerned?

MR McPHEE: What they consulted with us. What they didn't do is negotiate. What they said is "We are doing this. We have spoken to the union."

DEPUTY HILL: Can I just butt in and ask maybe ----

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes, I am done on that.

DEPUTY HILL: No, no, I was just on that theme actually, but how much, how often and when? You know, is it possible to tell us when this took place, a couple of years ago?

MR McPHEE: Yes.

DEPUTY HILL: And how many occasions? How many meetings did you have? Are you in a position to say?

MR McPHEE: What we probably did was meet the Chief Officer a couple of times. I don't recall meeting the Committee on it, but certainly most of the discussions were through the Chief Officer.

DEPUTY HILL: Was there ever a working party looking at ----

MR McPHEE: There was a working party, but it was disbanded on the instructions of the

workforce. They said they wanted nothing more to do with it because they felt that there was misinformation coming out of the meetings.

DEPUTY HILL: Could I just elaborate on that, please? When you say "*the workforce*", is that your workforce?

MR McPHEE: Our guys, yeah, the guys who are covered by the Manual Workers Joint Council, which are the manual workers and technicians, porters and what-have-you.

DEPUTY HILL: But there had been a working party set up and some of your representatives were on it?

MR McPHEE: Yes.

DEPUTY HILL: Do you know, was that way before this so-called consultation took place, or was that afterwards?

MR McPHEE: This was after the Fischer Report, which must go back about five years/four years. The working party went on for about three or four meetings and then what was coming out of the meetings in notes of the meetings, because they weren't minutes, were misleading as far as the workforce were concerned.

DEPUTY HILL: Could you elaborate on who was in this working party? Can you remember who it consisted of?

MR McPHEE: Yes, yes. I was on it. Myself and two fellow shop stewards, the Chief Officer and one of the civil service reps and some of the higher officers within the harbours.

DEPUTY HILL: None of the people from like the port users or marina users or anyone who makes use of the facilities down there at all?

MR McPHEE: Not at the meetings I was at.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Can you clarify something on that, please?

MR McPHEE: Yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Would the Chief Executive/Harbour Master have been at that meeting, or would it have been the project officer, which I presume would have been Mr Baker, Piers Baker?

MR McPHEE: They were both there.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Both?

MR McPHEE: Both usually attended with ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: The Chief Executive, the Chief Executive being the Harbour Master.

MR McPHEE: It was both at one time and then it became two, so ...

DEPUTY RONDEL: That is right.

SENATOR VIBERT: Could I just ask you about the limited liability company proposal? Have you had any consultation with the Committee about that proposal?

MR McPHEE: Not with the Committee, but we have spoken with the Chief Officer and they did a presentation. What we had was a presentation after the report, saying "This is the way forward. This is what we are going to do." You know, they were just selling it to us really, but unfortunately it didn't take off very well.

SENATOR VIBERT: We have asked the question this morning and got the answer, which is that in fact the limited liability company would be open, even though it would be owned by the States, it would actually be open to be sold if the States suddenly decided they needed some income or needed some capital, which you couldn't do with a trust. Was that a concern of the unions?

MR McPHEE: Absolutely. At the moment, there is absolutely no way they want to leave the auspices of the Manual Workers Joint Council and they certainly don't want to lose the pension scheme that they're in.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Were you or the union or the workforce ----

MR McPHEE: The workers.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Were you privy to seeing the Deloitte's Report on the review of Jersey Harbours?

MR McPHEE: I did have sight of it. Not everyone had. Originally I was told it was the property of the Finance & Economics Committee, which eventually I got a copy off Brian Nibbs after a while.

DEPUTY RONDEL: So you did have sight of it?

MR McPHEE: Yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Do I take it from that that it wasn't easy to get?

MR McPHEE: It was difficult to get.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Can I go back a stage, please? Some several years ago now there was a Port Master Plan, a 20 year vision for the ports. Were the workforce and the union involved in putting together that 20 Master Plan and were you asked to partake?

MR McPHEE: No, we were issued with it and told “This is what we are doing for the next 20 years.”

SENATOR VIBERT: Can I just be excused, Mr Chairman. I have got to go back into court for that hearing?

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Okay.

Senator Vibert left the hearing room

DEPUTY RONDEL: Sorry, on that 20 year Master Plan, do you believe that if you had been approached through the union and also the workforce that you could have contributed and come up with some alternatives to that Port Master Plan?

MR McPHEE: Some practical alternatives? Well, I don't know because we weren't asked to do it.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Can I just ask for clarification? I am not quite sure that I understand. The trust port, the movement towards a trust port, as I understand it, was not continued as a result of rejection of the plan by the workforce; is that correct?

MR McPHEE: No. What happened was that after the initial consultation (we will call it), the workforce became rather disillusioned with this port trust plan, so we hammered it out and said “These are the conditions under which the workforce would move to trust and they are in this letter.” That was the end of it then. If they wanted to go to trust and fulfilled these conditions, the workforce would have been perfectly happy because it would not have affected them. That is when they did the report by Deloitte & Touche, which came out saying “Oh, we should privatise it or incorporate it and then privatise it, whatever your vision is of it.”

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: I would presume -- and correct me if I am wrong -- but I presume that you are not overly bothered which format the Harbours ultimately ends up in, providing your members have security of jobs and pensions and similar working conditions as at present. Is that

the case or not?

MR McPHEE: As it stands at the moment, the incorporation would not give them the protection that they have and there is absolutely no way they would want to go there, but bear in mind that is an opinion. We haven't taken any vote. It is an opinion.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: So is there a possible uncertainty in the future?

MR McPHEE: Absolutely.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Do you believe the current working practices of Harbours are too cumbersome and bureaucratic, from the top down?

MR McPHEE: I mean, I could guess that could be said of any organisation, but, yes, they are quite cumbersome, yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: If your staff (because they haven't been approached) are approached to look at going down the road of a limited liability company, will your union allow your staff to get into negotiations, if they are meaningful negotiations?

MR McPHEE: I think they would have to open the door and see what's there. I mean, you can't just have a closed mind to everything, but bear in mind what the staff have at the moment is the starting point, the security of tenure and a pension.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Our understanding from this morning's interviews is that nothing is ruled in and nothing is ruled out. A trust is in the background, but it may be revisited and there is also the possibility that a hybrid may evolve that is a combination of various methods. But obviously one would hope that you would be involved in the consultation.

MR McPHEE: I must state that, as far as the workforce are concerned -- for only the manual workers, I can't speak for the civil servants -- the status quo is what they really, really want. They have no wish to move to a trust and they have no wish to move to incorporation. The status quo is the preferred option. If it is not an option, well that is when we start negotiating.

DEPUTY RONDEL: As the States move down the line into the ministerial system, it would appear that certain elements of the States' structure will not fit well within a ministerial system and one of the areas, it would appear to be Harbours. Therefore, I am reading down the line that that is the reason why Policy & Resources, F&E and Harbours originally set the train in motion to

hive this area off into a trust port or a limited liability company or, as the Chairman has said, into a hybrid. That being the case, I would expect the negotiations on behalf of the States to make sure that your membership got no less than what they have got at present.

MR McPHEE: I think originally one of the options was Economic Development Committee, and why can't they go there? If someone can explain why we just can't go on the Economic Development Committee, I will certainly listen to them, but no one has given me any reason for not going on there.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes. It has been raised by a number of people that there really ought to be a Ministry of Transport that deals with all transport, whether it be harbour or ships. I wondered what your view was of that?

MR McPHEE: I can only really speak about the harbours. I mean, I know this isn't official, but, I mean, that is certainly a moot point. There is certainly more than Harbours involved. If you are talking about Harbours & Airport taking on other transport or ... I mean, as long as it stays a government department and doesn't start trying to incorporate that or move that around, yes, it is probably a favoured option for the workforce.

SENATOR VIBERT: Would it also be your view that, of all the choices, you would feel more comfortable with a trust port as the right structure?

MR McPHEE: In all honesty, the choice would be as a government department. Failing that, I think the comfort would be drawn in a trust port as an alternative to being in a government department. The primary, the very first option, would be a government department. If that were not possible or politically unacceptable, then trust port would be the next option, because then you would be able to operate the way the Parish of St Helier does, for instance. You can keep all the terms and conditions and operate independently, but the workers are protected.

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, under the Newcastle project, all of the users of the port are the stakeholders in it. They are not a profit-making concern and any money they make has to be ploughed back into the facilities in the port. According to the information we have received from Mr Clifford, that has been working extremely successfully up in Newcastle, where there were some union difficulties initially when there was a move to change it over from being run by

the council into a trust port. But apparently the unions are very happy with the situation.

MR McPHEE: Well, not having spoken to them and not had the presentation, I would have been pleased to see it, but that is by the by, I suppose.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Any further questions?

DEPUTY RONDEL: Obviously there is a certain amount of disquiet, I would have thought, within your workforce, given that this has been held over their heads, either a trust port or a limited liability company and all the others for a number of years now. It must create a fair amount of resentment amongst the workforce that this is not resolved.

MR McPHEE: There is a little bit of uncertainty. But you must remember this letter has been flying around for nearly two and a half years, and this is what they are pinning their hopes on, that whatever happens the next committee or whoever is in charge will follow this guideline or precedent or whatever you want to call it.

SENATOR VIBERT: It does, of course, fit in with the guidelines of Policy & Resources in respect of a number of other areas, which is that there should be no involuntary redundancies. I take it the workforce would expect that kind of principle to be committed to this particular project? At the moment, the principle is about the parks and gardens and those areas. Well, actually, I think it covers the whole ----

MR McPHEE: The whole of it, yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: So in fact you feel that not only do you have this, but you also have this recognition that, certainly until the end of -- is it 2006?

MR McPHEE: I think you will find that that may not be so.

SENATOR VIBERT: Do you mean there isn't ----

MR McPHEE: There isn't an agreement for no compulsory redundancies for five years.

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, under the *Vision* process that has been passed in the States, that was an integral part of it and that commitment was made in the House.

MR McPHEE: Only if the union worked together with the employer. That is when the no compulsory redundancies came in.

SENATOR VIBERT: I understand.

MR McPHEE: If the terms of working together were unacceptable, then we have to accept that there may be compulsory redundancies.

SENATOR VIBERT: Right. Okay, I understand that.

MR McPHEE: That is why I wasn't here this morning.

DEPUTY RONDEL: If the States decide it will go down a trust port and/or limited liability company or something of a hybrid, the question I put to the States Members this morning and the Harbours is would you see a position for a member of your workforce to sit on the board or trust?

MR McPHEE: It if was a trust port, I would expect a member of staff on there, certainly someone from the shop floor. I don't mean some deputy chief officer or something. Yeah, we have got an employee on there. I mean, a proper, hands-on worker.

DEPUTY RONDEL: The coal face?

MR McPHEE: Yes, absolutely.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Bob?

DEPUTY HILL: Yes. If I could just have a couple of questions, please? Could I just ask actually, with the workforce that you are responsible for, are they just involved in the harbour at St Helier, or do they have an involvement that is wider? One of the things that came out this morning was that one felt that there should be much more of a focus given towards making the harbour a separate entity from that at St Aubins, Rozel, St Catherine's and the rest.

MR McPHEE: Well, you are asking the right man, because I am the engineer who does the cranes in the harbour and I do the harbours at St Aubins, Gorey, Bonne Nuit, Bouley Bay and Rozel. We do them all, yes. That is the way it is at the moment. If they want to change that, then you are talking about jobs going, I think. The workers, the manual workers -- again, I must emphasise that is who I am representing here -- the manual workers do all the work around the harbours, the outlying harbours. They do the repairs. They do the rails. They maintain the cranes. If you are talking about taking that away, you are talking about taking jobs away.

DEPUTY HILL: Well, I'm not talking about anything.

MR McPHEE: No, no, I'm just telling you that's the facts of it.

DEPUTY HILL: I'm just saying that these are the sort of things that are coming out as a result of asking questions, because if indeed we are looking towards maybe separating the harbour because of its particular function with passengers etc, as opposed from what we would call some of the other more leisure activities, which one would have maybe at St Aubins or Rozel and all that, one can understand some people feeling that, you know, the harbour should become much more a commercial basis and why should that therefore pay for some of the leisure activities at the other places. So it may not mean redundancies. Who knows? I mean, I am asking the question.

MR McPHEE: Yes. The view we have is that Jersey Harbours is owned by the people. It is public. Therefore, why shouldn't it cross-subsidise other parts of public utilities? It is just a common ... it is like a leisure service. You can't expect to make money.

DEPUTY HILL: No, but that is how it is. Again, I start off with the question ----

MR McPHEE: Not what some people say it should be.

DEPUTY HILL: Your members are involved throughout the Island, not just here?

MR McPHEE: No, no, they are not contained, sorry.

DEPUTY HILL: I have been ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: Can I come in on the back of your Heritage point, Bob, please?

DEPUTY HILL: Okay.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Because you mentioned the Heritage, i.e., the Rozels, the Bonne Nuits and the like. If the jobs instead of being lost actually moved across to some other department that looked after the heritage of the Island, would you still be in a position to say "We are not going that way"?

MR McPHEE: I wouldn't be in a position to say it. What we would be in a position to do is we would be saying "(a) where are the jobs going, are they going under them or are they changing under these terms and conditions?" That would be the first question, and it isn't actually two or three people that do the Heritage side of it, it is the whole workforce. The guy from St Helier Marinas might go out to Gorey and do the moorings. Another guy from the main works might be out at St Aubins doing a job. It is all cross. There is no individual post that is

designated to outlying harbours. It is all parts of each job.

DEPUTY RONDEL: So that would be quite easy to break out and be charged accordingly to the various departments?

MR McPHEE: Yes, but I'm not a ----

DEPUTY RONDEL: No, but it could be easily done.

MR McPHEE: There's timesheets filled in and every job you do is on a card.

DEPUTY RONDEL: So therefore it wouldn't be a problem.

MR McPHEE: Not to me it wouldn't.

DEPUTY RONDEL: So it could be recharged to the Heritage side.

MR McPHEE: It sounds to me like another two jobs for accountants up there.

SENATOR VIBERT: Can I put to you that there is or there has been a view expressed in writing to us that in fact the States itself, with States employees, really shouldn't be running a business, the impression being given that once you go to private enterprise suddenly all the people who work for the States are all going to become business geniuses and suddenly everything is going to be fine? I just wondered what your view was of that kind of view, which is that it can all change once you go to private enterprise and all become super efficient and it is going to cut costs and you will get better management; because it seems to us that the evidence we have got is that what happens is that the top end of the scale get massive pay rises once they go into private enterprise, but they then start comparing themselves with private business. We have seen it in Telecoms and we have seen it in Postal. In both of those areas, we are talking to some degree of increases of 25% in the top wages order. It appears that the people who don't get the money are the lower end of the scale.

MR McPHEE: When you are talking about departments like the Harbours, you are not talking about businessmen; you are talking about people who are administrators. They are administrating public departments. They are not businessmen and they shouldn't be businessmen. Their job is to administrate the harbours to the best of their ability and do the best job for the Island. I mean, I am just shocked that people think they are businessmen or think they should be businessmen.

SENATOR VIBERT: You can see the change of title, can't you? You can go from being in charge of administration to a director of corporate strategy. It is the same person, different title, another £20,000 a year.

MR McPHEE: Yes, yes, well.

SENATOR VIBERT: And I am sure that would be one of the perceptions -- I am putting to you whether it is -- of the workforce. We have seen it happen with Telecoms.

MR McPHEE: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: We have seen it happen with Postal.

MR McPHEE: That is exactly what I think will happen.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Okay. Do we have any further questions?

DEPUTY HILL: I was going to come back to the second question, if you will allow me. I have been looking through the terms of reference in Deloitte & Touche's Report here, but I couldn't see anything here to look for any consultation with you, so there was no consultation at all.

MR McPHEE: No. They got me in one afternoon after meeting for about 10 minutes and all they banged on about were these two things, which is a membership ----

DEPUTY HILL: Because there is no reference made to you.

MR McPHEE: No, no. They said that they have spoken to ... If you read it, they will say that they have spoken to or consulted with union officials. This is the sort of wording that comes out. They call you in, speak to you and then say "We have spoken to the union." They don't say it is okay, they just say "We have spoken to the union" and leave it at that.

SENATOR VIBERT: That is the Jersey way, isn't it, of consultation. We have spoken to the shooter's party, where the President of the Committee said that he had consulted with all the shooters of the Island. What he did was he called a meeting and said to them "This is what we are going to do" and then left.

MR McPHEE: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: That sounds to be precisely what has happened with your union.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: There is a world of difference between consultation and presentation.
Yes?

DEPUTY HILL: Could I just add on that, that this morning one of the witnesses said that he had a feeling that the present Harbours Committee didn't know where they were and where they were going. Would you share that view?

MR McPHEE: It's hard to say. I don't really get a political input there, but, I mean, I think they are trying to head towards incorporation, but they don't know how to do it. That's the feeling I get.

DEPUTY HILL: It was suggested maybe that, as opposed to a think tank, maybe a working party made up, as I mentioned earlier on, possibly of people like yourself, port users, politicians, administrators etc, who got round a table and had a proper working party to consider policies or criteria to work to, to come up with some formulation or something, would you see that as a step forward?

MR McPHEE: I mean, everything is open. As I have said before, there are two pre-conditions at the moment, which are that they stay in the Joint Council and they retain membership of the PECRS (Public Employees Contributory Retirement Scheme). Those are pre-conditions. Then we go on and negotiate. That is fine. The workforce don't stop any negotiations unless it starts coming out "We are doing this, we have spoken to the union, never mind that we are poles apart", and then it will break down again. That is what happened the last time.

SENATOR VIBERT: We have actually been given a strategy for a sustainable future in Jersey Harbours.

MR McPHEE: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: And on it they list 48 tasks that they have completed. I have gone through those tasks and I can't see anywhere any consultation with the union. As an example, there was an away day for stakeholders, which was in November. I presume what that means is they went to a hotel somewhere, possibly the Atlantic Hotel, to discuss, you know, what was going to happen. There was an away day for the staff. There were presentations given. It goes on and on and on, staff negotiating policies. Now that is an interesting one which was held in April. I wondered if your union was involved in those discussions.

MR McPHEE: They were involved in some of it. The staff presentation was done up at

Trinity. I wasn't there. I was elsewhere.

SENATOR VIBERT: At the RJ&HS (Royal Jersey Agricultural & Horticultural Society)?

MR McPHEE: Yes. They held the staff one there in April, but I couldn't tell you exactly what went on. Does it have any details with it, or?

SENATOR VIBERT: No. We have just got the list. The reason we have got the list is we have asked for costings of how much this has all cost so far.

MR McPHEE: Yes, yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: And I think the off-hand figure they have given us is about 100,000. Well, I think it is going to be double by the time they have done their sums.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Five times as much.

SENATOR VIBERT: Sorry. You are the exaggerator. I am very conservative about things like that.

DEPUTY RONDEL: No, no, I've been around longer.

MR McPHEE: Think how much mooring fees will be going up.

SENATOR VIBERT: But when you think there are 48 issues here and really there is only one that really you can say involved people.

MR McPHEE: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: Okay.

DEPUTY RONDEL: The former CEO, I don't think I would be wrong in saying, held everything close to his chest when any negotiations came along. You don't have to answer that, but with the new CEO, are the working relationships more relaxed?

MR McPHEE: He seems more overt.

SENATOR VIBERT: I am sorry I gave you the wrong information. It is not 48. There is a second sheet. It is actually 71. I am sorry about that.

MR McPHEE: Could we amend the minutes?

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: Any more questions? Bob? Is there anything else you would like to add?

MR McPHEE: No, I am quite happy. I am pleased it is being looked at and I think it will be

nice if we get to see the results of this, and we will, so that is one of the good things.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Maybe it could be made public.

MR McPHEE: Yes, absolutely, yes.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: In addition to that, all the transcripts of evidence are on the website, so
 anyone can look up and see what everybody has said.

MR McPHEE: Is that on the intranet?

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: It will be on the intranet, yes.

MR McPHEE: I can pull it off.

DEPUTY BAUDAINS: But also transcripts of your evidence will be sent to you so you can make
 any corrections there may be.

MR McPHEE: I don't think ... I have been very careful.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Well, as you appreciate, it is public.
