

**Inspection of
Dale Matheson Carr-Hilton LaBonte LLP
(Headquartered in Vancouver, Canada)**

**Issued by the
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
April 29, 2011**

**THIS IS A PUBLIC VERSION OF A PCAOB INSPECTION REPORT
PORTIONS OF THE COMPLETE REPORT ARE OMITTED
FROM THIS DOCUMENT IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH
SECTIONS 104(g)(2) AND 105(b)(5)(A)
OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002**



Notes Concerning this Report

1. Portions of this report may describe deficiencies or potential deficiencies in the systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct of the firm that is the subject of this report. The express inclusion of certain deficiencies and potential deficiencies, however, should not be construed to support any negative inference that any other aspect of the firm's systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct is approved or condoned by the Board or judged by the Board to comply with laws, rules, and professional standards.
2. Any references in this report to violations or potential violations of law, rules, or professional standards should be understood in the supervisory context in which this report was prepared. Any such references are not a result of an adversarial adjudicative process and do not constitute conclusive findings of fact or of violations for purposes of imposing legal liability. Similarly, any description herein of a firm's cooperation in addressing issues constructively should not be construed, and is not construed by the Board, as an admission, for purposes of potential legal liability, of any violation.
3. Board inspections encompass, among other things, whether the firm has failed to identify financial statement misstatements, including failures to comply with Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") disclosure requirements, in its audits of financial statements. This report's descriptions of any such auditing failures necessarily involve descriptions of the apparent misstatements or disclosure departures. The Board, however, has no authority to prescribe the form or content of an issuer's financial statements. That authority, and the authority to make binding determinations concerning whether an issuer's financial statements are misstated or fail to comply with Commission disclosure requirements, rests with the Commission. Any description, in this report, of financial statement misstatements or failures to comply with Commission disclosure requirements should not be understood as an indication that the Commission has considered or made any determination regarding these issues unless otherwise expressly stated.

INSPECTION OF DALE MATHESON CARR-HILTON LABONTE LLP

The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") has conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Dale Matheson Carr-Hilton LaBonte LLP ("the Firm"). The Board is issuing this report of that inspection in accordance with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

The Board is making portions of the report publicly available. Specifically, the Board is releasing to the public Part I of the report and portions of Part IV of the report. Part IV of the report consists of the Firm's comments, if any, on a draft of the report.^{1/}

The Board has elsewhere described in detail its approach to making inspection-related information publicly available consistent with legal restrictions.^{2/} A substantial portion of the Board's criticisms of a firm (specifically criticisms of the firm's quality control system), and the Board's dialogue with the firm about those criticisms, occurs out of public view, unless the firm fails to make progress to the Board's satisfaction in addressing those criticisms. In addition, the Board generally does not disclose otherwise nonpublic information, learned through inspections, about the firm or its clients. Accordingly, information in those categories generally does not appear in the publicly available portion of an inspection report.

^{1/} The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. In addition, pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report at all. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any portion of a firm's response that addresses any point in the draft that the Board omits from, or any inaccurate statement in the draft that the Board corrects in, the final report.

^{2/} See Statement Concerning the Issuance of Inspection Reports, PCAOB Release No. 104-2004-001 (August 26, 2004).

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from October 26, 2009 to November 6, 2009.^{3/} These procedures were tailored to the nature of the Firm, certain aspects of which the inspection team understood at the outset of the inspection to be as follows:

Number of offices	3 (Port Coquitlam, Vancouver, and White Rock, Canada)
Ownership structure	Limited liability partnership
Number of partners	15
Number of professional staff ^{4/}	101
Number of issuer audit clients ^{5/}	46

^{3/} The Board's inspection was conducted in cooperation with the Canadian Public Accountability Board.

^{4/} "Professional staff" includes all personnel of the Firm, except partners or shareholders and administrative support personnel. The number of partners and professional staff is provided here as an indication of the size of the Firm, and does not necessarily represent the number of the Firm's professionals who participate in audits of issuers or are "associated persons" (as defined in the Act) of the Firm.

^{5/} The number of issuer audit clients shown here is based on the Firm's self-reporting and the inspection team's review of certain information for inspection planning purposes. It does not reflect any Board determination concerning which, or how many, of the Firm's audit clients are "issuers" as defined in the Act. In some circumstances, a Board inspection may include a review of a firm's audit of financial statements of an issuer that ceased to be an audit client before the inspection, and any such former clients are not included in the number shown here.

Board inspections are designed to identify and address weaknesses and deficiencies related to how a firm conducts audits.^{6/} To achieve that goal, Board inspections include reviews of certain aspects of selected audits performed by the firm and reviews of other matters related to the firm's quality control system.

In the course of reviewing aspects of selected audits, an inspection may identify ways in which a particular audit is deficient, including failures by the firm to identify, or to address appropriately, respects in which an issuer's financial statements do not present fairly the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP"), or, as applicable, International Financial Reporting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board ("IFRS").^{7/} It is not the purpose of an inspection, however, to review all of a firm's audits or to identify every respect in which a reviewed audit is deficient. Accordingly, a Board inspection report should not be understood to provide any assurance that the firm's audits, or its issuer clients' financial statements, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included a review of aspects of the Firm's auditing of financial statements of five issuers. The scope of this review was determined according to the Board's criteria, and the Firm was not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the scope.

^{6/} This focus necessarily carries through to reports on inspections and, accordingly, Board inspection reports are not intended to serve as balanced report cards or overall rating tools.

^{7/} When it comes to the Board's attention that an issuer's financial statements appear not to present fairly, in a material respect, the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with GAAP or IFRS, the Board's practice is to report that information to the SEC, which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements.

The inspection team identified what it considered to be audit deficiencies.^{8/} The deficiencies identified in three of the audits reviewed included deficiencies of such significance that it appeared to the inspection team that the Firm did not obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements.^{9/} Those deficiencies were –

- (1) the failure, in two audits, to perform sufficient audit procedures when using the work of a specialist; and
- (2) the failure to perform sufficient audit procedures to evaluate whether oil and gas properties were impaired.

B. Review of Quality Control System

In addition to evaluating the quality of the audit work performed on specific audits, the inspection included review of certain of the Firm's practices, policies, and

^{8/} PCAOB standards require a firm to take appropriate actions to assess the importance of audit deficiencies identified after the date of the audit report to the firm's present ability to support its previously expressed opinions. See AU 390, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date*, and AU 561, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report* (both included among the PCAOB's interim auditing standards, pursuant to PCAOB Rule 3200T). Failure to comply with these PCAOB standards could be a basis for Board disciplinary sanctions.

^{9/} In some cases, an inspection team's observation that a firm failed to perform a procedure may be based on the absence of documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence, even if a firm claims to have performed the procedure. PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 3, *Audit Documentation* ("AS No. 3"), provides that, in various circumstances including PCAOB inspections, a firm that has not adequately documented that it performed a procedure, obtained evidence, or reached an appropriate conclusion must demonstrate with persuasive other evidence that it did so, and that oral assertions and explanations alone do not constitute persuasive other evidence. See AS No. 3, paragraph 9; Appendix A to AS No. 3, paragraph A28. For purposes of the inspection, an observation that the Firm did not perform a procedure, obtain evidence, or reach an appropriate conclusion may be based on the absence of such documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence.

procedures related to audit quality. This review addressed practices, policies, and procedures concerning audit performance, training, compliance with independence standards, client acceptance and retention, and the establishment of policies and procedures. Any defects in, or criticisms of, the Firm's quality control system are discussed in the nonpublic portion of this report and will remain nonpublic unless the Firm fails to address them to the Board's satisfaction within 12 months of the date of this report.

END OF PART I



PCAOB Release No. 104-2011-133A
Inspection of Dale Matheson
Carr-Hilton LaBonte LLP
April 29, 2011
Page 6

PORTIONS OF THE REST OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC AND ARE OMITTED
FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT

PART II

* * * *

B. Issues Related to Quality Controls

The inspection of the Firm included consideration of aspects of the Firm's system of quality control. Assessment of a firm's quality control system rests both on review of a firm's stated quality control policies and procedures and on inferences that can be drawn from respects in which a firm's system has failed to assure quality in the actual performance of engagements.^{10/} On the basis of the information reported by the inspection team, the Board has the following concerns about aspects of the Firm's system of quality control. * * * *

Audit Performance

A firm's system of quality control should provide reasonable assurance that the work performed on an audit engagement will meet applicable professional standards and regulatory requirements. On the basis of the information reported by the inspection team, including the audit performance deficiencies described in Part II.A (and summarized in Part I.A) and any other deficiencies identified below, the Board has concerns that the Firm's system of quality control fails to provide such reasonable assurance in at least the following respects * * * * –

* * * *

Financial Statement Disclosures

In three of the audits reviewed, the inspection team observed instances where disclosures required under GAAP were not included in the financial statements. In two of these engagements, the disclosure deficiencies were identified by the SEC and the financial statements were subsequently restated by the issuer. The inspection team reported that in each of these three audits, the engagement team failed to use a

^{10/} A firm's failure to comply with the requirements of PCAOB standards when performing an audit may be an indication of a potentially significant defect in a firm's quality control system even if that failure did not result in an insufficiently supported audit opinion.

standard practice aid such as a SEC disclosure checklist in reviewing financial statements and related disclosures to mitigate the risk of the issuers' erroneously omitting required disclosures. This information provides cause for concern regarding the Firm's quality control policies and procedures related to the Firm's auditing of financial statement disclosures. [Issuers A, B, and C]

Fraud Procedures

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide sufficient assurance that the Firm will perform all of the required procedures in accordance with the provisions of AU 316, *Consideration of Fraud in a Financial Statement Audit*. Specifically, the Firm obtained journal entry listing from management and selected items from the listing for testing; however, the Firm failed to test the completeness of the listing provided by management from which sample selections were made [Issuers A, B, C, and D], failed to determine that journal entries and other adjustments above the Firm-established dollar threshold for testing were subject to appropriate audit procedures [Issuers C and D], and inappropriately excluded from testing entries made by the issuer's external bookkeeper in preparation of the financial statements. [Issuer C]

Audit Documentation

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide sufficient assurance that the Firm will assemble for retention a complete and final set of audit documentation as of a date not more than 45 days after the report release date in accordance with AS No. 3. [Issuers B and D]

* * * *

PART IV

RESPONSE OF THE FIRM TO DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the Firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the Firm's response, minus any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.^{11/}

^{11/} In any version of an inspection report that the Board makes publicly available, any portions of a firm's response that address nonpublic portions of the report are omitted. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm's response is made publicly available.



Partnership of:

Vancouver	Robert J. Burkart, Inc. Alvin F. Dale Ltd. Robert J. Matheson, Inc.	James F. Carr-Hilton Ltd. Barry S. Hartley, Inc. Rakesh L. Patel Inc.	Kenneth P. Chang Inc. Reginald J. Labonte Ltd. F.M. Yada FCA Inc.
South Surrey	Michael R. Braum Inc.	Peter J. Donaldson, Inc.	
Port Coquitlam	Wilfred A. Jacobson Inc. Brian A. Shaw Inc.	G.D. Lee Inc.	Fraser C. Ross, Ltd.

December 9, 2010

Mr. George H. Diacont, Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC U.S.A. 20006

**Re: Response to Part I of Public Company Account Oversight Board (PCAOB) Draft Report
dated November 10, 2010**

Dear Mr. Diacont:

DMCL is pleased to provide our response to Part I of the Draft Report on the inspection conducted in November 2009. We are fully committed to the performance of high quality audits and support the inspection process and the efforts of the PCAOB as part of our mandate. The PCAOB has provided valuable observations and assessments which contribute to the overall monitoring of our professional practice in servicing the requirements of our public company audit clients.

We have evaluated the specific matters identified in the Draft Report regarding additional procedures when using the work of a specialist and have revised our audit processes to address these matters including improved documentation of procedures in our working papers. With respect to the procedures performed to evaluate for impairment of unproven oil and gas properties we believe in our professional judgment that the work performed supports our opinion. Although we agree that the reasons for our conclusions could be better documented we do not fully agree with the conclusions and characterization of these deficiencies in the Draft Report.

We wish to thank the inspection team for their efforts and professionalism in carrying out the inspection.

Respectively submitted,

DMCL

**DALE MATHESON CARR-HILTON LABONTE LLP
CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS**

Vancouver Suite 1500 - 1140 West Pender Street, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6E 4G1, Tel: 604 687 4747 • Fax: 604 689 2778 - Main Reception
South Surrey Suite 301 - 1656 Martin Drive, White Rock, B.C., Canada V4A 6E7, Tel: 604 531 1154 • Fax: 604 538 2613
Port Coquitlam Suite 700 - 2755 Lougheed Highway, Port Coquitlam, B.C., Canada V3B 5Y9, Tel: 604 941 8266 • Fax: 604 941 0971

April 7, 2011

Mr. George H. Diacont, Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC U.S.A. 20006

Dear Mr. Diacont:

**Re: NON-PUBLIC - Response to Part II of Public Company Account Oversight Board (PCAOB)
Draft Report dated November 10, 2010**

Dear Mr. Diacont,

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the comments and assessments included in Part II of the Draft Report.


REDACTED. Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report



We have revised our audit template to ensure work performed and documentation thereof will be in compliance with AU316.

We have reviewed our policies relating to the completion of SEC checklists. We will ensure that for future audits we will perform sufficient and appropriate audit procedures to ensure that the risk of a material deficiency in the financial statement disclosure is reduced to an acceptable level.

REDACTED. Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report



Respectively submitted,

DMCL

**DALE MATHESON CARR-HILTON LABONTE LLP
CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS**