



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

Fourth Session  
Forty-Seventh General Assembly

---

**Proceedings of the Standing Committee on  
Social Services**

May 12, 2015 - Issue 3

Department of Justice and Public Safety  
Fire and Emergency Services-Newfoundland and Labrador

---

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Assembly  
Honourable Wade Verge, MHA

## **SOCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE**

Department of Justice and Public Safety  
Fire and Emergency Services-Newfoundland and Labrador

---

Chair: Glenn Littlejohn, MHA

Members:

Tony Cornect, MHA  
Lisa Dempster, MHA  
Stelman Flynn, MHA  
Glen Little, MHA  
Kevin Pollard, MHA  
Gerry Rogers, MHA

Clerk of the Committee: Elizabeth Murphy

---

Appearing:

### **Department of Justice and Public Safety**

Hon. Darin King, MHA, Minister  
Hon. Felix Collins, MHA, Attorney General  
Dan Chafe, Director, Quality Management & Support Services  
Debbie Dunphy, Departmental Controller  
Heather Jacobs, Assistant Deputy Minister, Strategic & Corporate Services  
Luke Joyce, Director of Communications  
Fiona Langor, Director, Policy and Strategic Planning  
Donovan Molloy, Director of Public Prosecutions  
Paul Noble, Deputy Minister and Deputy Attorney General  
Derick Reid, Executive Assistant  
Todd Stanley, Assistant Deputy Minister, Courts and Legal Services

### **Fire and Emergency Services**

Sean Dutton, Chief Executive Officer  
Marilyn McCormack, Assistant Deputy Minister

### **Also Present**

Eli Cross, MHA  
Eddie Joyce, MHA  
Andrew Parsons, MHA  
Graham Letto, Researcher, Official Opposition Office  
Ivan Morgan, Researcher, NDP Office

Pursuant to Standing Order 68, Eli Cross, MHA for Bonavista North, substitutes for Glenn Littlejohn, MHA for Port de Grave.

Pursuant to Standing Order 68, Andrew Parsons, MHA for Burgeo – La Poile, substitutes for Lisa Dempster, MHA for Cartwright – L’Anse au Clair.

The Committee met at 9:00 a.m. in the Assembly Chamber.

**CHAIR (Pollard):** Let’s call the meeting to order.

Good morning everybody. This is Tuesday, May 12, 9:00 a.m. We are into the Social Services Committee and we are doing Justice and Public Safety.

I would like to welcome everybody here. I appreciate everybody coming out. You all look sharp and bright.

We will start by having some introductions to my right in the beginning, and then we will go to my left for introductions.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Andrew Parsons, MHA, Burgeo – La Poile.

**MR. LETTO:** Graham Letto, Researcher, Official Opposition.

**MS ROGERS:** Gerry Rogers. I work for the good people of St. John’s Centre.

**MR. MORGAN:** Ivan Morgan, Researcher, NDP caucus.

**MR. CROSS:** Eli Cross, Bonavista North.

**MR. LITTLE:** Glen Little, Bonavista South.

**MR. CORNECT:** Tony Cornect, Port au Port.

**MR. DUTTON:** Sean Dutton, CEO of Fire and Emergency Services.

**MR. KING:** Darin King, Minister.

**MS MCCORMACK:** Marilyn McCormack, Assistant Deputy Minister of Fire and Emergency Services.

**MS DUNPHY:** Debbie Dunphy, Departmental Controller.

**MR. MOLLOY:** Donovan Molloy, Director of Public Prosecutions and Assistant Deputy Minister of Criminal Operations.

**MR. STANLEY:** Todd Stanley, Assistant Deputy Minister of Courts and Legal Services.

**MS JACOBS:** Heather Jacobs, Assistant Deputy Minister of Strategic and Corporate Services.

**MR. CHAFE:** Dan Chafe, Director of Quality Management and Support Services for Public Safety and Enforcement.

**MR. REID:** Derick Reid, EA to Minister King.

**MR. JOYCE:** Luke Joyce, Director of Communications for the Department of Justice and Public Safety.

**MS LANGOR:** Fiona Langor, Director of Policy and Strategic Planning.

**MR. F. COLLINS:** Felix Collins, Attorney General.

(Inaudible) when it is relevant to him.

**MR. HUTCHINGS:** He will introduce himself when he comes down.

**CHAIR:** Okay. Thank you very much.

My name is Kevin Pollard, MHA for Baie Verte – Springdale and Chair of the Committee this morning filling in for Glenn Littlejohn.

A few remarks before we begin; the minister has fifteen minutes as you all know. Then subsequent to him, the first speaker over here will have up to fifteen minutes as well. Ensuing members will have ten minutes thereafter.

How shall we proceed this morning? Is it Fire and Emergency Services? Is that the proposal this morning starting off?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Actually, I am going to ask that Fire and Emergency Services be done after. We have somebody else coming out to do that.

Eddie Joyce will be handling that. My plan was to start with Justice.

We can tell him to get ready sooner rather than later, but he is not here yet.

**MR. KING:** Okay.

**MS ROGERS:** The same with George.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** The same with George?

**MR. KING:** Okay. We were planning to do it in reverse because they are usually the shortest, rather than having them wait the three hours towards the end.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** When is George going to be in?

**MR. KING:** We will accommodate.

**OFFICIAL:** Pardon me?

**MR. KING:** We will accommodate. I cannot ask officials to sit three hours. If you do not mind, can you give us some heads up when these guys arrive?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** Okay. Thank you for being accommodating.

**MR. KING:** Perhaps the office could let you know when they arrive. Give us a half an hour.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Yes, we have a message sent.

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** We will start with you. I will call the first heading, Minister.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** What we can do too is as soon as we know, we can give a heads up and everybody can come down, so there is no need to sit through.

**MR. KING:** Okay.

**CHAIR:** Okay, so Fire and Emergency Services will be on standby.

Okay. Thank you very much.

Elizabeth.

**CLERK (Ms Murphy):** Subhead 1.1.01.

**CHAIR:** Subhead 1.1.01.

We have up to fifteen minutes for the minister to have opening remarks and comments.

**MR. KING:** Sure. Thank you, just brief remarks.

To my right is the Attorney General, the hon. Felix Collins. To my left is my Deputy Minister Paul Noble. We are pleased to start when the members opposite are ready.

**CHAIR:** Page 18.3?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I am good to go.

Andrew Parsons here, thank you.

I will say a very quick thank you to everybody for taking the time to be here off the start. I appreciate it.

The first question I have is under the Summary of Attrition Details by Department. I believe there are seven positions in this year's Budget related to Justice and Public Safety. Can we get a list of those positions being eliminated due to attrition?

**MR. KING:** There is no specific list right now. The budget dollar figure target is spread over all of the divisions to meet our target. We have identified a number of positions, through possible retirements, that we will identify through the course of the fiscal year to reach our savings target. At this point in time we have not identified the specific positions.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I am going to move on to 1.2.01, Executive Support. In the Salaries, I believe it has gone up about \$100,000. How many positions is this?

**MR. KING:** Subhead 1.2.01, Salaries?

There are no positions there. As you are going to find in a number of these situations, that represents the 3 per cent wage increase and salary steps for employees.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

**MR. KING:** Mr. Chair, just for clarification for the members, if I could, we are going to go through section by section. I am assuming that is our plan, right?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** That is the plan. There may be some times when I ask a question that does not relate to that, I may have it in the wrong space. Feel free to tell me to –

**MR. KING:** Sure. As we get, say, section 1 done, we will vote and then move – okay.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Under the same section, under Purchased Services – sorry, 1.2.02. Yes, moving on, sorry. Subhead 1.2.02, under Administrative and Policy Support, under Salaries, obviously there is a significant jump there. What is the breakdown of this?

**MR. KING:** The increase in the Estimates for this year is approximately twelve positions for the Domestic Violence Court.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Is there a breakdown on the titles of the positions, the functions?

**MR. KING:** There is, yes. I am not sure I have them here. I can get them for you, though.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** So maybe we can put that on the undertaking list to be provided after?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** This would be the same list of team members who were involved, basically. Not the same, but a similar list of people who would have been involved in the family violence prevention court.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay. So we will still get a list of them just so we have them.

I am just wondering about that. I think the announcement, if I am correct, says that it is going to reopen in St. John's, and one other location on the Island I think it actually said, and then I think it said a sum of money towards

Labrador. Is that a case of exploring where we put it in Labrador, plus one other place on the Island? Is the plan to have it in St. John's, the Island, and Labrador?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** The plan is to open a St. John's court and then simultaneous with that, hopefully, or at least there will be a short lag in between the opening of another court in the Province on the West Coast at this point in time, it looks like it might be. Then the extra money is to explore the possibility of a similar situation in Labrador down the road.

These are treatment courts, as you know, therapeutic treatment courts. The treatment for Labrador Aboriginal people especially would probably take a different focus than treatment in a non-Aboriginal court, so that \$100,000 is to explore the possibilities of that.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** So I just have a couple of questions stemming from that. When you use the language "going to explore the possibility in Labrador," is it going to happen in Labrador?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** Right now we are looking at what would be involved in establishing a treatment court in Labrador for domestic violence.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** So, it is not for sure?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** We are committed to the Island and before making a commitment to Labrador, we are going to see what is involved in it. A considerable amount of work has to be done to establish what kind of court is needed in Labrador.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** So in terms of timelines, I think it is \$100,000, am I right, for Labrador for the exploration?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** Yes.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** What are the timelines on that? Is that to be explored over this year with the hopes of it happening next year?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** We will be engaging in that process as soon as we can, yes.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I ask this because we get a fair number of calls from Labrador, when they heard this announcement. So they will want to know – there is no timeline, per se, right now. How will you explore it? Will you explore it within the department? Is there going to be a team within the department, or is the \$100,000 for an RFP for an outside group to do that work?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** I do not know if we have the details on that yet.

**MR. NOBLE:** The intention is to create a team within the department and to utilize expertise of an external consultant, based in Labrador ideally.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

**MR. NOBLE:** That is to be done as soon as we can possibly get it going.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** The big takeaway for me for this is that you are committed to the exploration, but the actual establishment is not for sure yet. They could come back with information that you may not find feasible. That is a possibility of an exploration, am I right?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** I suppose that is always a possibility, but the thing is the focus here is that we have to look at – we need to do something in Labrador; we are committed to that. Just exactly what form it would take at this stage, we do not know. So that is the whole purpose of the preliminary discussions.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

Where is the location on the West Coast – Port aux Basques? I am kidding. Obviously, there are two locations. It is going to be Corner Brook or Stephenville. Has that site been selected?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** Not exactly. It is going to look at a number of things there. Some of this work will be done by video surveillance and whatnot for video connections from St. John's. We are looking at facilities and assets in Corner Brook versus Stephenville. Right now it looks like Stephenville, but we are looking at how best the system can work in connection with the system in St. John's.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I may be jumping forward here, but again we know that in last year's Budget there was the announcement of a courthouse in Stephenville. Will the fact that the courthouse is on pause, I think is the word, affect the placement of the Domestic Violence Court, the establishment on the West Coast? It could have been in Stephenville but for the pause of the courthouse, or is it still a possibility?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** The site of the court and the function of the court I do not think will be terribly affected one way or the other by the current facilities or new facilities. I do not think that will be an issue.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

Still under 1.2.02 – and I apologize, I may come back to that court because that is one of the big announcements in this year's Budget obviously. Under this same section, 1.2.02, Transportation and Communications went up \$80,000. What was the extra cost there? It went up last year – sorry, I am looking at \$277,000 budgeted and \$357,000 was spent.

**MR. KING:** The main cost there of inflation was postage – mail outs.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Good old postage.

I see that the budget for Professional Services was budgeted at \$150,000 last year, spent at \$105,000, and it is up to \$200,000. The increase there, what is that specifically related to?

**MR. KING:** There were savings there from the commissioner (inaudible) office as well as the Criminal Code review board, less than anticipated costs there for reimbursement and travel.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Just moving one line down, Purchased Services is a substantial jump there. Is that also related to the Domestic Violence Court?

**MR. KING:** Yes, it is related to contracts with the John Howard Society as part of the Domestic Violence Court.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay. Those contracts – are they actually in place or that is the anticipation?

**MR. KING:** Anticipation?

**OFFICIAL:** Anticipation.

**MR. KING:** Yes, anticipation.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I am just wondering now under the Revenue – Provincial – and I see it looks like every year it is probably \$63,000 budgeted. Last year it was \$263,000. What is that all about?

**MR. KING:** The upshot in revenue last year was a court settlement that saw the government on a winning side of a court case. It was about \$190,000 or so in increased revenue.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Am I allowed to ask what court case? It is over, I assume.

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MR. STANLEY:** We had a construction claim where we were suing in respect of work that was done in Labrador and I think it was on a municipal facility that was built. I think we settled the claim. It did not go to litigation, but that was the settlement amount that we got.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay, excellent.

I am just going to move forward to – actually, I am going to apologize; we talked about this, Minister, before. I understand that the Minister of Justice appoints the Consumer Advocate, but does the Consumer Advocate’s budget or salary come out of the department?

**MR. KING:** Yes, the Consumer Advocate is appointed by the minister. The Consumer Advocate’s budget falls under the Public Utilities Board and the Public Utilities Board’s budget is not administered by us.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

Moving forward to Legal Information Management, 1.2.03, the big thing there I notice

is Supplies jumped substantially last year just under \$200,000. What was that jump for?

**MR. KING:** That increase is a result of going from print media to electronic subscription materials, increased costs. Trying to move away from print materials to using more electronic materials for our libraries.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Usually you hear that doing that is going to save us money. Is this sort of the up-front fee and there will be cost savings down the road, or is it going to cost us more to make that jump?

**MR. KING:** Todd will elaborate.

**MR. STANLEY:** This is a combination. We are kind of in transition where we are still running print services for some subscriptions, but we also trying to move to electronic. What we are finding is the cost of the existing remaining print subscriptions is rising astronomically, so we are hoping to get a handle on this in the next year or two to bring it all into electronic and then bring the cost down.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

The Purchased Services went up by \$13,000. Is that postage as well?

**MR. KING:** No, that is related to storage and retrieval costs for document handling and some costs attributed to moving documents to a new storage location.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Again, this might be very small, but are we moving it and now it is at a new spot and stays there. Or was it moved for a short period of time and moved back?

**MR. STANLEY:** I do not know. I think the movement was one way. Most of these are costs for our records centre to access the private off-site storage that we have because we cannot keep everything in the records centre. They just charge us for shuttling boxes back and forth. So as activity goes up, the cost goes up.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay. I am going to move forward again here to 1.2.04. I will probably end off here because my time is running out.

So this is, “Appropriations provide for facilities planning and the acquisition of tangible capital assets.” Last year, if I am correct, there was nothing budgeted, but we spent \$373,000. That is how I read it.

**MS DUNPHY:** What this is, when we purchase police vehicles there is a piece of work that has to be done after their purchase which is a fit up with the lights, silent policeman, those sorts of things. So that got charged to Purchased Services rather than the Property, Furnishings and Equipment line. The budget we had for police vehicles, a portion went towards that expenditure.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Is that unusual for that to be put in a different spot?

**MS DUNPHY:** Last year, or the year before we had some one-time funding approved through Treasury Board to purchase some additional vehicles. It was getting late in the year so then they had to do the up fit in the past year. It does not normally happen that way, but it just did last year because we did buy I think it was eighteen vehicles fairly late in the year.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Seeing the time, I will end off here, Mr. Chair, and probably return here.

Thank you.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Andrew.

Gerry?

**MS ROGERS:** Thank you very much.

Thank you everyone for being here. I know how very, very busy everyone is. Thank you for your incredible work.

We know how fundamental a piece that justice is in our society and there have been lots of changes. I would like to thank you for all your work.

I would just like to go back to the Domestic Violence Court. Do you have a time frame as to when you are going to open the St. John’s court?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** The determining factors at the moment would be the recruitment of

personnel, the team that drives this court. As you know, it is a team of professionals, as well as the John Howard Society, who puts together the treatment counselling program.

The John Howard Society has to recruit and train their personnel. We have to recruit and get the Crown prosecutor, the defence people, the probation people, and the Victim Services people. All these people have to go into place to form a team. It really depends on when we can get them into place.

To put an exact time schedule on it might be a bit difficult at the moment. It is certainly going to take three or four months, or maybe even longer to get all that done, but as soon as we get it in place we will have it done.

**MS ROGERS:** Will the operation of the court be similar to the Family Violence Intervention Court, the pilot project?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** Yes, it will.

**MS ROGERS:** Will there be much variance?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** There will not be very much variance at all. The scope would increase a little bit. Debbie or –

**MS JACOBS:** No, the plan would be very similar at this time. We will look at it, as it is up and running, to see if we have to make any changes.

**MS ROGERS:** Also previously, I believe, it was the St. John’s Status of Women Council that delivered the empowerment and support groups, and therapy groups for the women and children. Will they be doing that again?

**MS JACOBS:** Yes, that is still the plan.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, great. The court on the West Coast, when is the anticipated opening of that?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** We hope to do it even concurrently with the St. John’s court, if at all possible. That may not be possible because some of the personnel in the St. John’s court will be used as an extension. There may be a lag



between it, but we are hoping to keep that reduced as small as possible.

**MS ROGERS:** So the West Coast location, will it be the same as St. John's, or are you planning to operate that in a different way?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** The court will be operated the same as the one in St. John's.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay. What I am specifically asking about is how much are you thinking would be video technology or video conferencing?

**MS JACOBS:** Some of it will be video conferencing, like first appearance, maybe, with the prosecutor. The offender will appear in court. Of course the on-ground services like probation, Victim Services, Legal Aid, all of that will be in person.

**MS ROGERS:** Great.

**MS JACOBS:** As much as we can we will – and John Howard of course, will be done by video conferencing.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

**MS JACOBS:** For example, like the risk assessment officer, we may only need one and that person may travel.

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MS JACOBS:** Or we may even consider some video conferencing there. It is still a little bit of a work in progress, but we are going to try to utilize some video conferencing as much as possible.

**MS ROGERS:** Of course you know that I will have a hard time not asking every now and then when this is going to happen.

Great, thank you very much.

I will pick up where Andrew left off at 1.3.01. Actually, can we go to 1.2.04, Administrative Support, Operating Accounts? That is the subtitle there.

Okay, we will go down now to 1.3.01, Fines Administration. How is it going with the collection of fines? I see that revenue there is \$700,000.

**MR. KING:** Which line item are you referring to?

**CHAIR:** Subhead 1.3.01.

**MS ROGERS:** Yes, Revenue – Provincial.

**MR. KING:** What was your question again?

**MS ROGERS:** How is this going, the collection? This is the actual fines collected, or is this money to do the collection of fines?

**MR. KING:** The revenue, the \$700,000?

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MR. KING:** That is not fine collections. That is billing from third parties.

**MS ROGERS:** All right, thank you.

That is the end of one.

**MR. KING:** Pardon?

**MS ROGERS:** You wanted to vote on one before going on?

**MR. KING:** Yes, that is the process, unless Mr. Parsons has a question.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** We all have questions on this topic, so if we could continue on.

**MS ROGERS:** Do you want to then pick up there to finish section one?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Is there an issue if we vote at the end on everything? That way there is –

**MR. KING:** What we try to do normally is not be flipping back and forth through the binder. Cover a topic, vote on it, and move on.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** The problem is that Gerry has four minutes left. I want her to use it, but that does not –

**MR. KING:** Okay, fill your boots. That is fine. No issue.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, so what did we decide? Sorry.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Keep going.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, great.

Subhead 2.1.01 is page 18.6. Under Salaries we see a considerable drop in Professional Services. Can you talk about that?

**MR. KING:** Your question is on the drop to \$1.8 million versus \$2.2 million?

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MR. KING:** Okay, so there are a couple of things there. One, an allocation was provided in the past budget for the Provincial Court judges' tribunal – \$150,000 has been removed. There is also \$286,000 removed from the access copyright file.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, thank you.

Subhead 2.1.02, Sheriff's Office, there is an increase in Salaries. Can you explain that?

**MR. KING:** Sure. Those are additional funding for Salaries as a result of following through on the external review that we completed a couple of years ago for the new positions.

**MS ROGERS:** So how many positions would that be?

**MR. KING:** There are, I believe, four new positions.

**OFFICIAL:** For this year.

**MR. KING:** For this year, yes. Four new in that dollar figure.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, and then there are plans for more in the next year?

**MR. KING:** I think this ends the report this year – is this the final year of implementation?

**OFFICIAL:** This is the last year.

**MR. KING:** I think this the last year of implementation.

**MS ROGERS:** So, does that fulfill the recommended number of new positions?

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MS ROGERS:** So it fills them all?

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

Transportation and Communications, an increase of \$80,000?

**MR. KING:** That is in the past budget year?

**MS ROGERS:** Yes, the revised.

**MR. KING:** That is increased travel. We had a number of situations where we had increased travel for provincial court duties, judges travelling, and others.

**MS ROGERS:** Why is that?

**MR. KING:** We had a vacancy of one in particular in Clarendville, a vacant judge. So there had to be travelling for other judges filling in.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

**MR. KING:** There are a couple of other costs in there too: circuit courts, increased costs; and some communications costs, increased cost for the telephones.

**MS ROGERS:** Thank you.

Purchased Services, there was a significant drop in the revised amount for last year.

**MR. KING:** The drop is related to the Leigh DesRoches review. There was funding provided last year, one time, that is not required this year.

**MS ROGERS:** Last year there it was budgeted for \$429,000, but only \$200,000 spent?

**MR. KING:** That is correct.

**MS ROGERS:** So what was that drop?  
Because if you were anticipating \$429,000 –

**MR. KING:** Pardon?

**MS ROGERS:** If you were anticipating \$429,000, but only spent \$200,000.

**MR. KING:** There were reduced jury expenses, in particular. There were eighteen juries scheduled, and only ten proceeded. So it was significant savings there.

**CHAIR:** Gerry, if I could hold you there.

**MS ROGERS:** Absolutely, yes.

**CHAIR:** If that is okay?

**MS ROGERS:** Yes, just for Purchased Services then for \$294,000, what would be some of those purchased services?

**MR. KING:** What is included in here? Debbie, do you want to speak to that one?

**MS DUNPHY:** What is included in that line object, as the minister mentioned, is administration costs for jury trials. There is also a provision for the banking fees and services for the trust account. It also covers any kind of repairs and maintenance issues.

Just to speak to the expenditures from last year as well, there was a significant amount of money allocated for security enhancements and upgrades as a result of the report. Those were carried out. All of them were carried out and some of those costs were actually a little less. That funding was only one-time funding so that is why the budget has gone down as well.

**MS ROGERS:** Were all the recommendations then for the security enhancements completed?

**MS DUNPHY:** There is one more. After this year, there is another small amount. No more positions after this year, but there is another small amount in the third year.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, great. Thank you.

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

Andrew.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Thank you.

I am going to go back to 1.2.04, Administrative Support, and it is more of a general question. I believe this is the section that deals with monies for the planning of facilities. I would assume that would include courthouses and penitentiaries. If I am wrong, you can direct me to the right section. Is there no money allotted for planning?

**MS DUNPHY:** That heading – kind of what happens, I guess, is when there is some thought to a new courthouse or a new penitentiary or whatever, we do not necessarily have a specific head for a specific project. So if there is planning money allotted we will put it in there, but it is very early in the stages.

As you go further through the book, you will see that there was a separate head for correctional facilities and court facilities. In this instance, there is no money in this account for any facilities planning at this stage for any of the projects noted.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Just so I know so I can make sure I cover it off later, which head would it be under?

**MS DUNPHY:** It would depend on the project. So if it was planning for HMP, for example, there is a separate head now. There was a separate head –

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Court facilities.

**MS DUNPHY:** – for that specific project, or if it was court; but this is very preliminary, sometimes when there is just an initial I guess exploratory stage –

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

**MS DUNPHY:** Rather than set a separate head, it would go under here.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay, thank you.

I am going to move on to 1.3.01, Fines Administration. What is the current outstanding amount for this Province for fines? I believe last

year it was in the \$37 million range, but I may be wrong.

**MS JACOBS:** That is still around the same amount.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** When I say \$37 million, I am not –

**MS JACOBS:** Not too far off, no.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** What portion of that is considered bad debt or uncollectable?

**MS JACOBS:** A fair portion of that probably is – as you know most of us, 80 per cent of us, do pay our debt and there is the 20 per cent who do not. I guess at some point what we should be doing is bringing forward more. We did not do very much this year, unfortunately, to start writing off some of this as uncollectable.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Gerry may have asked this. Under Salaries, it is a decrease from last year, I guess what was budgeted. It is an increase from what was spent. There is no new positions I assume in that section.

**MS JACOBS:** For this year a new position?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Yes.

**MS JACOBS:** No, not this year, but what happened was they did get a new position last year. They ran several vacancies and we were a while before we filled that position, and that position just got filled a couple of months ago.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** What is the title on that position?

**MS JACOBS:** It was a Clerk III position and it was to help the collection officers, kind of an admin position so that the collection officers could do their work.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

This is one of those topics where we see it all the time, it comes up in the news when you get these people – I do not mind using the word “deadbeats” – getting pulled over with \$50,000 owing and this and that. I know the Auditor General has looked at it. Has there been any

change in how we can approach it? I know Public Accounts dealt with this a while back.

**MR. KING:** I am going to ask Paul.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Perfect, thank you.

**MR. NOBLE:** This year, I guess recognizing that the kind of people, as you say, who are not interested in paying their fines, largely live off the grid. So collection officers behind computer terminals and on telephones have a hard time locating these individuals because they are kind of subterranean in their existence.

Our thinking was that there is one group of people out there who probably know who they are or where they are, and that is the police. We have undertaken a pilot project with the RNC this year, given them a list of names of – I will call – high-value targets and they are out there looking for them. They do interact with them occasionally. So when they do we are holding them in custody, bring them before a judge, and then there will be a hearing under the Criminal Code.

We have had a few of these move through. It is not going as quickly as we would like to. The judges recognize there is significant jeopardy attached to these people because they are looking at the possibility of imprisonment, so they want to make sure these folks have adequate legal representation of course.

We are really hopeful we can start zeroing in on some of these more significant scofflaws, utilizing the police in this fashion.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay, thank you.

Just moving forward there to 2.1.01, Civil Law – and I know Gerry asked a question and the minister responded about a Provincial Court judges’ tribunal and there was a savings there. Can you just elaborate on that for me because I never quite picked up on it?

**MR. NOBLE:** Which line item are you looking at?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I believe it was under Professional Services under 2.1.01, Civil Law.

**MR. NOBLE:** Okay.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** It had to do with the Provincial Court judges' tribunal, there was some savings. Is that because it was not done last year and it will be done –

**MR. NOBLE:** That is absolutely correct, yes.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

Again, I may be going off here, I apologize. I understand this year there is going to be a revamp of the rules of the Supreme Court, 1986. Is there a portion of money allotted to that; and if so, where and how much? I ask the question now so I do not forget. I have them marked down.

**MR. KING:** It is \$126,000 under the Supreme Court head here a little later.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Perfect.

**MR. KING:** Section 3.1.01.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Perfect, thank you.

Under this Civil Law, this is where sometimes government has to retain outside counsel. I assume you are anticipating me asking for a list of –

**MR. KING:** Subhead 2.2.01, you are into?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Subhead 2.1.01, Civil Law.

**MR. KING:** Sorry, Andrew, I have gone off here.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Subhead 2.1.01, appropriations for representation of government in court. Government has to go outside. How much was spent last year in outside counsel?

**MR. KING:** That would be \$2.471 million.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay. I am assuming that you have a list of the counsel that you will provide to us because it is a standard request I think every year. Is there a breakdown of that, like how many files are we talking here?

**MR. KING:** Todd.

**MR. STANLEY:** We do not actually have a number for how many files are represented in that. That external retention covers a large number of activities where we have to go get outside counsels, and that amount this year actually covers a couple of expert witnesses for some litigation that we had going on.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Is one of them still the tobacco case? I do not know if it is health care recovery or –

**MR. STANLEY:** The expenses relating to the tobacco case come out of that budget. This year, we did not have any significant expenditure on the tobacco case amongst the expenses that are there. It is just the way that the file has been going.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** It is still ongoing, it is just this year was –

**MR. STANLEY:** Yes, a slow year and slow bill on that kind of stuff.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I might ask – this might be a silly question – is that case anticipated to continue on for much longer? I believe it has been in the department now for fifteenish years.

**MR. STANLEY:** The current status right now is we spent a lot of last year waiting and looking at decisions on strictly procedural matters where the tobacco companies have been fighting us every step of the way in court. We got a decision on that, I believe it was last summer and now we are both trying to co-ordinate the next step of what it would be. I think the tobacco companies may have filed an appeal. Also, we are engaged with discussions with the other provinces that are also pursuing the same kind of litigation. It is slow, but it is still continuing.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay. I think the number I had here was \$2.471 million. There was not a lot spent in the big tobacco. Again, was there any case that was significantly large there?

**MR. STANLEY:** We had significant expenditures this year on outside counsel to help us with the pension reform. The Department of Finance chipped in to the department to help pay

for some of that, but that was our major expenditure on outside counsel this year.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

Just to confirm, so I will get a list of the breakdown of firms and amount –

**MR. STANLEY:** Yes.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I know you cannot give details, but I guess there is a file name or whatever.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Andrew. Can we park there for now?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Yes, you certainly can. Thank you. I am done with 2.1.01.

**CHAIR:** Okay.

Gerry.

**MS ROGERS:** Thank you.

I assume that any list that either Andrew and I ask for, we will both receive.

Great, thank you.

The tobacco case, exactly how much are we suing for? Do we have an amount?

**MR. STANLEY:** I do not believe we have put forward an assessment of damages yet in that file. That is one of the things that we still have people looking at and working on.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, thank you.

I am not sure if it is under this section, but the case of Kyra Rees who is going to court for the right to change her gender markers on her birth certificate, do we know how much that case is costing us?

**MR. NOBLE:** The file is being handled within the civil division, so there is no identifiable cost broken out and associated with that file.

**MS ROGERS:** Is there a budgeted amount of court time or staff time?

**MR. NOBLE:** No, it would not be tracked individually according to the file.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, thank you very much.

Perhaps under this category as well, the case of Desiree Dichmont in the Supreme Court case, and I believe that she went to the Supreme Court. Do we know how much that cost us?

**MR. NOBLE:** If I am not mistaken, there was no external counsel engaged by the department in relation to that case. So, again, it would not be any quantifiable amount associated with it.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, but there may be possibilities of, for instance, the Rees case, if they ask for their costs should they be successful in –

**MR. NOBLE:** That is correct.

**MS ROGERS:** Is there any indication where we are going with that, what is happening with that?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** That is the Rees case?

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MR. NOBLE:** Without divulging, I guess, solicitor-client privilege, we do have instructions on the file. I guess if I could be a little circumspect, but at least try to respect your question, ultimately it would be all our hope that we are not going to have to resolve this in court.

**MS ROGERS:** Great. Good, I am happy to hear that. Thank you very much.

I think I am okay now for Purchased Services. We have done that, the Sherriff's Office.

So Civil Law and Enforcement continued, 2.1.03, Support Enforcement. In 2014-2015, \$24,000 was budgeted, but \$66,000 was spent revised. What was that additional \$42,000 for?

**MR. KING:** Which head are you referring to?

**CHAIR:** Subhead 2.1.03.

**MR. KING:** Yes, which section?

**CHAIR:** Professional Services.

**MS ROGERS:** Under Salaries.

**MR. KING:** Salaries?

**MS ROGERS:** Purchased Services.

**MR. KING:** Purchased Services.

**CHAIR:** Yes.

**MR. KING:** The \$24,000 budgeted actually resulted in \$66,000 spent. It is mainly attributed to increased banking fees with trust accounts.

**MS ROGERS:** Wow, hey? That is a lot.

It is back down to \$24,000. Do you expect a drop in banking fees?

**MR. KING:** We are hopeful that we will not have as many fees.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay. Why would you not have as many fees?

**MR. KING:** We do not know, but the historical trend has been that we have not spent \$66,000. So we tried to line the budget more in line with what we have actually spent in the past.

**MS ROGERS:** You actually spent \$66,000 last year.

**MR. KING:** Right.

**MS ROGERS:** Now you have gone back down to \$24,000.

**MR. KING:** Right.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

Family Justice Services, 2.1.04, Transportation and Communications was budgeted \$75,800 and revised to \$45,800. Was there work you had anticipated to do and decided not to?

**MR. KING:** We had reduced travel requirements. Also, we put a freeze on discretionary travel. We found some savings there.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay. Would that be some of the people who are involved in counselling

mediation who did not travel? Or are they doing video conferencing?

**MR. KING:** It would have been discretionary travel. So anybody who would have been required to travel for conferences and mediation would have still travelled. This would have been discretionary.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

**MR. KING:** It could be other conferences, things like that.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay. Thank you.

**MR. KING:** To be clear, there was no freeze on travel for service delivery.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, thank you.

In Purchased Services we see a drop of \$72,000 for 2015-2016. Is there any particular reason why that has dropped?

**MS DUNPHY:** One of our budget initiatives this year, when we were looking at our accounts, was to try and reduce and make some efficiencies. One of the areas was we changed the business process in the Recalculation Office so that they are no longer using registered mail to send out notices. Now it is just regular mail so there are actual savings of about \$72,000.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay. That would be registered mail to clients, is it?

**MR. STANLEY:** Right now the regulations require registered mail to be used for a variety of notices out to clients, including notices of revised orders. We are in the process of getting that changed. We have to get the federal government's agreement on changing that due to an agreement we have. We figure that is not going to be a problem.

We are going to try to get that streamlined as much as possible to move from registered mail to just normal mail, and then hopefully from normal mail to even email for some notices, if we can, just to cut down on costs and increase efficiency.

**MS ROGERS:** What kind of notices would you have sent by registered mail and now are not going to?

**MR. STANLEY:** The Recalculation Office is the one that does recalculations of support orders.

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MR. STANLEY:** The regulations require right now that notices of your new support order, the recalculated support order, go out by registered mail. It is sort of an old practice for those kinds of things to be used. We are going to streamline and just have those sent out by regular mail and have the regulations deem a certain period of time you are just assumed to have gotten it.

**MS ROGERS:** So if somebody gets a notice in the mail of their support order, is that the way they would be notified? Or would they have been notified in another way and this is just backup?

**MR. STANLEY:** The intention is they would receive a reminder letter. Every year the way the process works is you are supposed to send in tax information to permit the recalculation.

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MR. STANLEY:** They should have received some kind of a reminder letter notifying them ahead of time that they are required to submit the information, and then they would have gotten a recalculated order.

**MS ROGERS:** Would the reminder mail have been sent by registered as well?

**MR. STANLEY:** No, I do not think the practice was to do that.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

**MR. STANLEY:** That is one of the things we are going to try to move from normal mail to an email system if we can. We are looking at sort of revitalizing this to make it more streamlined.

**MS ROGERS:** So if somebody has not received their notification and are required to up their –

what happens if they do not pay that increase because they have not gotten their letter?

**MR. STANLEY:** There is a positive obligation on people to supply the new tax information every year anyways. The reminder letter is just supposed to be to prompt you.

If you do not provide the information, there is a means where it can be deemed to have increased under the regulations. Then a new recalculation order can be issued on the deemed amount.

**MS ROGERS:** No, I was wondering, if somebody does not get the recalculation of the order because it is not coming by registered mail now, what happens then? Say you have been ordered to increase it by \$200 a month and –

**MR. STANLEY:** You never saw it.

**MS ROGERS:** – you never saw it.

**MR. STANLEY:** Eventually, I think the way the process would work is if you are not paying the proper amount, either the person who is the recipient could identify that to the court and/or to Support Enforcement. A significant portion of these orders end up in Support Enforcement, anyway, with the Province. Then those matters can be straightened out

**CHAIR:** All right Gerry, your time is expired, if you do not mind.

**MS ROGERS:** I just want to –

**MR. A. PARSONS:** It is fine by me.

**MS ROGERS:** If I can, yes.

**CHAIR:** It is okay?

Okay.

**MS ROGERS:** I am just curious, because in the end is it really a cost-saving measure? So many people are transient, particularly after dissolution of a relationship. We have constituents who talk about their mail being stolen.

**MR. STANLEY:** Well this is one of the reasons why we want to see if we can move to an



electronic delivery system for some of this stuff, if we can, because in those circumstances you have people who have multiple mailing addresses. We may see if we can change the – it requires a bit of an amendment to the rules of the court as well, to require that they provide us with an email address that they will commit to keep live.

If we provide that information through email, we do not have to physically find them, which I think will actually increase the amount of information distribution. That is moving to a new paradigm, to use a better term, from what was a very classical system where notices are sent out by registered mail. So we have some work to do just to change the regs and that kind of thing.

**MS ROGERS:** Is it being done in any other jurisdictions in the country?

**MR. STANLEY:** A number of jurisdictions have moved away, with the agreement of the feds, from registered mail.

**MS ROGERS:** Have, you said?

**MR. STANLEY:** Have, yes. So we are just following their lead on that.

I am not sure whether or not a bunch of jurisdictions have moved to fully electronic yet because it is – like I say, for lack of a better word – sort of a stuffy environment for this idea of notices of court and this kind of thing. I think most people are also trying to change the system to increase efficiencies to the greatest extent possible.

**MS ROGERS:** Great, thank you very much.

Thank you for the information.

**MR. STANLEY:** No problem.

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

Andrew.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am not going back, but you will have to correct me, I am not sure what heading it would be

under. I know back in the fall, I believe it was, that private counsel was hired to represent the HMP employees. It was Jerome Kennedy.

I am just wondering what heading that would have been under and how much. Is that relationship concluded or has there been a payment made yet?

**MR. NOBLE:** Yes, the file is concluded. I think Erin Breen was retained as well. So that would be in the earlier heading that we examined the \$2.4 million. That would be contained within that.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I am specifically interested to know how much Mr. Kennedy was paid, for obvious reasons.

**MR. NOBLE:** I cannot recall off the top of my head. It was not a significant amount, but it should be broken down in the list that we are going to provide – although, no, that is by law firm. Do you know offhand?

**MR. STANLEY:** I do not, but the total amount paid to Mr. Kennedy’s firm last year was \$3,600.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** To Roebothan?

**MR. STANLEY:** Yes.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** So they did not get paid anything for the tobacco file last year?

**MR. STANLEY:** I do not think so, no.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

Just as a general policy thing, again I understand if I am correct, the individual who is the employer retained Mr. Kennedy and then the relationship was struck where the employee’s fees would have been paid because he was employed by government.

I am just wondering how that works. Are all government employees entitled to private counsel of their choice for incidents occurred during employment?

**MR. NOBLE:** In this particular case, the employee in question retained Mr. Kennedy

directly, personally, and we agreed to underwrite the account, underwrite his billings. In that case, the employee was a member of the bargaining unit, a correctional officer, and there was an obligation under the collective agreement to provide him with counsel.

Similarly, an employee was in the management ranks and we extended the same benefit, if you would, to the management employee who, of his own accord, retained Erin Breen.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I just wonder: Does that go outside to other departments, through other collective bargaining agreements? I am just wondering if somebody in Transportation and Works has an incident –

**MR. NOBLE:** We have actually. Last year, legal advice was extended to various officials in Transportation and Works arising out of a couple of occupational health and safety investigations where there were fatalities. They were entitled to choose counsel to provide some initial representation to them.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

**MR. NOBLE:** It is a very rare occurrence, as you can appreciate.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Yes. So those matters, that specific case, those are over?

**MR. NOBLE:** Yes. In relation to the HMP –

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Yes.

**MR. NOBLE:** Yes.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

Under 2.1.03 and 2.1.04, the ones Gerry just did, Support Enforcement and Family Justice Services, under Salaries, would both increases be from the 3 per cent and step? There are no new positions or anything like that, it is just –

**MR. KING:** Salaries you said.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Salaries, yes.

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I am going to move forward to 2.2.01, Criminal Law. Under the Salaries section there is an increase there. Is that the same thing? Has there been a new Crown Attorney or is that increases, step, whatever?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** The breakdown there, from budget to revised, we were able to save \$146,000 as a result in delays in filling vacant positions last year. The budget increase is primarily the result of salary increases and adjustments.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

Just there under Transportation and Communications, there is a little jump there from what was budgeted last year which is the same as this year. There was \$375,000 spent. Was that just an accumulative thing or was there – what would make that up?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** Some of that came from additional travel for Labrador circuit courts.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay. This covers off Public Prosecutions for Crown Attorneys, so it is pretty much status quo in terms of the number of Crown Attorneys.

I understand the Crown Attorney's Office is overseeing the case with the RNC out in Corner Brook. Has there been any allotment? Will that cost us any more to have that? What is the status of that?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** I do not think so. Donovan, do you want to respond to that?

**MR. MOLLOY:** There was some delay in receiving the file from the RNC because, of course, as part of our review we would want all of the officers' testimony at the initial trial transcribed. The court will not transcribe anything unless there is an appeal. They just completed that and the file was received at my office on Friday of last week. Work will commence as soon as possible.

There should be no additional cost. It will be done in-house, most likely by me.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay, thank you.

Any timeline on when you expect your office to have that –

**MR. MOLLOY:** The DPP’s office is extremely busy. We are supervising all of the major cases throughout the Province. So it will be done as quickly as possible, but I suspect it will be at least sixty days for sure.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay, thank you.

I will move forward to Legal Aid, 2.3.01. Is there any change in the number of positions in Legal Aid? Is that still the same?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** In this year’s budget, the second phase of the recommendations, we are hiring three additional solicitors for Legal Aid.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Three solicitors. Where will they be – where are the positions?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** One is Grand Falls, one is Stephenville, and one is St. John’s.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Would this be the heading – for instance, if people are entitled to private counsel of their choice depending on the offence, is this where this heading falls under, the amount spent on private counsel?

**MR. STANLEY:** The instances where the Attorney General is required to provide private counsel to people actually occurs outside the Legal Aid funding. It is actually back in that Professional Services budget again under civil division. That budget is also used to pay for AG appointed counsel.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

Are you able to provide a list of people, I guess that breakdown of outside counsel for the last year and the cost?

**MR. STANLEY:** Well, the names of the outside firms that would have been appointed would be in the list of the total expenditures.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I believe there was an increase in the tariff for private solicitors. I think it went from – what was it?

**MR. STANLEY:** It went from a maximum of \$60 an hour to the plan in the budget is for \$135.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

Has there been any analysis done based on the last number of years’ trend toward what you think the increase will be for this year and years forward? You have a general idea. It is going to change every year, but you have a general idea of what that cost is and now you know the rate is increased. Do we know what that figure might be or an estimate?

**MR. STANLEY:** The budget increase for Legal Aid for that, we provided them with an extra, I think it was \$450,000 in the budget this year to cover off what we expect to be based on past years, what we are projecting to be their increase in cost as a rate of increasing the tariff rate.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I am just looking at the Revenue – Federal line under this heading. It is pretty big changes in the numbers there. Can somebody explain that to me? I do not know what that means.

**MR. F. COLLINS:** I will get Debbie to explain that in a minute. Before we put significant monies into Legal Aid last year, the Legal Aid administrative team had a lot of challenges trying to keep their audits up to date. The federal government owes us \$2 million a year for Legal Aid and because the audits were not up to date for previous years, we were back owed significant amounts of money.

With the investment of Legal Aid, especially appointing a new Director of Legal Services last year, we are now able to get all the audits up to date. So we are now in a position where we are able to bill the federal government and get all of our money that is owed to us.

Debbie can probably take that a little bit further.

**MS DUNPHY:** Sure.

Received the past fiscal year were actually claims from four prior fiscal years. We have increased it for this current year as well because there are still two claims outstanding, 2013-2014 and 2014-2015. We will be caught up this year.

As the minister indicated, it has been due to the amount of work put in by the team down at Legal Aid to get these outstanding claims resolved.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** You say there was a new position added to help with that. Did I mishear that?

**MR. F. COLLINS:** One of the positions added last year was an extra Director of Legal Services.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

**MR. F. COLLINS:** In addition to that, we also hired, under the first phase of the recommendations, I think it was four legal assistants. There is a new board also now appointed.

The whole administrative structure has improved significantly. As a result of that, we are able to take care of the backlog in audits and so on, which puts us in a much better position.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** If Gerry will just indulge me, I have one last question on that.

You annually get the \$2 million. So it is not more money, it is just different years based on that. That has not increased. It is just that you are getting more because you are caught up.

**MR. F. COLLINS:** Yes.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Andrew.

Gerry.

**MS ROGERS:** Thank you.

The new tariff regime, when does that come into effect for private counsel?

**MR. STANLEY:** The new tariff regime; we are expecting to get it in place in the next couple of months. It requires an amendment to the regs to bring into effect. So we have not quite got that done yet, but it is something we are working on right now.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, great.

So any private counsel, currently, will still be operating under the current rates?

**MR. STANLEY:** Yes. I do not think we are intending to make it retroactive. It will just be under the current rates until we get that done, yes.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay. What will that involve?

**MR. STANLEY:** I am sorry?

**MS ROGERS:** What will it involve in order to get to that point to be able to enact the new rates?

**MR. STANLEY:** The rates are set out in a schedule to the Legal Aid Regulations. So what we have to do is just revise that schedule. We are going to change the rates and a little bit of the structure of how they are calculated because the structure is actually a little obscure right now in how it works out. Then we just need the new regulations to be passed by Cabinet and –

**MS ROGERS:** So it is not a legislative change. It is just a regulatory –

**MR. STANLEY:** The rates are not a legislative change, no.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, great. Thank you very much.

Commissions of Inquiry, 2.3.02, so we are anticipating - Subhead 2.3.03, Office of the Chief Medical Examiner; there was a bump there from the 2014-2015 budget revised to \$462,000. That was a \$63,000 increase. What was that for?

**MR. KING:** That was extra administrative assistants for the ME's office.

**MS ROGERS:** Are those permanent positions?

**MR. KING:** No, it was temporary support that we put in this year, but the budget, you will notice for the next fiscal, reflects permanent assistants there.

**MS ROGERS:** How many positions would those be?

**MR. NOBLE:** It unfortunately has been a busy office.

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MR. NOBLE:** To reflect that, there have been some temporary administrative assistants required in his office. So we are kind of rightsizing the budget to reflect that.

As well, there is a portion of money here for a second part-time medical examiner. While he has had that for some time we are actually, as I say, rightsizing the budget to reflect that expenditure.

**MS ROGERS:** Great, thank you.

The extra administrative support; will that be a permanent position this year?

**MR. NOBLE:** Not at this time, no.

**MS ROGERS:** It is a full-time contractual?

**MR. NOBLE:** Yes, temporary.

**MS ROGERS:** Temporary.

**MR. NOBLE:** For the year.

**MS ROGERS:** One?

**MR. NOBLE:** Yes.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, thank you.

In subhead 2.3.04, Human Rights, we had \$689,000 in 2014-2015 budgeted. The revised amount – there was a drop by \$135,000.

**MR. KING:** That is correct

**MS ROGERS:** What was cut? Why was that amount not spent?

**MR. KING:** There were some delays in filling vacancies over there.

**MS ROGERS:** What vacancies were there? Do you know?

**MR. NOBLE:** There was a solicitor's position and an intake worker.

**MS ROGERS:** Have those positions been filled?

**MR. NOBLE:** Certainly one has for sure. I believe the other one is very close to being filled. I will ask Todd Stanley to provide the details.

**MR. STANLEY:** The intake worker position is, I think, on the verge of being filled, if not has been filled in the last week or so.

**MS ROGERS:** The solicitor's position?

**MR. STANLEY:** The solicitor's position was filled, I believe, in January.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, great. Thank you very much.

Is there a delay or a wait-list for cases at the Human Rights Commission now? Do you know from intake to actually – how are they doing?

**MR. STANLEY:** The Commission had some challenges in moving files through their system. I do not have any numbers on a wait-list or the number of files in place or anything, but they have been working to change their processes to move to far more of a front-loaded, I should say, mediation service, as opposed to a formal investigation process. They are moving that way in an attempt to try to eliminate as many files as they can upfront and get them resolved more quickly.

So it has been recognized that there is a problem with the amount of time that the files are taking at the Human Rights Commission. They are actively involved in trying to change their processes to get more people through and satisfied with the resolution more quickly.

**MS ROGERS:** How come there is such a backlog?

**MR. STANLEY:** The backlog is partially a result of their process. The Legal Aid Commission's traditional processes have been very investigation oriented, a complaint comes through and there is a full investigation and report done.

That process is just time consuming. As you can see, we added more resources last year to help, but it has been part of a partially processed piece. The idea of how they have been doing files they have gone back and looked at, because they realize that it would be more beneficial to everybody if files could be mediated between people more quickly. That is where they are trying to move to now to resolve that problem.

**MS ROGERS:** They would do the mediation themselves?

**MR. STANLEY:** Yes.

**MS ROGERS:** Then if they cannot come to an agreement –

**MR. STANLEY:** If the mediation fails, then it would go through their more formal process. That is their hope, to move to a model like that.

**MS ROGERS:** Do you have any concern at all that they are understaffed, under resourced, that it would affect outcomes in cases and our human rights legislation?

I do not mean to put you on the spot there. I am hearing that there is a problem from people needing to hear back.

**MR. KING:** I think no matter what part of our department or any department you deal with, you are going to hear complaints from people. Some are legitimate and some are not. That is just the nature of what we do, but our focus in the department is to try to maximize the resources that we have, the budget allocation and the human resources. We are confident and comfortable that what we have at that Human Rights Commission is able to do the job and meet the legislative requirements. We will continue to make sure that we focus on that.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, great. Thank you.

Office of the Public Trustee, we see an increase in the Salaries line there. Can you explain that?

**MR. KING:** Sure. There are two additional temporary estate officer positions, as well as salary increases and step increases.

**MS ROGERS:** Two additional –

**MR. KING:** Estate officer positions.

**MS ROGERS:** They are temporary?

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MS ROGERS:** Is it because there is a big lump this year, or is the amount to work that they are dealing with going to be the same next year? How come they are temporary?

**MR. KING:** It is not unusual for government, when we put new positions in, to make them temporary until we see how they work out and how the workload works out.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

Transportation and Communications, there is a bit of an increase there for 2015-2016.

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MS ROGERS:** Anything in particular?

**MR. KING:** That is a result of two new employees going to work. So we added appropriate fees in appropriate headings to support them.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, thank you.

Purchased Services, an increase there, is there any specific reason for that?

**MR. KING:** That is for professional audit fees.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

Revenue – Provincial, can you explain that a little bit? We see a variance from the budgeted amount for 2014 then the revised for this year.

**MR. KING:** The revenue there from the Office of the Public Trustee, obviously, is where they settle estates.

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MR. KING:** We project from year to year – it is hard to know because there are years when we can settle a lot of accounts and realize a lot of revenue. So last year we projected \$320,000. They actually settled enough accounts that it came in at \$682,400.

The estimate for next year, again trying to be modest based on historic trends, so we put it at \$400,000.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, great.

Thank you.

**CHAIR:** Andrew.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I am going to stay on the Public Trustee while we are there. The two new positions are temporary. What are they six months or –

**MR. KING:** No, a full year.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Full year, okay.

It is my understanding that one of the issues with these jobs is that there is learning curve associated with it and that you need some time in the job to really become effective at it. So is there some thought to, if these people do not stick around – it is one thing to come in and not like it – if we do not keep them on, we are not getting the full value out of it because there is a learning process to this type of work?

**MR. KING:** Our goal, as a department, would be to make those positions permanent, but given the fiscal climate we are in this year, we are very lucky to have secured two new positions in light of what is happening elsewhere.

We will certainly advocate, as we did in the budget process, to make these positions permanent, recognizing the value of what they do because when they settle estates there are two positive outcomes. Obviously, there is some revenue generated for government, but there are

also families out there who finally get to put things behind them and move forward.

We recognize the value of the positions. It would be our goal to secure those on a permanent basis.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I am fully in agreement with that. In fact, I have tried to advocate for that as well because it is one of the few areas where it is a revenue generator and I think there is money there to be made. In fact, I think there is more there to be made because I do get the complaints even now. I used to get them before and I get them now where people are not happy with the length of time that it takes to get an estate done.

**MR. KING:** Sure.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** So anything that is going to increase that and bring more money in, and I think it comes back to the point the AG made – and maybe this could be applied to Fines Administration. I know I am meandering off here, but under Legal Aid you brought in a director and you have those audits done, that is more revenue. This is an area where there are new jobs so hopefully there is more revenue. Maybe there is some thought to in certain areas increased employees means they will actually make up what they take back in.

I have to go back, just for a second, 2.3.03, Office of the Chief Medical Examiner. I think Gerry asked about this. Again, this is the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, which is responsible to the minister including the reporting of all deaths.

I am going to go to the case that we dealt with recently, Mr. Dunphy. Have you received any indication from the CME when he should expect to report to you on that?

**MR. KING:** No, I have not. I have not had any communication whatsoever.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Is it one of those situations where you would check in after a period of time to see the timeline or –

**MR. KING:** In all the time I have spent in Justice, I have never had a conversation with the

ME around that. I always just wait and let the report take its course until he is ready to submit it.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** You have not gone to him and he has not gone to you.

**MR. KING:** No.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I am going to move forward just under 2.3.06, Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission. I am going to make a wild guess that the increases in that have to do with this bill that we debated. Is that a fair guess?

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay. I am not going to belabour that. That is something that will come up again at another junction. Given the time is starting to go, I want to move forward. So I may come back to that.

I am going to move forward to 3.1.01, Supreme Court. Under the Salaries section there is an increase. Is this positions or step/salary?

**MR. KING:** It is a combination of all. There is an additional position for the Court of Appeal and also step increases and the 3 per cent salary increase.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** What is the position at the Court of Appeal?

**MR. KING:** Court Officer.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Court Officer. Okay.

Under Purchased Services there was a significant amount budgeted last year and just about half of it spent, and that is what the budget is this year. What is the change there and what you do not need? It looks like it is ongoing.

**MR. KING:** There were initial plans to have an outsourcing of transcription services. That did not go ahead. So there is a savings of \$152,600 there. The one-time money that we had put in there of \$150,000 for that project, we now removed that in the out years.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** So that is still done in-house. That is the plan.

Is this where you would find – maybe I am in the wrong spot. The courthouse out in Corner Brook, which I guess is the Supreme Court/Provincial Court, where would the budget be for the repairs to that building? We hear about different issues with the building whether it is the roof or whatnot.

**MR. KING:** Heather.

**MS JACOBS:** Usually that money is found in Transportation and Works. They would give us an allocation of money for different areas.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Was there any money spent on repairs or renovations to that building last year?

**MS JACOBS:** On the courthouse in Corner Brook or St. John's?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Yes, Corner Brook.

**MS JACOBS:** In Corner Brook I believe there was because they were doing the roof, but I am not sure the exact figure.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Redoing the roof?

**MS JACOBS:** Well, fixing it.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Now you know where I am going.

We have heard a lot about that roof. It is a new building and the roof continually has issues. So my question is simple, and I know this might be outside, this might be Transportation: what is going on? That might be a question better suited for the minister. I have heard rumours of what is wrong. I guess it is a slate roof?

**MS JACOBS:** The slate has been removed as far, as I understand, and they were putting the shingles on.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I guess maybe what we could do – because you might not have it – we will need to send a letter



to the minister saying: what was spent on the new courthouse to repair it this year?

**MR. KING:** The Minister of TW would (inaudible).

**MR. F. COLLINS:** That would be Transportation and Works.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay, that is fair.

**MR. KING:** To be frank, we do not engage in any of that kind of discussion. If we have an issue, TW manages the building. Our role is simply the provision of justice services in the building. We would not even necessarily be briefed on what they are doing out there.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Would TW have paid – there was a renaming ceremony, so now it is the Danny Williams Building. There was a ceremony out there, there is a new sign up on the side, and there would have been pictures and all that. Who would have paid for the ceremony?

**MR. KING:** I am not sure. Paid for it; what do you mean? Like the plaque and that you mean?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Well, there was a ceremony in the courthouse, so there would have been the little do, and there is the picture. There is all that stuff that goes into it for the renaming and the name on the side. I am just wondering what the cost was to rename that building the Danny Williams Building.

**MR. KING:** The actual sign was TW.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** TW, okay. How about everything else? There was a ceremony. I am assuming there is a cost associated.

**MR. KING:** I imagine it was us. We can check it out for you, if you want.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

**MR. KING:** So you are wondering if we paid for refreshments, or music, or microphones. Is that what you are getting at, those kinds of costs?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Yes, there would have been a cost, like any ceremony for anything. I

think there may have been a painting commissioned and stuff like that. I would just like to have an idea of what that cost.

**MR. KING:** Okay, we will follow up for you.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Thank you.

Maybe I am wrong, but I asked earlier about the two new courthouses. One is in Stephenville, which would fall under provincial. The new courthouse that was announced for St. John's back in the fall, the planning, there was an RFP, I believe, that was supposed to be issued. This was on November 6th. Where are we on that? Did that RFP go out?

**MR. KING:** I am just checking. The section, actually, you are referring to would be 3.3.01.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Subhead 3.3.01.

**MR. KING:** Court Facilities.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Oh yes, okay.

Maybe what I will do is wait until I get there, which could be shortly. No, I am going to go right there and I might have to come back to provincial. There was the announcement down in courtroom 7 on the new courthouse in St. John's. My understanding is that an RFP was to be issued in what was in the coming weeks.

**MR. KING:** Yes. The RFP was issued and we, obviously, received feedback from that. Government has taken a decision at this point that we are going to delay moving forward with anything further in that process.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay. I understand that the wording on it is: paused until fiscal situation improves. I might be going outside of what we are supposed to be doing here. I know right now it is May 11 or 12 and this was November 6 and we get into the price of oil.

I appreciate the fact that you were not the minister at the time, that it was the previous minister and the Premier, but wouldn't there have been some thought that the situation was the same back then? The price of oil was not that different back then than it is now. There

was a big announcement made and now it is paused.

**MR. KING:** It is probably an appropriate question for the Premier in Question Period.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Fair enough.

Right now, that courthouse is effectively on hold for an indefinite period and there is no planning. There is no money being spent this year from planning, no money allotted.

**MR. KING:** No. The only money that might be spent – actually no, there is no money in there. If there were any outstanding bills we would settle that, but in this case there is not.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I apologize, Gerry. What was spent for that to date on that courthouse, whether it was the announcement or the putting out of an RFP? It probably was a minimal amount.

**MR. KING:** Yes. There would have only been internal costs in terms of the paperwork because we did not proceed with the RFP at all.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Excellent.

Thank you.

**CHAIR:** Is it the wish of this Committee to take a five minute break for the people downstairs.

**MS ROGERS:** Sure.

**MR. KING:** Grab a quick coffee.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Not a problem.

**CHAIR:** Okay, we will pause for five minutes or so.

Thank you.

### Recess

**MR. KING:** Are we good to go? Is your mic on?

**MS ROGERS:** Not yet.

**MR. KING:** A mic for Gerry? Somebody is watching.

**MS ROGERS:** There we go. Thank you very, very much.

For Provincial Court –

**MR. F. COLLINS:** Gerry, the reason why we request that is some of the people here might have a hearing problem in the back (inaudible).

**MS ROGERS:** It would not be you. I know you are fine there. So am I, Felix; can hear a pin drop.

Subhead 3.2.01, Provincial Court, we have a bump of over \$500,000. Can you tell us what that is?

**MR. KING:** Sure. It is a combination of salary increases, step increases. As well there is salary there for a new judge for Clarendville. There is salary for a court officer in Harbour Grace, a court officer in St. John's, and a transcriptionist for St. John's.

**MS ROGERS:** Those are permanent positions?

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MS ROGERS:** Has a judge been chosen yet for Clarendville?

**MR. KING:** No.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

**MR. KING:** Are you interested?

**MS ROGERS:** I cannot imagine a more difficult job, a job more difficult than yours Darin, as a judge. I just cannot imagine it. Thank God there are people willing to do it.

**MR. KING:** There is a process, in all seriousness, outside of government. The Chief Judge of the Province initiates a process, solicits applications for interested parties and a short list is developed and forwarded to the minister. The minister then would select the person, but you select it from a list provided, just to clarify, by the Provincial Court judge. So, you need to talk to him.

**MS ROGERS:** It is a difficult job of being a judge and you have the difficult job of choosing who that judge might be, in the best interest of the people.

**MR. KING:** Correct.

**MS ROGERS:** Yes, people who do that work, thank God there are those who are willing to do it.

**MR. F. COLLINS:** For your information, Gerry, the provincial judges who have been appointed in the last seven or eight years, two-thirds of them at least have been women.

**MS ROGERS:** I have been counting, Felix, thank you. That is good news. I think that you should take some credit for that. That is great, but I do count. Thank you very much.

I think we can move on. There was talk of drug court. Was that promised in the last election? Is there any talk of a drug court?

**MR. KING:** Yes, there was a commitment made in the last election, as part of our platform, to explore the implementation of a drug court. We have not followed through on that direction at this point in time. We have been giving it careful consideration; but, as you would recognize from the Budget, there are other issues that took priority for us in securing funds for positions like the Provincial Court and the Domestic Violence Court. Given the climate we are in, fiscally, it is difficult to secure much more than we did in the Budget for Justice and Public Safety.

**MS ROGERS:** I was in Corner Brook yesterday for the All-Party Committee on Mental Health and heard testimonies from families who have adult children with severe and persistent mental health issues, particularly adult children who have been diagnosed with schizophrenia or bipolar, and this incredible suffering that these families are going through.

The Mental Health Court, how is it doing here, and is there any way to be able to extend its reach beyond St. John's?

**MR. KING:** Do you want to speak to that?

**MR. NOBLE:** In relation to the operation of the Mental Health Court here in St. John's, I am going to ask the Director of Public Prosecutions to give us an update on that. Then, the second part of the question, I think might be appropriate for the minister to address.

Thanks.

**MS ROGERS:** Thank you.

**MR. MOLLOY:** I think the experiences are largely positive in the Mental Health Court and the outcomes are positive as well. I do not know if anybody has kept any data with respect to the recidivism rates, but it does require a lot of intensive work. So it is not easily shipped to any other jurisdiction, because it requires a certain level of community supports, health care providers and things like that. We have always had the sense that it was going well, but I am unable to comment sort of on its transportability to another location.

**MS ROGERS:** Thank you.

Any thought of anything in other parts of the Province? We know that our correctional facilities have become our new asylums and that the majority of our inmates have probably persistent mental health issues or addictions issues. Do you have any thoughts?

**MR. KING:** Yes, we have certainly given it thought, but we have no plans at this point to move forward.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, thank you.

The Mental Health Court is not in a pilot position is it; it is a permanent court?

**MR. KING:** That is correct.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, great.

The resourcing of the court, in terms of its caseload, are there wait-lists? Are they able to keep up with the demand?

**MR. MOLLOY:** I guess anecdotally I have always been of the understanding – because there are no extra funds involved for the Mental

Health Court. If I recall correctly, that might have been a project of Judge Orr –

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MR. MOLLOY:** – who initiated it. We worked together for some time to come up with the framework and the parameters, but we have never devoted extra resources to it in the sense of hiring a prosecutor specifically for Mental Health Court. I have not heard any issues with respect to resources, or more particularly to your question, any concerns about lack of resources.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

So then folks who have persistent addictions issues, are they able to go through the Mental Health Court if they do not have a specific mental health diagnosis or –

**MR. MOLLOY:** It has been some time since I read the protocols, but my recollection is that absent a – also having a mental illness that you would not be eligible if you did not have a persistent and continuing mental illness that was seen as contributing to your difficulties in sort of living in the community.

We often see those in conjunction with drug treatment. So someone who has a mental health issue and a drug addiction issue, I am assuming, would get help for both as part of their treatment paradigm.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, thank you very much.

Police Protection, 4.1.01, Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, under Salaries we see an increase of \$2 million. Can you tell us a bit about that?

**CHAIR:** Subhead 4.1.01.

**MR. KING:** Subhead 4.1.01.

**MS ROGERS:** Yes, and an increase of \$2 million.

**MR. F. COLLINS:** The RNC?

**CHAIR:** The RNC.

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MR. KING:** The salary increases can be attributed to increased budget for overtime, as well as the creation of ten new officer positions.

**MS ROGERS:** How much of it is overtime?

**MR. KING:** I do not have the breakdown here for that. Do you have it?

**OFFICIAL:** A million dollars.

**MR. KING:** It is \$1 million.

**MS ROGERS:** Mr. Chair, \$1 million in overtime. That is projected for 2015-2016?

**MR. KING:** Correct.

**MS DUNPHY:** There is an increase of \$1 million –

**MS ROGERS:** Right.

**MS DUNPHY:** – added to the budget for overtime.

**MS ROGERS:** For overtime. Why is that?

**MR. NOBLE:** There has been an increase in violent crimes in St. John's, the Northeast Avalon, particularly shootings. For the most part, this has been largely directed by rival gang members towards each other. Obviously there is a huge public safety concern and risk associated with that. Each one of these shootings has to be investigated by a major case management team.

These are complex investigations utilizing a whole range of investigative techniques. Frankly, they are very expensive investigations, and most of that kind of work is done outside of the normal day-to-day business hours that most of us maintain.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, I guess you have to use the specifically trained officers to do that work?

**MR. NOBLE:** Yes, these are the largely specialized positions.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

**MR. NOBLE:** There is a lot of surveillance involved in these kinds of investigations. The

surveillance can run for many, many hours in the course of any given day.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

**CHAIR:** Okay, Gerry, your time has expired, if you do not mind. Or Andrew, are you –

**MS ROGERS:** Can I just ask about the ten new officers?

The ten new officers positions; are those general officers or are they for a specific unit?

**MR. KING:** No. Well they all come in as recruits, of course.

**MS ROGERS:** Right.

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, so it is not ten new specialized positions?

**MR. KING:** Normally new recruits come in as patrol.

**MS ROGERS:** Right.

**MR. KING:** From there, they develop a specialty or do further training.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, great.

Thank you.

**CHAIR:** Thank you.

Andrew.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Thank you.

I am going to go back to 3.2.01, Provincial Court, just for a second. Gerry brought this up. It is more a general question. I am going to imagine that Judge Pike is happy that there is a new position. Is there any timeline on when this judge will be appointed and placed in the Clarendville courtroom?

**MR. KING:** Well I have given direction for him to proceed. I gave the direction several weeks ago so it is in his court now.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

**MR. KING:** We will fill it as soon as we get a list submitted to us. The chief judge has to go through the process, I guess, of soliciting resumes, expressions of interest, and so on. You are probably more familiar with that process than I am.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I am sure there is a list that has been sitting there and they will go through the listing.

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I am just wondering – I looked at last year's Estimates. Back then Jim Bennett was the critic. He asked how many judges were there and the answer was twenty-three. Jim asked the question: Is that a full complement? The answer was yes. I am just wondering – that was last year in the Estimates. Now there is a new judge appointed so it was not a full complement last year? Was this sort of not planned?

**MR. KING:** At the time, twenty-three was the full complement. There was some consideration, some direction taken actually that we thought there would be an elimination of one position, not from Clarendville, but from another part of the Province. Based on historical patterns of busyness in the courthouse shall I say or put it that way, it looked like we could remove a position upon a retirement. That did not happen.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

**MR. KING:** We did not want to be perceived to be messing with the judicial system, so we simply put the money back to reinstate the judge in Clarendville and not take the one out of the other part of the Province that we were considering.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** This retirement that was thought would happen, is that not on? When is the next judge scheduled to retire? Are there any timelines on that?

**MR. KING:** First of all, that one did not happen. You are right. I think that individual could retire at any point in time.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay. If that retirement did happen the plan is to fill that position now?

**MR. KING:** Correct.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay. This is more of a general question, it is about policy, but it does fall under Provincial Court. It was not that long ago that Chief Judge Pike had an article in the paper about changing procedure at the courtroom when it came to first appearances; everybody would show up and then everything would be pushed back a year.

I do not know if the AG wants to talk about this or even the Director of Public Prosecutions. Is that going to happen? I think it is a case of all first appearances will be set over for a year. There was a story on that. That is of interest to the entire legal community and to people who are charged. I am just wondering if that is going to happen.

**MR. MOLLOY:** The short answer, Mr. Parsons, is that nobody knows. The idea was brought up about two years ago by Chief Judge Pike in a meeting of the criminal justice committee which was formed after the Lamer Inquiry. Prosecutions, PPSC, and Legal Aid wrote a joint letter raising concerns about the plan. My understanding is the RCMP, RNC, and maybe some other stakeholders sent a similar letter with concerns about the plan.

We advised that if the court was not prepared to consider any other plan that we would work with them to make the best of it in the circumstances. We never received any reply to those entreaties. In fact, after the recent meetings some of the internal stakeholder meetings that we had were cancelled by the court.

We are at a point now where we have no communication from the court as to whether or not they intend to go with that plan or any other plan. That is something you would have to address to Chief Judge Pike.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay, I appreciate that, thank you.

That may be something that will be brought up because that would be a significant change to procedure. I am sure there will be some

concerns by different counsel on both sides as to how that would all work. I appreciate your answer there.

I am going to go back to Court Facilities, 3.3.01. I asked about the St. John's court. I want to go to the Stephenville court that was announced last year. That one, I believe there was an RFP on. I think there was a company – and I cannot remember the acronym, KMA or something.

Can somebody give me an update on the status of where – I assume the Stephenville court is on pause. I am just wondering about the status of that court.

**MR. NOBLE:** Yes, the RFP was actually awarded. I do believe there was a functional program provided, or some options around various functional programs, similar to the St. John's courthouse complex. That project is being deferred.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I think \$70,000 was the RFP?

**MR. NOBLE:** Yes, I do not recall off the top of my head what it was. It sounds about right.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** The contract was awarded. The company got it. They have provided the plan to government so they have fulfilled their end of the bargain.

**MR. NOBLE:** Correct.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Now we just sit and wait, and hopefully the plan is still useful whenever that –

**MR. NOBLE:** Correct.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay, until oil goes back up.

**OFFICIAL:** Or we strike gold.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Or we strike gold. Okay.

So that is the two courthouses. Are there any other renovations to courthouses, court facilities that I am not aware of?

**MR. NOBLE:** Security enhancements to the Trial Division, Supreme Court, on Duckworth Street. Last year those enhancements were undertaken in the courthouse in Corner Brook and the Family Division on King's Bridge Road.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay. Thank you.

I am going to skip forward to 4.1.02, RCMP. Under Professional Services there is a significant increase there. I am wondering does that relate to the detachments, I believe, that were announced in the Budget. There were three, I think. Can you give me a breakdown of that?

**MR. KING:** Sure. It basically covers \$3.5 million for their major capital program and \$1.4 million for current service level adjustments. That relates to cadets, recruiting, and other costs.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** So when you say service level adjustments and there is more money, does that mean we have more RCMP?

**MR. KING:** No. Debbie, maybe you can give us some more detail on that.

**MS DUNPHY:** They are costs related to general increases for EI and CPP that the employer has to pay. Also, there was a change in how the Province is billed for the cadets recruiting and police dog services.

There are some other general increases as well relating to the service delivery of the provincial prisoners; some increases for biology casework; and, of course, as you mentioned, the major capital.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

When you say new detachments because I am not familiar – that is actual new detachments. Is there a detachment there, the three new places?

**MR. KING:** In some cases it is replacing an old facility, so it already exists.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay, so it is actual physical construction of new –

**MR. KING:** Yes, in other cases, it is remodeling and refurbishing what is there.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I am going to move forward to 4.1.04, that is Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, Capital. I am just wondering, there is a significant decrease there in Purchased Services. Did that have to do with the fact that the new building is done so there is less needed? It has gone from \$9.7 million down to \$2.3 million.

**MR. KING:** That is correct. That is related to cash flow for the renovations.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** So the Purchased Services for – and this falls under appropriations for planning and construction and extension and redevelopment. So given that is a new building, that \$2.3 million, how will that be spent?

**MS JACOBS:** It is to complete the construction of the annex.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I do not want to start a new heading, so I will go right back to Gerry's side.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Andrew.

Gerry.

**MS ROGERS:** Thank you, Andrew.

Subhead 4.1.01, under Salaries, Purchased Services, we see an increase of \$400,000. What is that for?

**MR. KING:** Subhead 4.1.01, RNC?

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MR. KING:** There are a number of things build in there: \$423,000 is to address current operating pressures; \$500,000 towards vehicle maintenance.

**MS ROGERS:** What does that mean, to address operating pressures?

**OFFICIAL:** Debbie, could you provide the details on that for me, please?

**MS DUNPHY:** Sure. The vehicle fleet for the RNC obviously takes a toll. They are pretty

much running twenty-four hours a day. We have had some struggles in recent years with the budget that has been provided for vehicle maintenance. So the main increase here relates to additional funding to assist with keeping the vehicles in top-running condition.

There was also some additional funding for the AVLs, the Automatic Vehicle Locators, that were provided last year. There is an annual fee so we have provided some funding for that.

This is offset by – last year we added in \$125,000 for expenses relating to mental health initiatives. We had funding from the Bell Pioneers. That was only a one-time thing. That has been removed and that is why the difference of \$423,000.

**MS ROGERS:** The \$423,000 operating pressures is about vehicles as well?

**MS DUNPHY:** That is vehicle maintenance, yes.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

What was the mental health initiative?

**MS DUNPHY:** I do not have the details, but the Bell Pioneers provided \$250,000 over two years. It is basically for mental health first aid. The cost was to train the first responders, as well to be trainers to provide it to employees and other officers to assist them in identifying mental health issues.

**MS ROGERS:** Do we know how many officers were trained?

**MS DUNPHY:** I do not have that information.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay. It is a great program. It is really a great program.

What is happening with the RNC, RCMP joint –

**MR. KING:** Combined forces.

**MS ROGERS:** – anti-violence thing for women. I had it written down there somewhere – intimate partners program.

**MR. KING:** Can you be more specific? What do you mean when you say what is happening?

**MS ROGERS:** That was announced last year as the initiative instead of the Family Violence Intervention Court so I am just wondering – I had it written down here. Where did I put it? Okay, here we go. What is the plan for the joint RCMP, RNC project on intimate partner violence, how about that?

**MR. KING:** Sure. It is a very vague question to say: What is the plan? We announced last year we are putting more human resources into that model of providing supports, and we have done that. Both forces are working towards that end to move that initiative forward, to train their officers, and spread the expertise throughout the force.

**MS ROGERS:** Is the main focus of this project to train officers?

**MR. KING:** I think there is a dual focus there. There is a professional development aspect to it, obviously, for officers in both forces and reaching out to clients. As we have debated many times in the House, the difference between that and the Domestic Violence Court is the Domestic Violence Court is designed to try and intervene after something happens. This one is intended to locate possible perpetrators of a domestic crime and intervene beforehand.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, thank you very much.

Corrections and Community Services, 4.2.01.

**CHAIR:** Subhead 4.2.01.

**MS ROGERS:** On Salaries in 2014-2015 the budget was \$25.8 million. The revised was \$28 million. Can you tell me what that revision was for?

**MR. KING:** Sure. There are actually a variety of factors. There is increased overtime and increased shift differential costs. We had some accommodations for employees with medical and other challenges that we had to accommodate. We also had a high number of retirements, which required severance and leave payout, just about a half million dollars, and



there were signing bonus payouts for correctional officers of a little over \$300,000.

**MS ROGERS:** So have we lost positions then of correction officers?

**MR. KING:** No.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

Can we have a list of overtime? How much money specifically was spent on overtime and in which facilities?

**MR. KING:** For all corrections in the Province?

**MS ROGERS:** For the correctional facilities.

**MR. KING:** Sure.

**MS ROGERS:** Thank you.

Supplies, there is an increase of a little over \$100,000.

**MR. KING:** Sorry, an increase of a little over \$100,000?

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MR. KING:** That is to provide for new clothing for inmates.

**MS ROGERS:** Oh, the uniforms. Where will the uniforms be used? Is it just HMP or is it in all the correctional facilities?

**MR. NOBLE:** Right now it is just HMP.

**MS ROGERS:** Just HMP. Have the other facilities been asking for it?

**MR. NOBLE:** No. As a matter of fact, there has not been a single seizure of contraband in any other facility in the Province, other than HMP.

**MS ROGERS:** Even storing people's clothes and going through it has been hard, hey?

**MR. NOBLE:** For HMP?

**MS ROGERS:** Yes.

**MR. NOBLE:** Yes.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, so just HMP. Thank you.

Purchased Services, we saw an increase in 2014-2015 from the original amount budgeted.

**MR. KING:** Yes, that is for the increased catering cost contracts.

**MS ROGERS:** For any particular facility or –

**MR. KING:** All facilities. To be clear, there are also some camera upgrades as well for facilities. They are a small amount but –

**MS ROGERS:** Surveillance cameras?

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, thank you.

We see a bit of a bump in revenue from the Revenue – Federal. Have we been housing more federal inmates?

**MR. KING:** That is a result of the victims fines surcharge was higher than we budgeted.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

**MR. KING:** Sorry, am I on the wrong one? Revenue – Federal, sorry, Gerry. That is a result of a retroactive payment from the federal government for an adjustment to the per diems.

**MS ROGERS:** Do we have an increase in the number of federal inmates that we have?

**MR. NOBLE:** We have an overall increase in both populations, provincial and federal.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, great.

Subhead 4.2.02, Youth Secure Custody. We know that it was deemed that we no longer needed Whitbourne, that it was not providing an efficient service, that there were very few youth that were remanded to Whitbourne. So what is the plan for it now?

**MR. KING:** Maybe you could clarify – I am not sure who deemed that we no longer need it.

**MS ROGERS:** It was the Whitbourne facility – here we go, I have it right here.

**MR. KING:** That was not our party policy. I am not sure where that came from.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, so the minister had not noted that the facility had outlived its usefulness because of declining numbers of inmates.

**MR. KING:** Yes, but there is a difference between that statement and saying that it is no longer required. The facility –

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, why don't we talk about then has it outlived its usefulness because of the declining number of inmates?

**MR. KING:** What are you quoting there? Just give me the background context?

**MS ROGERS:** Ivan.

**MR. MORGAN:** It was quoted from the minister two years ago.

**MS ROGERS:** Oh, it was quoted from the minister from two years ago, from our current minister –

**MR. MORGAN:** In Committee.

**MS ROGERS:** – in Committee.

**MR. KING:** In Committee discussing the cutbacks? I am just asking for the context of the quote.

**MS ROGERS:** Yes, I am going to get that for you.

**MR. MORGAN:** Discussing Whitbourne.

**MS ROGERS:** Discussing Whitbourne.

**MR. KING:** So, as I said then, I will say again today, the facility as it was being staffed and run had outlived its usefulness.

**MS ROGERS:** I remember this conversation now, yes.

**MR. KING:** Right. I never ever said that there was no need for the facility.

**MS ROGERS:** Right.

**MR. KING:** We absolutely have a need for the facility, for a facility.

**MS ROGERS:** That is right.

**MR. KING:** I think the long-term plan would be that we are probably going to try and find alternate arrangements for Youth Secure Custody. We have a huge facility out there now that is not even close to capacity. Back to the discussion you raised there at the time, the reason for that discussion was that we significantly reduced the staffing levels out there. I mean, we were staffing at one point almost three staff for every single youth that we had there.

**MS ROGERS:** I know, yes.

So, where are you at now with a plan of looking at an alternative to that facility?

**MR. KING:** We are not actively planning for a replacement of that facility at this point in time. Within officials, I am sure it is constantly being discussed, as most aspects of Justice would be. From time to time they will bring things to my attention for discussion; but, from government's perspective, we have more than enough to handle in Justice right now.

This year, we are back now with the new Domestic Violence Court. We are looking at three locations. That is a significant project to take on. We have challenges now around some delayed infrastructure that we are going to have to turn our attention to. I suspect we will turn our attention back to that; but, as we speak, today we are not focused on replacing that facility.

**CHAIR:** Okay, Gerry, I have to stop you there because you have gone into double overtime.

**MS ROGERS:** Thank you.

**CHAIR:** Andrew.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Let's hope tonight does go to double overtime.

I am going to stick with Youth Secure Custody just for a second. There has been no change in positions out there. I assume that increase is benefits, salary, or whatever.

**MR. KING:** Salary raises, that is correct.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

How many are currently in custody at that facility? I know it may be hard on a day-to-day basis.

**MR. NOBLE:** It typically ranges between ten and fourteen. I think that would be the normal range.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Again, you mention the size of it. What is the capacity? How many could you house?

**MR. NOBLE:** I think it is around sixty.

**MR. KING:** Sixty or sixty-five, something like that.

**MR. F. COLLINS:** (inaudible) almost twenty each.

**MR. KING:** It is sixty.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I am not sure, Gerry may have asked this. If so, I apologize. Under Professional Services it went from \$491,000 budgeted to \$351,000 spent and then \$301,000 budgeted this year. There is a decrease there. What does that account for?

**MR. KING:** The \$140,000 variance there was a redistribution of funds to reflect our actual expenditures relating to the intensive rehabilitative custody supervision.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Can I get a bit of a clarification on that?

**MR. KING:** Debbie will provide some detail to you.

**MS DUNPHY:** I am sorry, Andrew, I missed your question.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** The \$140,000 decrease in Professional Services was for a reallocation of funds that had to do with intensive rehabilitation, so I am just wondering how that –

**MS DUNPHY:** It is actually a program that is funded by the federal government. To answer the second part of your question, that is why there was a decrease. We had some increased funding one time. The way, I guess, the money is expended, some of it is on counselling but some of it may be to purchase supplies, or to purchase textbooks. It is kind of just an accounting exercise of moving it from Professional Services up to Supplies, down to Professional, that sort of thing.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I am going to go back up to 4.2.01, Adult Corrections. I know there is \$100,000 for the uniforms, which again is something that I have mentioned in the past in meetings. When is that program going to start? When will you see the changeover?

**MR. KING:** We can inquire for you through HMP, but we do not know exactly what the timelines will be. The money is appropriated so they are free to go –

**MR. A. PARSONS:** It is up to them.

**MR. KING:** Yes. We can get an update for you on that.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Thank you.

I am going to turn to 4.2.03, Correctional Facilities. Obviously, the big question there is Her Majesty's. We know that in November 2013 it was announced that it is going to be proceeding and the initial design phase is well underway.

Can we get a status update on that? It does not look like there is any – I do not know if there is any money planned for it or how this all works. There is \$300,000 here under Purchased Services. It looks like there was \$1 million last year, \$60,000 spent, and \$300,000 this year.

**MR. KING:** There is a little bit of money left there to pay some outstanding bills that we have

related to the current work that has been done. There is no new money allocated.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** What is the current work done?

**MR. KING:** We are up to the design stage, facility design.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** So when you say up to the design stage, has a design been presented to the department by the –

**MR. NOBLE:** Not a detailed design, but what the architects call functional programming design.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Has the site been identified or finalized?

**MR. KING:** No.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** That program may have to change depending on where you decide to construct.

**MR. KING:** It could. Although based on my knowledge, any number of sites – the six or eight they were considering – all could accommodate the design that we have at this point.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** So there is a list of possible sites. There is functional plan, but in terms of going forward this year, there is no money allocated and essentially no more work to be done on that for the time being.

**MR. KING:** No, that is correct.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I am going to move forward to 5.1.0 – just to give a heads up, I guess, will the folks from Fire and Emergency Services be returning? Do you have a time set for them? Do you want to give them a heads up maybe?

**MR. KING:** Yes, they will.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** If they are on the way and then the Committee is on the way then –

**OFFICIAL:** They are on their way.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Fish and Wildlife Enforcement, under Salaries – there are no new positions here I assume.

**MR. KING:** No, the increase is similar: salary increases and step increases.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Under Supplies, there was a pretty big jump there last year. What extra had to be supplied?

**MR. KING:** Additional requirements for a combination of uniforms and body armour for new employees.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** That had not been, I guess, allotted or budgeted for, it just came up?

**MR. KING:** Yes. We were following through on a commitment a couple of years ago. We put new officers in the field, so that was the final follow-through.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

I getting towards the end and I know that there will be some questions on Fire and Emergency Services so I want to save some time for my colleague. I do have a couple of general questions if that is okay. There was an Advisory Council on Crime and Community Safety announced by the Premier in January, I believe. I want to get some idea on that. What is the budget for that? Have they met?

**MR. NOBLE:** They have had seven meetings so far. The plan is to do public consultations in June and later this month they are travelling, or some of the members of the committee are travelling to Labrador. Work is proceeding.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** What is the goal? What is the mandate? Is there a strategy to come out of this or recommendations?

**MR. NOBLE:** Exactly that: a strategy and recommendations on improving community safety, and I guess policing strategies to improve community safety. The big thing they are finding so far is making sure that – community safety is not just a policing initiative, I think, as you can appreciate. It is engaging the full spectrum of social agencies that deal with people who often commit crimes. A big part of this, I

think, is the bringing of those communities together.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** What is the budget for the group?

**MR. NOBLE:** We are absorbing it within the department's budget. The costs are minimal. These are volunteers.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Going to Labrador is –

**MR. NOBLE:** It is absorbed within our department budget. As I say, they are volunteers and we are providing some assistance. We have some people in the policy and planning section who are providing some research assistants, so we are absorbing the travel costs.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I am just wondering now – and I might be off, but I think it falls under this department. There was a proposal put forward by, I think, Egale under LGBTQ, would that fall under Justice. I think it was a three-year pilot program. I do know that Justice had some part in it, and I know the Attorney General may have had some awareness of this, but that does not fall under –

**MR. KING:** I am not familiar with it, no.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I think there was – and I will double-check – March 27 Justice backgrounder. So I will go back and check that for my next round.

**MR. F. COLLINS:** What group was that again?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I tell you what I will do, I will double-check. I do not have it right here in front of me. There was a press release on that last year, so I will get that.

**OFFICIAL:** (Inaudible).

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I believe so, yes.

So I will get that. Instead of sitting here surmising, I will come back with it.

**MR. KING:** Okay.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I think that is what I have for now – my time is running out. I do have one

question for Fire and Emergency Services in terms of the allotment. Is it possible to get a breakdown of monies spent under Fire and Emergency Services when it comes to equipment, fire trucks, et cetera, district by district for last year?

**MR. KING:** Yes. You did well – you did very well.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Some would disagree.

**MR. KING:** Comparatively speaking.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Like I said, I will see the list and judge it accordingly, but the list for this year has not been figured out?

**MR. KING:** No.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Any idea when that will start rolling out?

**MR. KING:** I would say I will start moving on that within a couple of weeks.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay.

**MR. F. COLLINS:** I have much the same question, Andrew.

**MR. KING:** The application deadline was a while ago for communities to submit their requests. A list has been compiled; I saw a draft of it. I am meeting with staff probably sometime this week to get a sense of things.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Okay, excellent.

**CHAIR:** Okay, thank you. Time has expired.

Gerry, do you have any more?

**MS ROGERS:** Back to 4.2.03. So the functioning programming design has been completed. You probably do not even need to look at that. Basically I am asking about the new HMP. With that amount of work, does it give us any ballpark idea of what the budget might be for such a facility, with the work that has been done to date?

**MR. KING:** Yes, I guess it does, but we are not really in a position to speak about it now

because it is irrelevant; we have paused the project. The relevancy will be when we bring the project back on stream.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay.

About the current HMP, in the review of the psychiatric services it was recommended that the current psychiatrist not work in isolation, and also the recovery model, which is best practices in any kind of mental health therapy or delivery of mental health services would be used. We know that the facility, in and of itself, is not conducive to implementing the recovery model.

Can you give us an idea (a) is the current psychiatrist who is providing services still working in isolation? If not, how has that been remedied? Also, what is the plan going forward since it is going to be years down the road before we see a new facility, yet we have a legal and a moral obligation to provide the best practice and the best services we can for mental health services for our people who are incarcerated? What is the plan going forward for that?

**MR. NOBLE:** With respect to the first part of your question, the psychiatrist is not working in a silo. He is consulting routinely with physicians in the community who may have followed the care of a particular inmate. He works as a member of a case management team for some of the more complex cases in the prison. Others on the team might include the prison psychologist, the nurse practitioner, and the John Howard Society justice project. He would be an active participant in those case management teams.

If I am not mistaken, I believe he has a peer who has been identified nationally who has expertise in providing psychiatric services in correctional facilities as well.

The second part of the question with respect to the recovery model, I know that training has been received. I am not sure, so I do not want to speculate, but I did not think that the implementation of that model was necessarily dependent on new physical infrastructure. I think there are certainly principles and philosophies of that model that can be implemented even in the current facility, but I

would want to check on that to be certain. I know the training has been sought and received.

**MS ROGERS:** I guess some of the direction of the recovery model, there are space requirements for groups. There are space requirements for – and I think that is probably what is problematic. I have visited HMP where there is a drug rehab program and people are packed in like sardines, which is not conducive to intensive therapy. The space is actually the antithesis; it is detrimental to the work that needs to be done.

**MR. NOBLE:** Yes, as you know there is certainly some very good work being done there, to the best of their abilities, with the constraints they have. I do think the recovery model can – at least parts of it, as I say, some of the foundational principles I think can be introduced to the prison.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, thanks.

Of course I have a million questions, but I will not do that. I do have a question about the Human Rights Commission while we wait for Eddie Joyce. How many complaints went before the Commission this year? Have we seen a rise or an increase?

**MR. KING:** We do not have that information here. We can get it for you.

**MS ROGERS:** You can get it?

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MS ROGERS:** Okay, great.

Actually, I can probably get it from their annual report, so I am fine. Thank you.

**MR. KING:** Okay.

**CHAIR:** Before we proceed to Fire and Emergency Services, we will call the subheads to dispense of that business.

**CLERK:** Subheads 1.1.01 to 5.1.01 inclusive.

**CHAIR:** Shall 1.1.01 to 5.1.01 inclusive carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I just stepped out for a second. What are we doing?

**CHAIR:** Subheads 1.1.01 to 5.1.01, all the pervious business to be dispensed of before we get into Fire and Emergency Services.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Thank you.

**CHAIR:** All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Contra-minded?

Carried.

On motion, subheads 1.1.01 to 5.1.01 carried.

**CHAIR:** Are we ready for the switch to Fire and Emergency Services? We will take a minute.

**Recess**

**CHAIR:** Okay, the light is on. To save time, I suppose, can we just introduce the new people? Would that be okay?

**MR. A. PARSONS:** That is fine by me.

**CHAIR:** Okay.

**MR. JOYCE:** Eddie Joyce, MHA, Bay of Islands.

**MR. DUTTON:** Sean Dutton, CEO, Fire and Emergency Services.

**MS MCCORMACK:** Marilyn McCormack, Assistant Deputy Minister, Fire and Emergency Services.

**CHAIR:** Okay, thank you.

**CLERK:** Subhead 6.1.01.

**CHAIR:** Subhead 6.1.01.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just have one observation to make before I turn it over to my colleague and it refers to the allocation of funds per district. I just ask for a list to be provided.

Just for clarification, I guess the concept of doing well depends on how one looks at doing well. I think that once the list comes out – I want to point out, as far as I understand, Burgeo – La Poile got \$56,000. Now, I am not sure how well that was compared to other districts, but I just want to say that sometimes the concept of doing well depends on which angle you are looking at. This is in response to the minister's comment earlier.

**MR. KING:** To that I would say, if you compare the \$56,000 to the dollar value of other districts, you did well.

I will get you the list.

**MR. A. PARSONS:** I look forward to seeing that list, Minister.

I am going to turn it over to my colleague.

**MR. JOYCE:** Thank you.

Minister, first of all, I do not know if you would like to have a few comments because I would just like to recognize all the volunteer firefighters. I am sure you would also recognize all the volunteer firefighters and firettes in towns that provide their services to the districts.

What we usually do is let the minister have a few words about the Fire Emergency Services, about the headings, so if you want to –

**MR. KING:** You go ahead, that is fine.

**MR. JOYCE:** You are fine?

**MR. KING:** Yes.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay. I just want that on the record the great job they are doing.

Minister, 6.1.01, Salaries went over a small bit by \$87,200.

**MR. KING:** Yes, that is a severance payout for a retiree. Also, there was an Administrative Officer I positon moving into Executive from our Disaster Assistance area. There was a summer student cost as well.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay.

This year it is up to \$696,000.

**MR. KING:** That is correct. The increase of \$92,500 is the result of 3 per cent salary increases and step increases, as well as the transfer of that position on a full-time basis from Disaster Assistance into Executive.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay.

Professional Services, \$150,000 – can you tell us what that is allocated for, please?

**MR. KING:** Do you want to speak to that, Sean?

**MR. DUTTON:** When the funding for the 911 implementation was approved, some of the funding for that over a two-year period was re-profiled from this line item into Emergency Services, and there was some additional one-time money approved for budget 2013-2014 to pay for implementation. So with the conclusion of that project, the \$150,000 returned to the base funding in Executive Support. So, the other funding came to an end because it was a one-time initiative.

**MR. JOYCE:** So, this money is taken back from 911?

**MR. DUTTON:** Yes, at the time in budget 2013 in order to fund the implementation of 911 there was funding re-profiled from here. In previous years – this would have been the source of money for the cost of the POMAX report, which would have been completed in 2012. That was put towards the cost of 911 implementation. So it is returned to the base this year.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay. My question to you – I have a copy of the proposed budget and it says that they are going to get the money back from government over a four-year period, so –

**MR. DUTTON:** That is correct.

**MR. JOYCE:** So how did you get this money back, they only started putting in the seventy-five cent fee –

**MR. DUTTON:** No, out of these funds in 2013 and 2014 where we would have expended that each year, that would be part of the total amount

the government spent on 911 implementation over a two-year period, and that would be recovered over time from the 911 fee over a five-year period. So we have agreements with the 911 bureau, they start to collect the telephone fees – I think the first payments are due by Friday from the telephone companies, and they have a repayment plan with us where they will repay the agency on a quarterly basis over that five-year period until that debt is returned.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay.

Purchased Services stands at \$400,700, actual expenditure – is this a contract of some type? Can you tell us what this is for, Purchased Services?

**MR. DUTTON:** The primary cost is for office rental, including for the Fire and Emergency Services headquarters building at Hallett Crescent in St. John's. So most of the cost is related to office rental.

**MR. JOYCE:** Four hundred thousand dollars?

**MR. DUTTON:** I think it is about \$350,000 for office rental.

**MR. KING:** It also includes equipment repairs, maintenance, advertising, printing, copier charges, and –

**MR. JOYCE:** Can we get a list of what that is for? That is an awful lot for rent.

**MR. DUTTON:** I think it is also for one of our other locations. We have offices in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Deer Lake, Grand Falls-Windsor, and Clarendville. However, the offices for most of those locations are paid by Transportation and Works or another department.

What was the other one we are paying here directly?

**MS MCCORMACK:** Deer Lake and there is warehouse space on Mews Place for fire equipment and resources that staff need.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay. It seems like a lot when it is just for office space or –



**MR. DUTTON:** It has to meet certain qualifications. There is a set of standards for emergency operation centres that need to be met. Also, the building has to be accessible. It has an elevator, where it is a two-story building. So those were all elements in the cost of the lease.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay.

Subhead 6.1.02, just a quick clarification, there was a budget of \$7,000 and there was \$12,000 spent. It is back to \$7,000 again this year.

**MR. KING:** Under Employee Benefits?

**MR. JOYCE:** Fire Services, sorry, 6.1.02.

**MR. KING:** We budgeted \$7,000, spent \$12,000, and back to \$7,000. Is that the section you are referring to?

**MR. JOYCE:** Yes.

**MR. KING:** That is a result of we spent more than we had initially budgeted on course and conference registration and fees for employees.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay.

The next part \$241,500 under Grants and Subsidies, that is the same amount as last year. Is that for equipment?

**MR. KING:** No, that would be for the Newfoundland and Labrador Association of Fire Services, the Learn Not to Burn campaign, and HazMat training.

**MR. JOYCE:** Is the training by your department or is it contracted out?

**MR. DUTTON:** The agency delivers hazardous materials response training to the fire departments that participate in the Province-wide program. The participants can charge back for their expenses for participation.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay.

Subhead 6.1.03, Emergency Services, Salaries has dropped a fair bit. The budget is going from \$713,900 down to \$445,700. Can you explain the drop?

**MR. DUTTON:** Certainly, in Emergency Services is where the funding for the 911 project was voted in the previous two years budgets. So the drop-off is because of the conclusion of the implementation. We had four temporary positions that worked in the agency last year and the year prior. They concluded their work, with the conclusion of the project at the end of February. So the staff of the 911 bureau are outside of the agency. They are on the payroll of the bureau. That is outside of the agency's budget.

**MR. JOYCE:** So this is 911 mainly?

**MR. DUTTON:** This would be the implementation team, the four positions. They concluded their work. They were on contract.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay.

Disaster Assistance, 6.1.04; that is a drop also from \$291,400 to \$92,100.

**MR. DUTTON:** In 2014-2015 we have concluded the submission of claims for all outstanding major disaster events. They have mostly concluded their work. We had three positions in that section last year. Two of them were temporary employees who concluded their work at the end of March. We are still budgeting for the manager position.

The main work over the course of the year ahead is working with the federal government on the final audit of the Hurricane Igor claim. We anticipate having the payouts on the final payment for Hurricane Igor 2010 and for the Northeast 2008 flood at Gambo in the coming fiscal year.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay.

There was \$500,000 in Professional Services last year. There is none in it this year. Can you tell me what that \$500,000 was used for last year?

**MR. DUTTON:** I am sorry, are you going back to Emergency Services? I do not see that in the Estimates.

**MR. JOYCE:** Subhead 6.1.03.

**MR. DUTTON:** That is also a component of the budget for the 911 implementation project. We have funding in Professional Services, Purchased Services, Property, Furnishings and Equipment, and Grants and Subsidies that was all related to the 911 project.

**MR. JOYCE:** It is my understanding of the budget that was sent out to me was that this is all going to be recovered?

**MR. DUTTON:** That is correct, over a five-year period.

**MR. JOYCE:** Every cent. Okay.

**MR. DUTTON:** Yes.

**MR. JOYCE:** Disaster Assistance, 6.1.04, there is \$92,000 in the Salaries piece that has been eliminated. I do not know if it is transferred, delayed – 6.1.04.

**MR. DUTTON:** Are you talking about Salaries in that area?

**MR. JOYCE:** Disaster Assistance.

**MR. DUTTON:** Yes.

**MR. JOYCE:** It was the Salaries piece, yes.

**MR. DUTTON:** We just spoke about that a few moments ago. There were three positions and now there is one manager position in Disaster Assistance. There were two temporary positions that concluded their work at the end of March.

**MR. JOYCE:** There is \$1 million under Grants and Subsidies that was not spent last year but is not in the budget this year.

**MR. DUTTON:** Last year would have been the last municipal projects completed related to Hurricane Igor. So I think there were six or seven municipal projects that were done. The way the funding typically works is the funding at the start of the year is voted under Grants and Subsidies, and over the course of the year is reallocated into Professional or Purchased Services, as appropriate. So, they would have been expended on – Professional Services would have been engineering work, and then Purchased

Services would have been the actual construction activity.

So those projects are all now complete. The claim has been submitted, so there is no further work related to Hurricane Igor or other disasters anticipated in the year end.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay.

Subhead 6.1.05 – over \$5 million for fire trucks and fire departments – is there an evaluation being completed for fire trucks, major items, the smaller stuff, but the major – is there an evaluation system for that, for this expenditure?

**MR. DUTTON:** I am not sure I am following what you mean.

**MR. JOYCE:** Some of this is going to be buying fire trucks, twelve fire trucks.

**MR. DUTTON:** Yes.

**MR. JOYCE:** Is there an evaluation system being completed by the department on this?

**MR. DUTTON:** Yes, well, there is an application process.

**MR. JOYCE:** I know that, yes.

**MR. DUTTON:** So, each of the local government fire departments received the application forms. The municipality, or local service district, or Inuit community government are eligible recipients. They are asked to make their applications by the end of March. The criteria are spelled out in the form; they provide their information.

We also review the fire department assessments as part of that, because some of the information we were collecting in past years was already available to us through the fire department assessments. Ultimately, the minister will make his decision sometime during the course of the year.

**MR. JOYCE:** There is an evaluation system done by the department itself, or the Fire and Emergency Services?

**MR. DUTTON:** Well, the fire services division reviews all of the applications. We provide all the information to the minister, and the minister makes his decisions.

**MR. JOYCE:** Yes, okay. I just wanted it on the record that there is an evaluation system done. Some people think they are just giving it away, but I know an evaluation is being done. In York Harbour, where they ran out of a truck last year –

**MR. DUTTON:** Yes.

**MR. JOYCE:** – they came down and did an evaluation.

Okay, those are the questions for there. I do not know if you want me to bring up 911, because I think you heard me speak about that a couple of times. I have just a few general questions.

In itself, would you be able to supply me or the House, however you want to do it, with a copy of the evaluation about Nova Scotia not being dispatch? I know, Sean, you used it a couple of times, and the former minister used it, that Nova Scotia is not a dispatch; they are a call forwarding system.

Can you forward me the copy of the evaluation that you did? Obviously someone in your department did it about Nova Scotia. I read in that report, the POMAX report I think it is. I phoned personally – they are a dispatch and we are always being put up to the standards of saying we are just filling in like Nova Scotia and PEI. So can I get a copy of the report?

**MR. DUTTON:** As I understand it, the distinction is that they operate dispatch and 911 out of the same building. They are actually like adjoining sections of the building, but that they are separate functions but dealt with under the same roof, different staff.

**MR. JOYCE:** Can I get a copy of that report from Nova Scotia or PEI? Because I am sure there was a report done. You would not be just saying that unless someone went up and did an evaluation of what is being done in Nova Scotia.

**MR. DUTTON:** No, I think the POMAX report looked at 911 in other jurisdictions, certainly

before my time in the agency, when they were considering that, the staff had meetings with officials in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to discuss how their system was set up.

**MR. JOYCE:** Who had the meetings because – I just want this clarified and I asked this question before; I do not mean to be putting you on the spot, but I think this is a very important issue. No one can say here is the report we did about the other provinces because every time we ask about just basic dispatch and (inaudible) with someone in Nova Scotia has, but just who spoke to them, who did the evaluation, can we get a copy of that, that was passed to you or the former minister to make this decision?

**MR. DUTTON:** I guess the report that was used to make the decision was the POMAX report. So the government decided to contract POMAX to do an evaluation of the feasibility of Province-wide 911. That report was released in June 2012 and that was the basis for the decision to proceed to Province-wide 911. The POMAX report also makes clear in the document that there is a distinction that 911 is not dispatch, that it is a separate function.

**MR. JOYCE:** I will go back to it. I think it is page 32. I do not know, Gerry, if you want to –

**CHAIR:** Your time has expired.

**MS ROGERS:** No, you can go ahead.

**MR. JOYCE:** Okay.

I think it is page 32. This is very important and I know I spoke to the minister and I want this on the record too. I spoke to the minister on this and he would like to have further discussions on it with you. I do not know if this is going to change but we are going to have – and I thank the minister for that, for sitting down. I think it is page 32 – I am not sure – on that report. When they made the decision of funding and how it was going to work, they were using the RNC in Corner Brook, the RNC in Lab West, and St. John's regional firefighting. That was in the report.

**MR. DUTTON:** Yes.

**MR. JOYCE:** So if you are going to go on the POMAX report, everything that was supposed to be done then was dispatch because the RNC in Corner Brook was dispatch. They still have the facilities there to do it. Now, Corner Brook got it. I have no problem with that, but that is another issue. Corner Brook has it, but if you are going to go on that report, and nowhere in that report does it say about Nova Scotia – and I will read it again, unless I missed it; I will check again.

When that report was done in 2012 – because I stood up when Kevin O'Brien made the decision – I supported it because it was supposed to be dispatch from the RNC in both places and St. John's here. From 2012, when that report came out, to the time the announcement was made, something changed. It was supposed to be dispatch because the RNC in Corner Brook dispatched.

**MR. DUTTON:** Well, I think the important distinction is that POMAX was asked to assess the feasibility of Province-wide 911 or Enhanced 911. As a planning scenario, they looked at the existing 911 services that were in place, which were delivered by the RNC in Labrador City and Corner Brook, by the St. John's Regional Fire Department in St. John's, and by the RMCP in White Hills.

As a planning scenario they made the assumption, as a way to try to cost it out, that each of those call-taking centres would expand their call areas to take in the rest of the Province. That was a planning scenario to assess what would be the cost of expanding to a Province-wide service.

Subsequent to that, we had consultations with those service providers and also looked at the National Fire Protection Association standards and communicated those standard expectations to each of those services. That was the point at which the RNC and the RCMP indicated to the implementation team that they did not wish to participate in the system at that level. They would participate in 911, but as a secondary PSAP where they would be carrying out the responses.

That was the stage at which we talked to the City of Corner Brook. They were willing to

become a PSAP, and that was the plan on which we proceeded forward.

**MR. JOYCE:** Just to stop you on that. The constabulary were not ready to dispatch, so they made a request to the Department of Justice to get out of dispatch. Am I correct on that?

**MR. DUTTON:** Who made the request? Pardon me?

**MR. JOYCE:** The RNC.

**MR. DUTTON:** No, the RNC was doing a 911 service in Corner Brook and in Labrador City with one person per shift who was also doing other work within the detachment. In the case of Labrador City getting about 200 calls a year and in the Corner Brook, Bay of Islands area, about 2,000 calls a year.

When they looked at the standards of having to have multiple staff on shift, the infrastructure requirements that they would have, and the extra calling, they made a decision that they prefer not to be the call taker for the system. So we looked at other alternatives and Corner Brook was a viable alternative. Again, based on the report that we were looking at, call taking and relay, that was the system that was provided.

I think what occurred over time, which was also an issue identified by the CRTC in their review in 2013 across the country, was that there were not common standards across the country in terms of the level of service that was provided. So, each of those services evolved on their own without a province-wide governing structure and those were among the things that we are addressing through the Province-wide system where we have a 911 bureau responsible for oversight, implementation, and expansion of the service into Next Generation.

Now they are all following a common standard and the same level of service is provided throughout the Province.

**MR. JOYCE:** I wrote your department – and to be fair to the current minister, he was not the minister at the time – and I got a response. They said we cannot handle the number of calls for the volunteer firefighters across the Province. That was the response I got back.

My question again – and I will be fair to the current minister; he was not there at the time – can you give me the copy of the assessment that you did to determine that there would be too many calls coming in? I will use this for example, the Northeast Avalon is using St. John's, Carbonear is using the hospital, and Deer Lake are using the power plant, so there is a lot taken out of the equation. To make a statement that there are too many calls coming in, can you produce the study to show that?

**MR. DUTTON:** I think that there is a response to that question in writing from the previous minister on two occasions. There would have been an estimate of roughly 10,000 events per year to which volunteer fire departments would be asked to respond. We do not have a breakdown of how many of them may have been through 911 or through people calling the seven-digit number. Many of those fire departments would have been outside of 911 service at those times in any event.

**MR. JOYCE:** So, there was no report done?

**MR. DUTTON:** No, that is consistent with the response that was provided in writing earlier.

**MR. JOYCE:** I do not mean to be harping on this. You heard the incidents that are happening lately and I really feel strongly that there is going to be – how can the former minister – again, I will put it on record it is not the current minister – make a statement publicly and in writing that the number of people will over flood the system when there was no evaluation done? Will you do an evaluation because if you are going to make a statement like that, I am going to ask it?

**MR. DUTTON:** The distinction, I think, is that in following the NFPA standards, which would not have been a requirement on each of the call takers in the past, they have to answer a call within so many seconds 95 per cent of the time and then transfer the call within so many seconds 95 per cent of the time. So there is a high standard of expectation to be able to answer the call quickly, determine the nature of the emergency and where it is located, and transfer it to the agency of priority, and then move on to the next call.

Some incidents are going to have multiple calls, and there are going to be times when there is going to be a high call volume. So, the standard, as we have it there now, is to have two people per shift in each of the two PSAPs taking those calls. If they also have to be on the phone managing dispatch, then that is going to be adding much more time to the time on the line while other calls are coming in, and they are not going to be able to meet the standard all of the time, which would require the hiring of additional staff.

So there would be additional costs associated with performing the dispatch function. So that is fairly evident, although we have not quantified the number, but you can see from 10,000 incidents per year that it would not be an inconsequential number.

**CHAIR:** Could we park here for a moment? I think Gerry graciously gave up her time, I am assuming.

**MS ROGERS:** Yes, I am fine. All the questions I had have been answered, so I have not further questions.

I do want to thank the staff. I know what an inconvenience to come – I do not know if you had to wait around or what, but thank you very much. I know it has been a very complex few years doing this work, and I would like to thank you for that.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Gerry.

Looking at the time, 12:00 p.m., I am looking for direction – I assume that is the maximum time we have had. So I would like to bring this to a conclusion by –

**MR. JOYCE:** So, are we going to come back again?

**CHAIR:** Well, I am asking for – that is the decision of –

**MR. KING:** We are into a discussion of policy now, Mr. Chair. There have been no questions at all on the Estimates. So, we can move that to the House of Assembly. We have used our three hours allotted to questioning of the Budget.

**MR. JOYCE:** Mr. Chair –

**CHAIR:** Okay, we have agreed by the –

**MR. JOYCE:** I just want it on the record that there are questions I am going to ask on the 911, but we can come back, because it is a major issue, and there are questions – and this is not policy. I am going to be getting into some specifics. If you look on page 32, it is full cost analysis of putting in those three sites. My question is: How much extra did it – there will be lots of time. So, this is such a major issue, I really feel it is going to cost people's lives. I really, really truly feel that. I said that from day one, and I know, Sean, you are well aware of it.

I would like to come back, even if it is a half hour or forty-five minutes sometime, because it is such a major issue. I have a copy of the budget that was sent to me. I have major questions on the budget – there is a surplus in the budget, so if we need an extra two people, there is a \$180,000 surplus in the budget. So is it worth putting people's lives in danger when the money is there in the budget?

If you are saying – this is what I am saying to the minister – it is financial, I am going to ask questions about the budget and how it was paid. So I would like to come back for a half an hour someday to go through that because it is a major issue. Now finding out that there is no study done because we think there may be an overrun on the phones when there is a surplus, I have a major concern with that.

I would like to come back. It is at the minister's discretion, but I just want it on the record that I want to come back to finish off questions on the 911.

**MR. KING:** Mr. Chair, I am quite willing to have a meeting with the member, with my staff, and pursue his questions but his questions do not relate to the Estimates of Fire and Emergency Services. His questions are focused on policy and on the budget of the 911 bureau, which is outside of Fire and Emergency Services

So, as I see it, we provided ourselves here and answered all of your questions on the Estimates provided in the binder. I believe the Committee

should do a vote and we will make ourselves available to Mr. Joyce (inaudible) discussion.

**CHAIR:** We can make that compromise if Mr. Joyce wants to further get some clarification on policy. You can meet individuals with Fire and Emergency Services, the Minister, and his department.

**MR. KING:** I will facilitate it.

**MR. JOYCE:** Yes.

**CHAIR:** Would that be good?

**MR. JOYCE:** No, I just want to clue up.

**CHAIR:** You have one minute to clue up.

**MR. JOYCE:** I have one minute, I have no problem – we are discussing money that was in transfer from one department to another. We just got Sean saying how much money was transferred in and out. So when the minister says that it is not budgetary and it is not a line item, we just showed that it is.

I just want it on the record that I tried to discuss the 911, money that was transferred, there is money that is being paid back to government, which is in the line item, but I do not have an opportunity – I think it is wrong. I think it is going to cost people's lives.

I will continue to try to find some avenue, Mr. Chair – I am very upset that we cannot discuss this here, especially knowing that there is no study done.

Okay, I am finished.

**CHAIR:** Thank you, Eddie.

We will go to the vote. Again, we will emphasize that any further clarification on policy, you will meet with the individual minister and his department for clarification.

Thank you very much.

**CLERK:** Subheads 6.1.01 to 6.1.05 inclusive.

**CHAIR:** Shall 6.1.01 to 6.1.05 inclusive carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Contra-minded?

Carried.

On motion, subheads 6.1.01 through 6.1.05 carried.

**CLERK:** The total.

**CHAIR:** Shall the total carry?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** All those against, 'nay.'

Carried.

On motion, Fire and Emergency Services – NL, total heads, carried.

On motion, Department of Justice and Public Safety, total heads, carried.

**CHAIR:** Shall I report the Estimates of the Department of Justice and Public Safety carried without amendment?

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Contra-minded?

Carried.

On motion, Estimates of the Department of Justice and Public Safety carried without amendment.

**CHAIR:** I have a couple of housekeeping items before we dismiss.

I have the minutes of the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services, May 5, 2015. I am looking for a mover.

**MR. LITTLE:** So moved.

**CHAIR:** Moved by Glen Little; seconded by Eli Cross.

All those in favour, 'aye.'

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Aye.

**CHAIR:** Carried.

On motion, minutes adopted and circulated.

**CHAIR:** Thank you very much.

The next meeting of the Social Services Committee will be 6:00 this afternoon, Tuesday, May 12.

I just want to thank the minister and all of his department officials for your diligence and for feeling the piercing and probing questions, and for your patience as well. All questioners, thank you as well for your deliberations.

Have a good day. I think that is it.

On motion, the Committee adjourned.