



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Third Session
Forty-Seventh General Assembly

**Proceedings of the Standing Committee on
Resources**

April 8, 2014 - Issue 2

Department of Environment and Conservation
Women's Policy Office

RESOURCE COMMITTEE

Department of Environment and Conservation

Chair: David Brazil, MHA

Vice-Chair: Christopher Mitchelmore, MHA

Members:

Eli Cross, MHA
Keith Russell, MHA
Sam Slade, MHA
Tracey Perry, MHA
Lorraine Michael, MHA

Clerk of the Committee: Kimberley Hammond

Appearing:

Department of Environment and Conservation

Hon. Joan Shea, MHA, Minister
Jamie Chippett, Deputy Minister
Ross Firth, Assistant Deputy Minister, Natural Heritage
Martin Goebel, Assistant Deputy Minister, Environment
Peter Howe, Assistant Deputy Minister, Lands
Colleen Johnson, Manager, Finance, Budgeting & General Operations
Susan Piercey, Executive Assistant
Deb Thomas, Director of Communications

Women's Policy Office

Rachelle Cochrane, Deputy Minister (Acting)
Sara Norris, Communications Specialist
Wanda Trickett, Departmental Controller

Also Present

George Murphy, MHA
Tom Osborne, MHA
Calvin Peach, MHA
Lisa Dempster, MHA
Gerry Rogers, MHA
Peter Miles, Senior Policy Analyst, Official Opposition Office
Susan Williams, Researcher, NDP Office
Ivan Morgan, Researcher, NDP Office

Pursuant to Standing Order 68, George Murphy, MHA for St. John's East, substitutes for Lorraine Michael, MHA for Signal Hill – Quidi Vidi.

Pursuant to Standing Order 68, Tom Osborne, MHA for St. John's South, substitutes for Sam Slade, MHA for Carbonear – Harbour Grace.

Pursuant to Standing Order 68, Calvin Peach, MHA for Bellevue, substitutes for Eli Cross, MHA for Bonavista North.

The Committee met at 9:11 a.m. in the Assembly Chamber.

CHAIR (Brazil): I want to welcome everybody to the Estimates Committee for the Department of Environment and Conservation, and also Women's Policy and Climate Change Office.

Before we do introductions, we are going to do a bit of housekeeping.

We need a motion to select a Vice-Chair for the Resource Committee.

Can I have a motion for the Vice-Chair?

MS PERRY: I nominate Christopher Mitchelmore.

CHAIR: A seconder?

MR. PEACH: Seconded.

CHAIR: Seconded by Mr. Peach.

All in favour signify by saying 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed?

Motion carried.

Mr. Mitchelmore is the Vice-Chair.

On motion of Ms Perry, Mr. Mitchelmore was elected Vice-Chair.

CHAIR: Also, a motion to adopt the Resource Committee minutes of the Department of

Advanced Education and Skills for March 31, 2014.

Moved by Mr. Mitchelmore; seconded by Mr. Russell.

All those in favour, 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: Opposed?

Motion carried.

On motion, minutes adopted as circulated.

CHAIR: I would like to welcome everyone. We will first start – if we can do introductions with the Opposition usually.

Mr. Miles.

MR. MILES: Peter Miles, Opposition Office.

MS ROGERS: Gerry Rogers, MHA for St. John's Centre.

MS WILLIAMS: Susan Williams, with the NDP Office.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Christopher Mitchelmore, MHA for The Straits – White Bay North.

MR. PEACH: Calvin Peach, MHA for Bellevue District.

MR. RUSSELL: Keith Russell, MHA for Lake Melville.

MS PERRY: Tracey Perry, MHA for Fortune Bay – Cape La Hune.

MR. MURPHY: George Murphy, MHA for St. John's East.

MR. MORGAN: Ivan Morgan, Researcher, NDP Office.

CHAIR: Minister, we will start with you and your officials.

MS SHEA: Joan Shea, Minister of Environment and Conservation and Minister Responsible for the Status of Women.

MS COCHRANE: Rachele Cochrane, Deputy Minister, Women's Policy Office.

MS TRICKETT: Wanda Trickett, Departmental Controller for the Women's Policy Office.

MS NORRIS: Sara Norris, Communications Specialist, Women's Policy Office.

MS THOMAS: Deborah Thomas, Director of Communications for Environment and Conservation.

MS PIERCEY: Susan Piercey, Executive Assistant for Minister Shea.

CHAIR: Thank you.

Welcome to everybody.

We will start with the Women's Policy Office Estimates review first. I am going to ask the minister if she has any opening statements she would like to make.

MS SHEA: No, we are ready.

CHAIR: We are going to have Kim read the subhead, please.

CLERK (Ms Hammond): Executive Council, 2.7.01.

CHAIR: Minister.

MS SHEA: No, we are ready.

CHAIR: Okay. Good.

I will go right to Ms Rogers.

MS ROGERS: I want to thank you for being here this morning and taking time out of a very busy schedule. I know that Women's Policy is doing a lot of work. I want to thank you for the incredible work you have done. Some of the initiatives are so incredibly positive and very well communicated. You cannot go anywhere without seeing a purple ribbon somewhere. That

is a good thing. It will be interesting again to see some of the rollouts of some of the other initiatives you have and how they play out.

I want to thank you for your creativity, for your commitment, for your vision, and for working so hard on issues that often are life and death issues and are not often the easiest issues to work with. The optimism you portray in terms of looking at violence prevention is inspiring and so very necessary, so I would like to thank you for that.

I would like to look at some of the numbers and then I will have some questions as well around those. For 2.7.01, under Salaries, we have \$11,000 unspent in Salaries from 2013-2014.

MS SHEA: Is there a question?

MS ROGERS: Yes, well my question is: Is there any reason why that was not spent?

MS SHEA: It was delayed recruitment.

MS ROGERS: Sorry?

MS SHEA: It was a delayed recruitment.

MS ROGERS: Thank you.

There is a \$70,000 increase for 2014, is that a new position?

MS SHEA: That is the annualized funding for the policy analyst and the training officer, both at \$27,000. Well, one at \$27,600 annualized.

MS ROGERS: Okay.

MS SHEA: And the salary increases of 2 per cent.

MS ROGERS: Under Operating Accounts, there was \$1,400 Employee Benefits unspent. That is?

MS SHEA: Under Operating Accounts?

MS ROGERS: Yes, Employee Benefits, \$1,400 unspent. I imagine maybe that might refer to the delayed recruiting, is it?

MS SHEA: No. Which one are you talking about?

MS ROGERS: It is under Operating Accounts, Employee Benefits.

MS SHEA: Is that 2.7.01?

MS ROGERS: It is 2.7.01, under 01 Salaries, under Operating Accounts, it is the next –

MS SHEA: Yes. What is the question?

MS ROGERS: That is unspent money, Employee Benefits?

MS SHEA: Well, we spent \$100, yes.

MS ROGERS: Okay. It was budgeted for \$1,500. Was there a reason that was not all spent?

MS SHEA: No.

MS ROGERS: No reason, okay.

Under Transportation and Communications, it was under spent by \$15,700.

MS SHEA: Right. That is travel expenses for the staff and the community stakeholders, and some of our telecommunications costs.

MS ROGERS: Some of that, I guess you did not need it. Okay.

Professional Services, there was \$159,000 unspent out of a budget of \$171,000. What had you expected to do and then not done?

MS SHEA: There was work that we thought was going to be done by external consultants that was done in house.

MS ROGERS: What work was that?

MS SHEA: It was \$20,000 due to the project with NLSA for preliminary work with Statistics Canada provided in house, that was the \$20,000; \$22,300 savings in social marketing materials for VPI done in house; \$25,000 in savings due to the ability of IBRD to provide Women's Centre board training in house; \$16,000 Web site materials updates provided in house by OCIO; \$53,000 delaying the finalization of translations for the election handbook for Nunatsiavut women; and \$23,000 estimated until year-end.

MS ROGERS: Could we possibly have that in writing? It was so quick it is hard to write it down.

MS SHEA: Yes. Is this recorded in Hansard?

CHAIR: Yes, it is.

MS SHEA: Yes. It will be in writing.

MS ROGERS: It will be a while before we get Hansard, so is it possible to get that information?

MS SHEA: I will get it in writing as well. When does Hansard come out? I will write it up for you.

MS ROGERS: Okay, great. Thank you.

I imagine anything I request probably the Liberals would like as well.

MS SHEA: It is still going to be recorded in Hansard. It is all going to be in print.

MS ROGERS: Yes, I understand that.

MS SHEA: You are probably going to get it just as fast that way.

MS ROGERS: Okay. Thank you very much.

Was there any work – it was so quick, so I was not quite sure. Was there any –

MS SHEA: I can say it all again. It was \$20,000 due to a project with NLSA for preliminary work with Statistics Canada provided in house.

MS ROGERS: So that work was completed?

MS SHEA: You can write this down as I am saying it now: \$22,300 savings in social marketing materials for VPI done in house; \$25,000 savings due to ability of IBRD to provide Women's Centre board training in house; \$16,000 Web site materials updates provided in house by OCIO; \$53,000 delay in finalization of translation for the election handbook for Nunatsiavut women; and \$23,000 is estimated until year-end.

MS ROGERS: Okay, thank you very much.

We will see that there is a \$63,000 decrease for 2014?

MS SHEA: That is what we feel we will need this year.

MS ROGERS: Is there any of the work that you did last year that will not be done this year?

MS SHEA: Well, if it is done we do not need to redo it. We will not redo it.

MS ROGERS: Thank you very much.

Purchased Services, \$104,000 was unspent last year. What had you anticipated in Purchased Services that was not purchased?

MS SHEA: It was just that was all we spent. I do not think there was anything there that we had budgeted that we did not actually spend.

MS ROGERS: It is a significant percentage of the budget. So I would image in the Estimates for that budget there were particular projects, and I can see that almost half of it was not spent. What would not have been done? What was it budgeted for and –

MS SHEA: It is for advertising, printing, copier charges, rent, lease space, and other things related to that – community consultations.

MS ROGERS: Was there a particular project that was not done?

MS SHEA: No.

MS ROGERS: So just half the money was not spent?

MS SHEA: Right.

MS ROGERS: Okay.

Grants and Subsidies, \$51,000 was not spent last year. I imagine a lot of the grants and subsidies went to women's groups, anti-violence groups, and they are all just hanging on by a thread in terms of their budgets. Was there any reason that \$51,000 was not spent?

MS SHEA: No.

MS ROGERS: Can you explain that?

MS SHEA: No, there was no reason why it was not spent. It was not like we did not follow through with our grants and subsidies to the agencies that we support.

MS ROGERS: Okay.

There is an increase of \$499,000 for next year. What would that be for?

MS SHEA: We expect that as we roll out our new Violence Prevention Initiative there is going to be some additional funding spent and some additional programs.

MS ROGERS: What would they be?

MS SHEA: Well, when we finalize it, we will roll it out. We will make the announcements.

MS ROGERS: What is it going towards?

MS SHEA: It will be under program in the Violence Prevention Initiative.

MS ROGERS: Who will the money be going to?

MS SHEA: Once we finalize the initiative and we roll it out, we will have more detail on that. It is not finalized yet.

MS ROGERS: That is \$500,000; I would imagine you have some idea what it is for.

MS SHEA: Not that I am prepared to release until it is actually approved and released.

MS ROGERS: Will this be going to community groups?

MS SHEA: I am not going to say until we do the release.

MS ROGERS: Okay. So we have half a million dollars we are not quite sure what that is for.

Okay, thank you.

I have some questions. Is there any increase to your core groups, the funding for them this year?

MS SHEA: No.

MS ROGERS: Okay. They did not get an increase last year as well. So I guess that would, in real dollars, mean a decrease.

Where is the evaluation of Phase I of the Violence Prevention Initiative strategy?

MS SHEA: That would have been under line 06, Purchased Services.

MS ROGERS: Okay. Where is that evaluation? It was scheduled to be released I think, was it –

MS SHEA: I will have to check on that.

MS ROGERS: Has it been completed?

MS SHEA: Yes.

MS ROGERS: Okay. When was it completed?

MS SHEA: Well, I do not know. I will get the report, but it is under 06 in the budget.

MS ROGERS: We know that it is completed and when it will be released?

MS SHEA: I do not know.

MS ROGERS: Will it be released?

MS SHEA: I do not know this morning, I will check on it.

MS ROGERS: Okay, thank you.

For your Violence Prevention Initiative strategy there was a new strategy that was due. Where is that? What is the status of that strategy right now?

MS SHEA: That comes under line 10, and we will be releasing that I guess soon as it is finalized.

MS ROGERS: Do you have any idea when that might be?

MS SHEA: Not right now.

MS ROGERS: The strategy itself is not finalized. It is not just a matter of releasing it.

MS SHEA: Right. We will be releasing it once it is finalized.

MS ROGERS: The increase in the grant money, I know you said it is for violence prevention strategy initiatives, what are the priorities that have been identified for the Violence Prevention Initiative Phase II?

MS SHEA: Yes, I do not have that. I have the financial information and the amount of money but I do not have the policy here to go through this morning.

MS ROGERS: Okay.

Just generally, what can the people of Newfoundland and Labrador expect from this \$500,000 from the grants?

MS SHEA: There will be grants to each of the ten regional anti-violence groups. That will be \$80,000 to the Burin Peninsula Voice Against Violence; \$80,000 to Central West Committee Against Violence Incorporated; \$80,000 to the Coalition Against Violence for Avalon East; \$80,000 for Communities Against Violence; \$80,000 for Eastern Region Committee Against Violence; \$80,000 for Northern Committee Against Violence; \$80,000 to Roads to End Violence; \$80,000 to Southwestern Coalition to End Violence; \$100,000 to Violence Prevention Labrador; \$80,000 to the Western Coalition to End Violence; \$105,000 to Transition House Association of Newfoundland and Labrador; \$110,000 to the Newfoundland and Labrador Sexual Assault Crisis and Prevention Centre; \$100,000 to Multicultural Women's Organizations of Newfoundland and Labrador; and, as well, for Aboriginal women there is \$200,000 for a Violence Prevention Initiative for Aboriginal women to do anti-violence work; and \$100,000 for the Aboriginal Women's Network.

MS ROGERS: Can we also have that in writing?

MS SHEA: Sure.

MS ROGERS: Great, thank you very much.

CHAIR: I might note too, that while Hansard will not be out until after the House closes, the audio is available starting the day after the hearings.

MS ROGERS: Great, thank you.

CHAIR: Ms Rogers, are you getting close to the end of that because I would like to go back? I try to keep the ten to twelve minute routine.

MS ROGERS: I have just a few more questions.

CHAIR: Ms Dempster, if you are okay?

MS DEMPSTER: Yes.

CHAIR: Okay, you can complete that section and then I will go to Ms Dempster.

MS ROGERS: Okay.

The Women's Policy Office provides a consultative and advisory position to government on policy and legislation. Did government refer the issue of the Family Violence Intervention Court to the Women's Policy Office? Was that a piece of work that the Women's Policy Office did?

MS SHEA: Yes, I am going to talk about the finances and the budget here, but policy questions you can certainly ask at another time.

MS ROGERS: Okay.

I would like to ask, the Women's Policy Annual Report 2011-2012, we have that. Where is the annual report for 2012-2013?

MS SHEA: That will be posted in June.

MS ROGERS: Okay. Thank you very much for that.

I would like to go now to the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women. Can we have a breakdown, please, of the Grants and Subsidies?

MS SHEA: They will be getting \$430,000.

MS ROGERS: Can we have a breakdown of that budget?

MS SHEA: We give them a lump sum grant. They would do their own budgeting. We would not do the budget for them.

MS ROGERS: Okay.

I am just about done here, thank you.

We will have a list of the recipients from the Women's Policy Office.

MS SHEA: What recipients?

MS ROGERS: The recipients as you had listed out there.

MS SHEA: Okay. That is the stuff I read into the record?

MS ROGERS: Yes, that is great.

Thank you very much.

Is the Women's Policy Office tracking overall participation of women in trades? I know that was a big job.

MS SHEA: Again, we are going to talk about the budget here, but if there are any policy questions you can certainly pass them on to me and I will track down that information.

MS ROGERS: Okay.

All right, I think that is about it for me.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Thank you, Ms Rogers.

Ms Dempster.

MS DEMPSTER: Under 2.7.01, Ms Rogers asked some of the questions that I had but I have one under Transportation and Communications. Are there any social marketing campaigns in this development?

MS SHEA: The social marketing that we do within WPO would be under the Violence Prevention Initiative.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay.

Down under Purchased Services, I just have a question: What are you planning on purchasing this year?

MS SHEA: That is used primarily for printing posters, pamphlets, newsletters, photocopy charges, rent or lease accommodations, and community consultations.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay.

Also, I would like a list of the grants and subsidies, if I could, at the end of this.

MS SHEA: Sure.

I will give you the list. The Bay St. George Status of Women Council, \$127,625; the Corner Brook Status of Women Council, \$127,625; the Gander Status of Women Council, \$127,625; the Gateway Status of Women Council, \$127,625; Labrador West Status of Women Council, \$127,625; the Mokami Status of Women Council, \$127,625; St. John's Status of Women Council, \$127,625; the Status of Women in Central, \$127,625.

The grants for the regional anti-violence groups: \$80,000 for the Burin Peninsula Voice Against Violence; \$80,000 for Central West Committee Against Violence; \$80,000 for the Coalition Against Violence Avalon East; \$80,000 for Communities Against Violence; \$80,000 for Eastern Region Committee Against Violence; \$80,000 for Northern Committee Against Violence; \$80,000 for Roads to End Violence; \$80,000 to Southwestern Coalition to End Violence.

Also, \$100,000 to Violence Prevention Labrador; \$80,000 to Western Regional Coalition to End Violence; \$105,000 to the Transition House Association of Newfoundland and Labrador; \$110,000 to the Newfoundland and Labrador Sexual Assault Crisis and Prevention Centre; \$100,000 to Multicultural Women's Organization of Newfoundland and Labrador; \$200,000 to Violence Prevention Initiatives for Aboriginal Women; and \$100,000 to the Newfoundland Aboriginal Women's Network.

MS DEMPSTER: Thank you.

Now I have some questions around the Violence Prevention Initiative. The program was evaluated last year, and I am just wondering: What were some of the findings?

MS SHEA: Anything around the policy, we will release. You can speak to the department or send over your questions, but we are going to keep this to the finances, the budgeting, and the Estimates this morning.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay. Sometimes they are indirectly related to financing, but maybe I will schedule a meeting with you because I have a number of questions in that regard. Would you be available?

MS SHEA: Well, it is going to depend when you are able to meet, but you can certainly request.

MS DEMPSTER: Well, I will be available on your schedule basically –

MS SHEA: I am not going through my schedule here this morning, but you can certainly send me a letter.

MS DEMPSTER: Thank you.

Budget 2014 announced \$2.1 million to launch Phase II of the Violence Prevention Initiative. I am just wondering, how will this money be allocated this year?

MS SHEA: We will be doing a launch, and at that launch we will certainly talk about how we are going to allocate the funding.

MS DEMPSTER: Do you have a time frame on that, Minister?

MS SHEA: Not right now, no.

MS DEMPSTER: So I guess it is no good to ask: What are some of the activities? We are going to find that out at the launch?

MS SHEA: Right.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay, thank you.

On the radar, are you going to be providing any funding for the offender programs? We know the John Howard Society provided funding with counselling –

MS SHEA: That is Justice initiatives, actually. That is not the Women’s Policy Office.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay.

I just wondered if they might be receiving any funding from the Violence Prevention Initiative.

MS SHEA: No, that is not under that mandate.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay.

I can move on to the regional coordinating committees under the Violence Prevention Initiative. Can I ask how many Regional Coordinating Committees are out there now?

MS SHEA: We have the Burin Peninsula Voice Against Violence; the Central West Committee Against Violence; the Coalition Against Violence for Avalon East; Communities Against Violence; the Eastern Region Committee Against Violence; the Northern Committee Against Violence; Roads to End Violence; Southwestern Coalition to End Violence; Violence Prevention Labrador; and the Western Regional Coalition to End Violence.

MS DEMPSTER: What do each of these committees get, funding wise?

MS SHEA: As I had just read into the record when I did the grants. There is \$80,000 for the Burin Peninsula Voice Against Violence; \$80,000 for the Central West Committee Against Violence; \$80,000 for the Coalition Against Violence Avalon East; \$80,000 for Communities Against Violence; \$80,000 for Eastern Region Committee Against Violence; \$80,000 for the Northern Committee Against Violence; \$80,000 for Roads to End Violence; \$80,000 for the Southwestern Coalition to End Violence; \$100,000 for Violence Prevention Labrador; and \$80,000 for Western Regional Coalition to End Violence.

MS DEMPSTER: Thank you.

Now this funding, is it just renewed automatically each year or is there a process where they are evaluated in terms of effectiveness?

MS SHEA: That is their base funding that we give under the Violence Prevention Initiative.

MS DEMPSTER: So it is an automatic renewal.

MS SHEA: Right. We have not determined that one is going to get more based on a certain project. They work within their budgets.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay. Are you able to give us an example of some of the work they did in the past?

MS SHEA: Again, any of these committees can speak – I did not bring in the committee work for the Estimates for the finances here this morning but that is all readily available from any of these committees.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay.

In 2002, Attitudinal Survey on Violence, will they be conducting another survey now that Phase I is complete?

MS SHEA: Anything we do at this point we will be announcing in our Phase II.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay.

The Violence Awareness and Action training, is this something that is still being conducted?

MS SHEA: That is part of our Violence Prevention Initiative.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay. So it is still ongoing, that training?

MS SHEA: Yes.

MS DEMPSTER: I have a question around emergency protection orders. Has the department conducted an evaluation of these orders to see if they benefit the victims of violence?

MS SHEA: Again, that is a policy and it is not work of this department. I am here today to talk about the finances and the budgeting piece.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay, thank you.

Family Violence Intervention Court, \$4.4 million budget under the Women's Policy Office. I am just wondering, was there any consideration given to cost sharing with Justice to keep the Family Violence Intervention Court open?

MS SHEA: That was not part of this budget, of Women's Policy Office.

MS DEMPSTER: It was not part?

MS SHEA: No.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay.

I am nearly done on this section. I have a question around murdered and missing Aboriginal women. As you know, government came out in support. It was an all-party resolution to call for a national inquiry. I am just wondering what follow-up the Women's Policy Office has done.

MS SHEA: Again, that would not be in our finances, in our budget.

MS DEMPSTER: No, and you are not prepared to answer that.

MS SHEA: Well, that is work and policy but it is not what I am prepared to talk about here this morning.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay, thank you.

Again, this is kind of an indirect finance, under Safe and Caring Schools. I am wondering what role does the Violence Prevention Initiative play in Safe and Caring Schools?

MS SHEA: The committees have their base in our communities, so they can work with their schools or with any community agencies.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay. Not directly financially supported in any way?

MS SHEA: No. Women's Policy Office money would flow through the Department of Education, through their operating grants to school boards.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay. I just asked a question, I wondered if the Violence Prevention Initiative played any kind of role in –

MS SHEA: No, the money that flows into the school boards is an operating grant. You will see it through the Department of Education budget. That is how they get their funding.

MS DEMPSTER: Okay.

That is all I have at this time.

MS SHEA: Okay.

CHAIR: Okay.

Ms Rogers, do you want to follow-up with a question?

MS ROGERS: The Women's Policy Office was budgeted to develop on-line tools for resource in four years to comply with gender equity requirements. Were they able to do that?

MS SHEA: Again, I can take questions on the work of the Women's Policy Office separate from the Estimates.

MS ROGERS: Yes, I was wondering though, that was a budgeted item and I am wondering was that undertaken within the parameters of the budget. Was that work done?

MS SHEA: The budgeting is within the Salaries, and the work is assigned then within the Women's Policy Office. Again, a breakdown of who is doing what over there is something we can do but not something I would have been prepared for with finances this morning.

MS ROGERS: Okay.

I am not really asking how much staff time was allotted. I am just wondering if the on-line tools for resource employers to comply with gender equity requirements, if that work was undertaken that was budgeted for.

MS SHEA: You can certainly submit the question and we will have a look at it.

MS ROGERS: Okay.

Can you describe the gender based training in 2013 and plans for 2014? I imagine those had to be budgeted for. Are those items budgeted for?

MS SHEA: That falls under the VPI budget?

OFFICIAL: (Inaudible) that is under the regular department.

MS SHEA: No, that is under the regular department budgeting.

MS ROGERS: Is there something specifically budgeted for that?

MS SHEA: It is our operations. It is our ongoing work.

MS ROGERS: Okay.

I do not believe I have any questions that the minister would answer at this point, so I believe I will stop here.

CHAIR: Okay.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Mr. Chair, I would like to ask a couple of questions.

CHAIR: Okay, sure.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Minister, under 2.7.01 under the Amount to be Voted there is .02 Revenue – Provincial for \$2,000 under the revised budget of 2013-2014. Would you be able to explain that?

MS SHEA: Christopher, I did not get what line you are talking about.

MR. MITCHELMORE: It is 2.7.01 under Women's Policy Office, there is a line point at .02 under Revenue – Provincial. In brackets there is \$2,000 in the revised column, the middle column there. I am wondering where this revenue came from.

MS SHEA: Yes, that was revenue that came from the Oventions event we held.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Okay, so that was through –

MS SHEA: That was through corporate sponsors, et cetera that came through.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Oventions itself generated above and beyond a total of \$2,000?

MS SHEA: Right. Then some of the money we had in Oventions for that particular event we are using for the lunch and learns. I did a Ministerial Statement on it there last week and announced them for Clarendville, Grand Falls-Windsor, Corner Brook, and Labrador.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Okay.

MS SHEA: That is still some of the money we are using there.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Thank you.

Minister, is there money then in the budget under your policy office, or is it under the Provincial Advisory Council to host Oventions? Where would that budget fall, or there is no actual cost to Oventions? It is all funded –

MS SHEA: Right. No, that would be under the Women's Advisory Council in the meantime.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Women's Advisory Council?

MS SHEA: Yes.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Okay.

The only other thing I would like to ask is around 2.7.01 under your operating accounts when you talked about Professional Services. I believe you said there was \$53,000 for delayed translation of the Nunatsiavut election handbook? If that was delayed, is that something that is taking place in this year's budget?

MS SHEA: Yes. Rachelle will speak to that specifically.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Okay.

MS COCHRANE: The election handbook for the Nunatsiavut Government for the women's groups is just about completed. It is over with branding now for formatting, and the translation is underway. The group who are doing the translation have volunteered. It is the only way to describe it, I guess. They are only going to charge us about \$200. They are doing it as a contribution, given the significance of the issue of violence against Aboriginal women.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Great.

MS COCHRANE: So we will not really incur very much cost.

I will make another statement if I could, Minister. If you notice the Professional Services, a lot of this was done in-house. A lot of our clients who are out there are prepared to give us discounts, substantial discounts, when we are out seeking products in the marketplace because they are interested in giving back to help deal with the violence against women.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Wonderful.

Thank you. That is all my questions.

CHAIR: I think Ms Rogers has one last question.

MS ROGERS: Yes, just around Ovations. Minister, do you know how much money is being budgeted for Ovations this year?

MS SHEA: None in this particular budget. There will be no provincial funding for it.

MS ROGERS: Okay.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR: Okay. I am going to ask the Clerk to read the Estimates subheads for the Women's Policy Office so we can adopt them, then I will ask for a motion.

CLERK: Executive Council, 2.7.01 to 2.7.02 inclusive.

CHAIR: A motion to adopt?

Moved by the Member for Bellevue; seconded by the Member for Fortune Bay – Cape La Hune.

All those in favour, 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay'.

Motion carried.

On motion, subheads 2.7.01 through 2.7.02 carried.

CHAIR: Thank you.

We are going to take a quick five-minute break as we do the transition for new staff coming in for Environment and Conservation so that we can get the seating plan set up and the tapes pre-setup.

Recess

CHAIR: Welcome back again to the Estimates for the Department of Environment and Conservation. We will do another quick introduction, if we could. Plus, I would ask two things that are housekeeping: one, if a particular staff person is speaking, that they identify themselves for the recording; and two, for people who do not know, Hansard in print will not be out until after the House closes, but the audio is normally up the next day if you need to refer to something or need information relevant to that.

The other thing, this is about the Estimates, the dollar figures here. I ask that you stick as closely to the Estimates, the dollar figures, when asking the questions so we can move things along.

We will with start, Mr. Osborne, doing introductions. Wait until your light comes on.

MR. OSBORNE: Tom Osborne, MHA, St. John's South.

MR. MILES: Peter Miles, Opposition Office.

MR. MURPHY: George Murphy, MHA for St. John's East.

MR. MORGAN: Ivan Morgan, NDP Caucus Office.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Christopher Mitchelmore, MHA, The Straits – White Bay North.

MR. PEACH: Calvin Peach, MHA, Bellevue.

MS PERRY: Tracey Perry, MHA, Fortune Bay – Cape La Hune.

MS SHEA: Joan Shea, Minister of Environment and Conservation.

MR. CHIPPETT: Jamie Chippett, Deputy Minister of Environment and Conservation.

MR. FIRTH: Ross Firth, Assistant Deputy Minister, Natural Heritage.

MR. GOEBEL: Martin Goebel, Assistant Deputy Minister, Environment.

MR. HOWE: Peter Howe, Assistant Deputy Minister, Lands.

MS JOHNSON: Colleen Johnson, Manager of Finance, Budgeting & General Operations.

MS THOMAS: Deborah Thomas, Director of Communications, Environment and Conservation.

MS PIERCEY: Susan Piercey, Executive Assistant.

CHAIR: Minister, any opening statements?

MS SHEA: No, we are ready.

CHAIR: Okay, good.

Mr. Osborne, I am normally going to keep it ten to twelve minutes, but if you are close to the end of it, I will let you go from there.

We are going to call for the subheads now and we will start.

CLERK: Subhead 1.1.01.

CHAIR: Mr. Osborne.

MR. OSBORNE: Thank you.

Under 1.1.01, Minister's Office, the totals, the budgeted amount last year was \$308,400, and the revised amount was \$430,000. I am just wondering if you could give some explanation as to why the discrepancy.

MS SHEA: The increase was due to severance and leave payout to a couple of employees who left the department.

MR. OSBORNE: So those employees were out of the Minister's Office?

MS SHEA: Right, yes.

MR. OSBORNE: Under 1.2.03, federal revenue, we were expecting \$283,000, but only received \$90,000. Can you tell me what that federal revenue is for and why we only received the \$90,000 as opposed to \$283,000?

MS SHEA: Jamie Chippett, the deputy, will speak to that.

MR. CHIPPETT: The federal government changed the program, the funding availability for climate change adaptation. It moved from being project driven and determined at the beginning of the year to being proposal driven. So, we submitted four proposals. We had approval on two, and the third proposal was not approved until the end of February. So, generally we expended less and also received less revenue. That is also reflected in the 2014-2015 Estimates, because the federal government has confirmed there will be less revenue for that program.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

What programs were affected in the Province as a result of the reduction?

MR. CHIPPETT: There were no specific programs adjusted. A part of the funding in Policy Development and Planning are for proposals. So, any proposals that were funded and have not been finished will be funded in the next year as well. So there are no specific programs that are not being delivered, just proposals that would be funded and will continue to be funded in the next year.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

So were there any proposals that you were expecting under last year that dropped off because the proposal was not submitted in time and the funding was lost?

MR. CHIPPETT: No, all proposals were submitted in time, just approvals were coming back later.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Under 1.2.04, Salaries, under Sustainable Development, budgeted was \$352,000 and that had gone up to \$588,000. I am just wondering why the difference there.

MS SHEA: The difference there is there were some employees who left and there was severance paid out to a retired employee.

Is that what you are talking about, line 01, from \$352,000 to \$588,000?

MR. OSBORNE: Yes.

The total in 1.2.04 as well, from the \$735,000 to \$1.2 million – I know it is outlined above, but can you give some explanation as to why the increase in the total there?

MS SHEA: If you follow down through the lines, one of the biggest increases was in Transportation and Communications. The increase there for \$290,000 is reflected in the caribou initiative, the caribou-related work. The overall reduction in the budget is in relation to that work concluding. There was obviously more work needed to be done, and in Transportation and Communications that increase of the \$290,000 was primarily in relation to an increase in air services.

MR. OSBORNE: Those air services were primarily for the caribou studies?

MS SHEA: Right.

MR. OSBORNE: Where were they carried out primarily, in Labrador?

MS SHEA: No, this is the woodland caribou study, as opposed to the George River. This is

the work that was being done, the \$15 million initiative we had for the woodland caribou on the Island.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Are there any studies ongoing for the George River herd now?

MS SHEA: If we go over to 4.2.04, and you look at the numbers for the Estimates for this year, you will see that to do the study of the Labrador caribou, the George River, there is money disbursed there through Transportation and Communications, Supplies, and Purchased Services. The study that we are doing in Labrador is reflected under those subheads, under 4.2.04.

MR. OSBORNE: Why are they under two different subheads, the woodland and the George River?

MS SHEA: This is ongoing work that we are doing within the department and the woodland caribou was a specific initiative that we had announced five or six years ago, I think.

MR. OSBORNE: Under 4.2.04, just before we move off of that, the provincial revenue there, what would be the source of the provincial revenue this year, the \$82,000?

MS SHEA: Within that we have funding – and again this goes through the full list here, but if you go up to the Salaries there is money in there for a salary that is Nalcor funded; there is a monitoring position there. When you look at the salary increase, that is revenue that we are getting from Nalcor.

MR. OSBORNE: Is that specific to the George River herd as well?

MS SHEA: It was the Labrador-Island Transmission Link and it was part of the EA release.

MR. OSBORNE: Why would that be under Habitat, Game and Fur Management?

MS SHEA: It is primarily dealing with the caribou.

MR. OSBORNE: The funding was for the Labrador-Island link but –

MS SHEA: No, it was out of the environmental assessment to do the link, and that was part of the release of the assessment.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay, I am not connecting the dots. What does that have to do with the caribou herd?

MS SHEA: The deputy will speak to that.

MR. CHIPPETT: There were two positions required for Nalcor to fund in the environmental assessment release in June of the Labrador-Island Transmission Link. They were two monitor positions. One is contained within the Environmental Assessment Division. You will see revenue there, and you also see revenue here. Those are for monitoring Nalcor in performing their commitments with respect to endangered species, caribou, and any other mitigation and monitoring plans they submitted to us. They will be people on the ground who are employed by us and funded by Nalcor to ensure they are meeting their conditions under the EA release.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

The funding from Nalcor here, does that to do with the Labrador-Island link or the caribou herd?

MR. CHIPPETT: It has to do with the release from the Labrador-Island link, but obviously one of the environmental impacts that were discussed in the environmental assessment documentation was the potential for impact on caribou.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Is there any conflict in having a private company – well, Nalcor is not private; it is publicly owned. Is there any conflict in having a company provide funding for positions under an environmental assessment?

MR. CHIPPETT: We have done that before. I think the last time it was done, and Martin could correct me, was for the Cat Arm Hydroelectric Project. Is that correct?

MR. GOEBEL: The positions are funded, but all of the reporting, all of the hiring, and all of the day-to-day activity is directed by the department.

MR. CHIPPETT: We advertise for the position. We do the job description. We recruit. It is just a paper exercise of billing Nalcor for the expenses of those two positions.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Going back to 1.2.05, Purchased Services, there was a considerable drop this year in Purchased Services. Can you outline what was purchased last year that is not being purchased this year?

MS SHEA: Last year there was \$1.5 million, almost \$1.6 million, for the construction costs for the Discovery Centre at Salmonier Nature Park.

MR. OSBORNE: Is that up and running now?

MS SHEA: It will be open for the visitor season this year.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Under 2.1.01, under Professional Services, there was a considerable increase in what was spent last year as opposed to what was budgeted and, likewise, a considerable drop in this year's budget. Can you tell me what was purchased last year and what is being purchased this year under Professional Services?

MS SHEA: The majority of that would be the consultant services for the Buchan's remediation project, that was \$973,514; and the Hopedale remediation, that was \$2,258,420.

MR. OSBORNE: Was that Purchased Services or Professional Services you were speaking about there?

MS SHEA: Purchased Services.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay, I was referring to Professional Services, actually.

MS SHEA: Okay (inaudible).

Subhead 2.1.01, again, the highest expenditure there would be \$429,476 and that is in relation to the Hopedale, the annual monitoring and maintenance – no, that would have been the contaminated site in Hopedale.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay, and that is under Professional Services?

MS SHEA: Under the Hopedale project, there would have been expenditures under Professional Services and Purchased Services.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

What was the amount for Buchans again, under Purchased Services?

MS SHEA: Under Purchased Services for Buchans last year was \$973,514.

MR. OSBORNE: Just in looking at Hopedale and Buchans, is there any funding under 2.1.01 for remediation of Abitibi sites, or where would that fall?

MS SHEA: Are you referring to the Abitibi site in Grand Falls-Windsor?

MR. OSBORNE: Yes.

MS SHEA: That would be under the Transportation and Works budget.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay. There is nothing in Environment's budget there?

MS SHEA: No.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

CHAIR: Mr. Osborne, I am going to go to Mr. Murphy there now then we can come back to you for additional questions.

Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning to the minister and your associated workers who are working in your department. Thanks for being here today and answering a few questions.

Madam Minister, I will start off again on 1.1.01. In the Minister's Office you mentioned there was severance and leave granted for line .01 in Salaries, \$261,200 last year, \$406,500 this year. I am a bit curious as to how many people that severance would cover, number one; and number two, you mentioned there was an employee who was gone so a package was put together for them. I am wondering if we can get a breakdown of that.

MS SHEA: Yes, you can. The breakdown is that under the Minister's Office there was as EA. It was not a package put together. That would have reflected severance and leave payout. That would have been a predetermined schedule of how we do that. It was not something we put together.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Under 1.2.01 in Executive Support, I guess basically the same question. There was a cut in Executive Support payouts here, \$1,012,400 budgeted and the actual was \$1.4 million and change. I wonder if we can get a breakdown of this number, and at the same time while you are on .01 it also shows an increase from last year's budget number to \$1.2 million. Do we have anticipated layoffs? Well, I guess not anticipated layoffs. Did we have layoffs here and at the same time rehiring?

MS SHEA: No. What we had here was severance and leave payout to somebody who left at the executive level. This is the \$1.4 million number I am talking about now.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MS SHEA: That increased because of the severance and the leave payout, and also there was the signing bonus, what we call the signing bonus from the contract. All employees, with the exception of MHAs, received that. That is reflected in the \$1.4 million as well.

MR. MURPHY: The \$1,200, I think it was, signing bonus.

MS SHEA: Right. Yes, the \$1,400.

Then when you see the increase from last year over this year, that reflects the 2 per cent salary

increase and it also reflects there the funding for the CEO position of the MMSB. That is now reflected under that dollar figure.

MR. MURPHY: The Multi-Materials Stewardship Board chair would be under that heading?

MS SHEA: Right, and then come down to Revenue – Provincial at the bottom of that.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MS SHEA: That is the money that MMSB would pay us for that salary.

MR. MURPHY: It is \$164,000 for the chairmanship of the board of the MMSB?

MS SHEA: Right, yes. So the CEO – did I say chair? I meant CEO.

MR. MURPHY: CEO.

MS SHEA: Yes. So the CEO position is funded there. It is neutral for us, but I just wanted to point out the increase is offset down there.

MR. MURPHY: Right, okay. That is what I was wondering, that is what I figured.

Coming over to Policy Development and Planning, 1.2.03; again, I just wanted to get an explanation here. Professional Services, \$35,000 was budgeted last year, the actual turned out to be \$35,000, but now it shows an expenditure this year anticipated of \$135,000. I was just wondering what the extra \$100,000 was?

MS SHEA: That is required under the Green Fund. There is \$100,000 for an audit under the Green Fund. So that will be conducted this year.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Will that be a private outside company doing that? Wouldn't that be an initiative that government would carry out?

MS SHEA: That would be outside work done through a call for proposals.

MR. MURPHY: Again, what would that audit be for? What project would they be auditing?

MS SHEA: It is going to be an audit of the Green Fund.

MR. MURPHY: On the Green Fund.

MS SHEA: Yes, and we are required to do that.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Coming over to 1.2.04, I think this question was asked already; just an explanation of the \$351,000 in Transportation and Communications again. That was woodland caribou, right? Did I get that right?

MS SHEA: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, and –

MS SHEA: Wait, are you at 1.2.04?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MS SHEA: Yes, okay. Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Just a breakdown on Purchased Services here too in this same section; \$242,000 budgeted, the actual was only \$205,000, this year budgeted \$237,000. Could you give us an idea of what kind of projects would be under Purchased Services, what you would be purchasing here?

MS SHEA: Yes. Purchased Services here would be office space, leased accommodations, \$147,015, vehicle maintenance was \$7,336, and trapping service was \$6,000.

MR. MURPHY: Excuse me, tracking?

MS SHEA: Trapping.

MR. MURPHY: Trapping services, okay.

MS SHEA: I am going to give an acronym here: ARGOS fees for download of data from twenty GPS, \$4,919. There was storage leased accommodations, \$4,107; editing of professional reports, \$2,390; there was purchased services such as shipping costs, water delivery, and ergonomic assessment for just over \$2,200; copier fees of \$1,248; there was publishing paper in the *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, \$1,200; \$694 for shredding; there was \$584 for a

data entry contract; and there is a return of a low-tech coyote telemetric collar, \$350.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Pretty good. If we can have a list of that, that would be great.

In the meantime, Mr. Chair, anything that may be asked of the department or anything, if we could have a list generated at the end and probably share that with the Liberals, too, at the same time, with the Official Opposition, if we do have an ask.

I just wanted to come over to 2.1.01, Pollution Prevention. You mentioned Buchans cleanup of \$973,000 and change here. Is this the last bit of money for the Buchans cleanup now that we are going see from the original fund that was there?

MS SHEA: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

I know that mine is going to be in a shutdown process here now in the next little while, the other mine that is there. Is government going to have a hand in cleaning that up?

Basically, what I am asking is that even though this is under the heading of Pollution Prevention, we already have pollution that already happened so now we are dealing with a cleanup. Any time we are seeing industrial cleanup, is this where we are going to find it, in this particular section where government would have to be responsible for it?

MS SHEA: We did not put any specific funding in this year for – are you talking about Duck Pond?

MR. MURPHY: Right.

MS SHEA: There is no specific funding that was allotted in addition to our regular budgeted funding for that project. If we move through, I guess, and government plays a role, we will have to make that determination, but it is not in the budget.

MR. MURPHY: I am just wondering – and this might be a policy question that you might not want to answer – when it comes to industrial cleanup we are seeing taxpayers' money here go

towards a mine that has been shut down for a long time, obviously, when it comes to Buchans. Is there some way that government is – or, possibly, is government thinking about starting up industrial funding or taxing some of these companies so that we can end up cleaning up at no cost to the taxpayer, rather than having to see an expenditure of taxpayers' funds here to go towards this?

MS SHEA: That would be beyond me to talk about at Estimates today. If that was a government direction, there would be a process that government would follow to develop that policy.

MR. MURPHY: Government has not talked about that yet?

MS SHEA: I cannot answer that today. Unless I go and speak to everybody in government to see if anyone has talked about it – I am not prepared to answer that here this morning.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. I was just wondering, just for the record too, knowing that there was an expenditure here of taxpayers' money, if there was some way that we could recapture that or if government was thinking about recapturing that so that we can negate these monies from the budget in the first place.

I guess we do not have an answer to that.

MS SHEA: We do environmental assessments. There is no funding in this budget for the mine closure in Buchans, if that was the original question.

MR. MURPHY: Well, that was one of the questions, but okay. I was just wondering about if government might have been looking at a policy direction at the same time so that we would not have to have these expenditures of money for cleanup after the fact once the mine closes and that the taxpayers would be left with the environmental mess on their hands.

MS SHEA: That is not something I can discuss here this morning.

MR. MURPHY: All right, okay.

Carrying on over then to 2.2.01, Water Resources Management, under Professional Services, \$1.264 million and change was budgeted in 2013-2014; the actual was only \$1.064 million. There is a \$200,000 drop in revenue but at the same time Professional Services are expected to be about \$1.744 million. I am just wondering if I can get an explanation on that particular line. Just an explanation I guess on that line in general.

MS SHEA: The expenditures under Professional Services for 2.2.01 were the Hydrometric agreement which was \$847,409. There was the hydrology of Eastern Newfoundland with AMEC Americas Limited for \$4,421. For \$28,500 with AMEC, again, was the development of case studies to support a risk-based assessment for a redesign and planning. For \$2,900 with CBCL, which were the municipal groundwater supplies.

Then, there is an increase in Professional Services this year. The bulk of it is \$350,000 for flood risk mapping.

MR. OSBORNE: I apologize for interrupting. I know this is George's time. Can you tell me what line number that is?

MS SHEA: Go to Water Resources Management, 2.2.01, and then come down to Professional Services and you will see an increase from \$1.2 million last year to \$1.744 million this year.

MR. MURPHY: When we go a further bit down here in the same section, Minister, 2.2.01.01, Revenue – Federal, \$330,000, and provincial revenue, if you can get an explanation to these lines it would be great.

MR. CHIPPETT: We were approached by C-CORE to work on a project for Badger with respect to the Badger ice service, to improve some of the imagery to reflect ice conditions. So, we are hoping that will be a partnership between us, the federal government and C-CORE, but it has not been approved yet. We hope it will be in the round of proposals ongoing.

MR. MURPHY: So, you are talking about the Badger River service, is that what you are talking about?

MR. CHIPPETT: It is the use of satellite imagery, improved satellite imagery, to access the ice conditions in Badger.

MR. MURPHY: Is there any way that can be done besides satellite? Why would they be doing it by satellite? I am just curious.

MR. CHIPPETT: It would be beyond my technical ability to answer.

MR. MURPHY: All right. We will look into it.

Thank you.

Heading 2.2.02, Water Quality Agreement, in Purchased Services again there is a bit of a drop here: \$194,000 budgeted; \$50,000 was only actually spent on that; but again, Purchased Services for this year is projected to be at \$156,700. I am wondering if we can get an explanation on this line.

MS SHEA: Which line was that?

MR. MURPHY: It was 2.2.02.

MS SHEA: The Purchased Services?

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MS SHEA: That was meant for new technology, but it was not used. So, we anticipated that we were going to purchase some new technology.

MR. MURPHY: Any idea what kind of technology they were after here?

MS SHEA: No, I would not know.

MR. MURPHY: Can we find out or can we get a note on that?

MS SHEA: Sure, you can send over a question and we will have a look at it.

MR. MURPHY: Will do.

Coming over to Environmental Assessment, 2.3.01, under Revenue – Provincial, I wonder if I can get a breakdown as regards to what is happening here – \$220,000 revenue was anticipated, I am presuming here; \$36,000; and again, the number is up \$302,000 for this year.

MR. CHIPPETT: The \$220,000 is a figure that is used as a ballpark for expected registrations. There are fees associated with registrations for environmental assessments, and if I am not mistaken, the fees increase based on the level of assessment required. So last year we had less complex projects, and less projects registered. So that would explain the \$36,000. Then for the next year there are two things going on: we are back to the \$220,000 as a ballpark for revenue for assessment registrations and so on; and secondly, I mentioned earlier the second Nalcor monitor position, the funding from Nalcor for a second monitor is reflected there as well. That explains the salary increase in line 01 as well.

MR. MURPHY: So you are talking about for the monitoring of the caribou and the Labrador-Island Transmission Link.

MR. CHIPPETT: The Labrador-Island Transmission Link.

MR. MURPHY: Right, okay.

Coming over to 3.1.01, Crown Land. I just want to get a breakdown of the Salaries here; \$4.2 million was budgeted last year and \$3.4 million was the actual. Salaries this year are anticipated to be up again by about \$700,000 to \$4.1 million. Can you explain what is happening here?

MS SHEA: The decrease from last year's budget to revised was a delayed recruitment for some positions. So the \$4.1 million for this year reflects more the true allocation for what we will need for staffing for this year.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Coming down to 3.1.02, Land Management and Development. A breakdown of Professional Services, if you would, Minister; \$115,000 was budgeted and \$164,000 was actually spent. The same amount of dollars, by the way; the \$115,000 is budgeted again for this year.

I am wondering if you can give an explanation as regards to the difference here.

MS SHEA: Right. The expenditures last year included the Altius Group for appraisal for Crown land, Kenmount Road, and that was \$4,381. Then for \$42,083 was the MAE Design Ltd, the Salmonier Line contract. Then it was \$62,748 to Stephen Burt Surveys, and that was for the legal surveys of eighty-four cottage lots at Birchy Lake. Then \$34,980 was for Jon E. Williams Surveys, and that was lots as well. That came to \$144,192. That was our projections for the year end, but our budget basically stays the same year over year.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. So that breakdown is for cottage lot sales and that sort of thing?

MS SHEA: It was for appraisal of Crown land for Kenmount Road, it was \$4,381. Then it was the septic site evaluations for sixty-five cottage lots at Salmonier Line, \$42,083. It was the legal surveys of eighty-four cottage lots at Birchy Lake for \$62,748. Then there were legal land surveys as well for thirty-five Salmonier cottage lots at \$34,980.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

My curiosity, do you have the dollar figure in hand what they assessed the land on Kenmount Road for or what it was worth?

MS SHEA: No, I do not have it.

MR. MURPHY: You do not have that number, all right.

I guess, finally here, just a breakdown before I pass it over to Mr. Osborne.

CHAIR: Yes, I am going to let you finish off on the last part and then I will go back to Mr. Osborne.

MR. MURPHY: A Lands question, just a breakdown basically on what is happening here with Revenue – Provincial, 3.1.02, \$5.4 million last year, \$12,600,000 was the actual, but back down to \$5.3 million this year.

MS SHEA: That reflects two things. One is the cottage lot development sales, and it is the regular revenue from purchasing of Crown land.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Thank you, Minister.

CHAIR: Mr. Osborne.

MR. OSBORNE: Thank you.

I just want to go back for a moment to 2.2.01, the flood mapping.

MS SHEA: Yes.

MR. OSBORNE: You mentioned there was flood mapping included in the Professional Services there.

MS SHEA: Right.

MR. OSBORNE: Could you give some indication as to where that is going to take place this year?

MS SHEA: It is not determined yet.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Under Revenue – Federal, the \$330,000, can you tell me what that is for?

MS SHEA: Yes, Jamie can speak to that again. That is the Badger ice.

MR. CHIPPETT: That is the proposed project on the satellite imagery for the ice conditions at Badger.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay. Why are the feds paying for that? I am not complaining that they are but just wondering why the feds are paying for it.

MR. CHIPPETT: We were actually approached by C-CORE. C-CORE had been working with the federal government but there is a requirement for a provincial sponsor or lead government agency, so that would be our role in it.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Under Revenue – Provincial, the amount budgeted last year and estimated this year are the same but there was actually \$1 million in provincial revenue. Could you outline where the extra provincial revenue came from?

MS SHEA: The additional revenue reflects the invoices from industry that were paid.

MR. OSBORNE: What was that for?

MS SHEA: The invoices we give them for the water monitoring.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay. You did not anticipate billing the amount you did last year?

MS SHEA: We actually received more than what we had anticipated. It depends on when they pay, when we post it. If they pay after the end of the fiscal year it comes into the next year.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

If I went back to 2012-2013 you would see a decrease in the revenue there because it was made up last year instead?

MR. CHIPPETT: The revenue increases from year to year as we add industrial contributions. It would depend on, for example, if it was a condition of the EA release we add somebody midway through the year. Then that would come and be posted in the projected revised because we would not have known that in the previous year.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay. I am just looking at the budget last year on provincial revenue for Water Resources Management, and the budgeted amount and revised amount are the exact the same and the estimated amount for 2013-2014 is the \$774,800. I am just again curious as to why the department would not have known they were going to receive additional funding from industry.

MR. CHIPPETT: I think it is more a question of when the companies actually pay the invoices. We would always start with a budget of \$774,800 based on the number of monitoring stations in place. If invoices come in towards the end of the fiscal year, then it ends up getting

booked in the following year, if that makes sense.

MR. OSBORNE: Yes, I understood that from the explanation you gave a couple of moments ago, but I had just gone back to last year's Estimates and the budgeted amount and revised amount are exactly the same. If it had carried over from last year to this year, the revised amount should have been and would have been lower, but what you received was exactly what you budgeted.

MS SHEA: We will ask Colleen to speak to that because neither one of us were in the department last year, so we had nothing to do with the numbers from last year.

Colleen, do you want to speak to that?

MS JOHNSON: When you look at last year, and we projected we would take in the entire \$774,000 that is based upon the information that we assumed what we had invoiced in 2012-2013 would have been paid prior to March 31. Unfortunately, that did not happen. So that revenue actually came in this fiscal year.

MR. OSBORNE: That is what I am saying. I am looking at last year's budget and what you budgeted last year and what you received last year in revenue.

MS JOHNSON: What we projected last year was the same. We had anticipated the industry would have paid the invoices that we had submitted, but they did not prior to March 31. When we did our projections, which is what is in the Estimates, we had assumed they would have paid the invoices. They did not get here by March 31, which means they came into the 2013-2014 fiscal year.

MR. OSBORNE: No, I understand what you are saying. What I am saying is, I am looking now at last year's budgeted amount, and what you budgeted last year and what you received last year in revenue is identical.

MS SHEA: The numbers are reflected in the revised and that was around the end of February. This is what I am understanding she is saying: that, at that time, they thought the full amount that was invoiced would be paid by the end of

the fiscal year. If you look at what came in, this year, meant that there would have been an actual reduction in what they had projected last year.

MR. OSBORNE: There is not; I am looking at last year's budget.

MS SHEA: You are looking at what was revised, and the revisions were probably done – in February sometime?

OFFICIAL: In February.

MS SHEA: Yes. So, they are not the final numbers for the end of March. They are the projections, the revised that are done in mid to late February.

MR. OSBORNE: The revised amount for last year that is printed in the budget is not accurate?

MS SHEA: When you look at the revised numbers, they are not created as of March 31. They are created probably around the end of February and at that point you look at what is done and what you anticipate for the end of March.

These numbers, the revised, were probably printed before March 31 this year. That is how all of the Estimates are done. These books are printed before March 31.

MR. OSBORNE: I get that. So, basically what you are saying is the revised numbers here are not always accurate.

MS SHEA: Not to the exact cent but based on, say, by the end of February and our expenditures and what is outstanding, it is revised from the original budget, say, for this year in the 2014-2015, the Estimates, to the best budgeting process that we can go through, these are the allotments of funding. Then what we do is we do a revised – well, we do it within the department throughout the year, but we do a revised for these purposes, to go through the numbers to basically illustrate if there are any significant drops or increases and they are reflected then in the revised.

When you go back to the original budget for 2013-2014 that was the best budgeting numbers done by the department. The revised is basically

to outline how close we came to those numbers and we try to be as accurate as we absolutely can but sometimes if a payment comes in, in the last week of March that is not going to be reflected in revised. It may be reflected in our projected that we are expecting it but if we did not expect it and put it in and it comes in, it will show up in the next one.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay. Just for the record here for Hansard, the budgeted amount last year was \$604,000, the revised amount was \$604,000, and we are talking a discrepancy in what you received – in the 2013-2014 budget, the budgeted amount was \$774,000. You actually received a quarter of a million dollars more, so in last year's Estimates that means you are out by over 40 per cent on the budgeted amount and the revised amount, of the revised amount not being accurate. That is pretty considerable.

MS SHEA: We could get a look at all the invoices and the payment dates for all of them, year over year.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay. I would appreciate it if you could provide us with that because that would certainly be interesting to see.

Again under 2.2.01, I am just wondering, when we look at the issue of fracking and looking at water resources, would that fall under this Budget, the water resources testing for fracking?

MS SHEA: I am not sure what water testing you are actually talking about for fracking.

MR. OSBORNE: Have you done any sample testing in areas where fracking is proposed of water tables?

MS SHEA: I do not think there is an actual proposal in on fracking that we have come to an assessment for us.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Is there any money budgeted for the review of fracking through the Department of Environment and Conservation.

MS SHEA: No, that is Natural Resources.

MR. OSBORNE: That would be under Natural Resources?

MS SHEA: Yes.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Under Crown Land, again, I am guessing it is probably severance, but I will look for an explanation. The Salaries under Crown Land, there was \$4.2 million budgeted last year and the revised was only \$3.4 million. Was that severance you anticipated paying but did not?

MS SHEA: No, that was delayed recruitment.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Subhead 3.1.04: Under Professional Services, we had \$250,000 budgeted, but only \$71,000 spent; and under Purchased Services, again, \$236,000 budgeted and none spent. Could you give some explanation there?

MS SHEA: Purchased Services, the \$236,400 that was not spent reflects that there were no projects cost shared with industry in 2013-2014. Professional Services for 3.1.04: the \$45,711 was for the orthophoto mapping of the Northern Peninsula and South Coast for Aeroquest Mapcon; \$25,989 went to Aero-Photo (1961) Inc., and that was aerial photography and triangulation on the Northern Peninsula.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

What were you projecting that you would spend money on that you did not?

MR. CHIPPETT: This program was created initially to cost share with the federal government and industry initial digital mapping of the Island of Newfoundland. A lot of that has been done, as the minister noted. The Northern Peninsula and the South Coast have not been completed at this point in time, so there is not a need to go back and redo previous areas. The budget has actually been adjusted because we do not do that cost-sharing component with the federal government any more.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

So, the reduction from \$250,000 to \$71,000 would reflect that, is that what you are saying?

MR. CHIPPETT: Yes, that is correct.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

I just realized – I just want to go back to 2.1.01 for a moment, Pollution Prevention. There is \$2.5 million less in the budget. It is the total Environmental Management budget.

MS SHEA: Right.

That is the reflection of the fact that Buchans, New Harbour, and the first phase of Hopedale have been completed.

If you go up to Purchased Services, you will see where the reduction is reflected.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Do we have an inventory now of contaminated sites that are still to be done?

MS SHEA: We have an inventory of the contaminated sites in Newfoundland and Labrador. We have money this year in the Budget to deal with the issue as outlined by the AG, to be able to determine the liability. We are going to start that and get the work done as the AG required, but we do have the inventory of all the contaminated sites in the Province as well. The inventory itself does not provide the information that the AG would be looking for.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Are there any sites you are focusing on this year that we have not talked about yet?

MS SHEA: Hopedale is our focus.

MR. OSBORNE: Just Hopedale?

MS SHEA: Yes.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

CHAIR: Mr. Osborne, are you almost completed with the Lands Division?

MR. OSBORNE: Yes, just a couple of more questions.

CHAIR: Okay, then I will go to Mr. Murphy to start on Wildlife.

MR. OSBORNE: Thank you.

Okay, one final question under Lands before we go to Wildlife. Under Total: Lands, we had the budgeted amount last year and the revised amount last year. The budgeted amount this year is about \$400,000 less. I will ask that question first. Why was there a reduction of \$400,000 in Lands this year?

MS SHEA: When you look at from last year to this year – so you are looking at 3.1.01, right? 3.1.01 Lands, is that the one you are looking at?

MR. OSBORNE: I am sorry. It is 3.1.04, Total: Lands.

MS SHEA: Yes, okay.

If you go line by line through it, some of it is in relation to Salaries. Then the other budget, there is \$1,000 for Purchased Services. We just did the geomatics. The \$400,000 – there is one there 1.5, and then there is money there in Salaries again. I do not think there is anything specific that stands out. There is that one block for the \$400,000 as a reduction. It would basically be reflected in the geomatics and the Salaries, if you go line by line for Lands.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

One final question on Crown Lands; you talked about some deferred hires in Crown Lands last year which was part of the reason for the discrepancy in the budget. We know there are some backlogs in Crown Lands. Would that explain the reason for the backlogs because of the deferred hires?

MS SHEA: I could not comment on that because I am not quite sure what the people hiring would do or where the backlog was, but I know there was some delayed recruitment.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

I wonder is your deputy able to –

MS SHEA: I can get that information. We would have to go back and ask the directors and staff where their backlogs are, and it depends on the applications, too. I do not know if there is a generic answer right now that we can provide.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

I am just wondering generally, the applications for Crown lands and the backlogs, is there a specific concern in Crown Lands that would explain the reason for the backlogs?

MS SHEA: Some are processed routinely and do not have a backlog, and some are very complicated. It would depend on the particular case, I guess, and what that would entail, the complexity of the particular case.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

For a residential lot in rural Newfoundland, we have heard of some cases where they are in excess of a year or up to two years waiting for an application to be processed. That certainly would not be normal on a residential lot, would it?

MS SHEA: It would depend on the complexity of the issue. Most are routine and would not be, but I guess if there are some, there would be other factors.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

I would certainly appreciate if your department could provide us with some description or background on that.

MS SHEA: Yes, and if there are any particular cases and we have consent from any people, we could certainly go over the complexities of any of those cases. That is fine, too.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

CHAIR: Mr. Osborne, thank you.

Mr. Murphy, we are into Wildlife, Parks and Natural Heritage.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just have one more question in regard to Lands first before we move on, on one section that I missed here.

In 3.1.03, Surveying and Mapping, under Salaries 01, \$735,300 last year, the revised was \$536,200, down about \$200,000. I wonder if we can get an explanation of that one. That would be question number one. At the same time, question number two deals with the 2014-2015 estimate of \$664,000. I wonder if we can get an explainer to that, please.

MS SHEA: The revised down is based on delayed recruitment, and the difference in the Salaries this year was that when we went across the department there were some positions that were not going to be filled, vacant, and others that were unfunded positions. So we re-profiled the additional funding that was there to ensure that unfunded positions in other divisions were funded appropriately. If you actually go across the full salary line for all the different divisions, all the positions in all the divisions are funded appropriately under the budget.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Line 02 under Operating Accounts, if I can get an explainer here; \$190,300 budgeted for last year, the actual here was \$109,500, up to \$189,900 this year?

MS SHEA: Right. If you go up through the lines, the largest discrepancy would be in the budget for Salaries revised, and again that was for delayed recruitment. Then there is also another decrease there of \$3,100 for Employee Benefits. Then if you come right down you will see the revised numbers against the budget from last year, and that would give you the \$109,000 as compared to the \$190,000.

MR. MURPHY: All right, thank you.

Over to Wildlife and Parks, I guess, section 4.1; under Salaries 01, Parks and Natural Areas, \$3.1 million last year, \$3.36 million the actual, \$3.6 million this year in the Estimates. I wonder if we can get an explainer on these numbers?

MS SHEA: Yes, a number of things happened there. That calls into here the severance pay for retired employees. As well, we had unfunded

positions at Mistaken Point, that is reflected in that number.

When you look then at the revised for this year, at the \$3.6 million, that includes an increase here for the additional funding of \$74,000 for Mistaken Point. There is also a 2 per cent increase in Salaries as well that is reflected there. So that covers off the additional funding that we needed there, plus some of the collective agreement issues.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. The person, I think from Mistaken Point, are they currently on staff or being moved? Is that one of the positions that might have been lost last year or there might have been a rehiring here?

There was a position that was laid off, I think. We had a layoff from St. Mary's Ecological Reserve. Is it the same person, do we know?

MR. CHIPPETT: At Mistaken Point, there was some bumping that occurred because of the budget actions last year, so somebody did bump into Mistaken Point. This \$74,000 the minister speaks about is an extra resource to try to conclude the bid submission to UNESCO for Mistaken Point.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, so there were essentially no extra positions here, but a reshuffling, and that is where the money comes from.

MR. CHIPPETT: There is one extra position.

MR. MURPHY: There is one extra position.

MR. CHIPPETT: There is one extra position to help with the preparation of the bid document for the UNESCO World Heritage Site.

MR. MURPHY: Has the department run into any instances, for example, where some of the layoffs that were faced last year have led to a downgrading, if you will, of some of the reserve areas? What I am asking is, for example, St. Mary's ended up with, I think, a couple of layoffs there. Has government analyzed these layoffs at the same time to see if there was any chance of the possible rehiring of some of these positions, knowing that in this particular case we recognize the historical significance of Mistaken

Point? Again, the preservation of our natural heritage is also important, so I am wondering about the department's plans for the possibility of rehiring in some of these other positions. Is there money set aside for that?

MS SHEA: All the salary dollars are announced and are all listed here, so there would be no further salary dollars that are not reflected in the budget.

MR. MURPHY: So there is nothing here to show for any new hiring besides Mistaken Point?

MS SHEA: There is new hiring in Mistaken Point. That is our only new positions into the department.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Coming down to Transportation and Communications, is there any money here for the evaluation of the job losses that happened here as regards some of the reserve status that have been making the news?

MS SHEA: No.

MR. MURPHY: There is nothing there for that?

MS SHEA: No.

MR. MURPHY: Does government have any plans to evaluate in the future? What are they using to gauge the need for more people working in some of these reserves?

MS SHEA: I can certainly work within the department of people who oversee that work, but I would have to speak to them about how they are going to do their monitoring and their evaluations. It is not something I would have had prepared here for this morning.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

So there is no money here as regards to the evaluation in the future, for example, of any site within Newfoundland and Labrador that may need some sort of ecological protection or natural heritage protection here?

MS SHEA: That is a different question. We have staff who do that kind of work without having to have more work, as a different budget ask here, but there are staff who are assigned to this area that do that type of work.

MR. MURPHY: All right, I will leave that for now.

Section 4.1.02, Park Development, “Appropriations provide for the upgrading of Provincial Parks.” Purchased Services here are \$315,000 against \$70,000 that was budgeted. I wonder if I can get an explanation of that. At the same time, the Salaries line, I have to note, is down just a little bit. Is this an outside contract that would be issued or is this a government employee who would actually be looking at the upgrading of provincial parks?

MS SHEA: There is only one person there reflected in that salary. Then the Purchased Services that you are speaking about there goes from \$70,000 to \$315,000; that is going into the engineering assessment and repair for the for the St. Fintan’s washout and for the gravel emergency exit fire road for Barachois Pond Park.

MR. MURPHY: Are there any other plans for any other investments to the repair of some of the parks? I have to make note that in Sir Richard Squires Park there is one area where it has become very, very inaccessible, within the park access, to the salmon river, in particular, by some salmon fishermen. I have a letter of interest that the minister may want to see with regard to that, along with some pictures. I am just wondering: Is there anywhere else within the budget, besides 4.1.02, where a provincial park would be able to address its own internal – well, I guess we can call it maintenance or repairs?

MS SHEA: Any of the capital there would be reflected in 1.2.05. That is the Capital part of the budget.

MR. MURPHY: Under 1.2.05, Administrative Support, on page 9.5?

MS SHEA: Yes, it says Capital, if you look at it. “Appropriations provide for the purchase of

tangible capital assets and for a Provincial Parks...”.

MR. MURPHY: The repair section there would be under that.

Do we know if there are any plans here for Sir Richard Squires Park?

MS SHEA: I do not know what the staff have put as their priorities, but they will certainly do their assessments and based on the work that they feel necessary they will do –

MR. MURPHY: Do you have a contact name that I can write to as regards to that?

MS SHEA: Well, you can write me and I will get the answers for you.

MR. MURPHY: Just forward it off to you?

MS SHEA: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, that is great, perfect. Thank you for that.

The Purchased Services again, the \$315,000, is for engineering in Barachois Park and the fire access road?

MS SHEA: Right.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Section 4.2.02, under Endangered Species and Biodiversity, I want to ask you about Salaries here. Salaries are up to \$284,500 from the actual last year of \$200,300. I wonder if you can explain that here.

MS SHEA: Yes, the revised down was because somebody left a position and it reflects the vacancy, and the \$284,500 for this year reflects the salary increases. You go back to – we reprofiled the funding the department, because what we did was some divisions would have had funding attached to positions that were vacant and others would have had unfunded positions. So if you go through the budget now the more appropriate funding for salaries are attached to the real bodies who are in the positions. So that would have been a reprofiling from within the department.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, so we would find salary increases for the whole department in –

MS SHEA: Or down. If we were carrying money for a salaried position that was not filled or being filled, but we had another unfunded position in another division, what we did was we attached the funding into the appropriate division within – the budgeting itself would not have changed as much as probably where it is posted to be a more accurate reflection.

MR. MURPHY: So we do not know exactly what this position would be other than that it was budgeted for? We do not know what that position is?

MS SHEA: Jamie.

MR. CHIPPETT: That is a –

MR. MURPHY: I cannot hear you, Jamie; your light is not on.

MR. CHIPPETT: Sorry. Now I have light.

It is an ecosystem management ecologist position. So, as the minister said, the position was in the division, but it was unfunded.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Do we know where this ecologist position would be? They would be working all in wide, or one particular area of the Province?

MS SHEA: We would not have the details on who is doing what work, but again, if you want a list of who is working where we can provide that as well.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

While we are on the topic, Minister, I guess we can get an explainer as to how come the WERAC committee is not in place yet – the Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Advisory Council.

MS SHEA: I want to get the WERAC position done, and there had been a callout for interested parties. I just felt there was not sufficient youth represented in the numbers, so we went out and targeted certain areas where we thought we

would have youth with a particular interest in WERAC. I am hoping probably in the next week – I am hoping probably before the Easter break that WERAC is reconstituted.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. How many youth positions are you looking at here?

MS SHEA: The board is eleven people.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MS SHEA: I do not know particularly how many are youth, but I know there was no youth representation when I looked at the list specifically.

MR. MURPHY: None whatsoever?

MS SHEA: No, that is why we went out and really targeted people who would have an interest in this type of work and who were youth.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

The WERAC positions itself, when it comes to the other positions that were there, you do have a good dichotomy of people who are applying for these positions that you are looking at?

MS SHEA: My personal bias is, and I guess because I oversaw the names, I think it is going to be an excellent committee once we finalize. Until it is finalized, you cannot say because it needs to be done and you cannot announce things until people are informed or whatever but I think it is going to be an excellent committee.

MR. MURPHY: Again, the anticipated release of those names would be?

MS SHEA: I am hoping before the Easter break. This has been on my desk for a while and I just want to get it moved off. Again, we have put a concerted effort into the youth to make sure we had youth representation.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, that is great. It sounds like it is good news. I know I have been asking you some questions about that in the House, so I will lay off you for now when it comes to the WERAC committee. I will wait until after Easter break.

Minister, just a breakdown on 4.2.02, the same section, Transportation and Communications showed \$62,500 budgeted last year, the revised was \$42,500. I guess at the same time an explainer as well on Purchased Services, it shows a \$20,000 discrepancy here. It looks like money shifted from one section to another, from Transportation and Communications down to Purchased Services.

MS SHEA: The money was reallocated into Purchased Services; however, we felt that is what we would spend in Purchased Services but in essence we did not spend that full amount.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. Was there something you were anticipating you needed there that you did not buy, and what would that be? It is a \$20,000 purchase.

MS SHEA: Yes. There was some work we anticipated that we would be doing in this area but we did not, so we anticipate that we should be able to cover it off this year.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

Going on to 4.2.03 Stewardship and Education; first of all, I guess, the difference in salary details. I want to know if we can get an explanation as regards to line 01. The other thing that concerns me here is there does not seem to be any change to stewardship and education. I am just wondering what government's plans would be as regards to stewardship and education when it comes to that. I do not see anything here as regards to any kind of increase in spending when it comes to that.

MS SHEA: No, there is no increase in spending. There is a small increase you will see that is reflected in the Salaries in 01, and there is some funding there for students. The small difference between the budget and revised was for the signing bonus. Then the salary increase is the additional funding for some student positions.

MR. MURPHY: How many student positions are we talking about?

MS SHEA: I do not have that actual number. Sometimes that is broken down to how many weeks they are available and they can work and

how many positions. That is kind of a bit of work in progress. Typically, there is a formula used based on the actual budget number you can put in to students and what a student costs per week. Some costs a little bit more than others, based on whether they are first year or not. Then out of that tumbles out a number.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MS SHEA: Typically though, if we go back historically we would be able to see where the students were. Basically, we want to make sure there is money in the budget to cover off the student positions so we are not trying to rob Peter to pay Paul on the students.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, that is perfect. Thank you.

Under 4.2.04, Habitat, Game and Fur Management; again, this is where the Nalcor position comes into for the Labrador and George River herd. I believe, Jamie, you explained that one earlier. Is that right?

MS SHEA: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. So we are already through that one.

Under 4.2.05 Research; Transportation and Communications here on this line \$154,000 budgeted, \$420,500 was actually spent. I am just wondering if we can have a breakdown of what the monies were actually gone to here.

MS SHEA: Yes. There was an increase there of \$266,500 and that is the increased helicopter flying time. Sometimes that number changes for us with our best estimates. Sometimes we can get more in or less than our budget, and a lot of times that becomes weather dependent for us. That is why there was significantly more done last year.

MR. MURPHY: Do we have a breakdown on those helicopter flights?

MS SHEA: Yes, we do.

MR. MURPHY: Is that available?

MS SHEA: Yes, I will read it out here now for the record.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. I was just wondering if we can get a copy of that.

MS SHEA: You can also have a copy as well.

MR. MURPHY: At the same time, Minister, the helicopter flights I presume would be tendered out and there would be bids from various helicopter firms that come in here. I know the Auditor General at one time explained about having some issues with helicopter rentals, I think.

MS SHEA: Yes. The Auditor General made some comments and basically whatever we receive back as constructive criticism from the AG as to how things need to be and if we were not exactly following policy, that is taken extremely seriously and has to be followed to a T.

MR. MURPHY: Okay.

MS SHEA: The actuals for the air time, for the helicopter time, and you will see that – I am going to go through how it changes year by year. When we were doing the Woodland caribou initiative, \$15 million program for the Woodland caribou on the Island, you will see there was significantly more air time that was specifically related to that.

In 2012-2013, the total department budget for air time, for helicopter time, was \$2.9 million. Out of the \$2.9 million, \$1.1 million was for the caribou initiative. So that takes a fair chunk into there. Then when you go into the research in 2012-2013, because that is the one you just asked about, it was \$766,000.

When you go into last year, the actuals for 2013-2014, the biggest difference is our total came from \$2.9 million down to \$1.6 million. As I had just said, \$1.1 million was for the caribou strategy but last year that was \$250,000. That is reflective of the study being near completion. The research was \$367,000 out of our \$1.6 million last year.

What we are projecting this year, our helicopter projected time, this year we are expecting should

be about \$1.7 million. When you look at that, there are a number of different areas in our department that use helicopter time. That is what I wanted to explain, there is an overall number versus just this one piece of it.

The different areas whether it is – it could be Parks and Natural Areas, Stewardship and Education, Habitat, Game and Fur Management, they may use some of the air time. Our total for the department should be \$1.7 million, and anything that has been noted to us by the AG as to the policy and how we should do it is going to be followed.

MR. MURPHY: How have you tightened that up when it comes to the AG when he was asking about it? Because I know the AG noted that there were records of people who were moved but no names, for example, were given as regards to the people who were moved.

MS SHEA: Anything that has been noted by the AG that was not appropriate or not following policy has to be implemented. That is it; it is the implementation. If there is a way that this needs to be followed for auditing purposes, there are not going to be any departmental policies that are going not reflect what the AG says.

MR. MURPHY: Very good, okay.

CHAIR: Mr. Murphy, are you getting close to completing that –

MR. MURPHY: I was just going to say to you that I will digress and pass it over to Mr. Osborne.

CHAIR: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Osborne.

MR. OSBORNE: I just want to go back to 4.1.01 for a moment. I was wondering: With the natural area systems plan, where is government with that?

MR. CHIPPETT: As the minister said earlier, obviously, WERAC is a key component of that; the legislation requires a committee to advance protected areas. Some of the last advice provided by WERAC has been followed. There have been two designations this year of

ecological reserves; I think Sandy Cove and a redesignation of Glover Island, and work towards a third one actually that is not completed yet. Work continues internally on trying to finalize candidate areas for a natural area systems plan.

MR. OSBORNE: Can we anticipate a release of that plan this year?

MR. CHIPPETT: That would require approval of various levels of government so it is hard to anticipate if we would get there, but, certainly, we would work towards that.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Also under Parks and Natural Areas, the Mud Immortal event, was there any inventory of the damage to the park?

MR. CHIPPETT: There was certainly site visits done at the time. I think there might have been one prior to snow and ice and so on, but that would be looked at again as soon as we could.

MR. OSBORNE: There is no cost estimate of long-term damage or damage in general?

MR. CHIPPETT: No.

MR. OSBORNE: Is the Province still named in the lawsuit as a result of Mud Immortal?

MS SHEA: That is something we can discuss, I guess, from a legal perspective and provide information on it. It is not something we have any information on here this morning.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Moving on to 4.2, in general, do we have an update on both caribou and moose numbers in the Province, caribou populations and moose populations?

MS SHEA: I do not have the numbers with me today, but we do surveys through our Labrador initiative for Labrador caribou and we are expecting the final report on the woodland caribou, that \$15 million study, and the moose is tracked through quotas and our moose management. I do not have any of that

information with me this morning, for the numbers.

MR. OSBORNE: Do you know in general whether the numbers are up or down, without specific numbers?

MS SHEA: I do not have that information here now. It would depend on if you are talking about a certain caribou herd or whatever. We would be able to get that information. I just do not have it with me today.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Moving on to climate change, what was the total amount spent on the Turn Back the Tide campaign?

MS SHEA: That is going to be under Executive Council, under the climate change office, so I do not have that information with me this morning.

MR. OSBORNE: Are we doing climate change office?

CHAIR: We will also be doing climate change office.

MS SHEA: That is under Executive Council.

CHAIR: Yes.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay, we will wait on those questions.

Would the smart meters – they are not actually smart meters, but the pilot program for the meters that were announced through your department, Minister, is that also under climate change?

MS SHEA: Yes.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay, I just have a couple of other questions and then I am done, actually, with questions for today.

I am just wondering, on the Northern Strategic Plan, and I know I am going back now to Policy Development and Planning, but are you able to give an update on that plan?

MS SHEA: We would not have that plan as monitoring the Northern Strategic Plan. I think Labrador Affairs would oversee that project.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

The coastal erosion plan that was announced in this year's Budget, are you able to give any details of the plan, where you are looking at doing some studies or mapping of coastal erosion this year?

MS SHEA: The project that was announced in the Budget is under the Department of Natural Resources.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Cosmetic pesticides: Last year, I think, through the Estimates process it was determined that some of the products were still on store shelves or were being stored and waiting to be disposed of. Can you give an update on that?

MS SHEA: I would not have that information here with me about the pesticides, any specific pesticides, for the Estimates.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Another general question: The environmental assessments, there is a federal process and a provincial process and there is some duplication in those two processes; have there been any discussions with the federal government on streamlining that and eliminating some of the duplication?

MS SHEA: There is no specific plan. As the deputy has just indicated, he works with the feds and we try to work together in unison, but there is no formal plan to bring the two processes together at this time.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

One final question or at least I think a final question for this set of Estimates for me: The ECRC and the Coast Guard have some oil spill response capacity; has there been any investment by Province in oil spill response capacity?

MR. CHIPPETT: I presume you are talking about oil spills or whatever offshore. As a Province we do not have the responsibility offshore; our responsibility is when that pollution makes any interaction or shows up on land. We would have people who would work closely with the federal government to make sure we are prepared in the event that it happens, through science tables that the Coast Guard regularly sets up and includes us in.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

What is the oil spill response capability or capacity of the Province, should we have an incident, once oil does hit land?

MR. CHIPPETT: There are multiple departments involved in that. So it would be us and Service Newfoundland and Labrador. I think that would be the primary two –

OFFICIAL: Transportation

MR. CHIPPETT: – and Transportation, maybe.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

Is there any oil spill response capacity now for the Province?

MS SHEA: It would be within our general budget. In our capacity that we have as a department, we would provide those services, if needed.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay, thank you.

I just have one question: Are we doing climate change today? I understand that –

MS SHEA: No, it is coming under Executive Council.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

So that was scheduled under today's Estimates, though, was it, Mr. Chair?

CHAIR: On the schedule it was.

MS SHEA: Oh, I guess we are doing it.

CHAIR: So, it is scheduled –

MS SHEA: Oh, I am not doing it.

CHAIR: No.

MR. OSBORNE: So, are Executive Council coming into this session then?

CHAIR: Not that I know of, no.

MR. OSBORNE: Okay.

CHAIR: We will have to arrange with Executive Council under one of the headings to have that done in the future.

Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chair, I just have another question. Subhead 4.2.06, the last of the headings here before I move on to some general questions, some salary details, if you would. There was \$188,000 was budgeted, \$114,000 was the actual, and \$120,000 this year I would presume is the 2 two percent. I am wondering if I can get a breakdown as regards to what is happening or what happened here under Cooperative Wildlife Projects. At the same time while we are at it as well, you might explain to me on Purchased Services, give me an explainer on that line.

MR. CHIPPETT: On the Salaries – just a little bit of background on the Cooperative Wildlife Projects heading; they are not the same projects every year. The appropriation is designed for us to be able to work with universities or other governments, things like the firearms safety training course are in here. Basically what is reflected in Salaries or any other line item reflects the projects that are anticipated to be completed in a given year.

MS SHEA: Then the increase in the Purchased Services indicates what we feel are going to best suit the needs of the program. In the revised for Purchased Services under 4.2.06, there is \$80,000 for the Wildlife Division contribution towards the project, Atlantic Canada Conservation Data Centre, Newfoundland contribution. There is \$25,000 for developing restoration protocols for the Northern Peninsula limestone barrens habitats. There is \$24,000 for the co-operative project, phylogeography and postglacial dispersion of lake trout in Labrador.

There is a \$13,000 co-operative project, General Status of Wildlife, arthropods of Newfoundland and Labrador component. There is \$11,774 for four collars.

There is \$10,000 for the co-operative project Newfoundland and St. Mary's University, the project little brown mitosis maternal colony survivorship monitoring in Newfoundland bats. There is \$9,750 for a contribution to the project stewardship of at-risk American martin, piping plover, land birds, lichen, and their habitats in Newfoundland. There is a \$9,000 contribution to the Newfoundland and Labrador Envirothon.

There is a \$9,000 contribution to the Stewardship Association of Municipalities Incorporated, the EcoAction project. There is a \$9,000 contribution to the Stewardship Association of Municipalities Incorporated, the Environmental Damages Fund project. There is \$5,000 for the contribution to the project Rare Plant Ex Situ Conservation Program. Four thousand one hundred and twelve dollars was for the fire safety hunters' conference. There was \$3,148 for advertising. There was a \$3,000 co-operative project, Newfoundland martin stable isotope dietary analysis. There was \$2,174 for equipment maintenance. There were \$2,168 proceeds, document preparation for the cumulative effects workshop. There was \$2,000 preparation of updated limestone barrens ecosystem recovery plan.

There was \$1,937 for the instructor's travel for Firearm Safety/Hunter Education. There was \$1,225 for arranged rental for young hunters' skills events. There was \$1,125 for labour to construct thirty bat houses and 100 Martin hair snags, and \$320 for retrofitting of a security bar on firearms cabinets. It is a hinged steel plate bar, one inch by forty.

MR. MURPHY: It is a pretty good list.

MS SHEA: That is it.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

I wanted to come back then to the limestone barrens project. These would be the limestone barrens outside of St. Anthony?

MS SHEA: Yes, they are on the Northern Peninsula.

MR. MURPHY: I wanted to ask you a question about that. Exactly what are they looking at when it comes to the limestone barrens? Do you have any information on that?

MS SHEA: We can provide information on that, but we would not have it here for the Estimates today.

MR. MURPHY: There was some concern by the Mayor of St. Anthony some time ago about the spraying of Tordon chemicals and the effect of these chemicals being absorbed by the limestone in the watershed area. I am just wondering if the minister might have any more information on that or if government has been looking –

MS SHEA: There may be within the department, but I would not have it prepared for Estimates.

MR. MURPHY: So you do not have anything here on that?

MS SHEA: No.

MR. MURPHY: How much money again was gone towards that project?

MS SHEA: Well, under the heading that you had just asked me about, which was 4.2.06, Cooperative Wildlife Projects, just under that heading there was \$25,000 for developing restoration protocols for the Northern Peninsula limestone barrens habitats, Newfoundland.

MR. MURPHY: Who is doing that study, do you know?

MS SHEA: I do not have that information. Again, we can get that.

Then there was \$2,000 for the preparation of updated limestone barrens ecosystem recovery plan.

MR. MURPHY: We do not know who is doing that \$2,000 study?

MS SHEA: I do not have the names of who is doing it, but that is how the money was spent.

MR. MURPHY: I can have the names of those people who done that study?

MS SHEA: You can write over and ask us and if that information is there and available, we can give it to you. I just would not have it with me for this morning.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, I appreciate that.

I have no more questions on the line items. Minister, if I can just ask some general questions, policy and what has been happening –

MS SHEA: I am only prepared for the Estimates and the finances. You can write me your policy questions; I probably do not have the information here.

MR. MURPHY: Well, I was just wondering, some of your deputy ministers are here, so I would like to ask some questions about, for example, when it comes to the Multi-Material Stewardship Board and the move towards tire recycling and what we are doing there. I wonder if any of the deputies could –

MS SHEA: You are welcome to come over and if there is someone you need to meet with, we can have all the policy questions, but we were prepared for the finances and the budget and the Estimates here this morning.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, so you cannot give us any details as regards to –

MS SHEA: We can provide all the details. This would not be the forum which we can provide it, but we have no problem providing that information.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, very good. I guess I have been thwarted and I have no more questions.

CHAIR: Okay, thank you.

You are good, Mr. Osborne?

I am going to ask the Clerk –

MR. MITCHELMORE: (Inaudible).

CHAIR: Go ahead, Mr. Mitchelmore.

MR. MITCHELMORE: I just want to ask the minister, on page 9.9, Environmental Assessment, I guess it was the deputy minister, there was \$220,000 allocated as Revenue – Provincial under the budget, and this year there is \$302,000. The difference was explained, that \$82,000 was a Nalcor employee. The revenue was coming from Nalcor for the Environmental Assessment, the same revenue that is listed on page 9.14 which was explained under 4.2.04 Habitat, Game and Fur Management. That salary is listed there as well, and the revenue is also coming from off there. Why is it that same employee listed twice? Wouldn't that record an accounting error in Estimates?

MS SHEA: It is two employees. One in each of those divisions as indicated. We should have clarified that when we spoke. There is one in those divisions. The monies look the same but they are reflected in different divisions because the two positions are located in each of those divisions.

MR. MITCHELMORE: There are only two employees funded in your department by Nalcor?

MS SHEA: Right, from that funding.

MR. MITCHELMORE: From that particular funding?

MS SHEA: Yes.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Okay.

It is great to hear there is funding for the Limestone Barrens Project that is happening on the Northern Peninsula. Dulcie House and their organization do an incredible amount of work and it covers a broad region.

I wanted to ask about the Burnt Cape Ecological Reserve under the Parks and Natural Areas. Is there any funding there to reinstate the interpretation that was cut? Is there any type of funds allocated in that specific piece in this year's budget?

MS SHEA: There is no funding there for a salaried position to do that, but that is an area of interest within the department and how we can work either through the department or through the community to provide that type of work.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Okay, that is great.

One last question is around Crown lands and the revenue that we see the Province maintain for cabin owners, cottage owners, through cottage lots. We are aware that there are certainly a number of illegal cabin owners throughout the Province. Are there any staff resources or auditing done to look at compliance, particularly in the Grand Lake region?

MS SHEA: I am not going to speak specifically about an area. You are welcome to come over and we can talk about that, but enforcement is part of what we do. We have to work with the people who have cabins that are not under the legislation, or cottages or whatever. It is our intention to do the enforcement as necessary but also to work with people to allow them to plan for that as well, whether that means they move or they submit applications that are appropriate, or whatever.

Enforcement is something that is ongoing and it is something that is necessary because it is not fair for one person to take liberties over someone else and do what they want. We also want to be sensitive and work with people to make sure they understand what options they may have. Sometimes they just do not have options.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Right, and I guess it is not a cut-and-dried area because some people may have been there before legislation.

MS SHEA: Some people may be on land they can actually apply for, so rather than go and destroy the cottage, if there is a process they can follow, they need to understand. They may refuse to follow it. If they work co-operatively with us and work within existing legislation and policies, there may be an outcome that suits their needs better.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Right.

In the agreement under Bill 61, I believe, there were talks of a number of homes that would have to be expropriated, cabins and things like that. Is there money in your budget, or is that specifically coming through Nalcor?

MS SHEA: That would either be under the Transportation and Works budget or Nalcor. I am not sure, but it is not our budget.

MR. MITCHELMORE: Okay.

I do not have any further questions, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mitchelmore.

I am going to ask the Clerk to read out subhead Estimates inclusive for Environment and Conservation, and then we will have a vote to adopt the budget.

CLERK: 1.1.01 to 4.3.01 inclusive.

CHAIR: A motion to adopt?

MR. PEACH: So moved.

CHAIR: Moved by the Member for Bellevue.

MR. RUSSELL: Seconded.

CHAIR: Seconded by the Member for Lake Melville.

All those in favour, signify by saying 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay'.

Motion carried.

On motion, subheads 1.1.01 through 4.3.01 carried.

CLERK: Total.

CHAIR: All those in favour, signify by saying 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

CHAIR: All those against, 'nay'.

Motion carried.

On motion, Department of Environment and Conservation, total heads carried.

CHAIR: We are good.

I want to thank the minister and her officials, and I will thank the Committee.

We will let you know about the climate change, under which section that will be covered in the next number of days.

Could I have a motion to adjourn, too?

MR. RUSSELL: So moved.

CHAIR: So moved by the Member for Lake Melville.

We do not need a seconder for that.

So moved and agreed. Done.

On motion, the Committee adjourned.