

May 8, 1986

EVENING SITTING

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure
Culture and Recreation
Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 7

Item 1 (continued)

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that the member for Prince Albert-Duck Lake is here again yapping from his seat as usual.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. I would ask the member from Shaunavon to keep his remarks to the estimates on Culture and Recreation and not make references to other people in the House.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Chairman, it's interesting that all of a sudden we're worried about members talking or not talking about other members in the House. When the Premier or any of the government members are on their feet, they're continually talking about other members in the Assembly.

But I would like to ask the minister some questions about funding of recreational centres in some rural communities. And you will know very well that in many of the centres in my constituency, as in the other rural members', that the centre of activity is often the curling rink or the skating rink, during the winter months at any rate, and the ball diamond and other recreation facilities during the summer.

But my question to you, Mr. Minister: at the present time, I wonder if you could outline your program for assistance of funding construction of new facilities in the area of recreation. Have you got a grant structure of a community . . . Let's say the community of Shaunavon was wanting to build a new skating rink. What would you have available in terms of a grant structure at the present time for a community like that?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, we have in place, through the Department of Culture and Recreation, a program called the culture and recreational facility grant program. And the basis of it, to the member, is that there is a base grant available to every urban municipality of \$5,000, plus a per capita along with that of \$25 based on the 1981 census.

So in other words, for simplicity's sake, if you had a town of 1,000 people, that would give them a base grant of \$5,000 plus \$25 times 1,000 which would be another 25,000. So their total allocation over a five-year period would be \$30,000.

And as well with the program, there's a bonus grant of \$5 per capita if two urban municipalities join together and jointly fund a facility.

And as well as that, moneys are made available to rural municipalities who can contribute their funds towards a project in an urban centre.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Minister, on the issue of the \$5,000 basic grant, does that apply to all communities regardless of size or is there a cut-off for certain size towns? Can you outline for the different size of communities what that baseline is, and is this the same for the urban centres. Or what size communities would this apply to?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — The base grant would be applicable to all urban municipalities, rural, and Indian reserves as well — base grant.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The \$25 per capita, Mr. Minister, for a town of 1,000 — they end up with \$25,000. You will well know how far that will go in building a rink complex. Well, with the \$5,000 extra grant it would amount to 30,000.

But when you're talking about building one of these centres now, a combination curling rink and skating rink, I don't think you can build one for less than a million, and the amount that you are putting forward here in grants simply doesn't do anything. I might add doesn't do anything to help these communities.

And I would . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well the member from Weyburn, if he would quit shouting from his seat we might be able to get on. And maybe, Mr. Chairman, you could get him under control. Sits there and smokes cigars in the Assembly and shouts from his seat.

But I would just say to the minister that in the 1978, for example, or '79, there was a grant structure in place that allowed \$100 per capita at that time for construction of rinks. And that is at a time when . . . Well they could use the community capital fund as well if they were wanting to use it. And it was a good boost to the community. And that's when you could build a rink for half of what you can now.

I just say to you that this grant structure you have in place at the present time is meaningless. And many of the rural communities who elected you people, based on the fact that you had promised them that you would have lower power rates, for example . . . And the member from Kindersley will well remember making speeches from this side of the House about the high power rates and how, if they were elected, they would have a different rate for community facilities. And that's what they promised prior to 1982, Mr. Chairman.

And I know you're looking at me like you don't believe that statement, but you could ask the member from Kindersley. He promised that and he said it many times in the Assembly, that they would have a lower power rate for community facilities like skating and curling rinks.

And what has happened? Well the power rates have continually gone up. And many of these rinks, structures . . . And the member from Weyburn will well know that the communities are having a hard time keeping the doors open, let alone build anything new.

And in that area, I just say that your program has been a

dismal failure for the rural communities. And I just want to put that on the record because I get a number of letters every year when the rink boards go to open the rinks and put in their artificial ice that they are terribly disappointed — terribly disappointed — in what this government has done in terms of helping those local rinks and communities. Because what we are talking about is a commitment that was made, Mr. Chairman, by a government in its early days, to do something for these rural communities — and they have gone in the opposite direction. They've taken away the grants that were in place. Power rates have gone up; they haven't gone down.

And I just wonder, Mr. Minister, whether you can outline any plans that you have at the present time to help out these communities in terms of keeping their rinks open.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few comments in response to the comments made by the member for Shaunavon. The program we have got is a five-year program that is budgeted to be \$32 million, and I would compare that with the last program under the NDP which was a similar type program, a five-year program that in total was estimated to be about \$26 million. So if the member makes a statement that they're disappointed with the amount that's available here, they must have been terribly disappointed with the one that was in place under the NDP. And where he gets the \$100 per capita one, we're not aware of that in 1978 or '79. And also for the information of the members also, that the total number of projects that have been received to date since April 1, 1983, are 1,144. That's throughout our whole province. So indeed the program has a good take-up and is being taken advantage of by the communities.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — But the number of 1,100 . . . I wonder if you could outline what . . . You're certainly not saying that we've had 1,100 new rinks built in the province. I think you're away off base if that's the story you're trying to tell the committee. There certainly have not been 1,100 new rinks built. And I suppose if you're including every door that has been changed or every new light that has been put in. But it's inaccurate, Mr. Chairman, for the minister to stand and say that we've built or constructed 1,100 new facilities.

And what I'm saying is that many of these community rinks are having a hard time keeping their doors open. And the member from Rosthern will know very well, coming from a rural area, that he will have been lobbied as well by rink boards who are saying they are having tough times. And I'm just making the case that, when you promise to do something about that when you're in opposition, when you get into government I think you have a moral obligation to deal with the problem.

And what I was asking you: that in terms of the support for the operating of rinks, do you have any plan in place? Do you have any plan at all that would assist these rinks in keeping the door open? Because I'll just tell you that there are a number of rink boards around the province that are pulling their hair out every time they get the power bill from the Tory government. They don't know how they're going to keep their kids skating in the rinks because you

birds are charging them so much for the power and natural gas and they simply can't keep functioning.

And you will know very well, as the minister, that rink boards must have approached you, unless you've become so arrogant and isolated that they've totally quit talking to you. And that may be the problem. That may be the problem — that they've quit. They've just given up after four years. In fact, we're now into the fifth year of this government's term. After five years of arguing with you people to keep your election promises of having a lower power rate for rinks, which was promised in 1982, they may realize this government has become so arrogant — so arrogant with their massive mandate that they were given in 1982 to do things — that they have simply quit listening to the people of the province, and in return the rink boards may have quit writing to you. But I know that earlier on they were getting in touch with the office of the Minister of Culture and Recreation many times.

I know the recreation board in Frontier, for example — I'll use that one as the example. They have written me a number of times saying the power bills they're getting for that centre — that's the recreation centre in Frontier that . . . That was when Olaf Friggstad had Friggstad Manufacturing going in that town, before it went bankrupt after this government took over in 1982. They had a beautiful recreation centre that was built in part by Friggstad Manufacturing, a small-business person who had set up in that town in the '70s under Allan Blakeney, and had a flourishing business building cultivators and rock pickers. And within 18 months, Mr. Chairman, after this government took over, they were bankrupt. They were bankrupt because they got no support from this government.

And I'll tell you that the recreation centre that he built or helped build at that time is having a difficult time not only keeping things rolling, but keeping the door open because of the fact that the power bill is so high. And I have letters and I can go back to the office and get them and read them into the record. Because, I'll tell you that that community, under you birds, has practically ceased to exist, in terms of trying to keep the recreation centre open.

And I'll tell you that if you don't have a plan in place, that's something that's going to come back to haunt you in the next election. Because when you talk about making a promise to lower the power bills, you simply haven't done it. And I'm just wondering now, when you're in the dying days of this government, sort of a deathbed repentance, have you got any plan at all that would help those rinks out?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, the member has touched on a number of items in his remarks there. I think one of the ones was, you have a breakdown of the types of projects that have been undertaken in that figure I gave you, and I can go through the list here, and I believe I should.

Since April 1, 1983 there have been 227 complexes begun. And I should indicate here that this grant can be used not only for new complexes, but renovations. There's been 227 complexes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Chairman, if the members of the NDP would care to listen to the question, rather than shouting from their seat.

(1915)

The skating rinks, indoor, 174; skating rinks, outdoor, 19; curling rinks, 136; swimming pools, 35; tennis courts, 12; halls, 221; libraries, 31; museums, 13; arts centres, 7; playgrounds, 33; golf courses, 17; race tracks, 4; rodeo grounds, 7; gymnasiums, 4; playing fields, 109; theatre, 7; RV parks, 12; senior citizens' recreation centres, 9; bowling alleys, 8; and other, 27. So that would add up pretty close to the 1,144 that I mentioned in my previous response.

So indeed, the communities are taking up the program and the program was meant to facilitate a community building their project. It's not meant that the provincial government pays for the whole ball of wax; rather assist the community. Because as members will know, such as the member for Rosthern, contrary to your early statement, there can be rinks built for well under \$1 million.

And it's up to the community to do the planning. And one thing that's very important through this program is that it is the community that decides where this money should be allocated. For example, if they want to put X number of dollars towards the skating rink and the same towards the curling rink, it's up to the community to identify those needs, rather than the provincial government identifying it for them.

And, Mr. Chairman, I think I should just reiterate once again the number of dollars in this program as opposed to the five-year program under the NDP. And also, he alludes to the high cost of operation. And indeed I think one of the major reasons that the operational expenditures are quite high is because of the demand meters for power. And I believe the case is that demand meters were introduced in Saskatchewan by the former administration, the NDP administration, and I recollect very clearly that at the recent SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association) conference the minister in charge of Saskatchewan Power Corporation stated that SPC is looking at that, and we're hoping to get a new system, which shows that our government is willing to address that situation.

And I also should remind all the members that we have eliminated the E&H tax on all the power bills, so there's a 5 per cent decrease right there. I don't have the figures in front of me, but over the four years of a Tory administration, I would compare the power rate increases with the last four of the NDP, and I would be pleased to go over that, and I'm sure the minister in charge of Sask Power would do that as well.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister says very clearly and now agrees with us that there was a promise made to replace the demand meters on rinks four years ago, and he's correct in that, that statements were made and promises were made to the rink boards to change the power rate structure for rinks. That's what was promised, and the minister has now agreed with that, and

he says that in their fifth year, they're now looking at it, the possibility of changing that. That's what he's saying.

Well I'll tell you, a New Democratic government wouldn't only study it, they would do something about it. Well I'll tell you, in the 1970s there was money in the rural communities. There was a good deal of money, and Mr. Chairman will know that farmers at that time actually paid income tax because we had some income. That's what happened.

An Hon. Member: — They didn't vote for the NDP either.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Yes, in the '70s they did vote for the NDP. Yes, they did . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I believe the debate is straying from the topic. We're getting into irrelevant topics, and I would ask the member to come back to the debate, which is estimates on Culture and Recreation. It's not the income of farmers in the '70s or anything of that nature.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — I think the salary of farmers in terms of what they can afford for their children in terms of recreation has everything to do with the estimates of Recreation. Of course it does. If farmers don't have an income so they can afford to take their children to the rink, that has something to do with recreation. And, Mr. Chairman, if you'd follow the arguments, we will . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. Is the member from Shaunavon challenging my ruling?

Mr. Lingenfelter: — What I'm talking about is the income of farmers as it relates to the ability of people to buy tickets to go skating. Obviously in the 1970s farmers had good income; they could afford to buy memberships to the local rink, and it wasn't a big problem.

But I'll tell you, today everything is falling apart. Farm income is at the lowest level since the 1930s, since the last time that we had a Conservative government in this province, Mr. Chairman. I don't know whether you realize that. But the last time farmers had this much trouble with recreation and getting their children to the rink was in the 1930s. They haven't had an income so low since back in 1931 when the Anderson government was in — the Conservative Anderson government. That's how long ago it is since we had farm incomes that low. And I'll tell you they're having a great deal of difficulty paying the ever increasing amounts that they have to for their families to go to these skating rinks. And many of the families simply can't have their children in the curling clubs because the curling clubs have to charge so much because the power rates have gone so high.

And I say to you that farm income has everything to do with the recreation facilities in our local communities, and when farm income goes down there's not as much money that can be raised by going around canvassing to build the local rink. And I just think that that is so obvious, Mr. Chairman. The farm income has a lot to do with why we should have more input from the provincial government instead of less, which is what we're seeing at the present time.

Now I know as a rural member you will be well aware of that. And I'm sure that you can now agree with me that farm income is an important issue when it comes to whether or not your children and family members can go to the rink and skate, if in fact the rates are going up year after year.

And the provincial government has reneged on a very important election promise. That is that demand meters, as the minister has apologized for, has admitted that they promised to remove, haven't been removed, and what he is saying that in their fifth year they're now looking at it. Well I don't think that's a policy. I think that's a cop-out, Mr. Minister, that you're going to have to live with in the next election.

Because obviously the rural communities were promised that if Premier Devine got to be premier, which he did, that he would do something about it. And he's reneged on that. He's broken his word to the people of the province and the farm community. And I say that's unfortunate. And I'm just wondering that in the year that we're coming to, and in these estimates, there's any relief for the power bills for those rinks. Is there any relief for the skating rinks and for the curling rinks in the year that we're coming into and the estimates we're dealing with?

Now you say you're studying it. Have you got a committee set up? Or what does the study involve? What kind of a study are you doing at the present time to look at the power rates as they affect rinks and local community centres?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Chairman, once again the member from Shaunavon has touched on many issues. And I would certainly appreciate it if he would go through *Hansard* and just look at my remarks and see what kind of commitment I made on that. Rather, I think it was very succinct: that it was under the NDP that demand meters came into effect, and it is under us that we are looking at alleviating that problem. So let's be clear on that, that it was the NDP, not this government, that brought those in.

And as far as the NDP feeling for what's going on in recreational facilities across this province, Mr. Chairman, I just can't believe it. You know, the member alludes that he goes into a curling rink and everybody comes up running to him and says, I can't curl because the power rates are so high.

Mr. Chairman, I've spent a little bit of time in my lifetime around curling rinks; and not once — not once — has anybody ever come up to me and said, Rick, I can't curl because the power rates are so high. Mr. Chairman, and I'm sure as we go around here, people are not saying that. Rather, the strength in communities, the strength in curling rinks and hockey rinks, of recreation boards across this province, is the ability of the community to run their operations. They take pride in that.

Have you ever gone into the rinks around, and have you seen volunteer help in there helping out on the concessions? Have you seen volunteer help out there cleaning the ice? Have you seen volunteer help out there really pitching in to make their community proud of what they have?

The NDP say they are going to have a solution to this; as usual, there's no details. But maybe, if I can let my mind wander a little bit the way they brought in land bank, maybe their solution is rink bank, curling rink bank, skating rink bank, under the NDP. Vote for us, we'll nationalize your curling rinks — that's the NDP way of doing it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister is so off track that he doesn't realize that the rinks are already owned by the communities — that the rinks are already owned by the communities — and that's how out of touch he is with reality. And I suppose, Mr. Chairman, if you travelled in the circles that the rich people do, as the minister does on his curling tours, you wouldn't hear the stories that I hear.

And I say to you that people from the small communities . . . and I'll use an example. Let's take the Al Lind rink from Admiral who come from a different background than the minister, but I'll say, but don't have much trouble cleaning his clock from time to time on the ice at play-offs.

I'll say to you that the people will be able to tell you, if you cared to listen, that the power rates are too high. Well, the power rates are too high, that's what they're saying. And the minister will stand here and say that he has not heard it from anyone — that he hasn't heard that. Well I'll tell you, that is a government that is out of touch. If he hasn't heard the problem of high power rates in rinks then he's out of touch.

A Member: — He's curling in the wrong rinks.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — And he's curling in the wrong rinks with the wrong people. And I think maybe he's going to too many cash bonspiels in Vancouver and around Canada, and flying and taking the high flying operation, and should be going out to the Admirals and Eastends and Frontiers and Lafleche, and listening to what the people are really saying. Because if you were listening, this is what you would hear, is that the power rates are too high; that families are having to pay too much for their passes to the rinks because your government has failed on a major commitment, and that was to lower the power rates for those rinks. That was the promise that you made. And I wonder if you can tell me, Mr. Minister, whether or not before the next election you intend to fulfil that commitment.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Chairman, maybe I'd like to address a few comments in response to the member from Shaunavon.

Certainly I guess that in the travels that I've made through curling, that I've touched in many rinks in Saskatchewan and across western Canada and I'm sure that some of the people that I have curled with and against would be very interested in the comments you have made, that we're going around the elite. But I will tell you that not many of the people that I've played with or against have oil rigs in their backyard and have that as a . . . (inaudible) . . .

And as far as the remark about getting my clock cleaned in play-offs and that, well, what can you say to that, Mr. Chairman, except that maybe under the NDP they would like to get rid of the competitive spirit. And I go out there to win every game, and certainly we don't win every game. We tend to lose.

I guess what the NDP would like to see is a real roaring game of curling, and tie the game so that nobody gets beat and nobody gets their clock cleaned or anywhere else. That seems to be the socialist mentality. Any time they see someone who has a little bit of a competitive spirit or any community that shows some drive to get out there, they dump on it.

So you might be able to find a couple of communities across the province that are in dire straits, but I'm sure you'll find many, many more that really take a lot of pride in the operation of their facility.

An Hon. Member: — Is that the ones that own them?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — They own their own facilities — you're very correct. We realize that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, please do.

Mr. Chairman, the members are yelling from their seats of course, once again. It's quite simply — okay — I do have the MLA for Shaunavon and his constituency, which I don't know if he's aware of, but under this program we've had two projects in Admiral, one in Cadillac, two in Consul, one in Eastend, one in Glentworth, one in Mankota, one in Pinto Creek, and two in Ponteix, that have gone on with total actual costs so far of \$456,361.62. So there is activity there. Rinks are being renovated. They are being built.

(1930)

And I think if the member for Shaunavon will really look, it's the people of the community that pitch in and help make the community complex, the skating rinks go, the curling rinks go. That's the name of the game. People in Saskatchewan have the highest rate of volunteerism. They know how to pitch in and help, and have pride in their communities.

So no matter what you say, people in Saskatchewan have a lot of pride, and they will have a lot of pride in the future.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — The minister has outlined some of the projects that have happened in the Shaunavon constituency in the last four years. And I say, quite honestly, that we have been able to fight for and get some very important projects.

And the Shaunavon constituency, in getting projects, that's not the one I was worried about. But the problem is that not all the constituencies have NDP MLAs who will fight for their communities.

And I say to you that it's been a struggle to get those projects going. And the minister may try to take credit for everything that has happened down there. But I'll tell you the communities have fought hard for them. They have fought hard for them, Mr. Chairman, and as a result they did get some projects going. But the minister will know that the problems that are facing the communities are paying the power bills and keeping the door open — keeping the doors open.

And you will know that you have had many people come to you and written to your office . . . And if the Minister of Health would quit his chattering from his seat; he's just going on and on. I don't know where he had supper tonight but I'll tell you, he's pretty excited.

But I want to tell the minister that when you say that some of the rinks aren't proud of their facilities . . . I hear you say that, that some of the communities aren't proud of their facilities. The ones that are writing to you are saying that the power bills are too high; that those communities aren't proud of their facilities. I'm going to be sending that comment. I'm taking it out of *Hansard* tomorrow, and each one of the communities who has written in and complained about the power rates that you are referring to as not being proud of their facilities, I'm going to send that out to them. Because the people in Frontier will be interested in knowing that you as minister feel they are not proud of their facilities, because that's what you said.

But the question I asked you was whether or not you had any intention of fulfilling your commitment, the 1982 commitment, before the next election. That is to reduce the power rates for those facilities as you promised in the election campaign in 1982.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the member said that he's going to be pleased to take my comments out of *Hansard*. I hope he does. And maybe I can add something else for him to send to his constituents. As I went through the list of projects in his constituency . . . And he distinctly got up and said they had an MLA that's been fighting for their projects in his constituency. Since I've been Minister of Culture and Recreation, since the summer of 1983, not once, not once ever has the MLA for Shaunavon written to me, phoned me, asked about anything to do in his constituency, about any of the facilities.

So the battle in the constituency of Shaunavon to improve their facilities has gone on in the absence, I might add, of the member for Shaunavon. As far as the Sask Power, as I indicated earlier, the minister distinctly said at the SUMA conference that Sask Power is looking at the demand meter situation, and they're hoping to come up with a solution very soon. And I'll reiterate once again, demand meters were introduced in the province of Saskatchewan by the NDP.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well I wonder if the minister can tell me what studies are being done in that area. Have you got a committee set up or is there a joint committee between Sask Power and your department? Can you just outline what studies are going in to make those changes?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to indicate that

officials from Sask Power and officials from our department of Culture and Recreation are working together on this to bring this to a head and try to get the best possible result possible.

Mr. Chairman, I just received some figures that might be interesting on power rate increases in the province of Saskatchewan. In 1975, there was a 27 per cent increase; in 1976, there was 12.8 per cent increase; in 1977, it was 17.3; in 1978, it was 3.3 — I think there was an election that year; in 1979, there was an 8.3 per cent; 1980, 7.9 per cent; 1981, 15.8 per cent; and in 1982, another election year, 7.5 per cent. That's the NDP record; an average power rate increase under the NDP in those years of 12.5 per cent.

Under the administration of the Progressive Conservatives: 1983, 12.6 per cent; '84, 9.2 per cent; 1985, zero per cent — and you might recollect there was no election in 1985; in 1986, it's estimated at 7.5 per cent. The average under the PC government is 4.8 per cent a year. So once again to capsulize that, just for the member's sake: the NDP average for those years, 12.5 per cent per year; under the Progressive Conservatives, 4.8 per cent per year. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Well the minister will well know that the income of the farmers . . . And I, being one, will well remember that the income increases that we had during that time period were well in excess of 12 per cent. But I'll tell you that the rate increases now when my income isn't going up by 4 per cent, but in fact going down by 20 and 30 per cent a year, that we could afford to pay 12 per cent more very easily in the 1970s. But I'll tell you, we can't afford to pay 4 per cent more now when our income is going down by 20 per cent under the Progressive Conservatives. It's impossible. It's impossible.

I remember very clearly in '77 that our income on the farm was going up by 20 or 30 per cent a year — 20 or 30 per cent a year. And 12 per cent increases were about the rate of inflation, and we could afford to handle it. And you could follow the price of wheat going up under the NDP government. But I'll tell you, our price of grain has gone from 6 bucks a bushel back in '76 to \$3 a bushel under the Mulroney government. And 4 per cent increases of power for the rinks is no solution to the problem because they can't afford to pay it. They simply can't afford to pay it. And the minister can down play the issue and pretend it isn't there, and that's what he's doing tonight, pretending there's no problem, saying we're making up this story and the rinks who are writing in aren't proud of their facilities. That's what he's saying, and ignoring the problem. Well that's fine. If that's the arrogant attitude the minister wants to carry on with, that's fine.

And if you can convince the people of Saskatchewan, the rural communities, that it was bad times in the 1970s, that they were having a difficult time in the 1970s, that they were having a difficult time in the 1970s, go ahead. But I lived out there and I started farming at that time and I remember how exciting and vibrant the rural communities were in the 1970s, and what our income increases were each year during the 1970s. That was an exciting time to be a farmer in Saskatchewan. I'll tell you now there are more farmers wondering how they can get

off of the land under a Conservative government at the federal and provincial level than I have ever seen since I've started farming.

If they could get a job, and the reason that many of them are simply staying there is because there are no jobs . . . But they're up against the wall. And yes, it has a lot to do with recreation because it's directly related to the incomes and what farmers can afford to pay at the rinks. And if the minister is saying that we had a tough time in the 1970s, I don't know where you were at. I don't know where you were at, because I'll tell you, out in my constituency things were booming in the 1970s. Things were booming. And if you're saying that it's better times today in rural areas in 1986 under a Conservative government than it was back in '76, I don't know where the rose coloured glasses that you people are wearing are coming from.

So I would just say to you that you can carry on in your arrogant manner saying there is no problem, that there is no problem at all, and the rinks are wrong. The ones who are complaining simply aren't proud of their facilities — and that's your opinion. I'll leave it at that. Because I think you are impossible to talk to and I suppose coming from a big city, in terms of what my constituency knows, maybe you don't understand what it's like to keep a small rink open. But I'll tell you, I'll tell you that they're having a difficult time. and you can choose to ignore it if you want but I just wanted to put that on the record.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Chairman, once again the member has put a lot on the record here, you know, being against kids from the cities or whatever, as opposed to his own area. Indeed, people in Saskatoon are eligible for the program just the very same as they are in your community — \$5,000 base grant plus \$25 per capita. And indeed there's a lot of facilities in the city of Saskatoon. And believe me, there's a lot of people very proud of the facilities, that they have pitched in together.

I've had some further information given to me. Certainly the last increases I gave to you were electric. But now we get into the gas side of it through Sask Power and we'll start in good old 1975 again, under the NDP.

Under the gas there was a 66 per cent increase in 1975; a 27 per cent increase in 1976; in 1977, it was 19 per cent; 1978, 10 per cent; 1979, there were two increases, one of 3 per cent, one of 3.5 per cent; in 1980, they outdid themselves here, they had three increases of 4.2, 9.8, and 14.9 per cent. In 1981 they settled down a bit, they only had two increases of 6.5 per cent, and 6.1 per cent; and in February of 1982 they slipped in a quick 18.5 per cent increase. So that averages out, under those years of the NDP, to 24 per cent per year increase in the gas rates under Sask Power, under the NDP. And just for comparison's sake, under the Progressive Conservative government, in 1983, it was 13 per cent; in 1983 in September, there was an increase of 0.2 per cent; and in January of 1975 there was a decrease of 1.1 per cent — an average per year under the Progressive Conservatives of 2.5 per cent per year.

An Hon. Member: — And no sales tax.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — And on top of that I'm reminded that there is no sales tax any more on the power bills in the province of Saskatchewan, which is indeed a 5 per cent reduction.

So, Mr. Chairman, you know, he states that farm incomes were very good and vibrant, etc., in the late years, in the 1970s, and indeed that might have been the case. But I guess not having a real agricultural background, I would ask one question. If the agriculture incomes were going up and things were going so good out there on the farm, why did the NDP institute land bank and start buying the farmers' land?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, your cultural facilities grant programs, as you describe it, has a base grant of \$5,000 and has a per capita grant of \$25. If you take of community of 500 people, that will give the community \$17,500 over five years. If you take a community of 1,000 people, that would give them, I believe, \$30,000 over five years. If you take a community of 5,000 people, that will give them \$130,000 over five years.

Mr. Minister, if you need to build a community hall in a community, or a skating rink, the basic cost in a community of 500, 1,000, or 5,000 will more or less be the same. Now there will be some difference maybe in a 5,000 population community. Why, Mr. Minister, are you discriminating against smaller communities by providing them so little as \$17,500 and so much more for bigger communities, because it's probably not enough in today's age. When you think of the cost of a skating rink, an enclosed skating rink, \$130,000 is not a great deal of money. Why would you not consider, Mr. Minister, as used to be the case under . . .

An Hon. Member: — What would you do about it? You were Finance minister.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'll tell you what I will do. The member from Lloydminster speaks from his seat and asks what we would do. Well, I'll tell you what we would do, because we did it. You may have not remembered that, and you weren't here, and you may be forgiven for your ignorance of what went on. But I'll tell you.

In the previous recreation and cultural facilities grant program, there was a base grant; there was a per capita grant; and in smaller communities under a certain specified population there was an additional amount of money provided because there were not as many people in a population sense in those communities, and yet they still needed the facilities.

Now, Mr. Minister, why could not your program have included such a provision in it, where a community of 500 people could have had not only the \$25 but maybe another 15 or \$20 to assist them in providing the same kind of facility as a community that is larger, which they obviously need? Why wouldn't you have considered that?

(1945)

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, in response, I've checked with my officials and they're not aware of that clause that was there under the culture and rec facility grant program under the NDP.

But I will reiterate some of my remarks earlier: that our five-year program is budgeted at \$32 million over that period, and theirs was budgeted at \$26 million over that period. So whether or not they had that clause in there, I can't comment for sure. But if they did, they must have been taking it off the top end, because in fact their total allocation is less than what is under our program.

And certainly, Mr. Chairman, when we're looking at this program, I've talked to numerous communities that are interested in renovating or building new facilities. And when we talk about what is the fairest way possible of allocating money towards communities to help them build facilities or renovate it, the fairest way that we have found is through a per capita grant. So that indeed with the larger centres, whether they be very large centres or smaller ones, as we go down, the more people you have, the more people are in need of recreational facilities. I think that makes sense.

So there cannot be a formula, to our knowledge, that is any more fair than the size of the community on a per capita basis, then, right across the province. And certainly, if the members of the opposition have any solutions; we'd be very pleased to hear about them. But I think it's a fair program. And in talking to communities, they believe it is fair too, that everybody gets a fair shot at it.

And I will also reiterate that under our program there's a \$5 per capita incentive grant if two municipalities, two urban municipalities, get together to joint-fund a project.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, I'm not going to argue with your officials. I'm not here to discuss with them; I'm here to discuss with you this grant program. And I will say to you that either you're not telling us what your officials are telling you or your officials do not have the former program close at hand.

The former program, which I happened to be the minister at the time when it was announced, had a \$25 per capita provision, plus another amount of money — and I can't remember exactly what it was — in addition to that for communities under a certain size, plus another provision of \$5 per capita where more than one community joined together and jointly built a facility. I think that that's commendable, Mr. Minister. I think that that's a good idea.

But what I'm telling you is, that when you say you have some \$36 million in your budget, or \$32 million in your budget, and in previous years there was \$26 million, my only comment on that is — and it applies in lots of other departments, as well — too often what you budget in your government and what you actually spend doesn't quite jibe. And I suspect that may very well be the case again. I hope it's not, because I really think that some of these improved services are necessary. And I hope it doesn't happen. But I just want to make that point.

Mr. Minister, how can you say to a community of 500 people who needs a community hall that they can only have \$17,500, and a community of 1,000 which probably needs a hall of about the same size — I don't think you can build much difference in size halls — that they will get \$30,000? Can you explain how you see that to be fair?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned in my earlier remarks, we have gone across the province. We have developed this program in consultation with the communities. My officials have come up with this program. It was designed in 1983, and we are not starting year four of the program.

And as I indicated earlier, as you talk to people in the communities, and whether they're happy with the program or not happy with it, when you ask them, what is the fair way of doing it other than per capita basis? In other words, if you ask them, like, would you say that your community should maybe get twice as much? Well that means another community gets zero. Is that the kind of program you would like a provincial government to do?

If you got a basic amount of money that is there, are you going to go around as a provincial government and say, you need a new rink, here's a whole bunch of money; you guys need one, but no money for you. Or is it more fair to say to every community, you have the opportunity to use \$25 per capita as well as the base grant of \$5,000. I believe that is the fairest way possible, but like I said in my earlier response, if you have a better idea, then certainly we're willing to entertain it because in two year's time, under this government, we're going to be instituting a new program, and all suggestions are welcome, even from the opposition.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'm afraid, Mr. Minister, that even though your Premier doesn't want to call an election, in less than a year's time, it'll automatically be called. So you don't have two years. Keep that in mind.

Mr. Minister, you made a comment which I would like to explore further because I'm not sure that I understood what you said. Can you clarify to the committee how, under your formula, or the formula which I have proposed, some community would get zero. You said some communities would get zero. Would you mind elaborating on that and explaining how some communities would get zero.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, maybe I wasn't clear on that, Mr. Chairman, but what I said was, in consultation with the communities when they meet — and I've met with numerous communities that have projects in mind — that when we give them the details of the program, such as what we've gone through here before of \$5,000 base grant plus \$25 per capita and the possible \$5 per head bonus, that indeed works out to a certain amount. And they said, is there no more available?

And you know, it's simply a discussion comes along to what is the fairest for every community in the province of Saskatchewan. And when it comes down, why we got a project that we deserve more money for, I said, okay, for example, if we gave you twice as much money, that

means other communities would have zero.

An Hon. Member: — Why?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — If we were working with the same number of dollars. Under any other kind of program, if you don't do it per capita, which I think is very fair, then I guess one of the other solutions is that the provincial government with their money comes along and says, that community will get some, that gets none. Community X gets zero. What kind of program can there be? I just bring up that example.

If you're talking about fairness, I believe the per capita grant program that we have is the fairest possible. And in consultation with the communities when this conversation comes up, we have not heard of any other possible formulas or any other context that we could disburse the funds on.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, I suppose if we were describing your procedure and your policies in giving out tenders to contractors under your government — it may be for recreation purposes, Mr. Chairman, or other purposes — or if we were talking about how advertising is allocated to advertising agencies which your government chooses, then, yes indeed, there would be some. A lot who would get zero, and a few who would get everything.

Mr. Chairman, that's what the minister's talking about. In line with that kind of Conservative logic, this government would rob from Peter to pay Paul. They would take from one community and give to another.

That's not what the proposal I'm talking about is all about, Mr. Minister. All I'm saying is . . . Let me ask you this question before I say it. This community of 500 which needs a community hall will get 17,500. Another one of 1,000 will have a similar hall that they need to build, will get \$30,000. Don't you agree that the community of 500, Mr. Minister, would have to raise more money locally than the community of 1,000 — similar hall?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, on the examples the member brings up, on communities of approximately 500 or 1,000, if you take a community of 500 and compare it to a community of 1,000, obviously the one community under this program is going to get more money than the other. But on the same token they're going to have to provide more services because there's going to more people taking advantage of those facilities that are in need, either proposed to be built or renovated; and as I made reference before, that it is the intent of our program that the community understands exactly how much is going to be available to them over that five-year period, so that it can help in their planning.

And we under this program, we let the community come back to us and recommend where the money be spent. In other words, they can allocate a part of it to the hall projects, such as the member indicates, and perhaps another chunk of it towards the curling rink project; whatever it might be that is deemed in the best interest of that community.

It helps out in their planning function, and, you know, the example you bring up of 500 people versus 1,000, and certainly logic would indicate that there are more services needed in a community of a 1,000 than there would be in a community of 500.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Minister, you avoided my question. Let us assume that these two communities needed a hall — a community hall, each one. The services . . . As soon as the member from Saskatoon quits interrupting, I will continue. I won't want you to miss my question. Thank you.

Now, Mr. Minister, you're right. And I think that's laudable too. If two communities choose each in their case to build a community hall, that's a choice they should make. We won't disagree with that. So let's take these two communities; each one decided to build a community hall. Do you not agree that the one with the 500 population would have to raise more money locally, under your program, than the community with 1,000? Simply question: yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — I guess if you're looking for a very simple answer, I guess the answer would be no, because in fact, as I pointed out earlier, the base grant is the same for the city of Climax, or the two of Climax, as opposed to the city of Saskatoon. The base grant is \$5,000. So it seems like there's a distinct advantage there to the smaller centre.

And also, if two communities are planning a community hall, one to service 500 people, the other one to service 1,000 people, presumably the community that serves the 1,000 would need a bigger community hall, so therefore it should be a larger facility. The member laughs. I guess he thinks it's funny.

You know, does that not sound logical that if you're building a facility to on one hand accommodate 500 people in your community, that you would have a smaller community hall than one to service 1,000 people? So like I say, the obvious quick answer is no. Because we are servicing just like a city of Saskatoon if they were building a community hall, it has to serve a lot more people than it would, say, in Moose Jaw for example.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Minister, I think this proves your lack of contact with the communities and your lack of making yourself available to communities and organizations.

For you to stand up and make that fallacious argument that somehow you can scale down a standard community hall between a community of 500 and 1,000 people, Mr. Minister, really is . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. I'm afraid I must ask the member from Regina North East to go on to a new question. I have been following the line of questioning in the House, and since 7 o'clock, essentially two questions have been asked, one by the former speaker, and one by you. And the business of the House cannot proceed if we have this constant repetition.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I think . . . I don't

mean to argue with you, Mr. Chairman, but I think you lost sight of the total purpose of the committee of finance. In the committee of finance, Mr. Chairman, if I may make this point, there is a great deal of room to ask questions, as many questions as one wants, by as many members taking as many opportunities as they desire, until the minister either answers the question or refuses to answer the question.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I believe that members have great latitude to ask questions — and often similar — but I do not agree that essentially the same question can be asked over and over. And I ask the member to go to a new question.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I have only asked this question once, and the record will show. I asked the question of the minister and he avoided answering it. The question was simply this: if you take two communities, one of 500 and one of 1,000, would the minister not agree, if each of those communities decided to build a community hall that the one of 500, because it only gets half of the grant, would have to raise more money locally? This, Mr. Chairman, is the second time I've asked that question, and I would like the minister to answer it.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, if I can possibly clarify it for him. On those two exact examples that he uses, in a community with a population of 500, they would get, for a community hall project or whatever project, they would get 500 times \$25, which is \$12,500, plus the base grant of \$5,000, which equals 17,500. When you divide . . . Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the members opposite are interested in the answer. When you divide the total amount there that's available, as I just outlined, \$17,500 divided by 500, which is the population, that works out to \$35 per capita.

You take the example of a population of 1,000. You get 1,000 people times \$25 is \$25,000, plus the \$5,000 base grant is \$30,000. You divide \$30,000 by 1,000 is \$30 per capita. So in effect, using the member's argument, the members of a community in a population of 500 get more per capita than a population of 1,000 . . .

(2000)

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, that is a weird argument, and I just want to respond to that comment. Are you suggesting, Mr. Minister, that the community of 1,000 people wouldn't also have a municipality, an R.M., joined with them as well? I mean, what kind of logic is that?

Okay. Maybe I misunderstood. Tell me how the community of 500 would get a \$30 per capita grant but a community of 1,000 would only get \$25? Will you explain that?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I think obviously the member did not hear it. It's very simple. We're operating under the concept that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Perhaps the members beside him there don't want to hear the answer but I know this member does. Okay. Very equal situation, no R.M.s getting involved, nothing else, pure and simple. Population 500, they get a grant of 500

times \$25, which equals \$12,500. Right?

An Hon. Member: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Thank you. Plus a base grant of \$5,000; that equals \$17,500. Correct? If you take \$17,500 and divide it by \$500, you arrive at \$35 per capita. Right . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Try you one more time. Well just to continue here because we're comparing it to a population of 1,000.

In a population of 1,000, you get 1,000 times \$25, which equals \$25,000, plus \$5,000 base grant, which equals \$30,000; you divide \$30,000 which is the total, divide that by 1,000 people, and you arrive at \$30 per capita.

So therefore in conclusion, for the community of a population of 500, it works out to \$35 per capita; for the community of a population of 1,000, it works out to \$30 per capita. Is that clear?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It's clear, Mr. Minister, but it's nonsense. Now either you have a base grant or you don't have a base grant. Now a little while ago you said you had a \$5,000 base grant which every community was eligible for. Now you're saying, oh, no, we're going to add it all up and then we're going to divide it by the population and we're not going to call it a base grant, we're saying this is what you're getting per capita. Now you can't have it both ways, Mr. Minister. Either you have a base grant and a per capita grant or you have a straight per capita grant.

So don't turn your argument around when you find yourself in some difficulty, and even though . . . And don't listen to the advice from the member from Eastview because he just gave you some advice a little while ago and you know that it was wrong.

The point, Mr. Member, and I don't want to pursue it any more, because we don't want to exhaust . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, if the members opposite want me to, I will. I'm quite prepared to do that. The point, Mr. Minister . . .

Mr. Chairman, I can't hear because the members on the government side are so noisy. Can you get them to come to order? Well, it's the member from Moosomin's pipe that kind of confuses things here.

Mr. Minister, let me give you the proposal that I think is a more reasonable proposal, and this is the New Democratic Party proposal. And the proposal is that a comment . . . a program which would work well would be one in which there was a base grant, and yours is \$5,000, and I know that should change from time to time as costs of construction go up and so on. You have a base grant. You should have a per capita grant. You should have an additional incentive grant for more than one community to jointly participate in the program.

And finally, Mr. Minister, there should be some provision for communities of smaller size to assist them. And let me explain to you why I believe that's important, because under your program what you're doing is you're saying to smaller communities, you know, you're pretty good people out there — and I agree they are — because . . .

Well if the member from Lloydminster keeps yelling from his seat, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how we can proceed in this House. Now either you should call him to order, or we can't really get much done.

Now, Mr. Minister, the reason I think that my proposal is a more adequate proposal is this: because under your proposal you're saying to the community of 500 — or you pick your size, 700, 800 — that you people are more able to raise money voluntarily. I'm not sure I agree with you, but that's what you're saying. And because these people will go out, and they will sell raffle tickets, and they will have hockey pools, and they will sell hamburgers at the concession counter, and they will do all of these things, they will raise more money locally because they have to. And you're saying to them: because you've got this spirit, you're going to go out to do it, we're going to punish you. We're going to punish you by not providing some additional money because of your smaller size.

I feel strongly about this because from 1969 when I first got involved in politics and there was a cabinet minister of the former federal government going around, small communities have to die and two-thirds of the farmers have to get off the land. I said at that time we have to have government programs which really provide some kind of a balance, so that small communities do not get punished for being small communities, because they are very wonderful places in which for people to live, and they should be encouraged in every way possible.

The problem with your program is it doesn't do that; it goes the other way around. And when I got up to ask you these questions I wasn't prepared . . . wasn't going to get into a debate. I simply wanted to make the point. I wanted to ask you, why would you not have considered providing the additional 5, \$10 grant to smaller communities? Because, as the member from Rosthern would agree, that would have been, I think, a very logical program.

I'm not suggesting the member from Rosthern said anything. I think he's a reasonable man and he would agree with my proposition . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well maybe the member from Indian Head wouldn't, but the member from Rosthern, I'm quite sure, would. I know him very well.

That's simply the point I'm trying to make with you, Mr. Minister. That's the program I think would be a more adequate program. And if there was a New Democratic Party government in place, that's in general terms the kind of program we would have in place.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I have just a brief response. I think, you know, what you have outlined there as a proposal is almost exactly what is in place right now, with the exception of your small community numbers. I'll say we'll look at that. And I'm sure that our officials, when they developed this program, did look at that.

But I would maybe caution on one thing there, that when you have two communities — and seeing that you used the member for Rosthern, I'll use him as an example also

— depending where you put that border of who's eligible for this extra money because they're a small community.

Pick a figure of 500 or 1,000 — say, pick 1,000 people. Anybody under 1,000 people would get an extra grant. What about the community of 1,200? They would look at the community down the line of 900 and say, they get an extra amount of money; they're smaller; they don't have to provide the services we do; why should they get more money than we do and we have more people to serve? That's one that comes to mind.

Certainly we'll look at it because, like I mentioned earlier, after the next election we'll be sitting here deriving a new program when this program runs out in two years.

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Chairman, it seems that I'm in this debate this evening even if I wasn't in it. Mr. Minister, I have two or three questions for you, and I guess more to put something on the record than to get into the questioning.

In my constituency, which is probably one of the fastest growing constituencies in the area because of the population growth surrounding Saskatoon and the bedroom community aspects, when we, in Martensville, were building a new rink we were given the privilege of, instead of taking census figures of Canadian government and qualifying that on the \$25 and the \$5, you came out with a new policy that allowed us to take a census of our own of the community by counting people, and therefore, the grant for that community was about 30 to 40 per cent higher because of that. Is that basically correct?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, in response, that is indeed the case. As I outlined the program earlier, the population figures were based on the 1981 census. And if indeed we have a community that is growing at that kind of rate, we get a resolution from their town council saying, that according to their latest census or whatever way they might come up with a new population figure, as long as they have a resolution of the town council stating that that is their population, we will address that in our program.

Mr. Katzman: — Mr. Minister, you asked for any members who had suggestions. Obviously, in 1988 when the next possible grant will come out, and I assume the Tories will be the government — I won't be here because I'm retiring of my own volition — and I would hope that you will continue that policy which is so effective in my constituency because of the growing communities.

The other comment I would like to make is that the grant in the small community of Neuhorst, which is less than 200 people, was able to give them an outdoor rink which they are super glad to have, but they would not have it hadn't been for the program.

So I would hope that the formula of allowing small communities with a base grant and the \$25 per person, and they choose — and I report that is important — they choose if they want to put artificial ice in their plant or build an outdoor rink, be continued as well. and those are the feelings of my town councils and so forth that I am

repeating.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, certainly I'd like to thank the member from Rosthern for the question that, indeed, he reflects a knowledge of the program and certainly reflects the attitude of communities within his constituency that understand the program and the major points of it, and certainly I congratulate him for that.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I want to return in part to the theme that I was enunciating before 5 o'clock.

I dealt with the Arts Board, the funding for professional artists, and pointed out that over the four years that this government has been in office, the funding has increased by only 7 per cent during a time of 27 per cent inflation, during a time when the government's expenditures have increased by 33 per cent, and during a time when your revenues have increased by 32 per cent. You've obviously decided for some reason or other, not to make cultural affairs a priority.

Mr. Minister, I want to refer you to the general spending in your department. If you take out the \$6 million that you've . . . for the provincial cultural and recreational facilities program, take out subvotes 15, 16 and 17, take out the provincial cultural and recreational facilities program, take out the grant for the Young Canada Games Society, Saskatoon, take out the grant to the Western Canada Summer Games — none of which had any equivalent in 1982-83 when you first assumed office, you're left with expenditures of somewhat over 12 million.

Mr. Minister, the funds provided for your department this year are 85 per cent of what they were in 1982-83. In absolute dollars the funding is only 85 per cent of what it was in '82-83. I ask you, Mr. Minister: why is it that your government has decided to spend less on culture and recreation and sport rather than more? Why is it that you determine that this isn't important? I really wish you would address the issue that your government has obviously done that, because you've decreased spending. I wish, Mr. Minister, that you would share the reason with us.

(2015)

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, if the members of the opposition would like to listen to the answer. The member for Regina Centre asked the question that if you take away certain subvotes, which I think are legitimate expenditures for the Department of Culture and Recreation, and the ones he points to are 15, 16, and 17, which is under the culture and rec facility grant program, the 1989 Canada Games in Saskatoon, and the 1987 Western Canada Summer Games, if I understand correctly you're saying if you take those out, the total amount spent does not compare favourably with 1981-82.

You know, without going through the figures in great detail, just looking at what it was in the year 1981-82, or excuse me, the estimated 1982-83 which is your budget, you had an item in there youth employment services, which used to be under culture and youth, of \$1.27

million. That's one example of a program that was in that budget then that is not in it now; it's rather transferred to Advanced Education and Manpower.

And another one I'm informed, just looking at it quickly, is under the subvote there, subvote 6, under this budget of yours, under heritage conservation. I believe, and I'm informed that historic parks receive money under that subvote — and that of course is over to Parks and Renewable Resources.

So without going through in great detail trying to figure out the exact parallels between the programs that are offered now in our department as opposed to four years ago, it's hard to give a specific example. But I'll raise those two just for the sake of comparison what may have happened throughout.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, the three that I mentioned are not . . . The three that I mentioned were not a part of the '82-83 budget; '82-83 happened to come between programs, as a matter of interest.

The minister will remember that in March of 1982 the then NDP government announced a cultural and recreational facilities program to begin on April 1, 1982. Your government, I think unwisely, chose not to proceed with that program. And it wasn't in your '82-83 budget. So there was no \$6 million figure in your '82-83 budget because you people chose to skip a year. The program had been in continuous existence for many, many years. You chose to skip a year, and you did. So the \$6 million figure was absent from that budget and virtually none other.

In addition the \$2.5 million grant for the Western Canada Summer Games and the \$5 million grant for the Young Canada Games are not ongoing programs. Presumably they'll be over . . . presumably next year will be the last expenditure under one, and three years hence will be the last expenditure under the other.

So I'm talking about your programs and your grants. Not your one-time extravaganzas — the games. I'm talking about your programs and your grants which are designed to assist the Saskatchewan people in promoting cultural and recreational sporting facilities in their own communities. That's what this department is all about, is promoting those activities in their own communities.

So take out these figures and you're spending 85 per cent of what you were spending in 1982-83. I ask you how you justify that? How you justify a decrease? Is this something you think that the provincial government should be decreasing its role in, is an area you feel could be best left to the communities and to individuals themselves? What is your philosophy, in a word, Mr. Minister, with respect to this department? You appear to be cutting back on the funding for regular programs and ongoing grants.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well specifically, Mr. Chairman, the member is correct in the sense that indeed after 1987 the subvote number 17 for the Western Canada Summer Games will no longer be continuing, as well as number 16 for the Canada Summer Games in Saskatoon, 1989. That'll only carry on for a certain amount of time. And as

well under the culture and recreational facility grant program, that'll receive a budgetary one next year, which will be the end of that five-year program.

I should just shed light that under our first budget, when we brought in the culture and rec facility grant program, that was made retroactive to the end of whenever your program ended, which I believe went to January 1, 1982. I believe that's correct. So that was made retroactive so that, indeed, nobody fell through the cracks, or any community, that there was a facility there.

As far as trying to compare exactly what has been spent in each area, you know, we do have, as I was mentioning earlier this afternoon, we do have a very good working relationship with the lotteries, people involved with the lotteries. And indeed, one of our things that we've been trying to do is not duplicate services exactly between funding from the Department of Culture and Recreation and those that come through the lotteries, whether they be for sport, culture, and recreation.

So as we go through here, as we get into specifics where you think there might be a cut-back, I would like to comment on that, because indeed in some of the cases some of the programming is being picked up by the lottery trust, which is offering basically the same program. So, in effect that service is being picked up by the lottery, and sometimes enhanced. So if we can get maybe more specific, we can go through it in detail.

Mr. Shillington: — Is that your philosophy, that it is appropriate for the lottery trust to be picking up this department's responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — No, it's not. The department has a responsibility and that, as you know, as a former minister of Culture and Recreation, or culture and youth, is to promote and enhance the sporting scene in Saskatchewan, the cultural scene, the recreational scene.

And certainly even when you were minister, there were lottery dollars available, which served the same purpose — sport, culture, recreation. You know, using broad headings.

So when you have two organizations, one the Department of Culture and Recreation with the Government of Saskatchewan, and the other using lottery funds for similar purposes, I think it's incumbent that the two organizations get together, see what their programs are hitting, so that, indeed, there's not duplicate funding or indeed that the best bang for the buck, if you wish, is achieved, so that, indeed, the lotteries, through some of their programs are not doing the exact same thing as the Department of Culture and Recreation is.

So we've been working together on that to make sure that indeed the province of Saskatchewan has served to the fullest extent possible in those areas of sport, culture, recreation, heritage, etc.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, Mr. Minister, co-ordination is a laudable goal. It's always been done, and I'm not aware that duplication has ever been a particular problem. The groups have always talked.

Your departmental officials have carried on that responsibility for the full 14 . . . 13, 14 years that the lottery's been in existence. So you're not announcing anything when you tell us that you believe co-ordination is desirable. Of course it is. It's always been done. That's nothing you initiated, and nothing, I think, you've changed.

What you've changed is, you are in effect phasing out your department. And the only excuse you offer is to all of these things, well, the lottery's picking it up. I don't think the lottery is picking up the whole load. But let's leave that aside for the moment.

I ask you again: do you think it's appropriate for your department to be spending 85 per cent of what it was in 1982-83, with, as you claim, the lotteries picking up the difference? Do you think that's an appropriate program delivery mechanism?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Chairman, you know in response I think it should be made clear that I do not accept his figures that there's only 85 per cent being spent. In my previous example — just after a couple of minutes of looking at it — we picked out at least two programs that were in the '82-83 budget that are not currently within the department. So it's like comparing apples and oranges, if you wish.

As far as using lottery dollars which are designated for the same purpose basically that, you know, the Department of Culture and Recreation, I think it only makes good sense that when you have an organization with government — Culture and Recreation — and an organization through lottery funds, that they work together to serve the needs of the communities all across the province.

Indeed, just recently in the past year or so, there's been a new program announced called the trust initiative program which gets lottery dollars down to the community level, which has been sorely missed since lotteries were instituted in the province, like you say, about 14 years ago. So this is one area where lotteries are indeed getting their money back to the community level and that is appreciated by the communities.

Certainly I'd be prepared to go through the individual subvotes to clarify the situation on what the funding is and how it is looked after on a provincial scope.

Mr. Shillington: — All right. You say there were two programs which were with the department in '82-83 and are not there now. What are those programs and what was the funding?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — The way we look at it right now, just at a quick look, under number 12 for 1982-83, you have youth employment services, which is not with the Department of Culture and Recreation any more in 1986-87. That's an expenditure — just picking it right off the top — of \$1.27 million. And I'm informed that when we look back at subvote number 6 in that budget that we have, under heritage conservation, the historic parks received funding under that subvote. And that, of course,

is with the Department of Parks and Renewable Resources. There's two examples we pick out right away just to show that indeed we're not comparing apples and oranges and, indeed, the two budgets are not easily transposed upon each other. That's why I think it only fair that we go through it subvote by subvote to compare the services that are provided under the Department of Culture and Recreation.

Mr. Shillington: — All right, Mr. Minister. Take those two programs out, you're still about half a million dollars short of what you were spending in '82-83. Please deal with the issue and stop trying to complicate it. You're not spending as much money now as you were then. Why? What is your approach to this department?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Chairman, like I say, without going through it with a fine-tooth comb to get the exact figures of what was in the budget in '82-83 versus what is in for '86-87, if you, for some reason, take those three subvotes out of our budget for this year, you arrive at a figure of approximately, I think — what was it? — \$12 million. And if you do the same for 1982, just the two that we have identified, without going through these with a fine-tooth comb, you arrive with approximately the same figure. That's without going through and finding out any other programs which are not applicable. So neither . . . Using that logic, they're approximately the same.

Mr. Shillington: — No, they're not approximately the same. You take out, factor out all of those things, by my calculation, you're now spending \$400,000 less than you were then. In an era of 27 per cent inflation, when you ought to be spending close to \$15 million in constant dollars, you're spending almost the same. That, Mr. Minister, is a decrease.

(2030)

I ask you again, Mr. Minister: why? What are you doing, phasing out your department? Do you believe that this is not a proper role of government, that it's a proper role for the lotteries or the communities or someone else? What is the philosophy which lies behind this downgrading of this department?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no downgrading of this department. The member is using a hypothetical argument, and I've been trying to follow it with him.

If you look at our expenditure for the Department of Culture and Recreation, they amount to \$21,492,610. That is a department that serves the basic premise of sport, culture, recreation, and heritage in the province of Saskatchewan.

So to try and follow this ludicrous argument that he's putting forward is absolutely crazy.

We're very proud of the Department of Culture and Recreation. And when he finds such subvotes as the Saskatoon, Saskatchewan's hosting the 1989 Canada Summer Games, shouldn't be in our budget; he finds such things as the 1987 Western Canada Summer Games being hosted in Regina, Saskatchewan, shouldn't be in

the budget — let's not compare these things — then he's also saying, take out the culture and recreation facility grant program, which there's been in effect for at least eight years right now.

I think it only fair that we talk about this budget here, the budget that is in front of us for \$21,492,610. That's what's in effect for this year.

And as we go through the subvotes, I can explain in detail how we work with the lotteries, so that in fact the population and the sporting, culture, recreational, heritage groups throughout the province of Saskatchewan are served both through the Department of Culture and Recreation and through the lotteries.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, if you take out those programs you wind up with — and assuming the figure to be taken out which I think is within a few thousand dollars of being accurate, is \$400,000 — that's the program you take out for the heritage program. You wind up with a figure for current expenditures, on the same programs, of \$12,939,170, versus \$12,492,000; you're still spending \$500,000 less. Now please deal with the issue. Adjusted for inflation you'd be spending around \$15 million. So I ask you, Mr. Minister: what are you doing with this department? Why are you spending less now than you were then?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, as I've tried to indicate, that is not the case. I do not accept those figures because indeed, until myself and our officials get a chance to go through the budget that he's alluding to, to find out exactly what goods and services and programs were offered and the one he is talking about, and compare them to exactly what's being offered in 1986-87, until we get a chance to do that, I don't think it's a fair comparison. You're comparing apples and oranges.

I think we should be talking about the estimates for the Department of Culture and Recreation 1986-87, which is what we are here for. If the member believes that there is a subvote there, any specific one, any specific program within Culture and Recreation that he believes has been cut back, please identify it and we'll explain it.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, take the figure for 1982-83; take out those two programs; you wind up with \$12.4 million. Add the 27 per cent inflation and you get a figure of \$16.5 million. In constant dollars that's what you should be spending, is 16.5 million. You aren't; you're spending \$12.5 million. You're spending considerably less in this department and I want to know why, and I think the public are entitled to an explanation.

If you're going to cut the department down, if you're going to cut it back, you may do so. You are a duly elected government and you have the right and responsibility to decide your own spending priorities. But you have a responsibility, Mr. Minister, to tell this Assembly and to tell the people what you're doing. And that's what I'm asking you to do. I do not quarrel with your right to cut back on the expending in this area if you think it's not appropriate. If the Premier thinks that health and agriculture and education, and all those things that you pat on the back endlessly, are the priorities and this isn't,

then, Mr. Minister, that's your responsibility. But you do owe us an explanation, and you're not giving it to us.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm very interested in the comments of the NDP and their priority they put on health, education, agriculture, and job creation through the Government of Saskatchewan. I'm sure there will be many people interested in those comments. Like I say, Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to make this clear. I do not accept the figures that he's throwing because for one, if we take the 1981-82 budget, and take out, as you do, the culture and rec facility grant program that is denoted here at \$3 million, that brings the total expenditures for that year at approximately 11. And then if you take out those other programs, the 1.2 plus whatever you're submitting for heritage parks, that takes it under \$10 million. So I don't know why we're comparing apples and oranges here. I've made the commitment that if he believes there's a cut-back in one area, be pleased to explain it — what services are being provided through that subvote and indeed where applicable how the lottery funds through the set-up that's been in the province for a number of years are servicing the needs of the Saskatchewan people.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, your case is a great deal worse if you use the '81-82 figures, as you just finished doing. You said, okay, that's not fair; let's use the '81-82 figures. Let's do that.

The decrease is \$400,000 more. Mr. Minister, you have to remember that it was a very high rate of inflation. The cost of living increase since March of 1981 is not 27 per cent but 43 per cent. So your case, Mr. Minister, is a great deal weaker if you want to compare your last year in office — and believe me, this is going to be your last year in office — if you compare your last year in office with our last year in office, your case is a great deal weaker and the drop in expenditures in constant dollars is a great deal more marked.

So choose that comparison if you like, but tell us why you're spending so much less in this department now than you were four years ago. Tell us why you're doing it. That's all you owe us. You have every right to cut back in this area if you think the money is needed somewhere else. But you do owe us an explanation and I'm going to insist upon it, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I think even the member for Regina Centre just somewhere might admit that over the course of maybe five or six years some things will change. You know, in a department such as ours, programs are going to change. We've got new programs that have been instituted in the last few years. They had new programs that they instituted. So to try and compare budgetary figures with either 1981 or 1982 with those of 1986 serves no purpose at all. I can't figure out his logic in it.

If you look through, these are the estimates we are going through — this year's. If you have a concern, a special program, if there's a new one we've instituted; if you happen to think we've cut a program: bring it up, we'll explain it. That's the purpose of estimates — right now. If you believe that the area of sports has been cut back in

five years, say that. We'll explain it. If you believe the area of culture has been cut back, say it and we'll explain it. Quite simply, we're making the offer to go through these estimates just as we should.

Mr. Shillington: — Any discussion with you with respect to item by item is absolutely pointless. I found that out this afternoon. Because if I want to talk about the Arts Board, you want to talk about the lottery; I want to talk about funding in arts, cultural and multiculturalism, and the heritage, you want to talk about another subvote. You won't talk about the subvote that I raise.

So I am raising the whole vote for this department, in the hope that you'd confine yourself to that. So that, Mr. Minister, is why I do not want to discuss with you each individual subvote because you inevitably talk about another one. It is painfully obvious you don't want to deal with the issue, and I do. And I ask you to tell us why, in constant dollars, this department has been cut back so drastically.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I have repeated, I don't know how many times, that is simply not the case. You cannot make that comparison. You simply cannot. The functions, the programs are not the same in 1986 that they were in 1980.

An Hon. Member: — They are.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — They are not. How can you possibly say that every program is the same in 1980 that they are in 1986? You're talking through your hat, Mr. Member.

I'm saying, let's talk about these estimates. That's like comparing your age now as opposed to six year ago — saying it's the same thing, you did the same things. That's like saying a six-year-old child wears the same size clothes they do when they're 12. Let's talk apples and apples, or oranges and oranges — not compare oranges and apples.

Mr. Shillington: — We are comparing apples and apples. Mr. Minister, this department has changed less than practically any I can think of. This department has changed very little. In 1981-82, and 1982-83, there were seven subvotes under program services. Lo and behold, I'll be darned if there aren't still seven. There are darn few departments which we can say that.

How many subvotes are there for grants to local authorities and third parties? Well we find 17 now, 15 then, and you're quite right. We take out the last three now because they weren't in there then, and you have to take out of the '82-83 the youth employment services because it isn't now a part of that department; it's now in a different department. But, Mr. Minister, this department has not changed. You have basically the same people, doing the same job, with less money. And I want to know why you have the same people, with the same programs, minus the two exceptions which is common ground between us, with less money. Why are you doing that?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, he is implying that the needs of the communities are the very same they are now in 1986 that they were in 1980. He's implying that the

needs of the groups out there that receive funding from Culture and Recreation are exactly the same in 1986 that they were in 1980. He's implying that the facilities that were needed in 1980 are the very same as they are in 1986.

He's implying that indeed we should ignore the fact that the 1989 Canada Summer Games are coming to our province. He's implying that we should ignore the fact that the 1987 Western Canada Summer Games are coming to our province. He's arguing that we should ignore the fact that there is a culture and rec facility grant program that's in effect.

He's ignoring the fact that indeed the groups have changed out there. And he can make his argument as we go along there that the subvotes seem relatively the same, but I've already pointed out that after one minute, we pick out two of them that are no longer within our department that were here in 1980 or '81.

I believe we should be talking about the estimates, the programs, the services that are available through Department of Culture and Recreation, 1986 year end review.

Mr. Shillington: — Erosion, Mr. Minister, in the funding has not come about this year. It's been a gradual thing. I happen to have in front of me the estimates for each year, back to and including the year 1980-81. and the erosion of this department has been gradual. It hasn't occurred in one year. You didn't decide — when you decided to chase the Western Canada Summer Games, that wasn't the year you decided that this department was no longer important to you. The erosion has been gradual over the years. It appears to be a conscious decision that this is not a proper role for the government, and if it is, I just want you to tell me that and tell me why you think that, or it appears to be an unconscious decision.

Mr. Minister, you said the needs of the communities change over four years. All right, if that's your explanation for the smaller expenditure in constant dollars, then tell me how the needs have changed? Expand on that comment a bit, because that's the comment I'm trying to get from you.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, for example, as was brought out earlier by the member for Rosthern, he has an example of a community that indeed has increased dramatically in the size, perhaps doubled. There's one example of a community that may have changed. We may have examples of communities in our province that have gone down in population. That's an example of how a community has changed.

There could bring out examples where there's been a change-over in people. Some people have moved out; others have moved in. Emphasis may be going from one sport to another. Whereas six year ago maybe the big sport in town was curling, but now it's hockey; maybe it used to be soccer, but now it's baseball. Those are the kind of examples that the needs of a community and the activities that go on there can change.

(2045)

Mr. Shillington: — But, Mr. Minister, all you're talking about is fine tuning. The population of this province has not changed by 1 per cent since you took office. It's a fact: the population has not changed by 1 per cent. So I doubt that it is a shift in the demographics that's caused the smaller expenditure in constant dollars. and you can't deny there is a smaller expenditure in constant dollars. I mean, you can't — the difference in constant dollars is 4 to \$5 million, depending on which year you're talking about. So, Mr. Minister, what is it about the . . . how have the communities changed which justifies you spending less in this area?

So I don't think, Mr. Minister, your priorities are other people's priorities. Your priorities appear to be pumping an endless amount of money into the oil industry, and some horrendous expenditures on travel, some horrendous expenditures on advertising, and what one former member called mind-boggling salaries on mindless hacks.

Mr. Minister, I want to read for your benefit a resolution in the 1986 convention of SUMA, when they talk about the need for recreational grants. Resolution number 29 reads:

WHEREAS many of the recreational structures in the province are ageing physically; and

WHEREAS the mental and physical well-being of the province's residents is a source of economic strength; and

WHEREAS there is the need to protect the existing public investment in these recreation facilities and to make changes to facilities to meet new community (standards); and

WHEREAS the necessary financial resources to conserve our existing recreational facilities is becoming more difficult to locate.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that SUMA request the Province to make provision in its funding programs for both the construction of new recreational facilities and the renovations and upgrading of existing recreation (facilities).

And admittedly it deals with recreational facilities. It doesn't entirely deal with the spending that we're talking about. But, Mr. Minister, it shows that recreation and culture is still important to this province, still important to the communities in this province, as voiced by their elected representatives. And you say, Mr. Minister, it's not, because you're spending less in constant dollars.

So I ask you, Mr. Minister, to tell us what in Heaven's name you're doing. If the communities have changed, and that justifies the smaller expenditure in constant dollars, then tell me how they've changed and how you arrived at that conclusion?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, to continue to discussion there, just to show there have been numerous new programs to the Department of Culture and Recreation the last few years, such as the Best Ever program that was instituted, the municipal incentive

program, the athlete assistance program. These are examples of new programs that are in effect right now and show up in this budget, that of course would not show up in 1980, '81, '82, whatever figures that . . . Just some examples of brand-new programs. And I've got numerous pages here of others that probably would not be applicable, you know, six years ago.

As far as the resolution he reads from SUMA, we're very aware of it, and I did send a response to that resolution. In fact, we had a lengthy discussion with some of your colleagues on the Culture and Recreation facility grant program, just explaining how it works and the uses it can be used to.

And indeed SUMA does bring to our attention needs in their communities, which exactly they should do. And it is our responsibility to respond to their resolutions and work with them whenever possible.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I want to take you back to the Helicon days of 1982 to '84. This was the days . . . You've no doubt forgotten these days. This was the days when ministers of this government actually had a vision. There were things they wanted to do, and they enunciated them. And people in this government opposite . . . I know this seems impossible these days, because all you do is defend. You've been in a defensive posture for 18 months. And you really do have a siege mentality.

But I want to take you back to a time when this government actually had some vision and some ideas. I wonder, Mr. Minister, the question I'm going to ask you . . . I wonder if the House is interested in a small diversion, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the House is interested in a small diversion, with respect to the Alberta election.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. Member from Regina Centre, please be seated. Please be seated. Would you continue on with the questions in estimates that are relevant. Thank you.

Mr. Shillington: — In the province of Alberta, in contrast to this province's spending on recreation and cultural facilities, they have had a generous program; and they have. It is much more generous than ours. It is much more generous than ours, and has been supported by the New Democratic Party enthusiastically. Let me tell me what that support has brought the New Democratic Party in Alberta. The NDP are leading in 20 seats in Alberta. Twenty seats in Alberta. Mr. Minister . . .

An Hon. Member: — Sixteen, Ned.

Mr. Shillington: — Even 16 is the upset of the century, it really is. Even 16 is the upset of the century.

Mr. Minister, I want to take you back to a day when ministers in this government had vision, had confidence and had some ideas. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you can identify the spokesman:

Culture and Recreation Minister (Blank) last Tuesday handed the Western Development Museums a cheque for \$1.2 million as part of the

government's \$7 million, three-year capital funding commitment. He then enunciated the "founding principles"

...

The person who said this is of course the member from Saskatoon Sutherland. I guess it is, the current Minister of Tourism and Small Business, but I can't remember his seat.

The current Minister of Tourism and Small Business, the then minister of the then department of culture and youth said the following:

He enunciated the "founding principles" of the Conservatives' new cultural policy: the importance of the creative individual; universal access to cultural activities; community involvement in decision-making; and promotion and encouragement of the arts. Most significantly, he enunciated the need for government involvement. Schoenhals (then) gave recognition to Dr. Gordon Vichert's 1979-80 cultural study and the (limited) NDP implementation, but in signalling a PC willingness to become involved, he has in effect told Saskatchewan artists that they will not be abandoned.

It's part of an editorial in the *Leader-Post* dated May 30, 1983, and the editorial then goes on to say, those are fine words, Mr. Schoenhals. We support what you've said, but we gotta see some action.

And the last sentence — the last two sentences are:

Come now, Mr. Minister, in the words of another cultural figure, (W. Shakespeare): "Suit the action to the words, the words to the action." (Then the editorial says) But at least let us have the action.

What, in fact, the intervening years have brought us, is a departure of that minister, supposedly to greater things which he made an enormous mess of. But he was moved out of the department, some lesser figures took his place, and the department has been downgraded ever since. No... I am sure when the cultural, artistic, and sports and recreational community in Saskatchewan heard those words they were encouraged by them. Because as I said, in those days, members of these treasury branches had courage and vision and ideas and they were going places.

For 18 months, for the last 18 months, Mr. Minister, you have had a siege mentality. You are for ever defending yourself against enemies. And when I see the results rolling in from Alberta, I can understand some of why you have a siege mentality. But, Mr. Minister, your action contrasts so starkly with those words. Why, Mr. Minister — if the minister can stop yawning — I'll wait till I can get his attention.

An Hon. Member: — I'll tell you, when the Alberta results come in, he won't be yawning.

Mr. Shillington: — Well believe it or not he still is. He obviously doesn't care. Mr. Minister, how is it that you came to depart from that statement which I and the editorial writers at the *Leader-Post* heartily endorse. How

did you come to depart from that?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, in fact there has been very little departure from the cultural policy that was enunciated there, and as well, under this government. and may I emphasize under this government there was a sport policy introduced, there was a cultural policy introduced, and recreational position paper that have been followed by this government. And the member for Regina Centre seems to make light of the performance of one of my colleagues, the member for Saskatoon Sutherland, and I'll share with you, Mr. Chairman, just some of the comments that I have heard.

As I've been visiting with culture groups, recreation groups, sport groups throughout the province, believe me there is a big smile comes across their face whenever we start to compare the performance of that minister, the member for Saskatoon Sutherland, as opposed to the performance of that member from Regina Centre when he was the same minister. And whereas this minister, in his words, went on to bigger and better things. In fact, after his tenure as minister of culture and youth, he found himself as a back-bencher. That's how good he did with his...

And, Mr. Chairman, seeing that we seem to be bringing in some westerly comments here, it reminds me that when they bring in the number of 20 or 15, whatever the case might be, that seems to be in my mathematics to leave about 60 or 70 for the other side. And it reminds me of a saying, that they are so far behind they think they're ahead.

Mr. Shillington: — I said a moment ago, Mr. Minister, that I believe that these were the last time we would do culture and youth estimates. When I look at these Alberta results, I'm not sure that this is going to be the last time you do culture and youth estimates.

Mr. Minister, well let me tell you what the support of the Liberal party for the cultural affairs in Alberta has brought them — two elected in two and leading in one.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I've indicated earlier, and you have had your say regarding that event. Would you please get back to estimates regarding Culture and Recreation in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Shillington: — I can see why the Chairman would not want to discuss this.

Mr. Minister, I'm going to leave the area of the role of your department with the simple comment that I, for one, regret it. I, for one, very much regret the downgrading of this department. There's a saying — I believe it's biblical — that man cannot live by bread alone. While economic development is important, so is the quality of life, and that's what your department addresses directly.

And it provides leadership from the only source that it's ever going to have in Saskatchewan. In New York City and in Paris and in London, leadership in cultural affairs and patronage for it is going to come from a different source, but not in Saskatchewan. Leadership must come from this government in cultural affairs and, to a lesser

extent perhaps, in recreation and sport, and you're not giving it. And I, for one, very much regret it, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Minister, I want to make one more comment, and then I want to get on to a different subject. When I was out canvassing before the session started — I have not been out since — when I was out canvassing before the session started, I had a remarkable number of people ask me, what is your cultural policy? What's your approach to cultural affairs? And I may say, Mr. Minister, that a fair number of artists live in my riding; they live downtown for a variety of reasons.

I know now, Mr. Minister, why they are interested in an alternative — because the leadership which your government has given in cultural affairs is an abomination, an absolute abomination. And whether or not you believe it's a rallying cry for people against you, it is going to hurt you, Mr. Minister, in the next election. And I, for one, look forward to the day, which may be some time distant now, when you people actually have the courage to call an election.

(2100)

Mr. Minister, I want to get on to a different subject if I might. The executive director of the Saskatchewan Arts Board resigned. I want to know, Mr. Minister, what benefits she got in terms of sick leave, vacation leave, EDOs, overtime, and severance pay, if any.

Mr. Minister, you may want to provide that to me in writing. I don't particularly want to embarrass someone who's already gone and who may have suffered their quota of embarrassment already. So, Mr. Minister, if you want to provide that in writing, and you undertake to do so at a reasonably early date, I'd be prepared to accept that.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, in response, I will endeavour to get that information to the member. Obviously the resignation did occur and now we have a new executive director in place, but we'll endeavour to get that information to you.

Mr. Shillington: — Well I'd like it specifically. Do you undertake to give to me sick leave, vacation leave, EDOs, payment for overtime, and severance, if any?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that the individual that did resign will be receiving benefits similar to the situation of anybody else in that particular position that would have resigned. So in response to the question, we will endeavour to get that information for him.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, is your current executive director entitled to overtime pay? Current executive director of the Arts Board — is he entitled to overtime pay?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, the simple answer to that is no, he's out-of-scope appointment — order in council appointment; and there's no overtime. He's under contract.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, would you give me the amount actually expended for '85-86 on the culture and recreational facilities grant program?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, the actual amount expended under the culture and recreational facilities grant program for 1985-86 is \$4,594,942.

Mr. Shillington: — Very close to 5 million, what was estimated. Mr. Minister, when the program was initially announced, you announced a \$32 million program. You spent 3 million, a little over 3 million the first year; a little over 5 million the second year; the third year you spent about 5 million; at this rate of going, you're never going — unless I'm misunderstanding something — you're never going to spend the 32 million. I wonder what's going on here, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, indeed the member, if he wants the exact figures on the draw-down on the program, it's 3.1 million in '83-84; 5.8 million in '84-85, and this figure I just gave him of approximately 4.6 million. That gives us a figure of approximately 13.5 million over the three years. In fact, I am advised that no application that has come into the department for funding under this program that is properly done, if you wish — has everything in place — has been rejected. So this accurately reflects the number of applications that have come in.

The nature of these kinds of programs is that the larger cities do not come in with their big dollar expenditures until later on in the program. We can expect that to start happening this year, then of course next year in the fifth year.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I grant you that's probably right. Given the formula, the government has virtually no control over the amount spent. If it had all come in and got it all the first year in some impossible fashion, you could have spent 32 million the first year. I grant you, Mr. Minister, this is not a deliberate underexpenditure. I grant you that with respect to this program you haven't much control over it, because it's up to the municipalities to take it up.

If I may echo a comment made by the member from Shaunavon a moment ago, he said, with respect to operating grants, with respect to assistance for operating rinks, the times had changed. And what was appropriate for the period up to '82, which was a period of prosperity, not entirely because of the government in office — and what has followed since '82 has been a sharp recession, not entirely your fault.

But while you didn't engineer a drop in grain prices, and the grasshoppers, and the drought, the reason why these results are coming in from Alberta and other Conservative provinces the way they are is that Conservative governments have by and large failed to react. You have simply said — you and other Conservative governments have simply said, well that's tough, but these cycles come and go. And that's okay if you've a secure job, but it isn't okay if you're on the receiving end of this.

And the Alberta results, I say to the House, the Alberta results reflect a frustration with Conservative governments which won't change the policies for these changing times.

Mr. Chairman: — Order, order. Order, order, order. The election in any other province, or what's going on, has absolutely nothing to do with these estimates, and let's get on with them.

Mr. Shillington: — It has everything to do with this government and these estimates, but I grant you that it may be out of order. I grant you that the rules may not reflect reality.

Mr. Minister, times have changed. As the member from Shaunavon said, times are tougher. Municipalities . . . A formula which was appropriate during the '80s . . . I'm sorry. A formula which was appropriate during the '70s is clearly not appropriate during the '80s, because it's not being taken up.

It seems to be, Mr. Minister, that if this was truly a job creation program, as it was billed, then it's incumbent on this government to change the formula and make it more attractive. Clearly what was . . . The program in the '70s were all taken up; almost every nickel of it was used. It's not happening now.

I think, Mr. Minister, it's clear that this government ought to change the formula to make it more attractive. Instead of saying that they must come up with 50 per cent of the money, one might say 30 per cent or some other figure to make this a more attractive program. As it is, Mr. Minister, it's not doing much for job creation, which was one of the prime benefits of this program.

So I ask you, Mr. Minister: why haven't you and other Conservative dinosaur governments in this country changed your program to the changing times? That, without getting back into . . . without irritating Mr. Chairman any longer and getting back into the Alberta election, that's why you're doing so badly in Alberta and across Canada as you are, because you're not changing your programs. This is an obvious one which should have been changed. And I ask you, Mr. Minister: why didn't you change it?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, in response there, he covered a few areas there. Number one, I would like to indicate to the House that the value of the total projects that are in effect under this program are \$70,189,101. So in fact, even though through the program there might only be in the neighbourhood of \$13.5 million expended by the Government of Saskatchewan through the program, the total value of these projects is approximately that \$70 million program. And indeed, there is a lot of jobs created, I think throughout the facilities, through the communities.

In response to the second part of his discussions, diatribe perhaps, he suggests that perhaps we should change this program. Well, Mr. Chairman, quite simply, when you introduce a five-year program that has a formula based on per capita, you cannot change it half-way through, because it would not be fair to the communities that have

already drawn down by it if you change the criteria.

Quite simply, the reason we will not change it now is because it would not be fair if we did so, and I'm surprised the NDP would even mention that.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I want to give you an update on why Conservative . . . I guess I'm not going to be allowed, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: — No.

Mr. Shillington: — Let me ask a question, Mr. Minister. If I were to tell the House that the NDP is elected in nine, leading in seven, would that be out of order? I guess it would be. So I won't announce it. I'll leave that. It's obviously out of order.

Mr. Minister, I grant you that we have . . . that there's \$70 million worth. But when it was announced . . . I have the press release sitting right in front of me. When it was announced, you claimed \$100 million worth of projects. And if you had got the take-up that you wanted, you would have got the 100 million. But you didn't.

I ask you again, Mr. Minister: would it not have been a good idea, when the program wasn't flying, to enrich it?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, no. I already covered that in my previous answer. When you introduce a five-year program that is based on per capita, is that fair to the communities that have already drawn down, that have already built their rink based on their planning that they got this amount of money for this program? Say they drew down \$30,000 and suddenly you're going to say, well, you got an extra \$10,000 available. They've already built their project. That's not fair to those communities, and I think that would be the answer to that. If there's something else there, too. Maybe I could get him to repeat the first part of his question for me, please.

Mr. Shillington: — The member from Regina North East will be in here in a minute.

(2115)

Mr. Martens: — I'd like to ask the minister a question or two about the provincial Culture and Recreation facilities program.

First of all, the urban structure. How does that work in the Culture and Rec facilities grant? How does that work? Can you describe that for me?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Right. The basics of the program is that any urban municipality, or rural, gets a base grant of \$5,000 plus \$25 per capita, and if two urban municipalities wish to get together to joint-fund a project, they would be eligible for an incentive grant of \$5 per capita.

Mr. Martens: — I notice, Mr. Chairman, that under that facilities grant there's an increase of a million dollars, from five to six.

I was particularly impressed at how the communities are allowed to give an opportunity to express themselves in the kinds of facilities that they want to have. And if I reviewed some of the things that happened in my constituency, and they had the flexibility, Mr. Chairman, to determine within their community what they wanted to have, who they wanted to work with. And I think that the people of my constituency have appreciated that opportunity.

And it hasn't only gone to individual towns, it's gone to rural municipalities, and things like that. And I have been very pleased to work together with the minister in developing some of these programs.

And I just did a swift calculation of some of them. We've had about four that are over 35,000, and some over 20 that received grants, and they were very appreciative of the fact that they had that opportunity to work together with the department.

The total is almost \$250,000, and I think that that's important. And I think that as I see this increase, I think it's going to bid well for the other communities in my area that have not had an opportunity yet to use this. And I know that there are some that are going to be actively approaching the minister with some of those grant programs that they have.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I want to know . . . I wonder if you'd give me the total expenditure of this government on the 1987 Western Canada Summer Games, and the 1989 — I have to use the English — Young Canada Games?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, if he's looking for the figures on the commitment — for the 1987 Western Canada Summer Games there's a commitment by the Government of Saskatchewan of up to \$4 million in capital and up to \$2 million in operating expenses to host the 1987 Western Canada Summer Games in Regina. The commitment to Saskatoon for the 1989 Canada Summer Games is \$2.5 million in capital. And that is a joint capital program; one-third, one-third, one-third, with the federal government, the provincial government, and the host city.

Mr. Shillington: — That's total? There's nothing for operating for the Young Canada Games?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — The Canada Summer Games — the operating costs are picked up by the federal government.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, the staffing for regional services is down from 42.5 to 35.3. I'd like to know what positions are being deleted and where.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that there were 7.2 person-years that were in last year's budget that were used under that subvote for Heritage '85; that, of course, is no longer in effect in '86, so that is why there is that reduction there.

Mr. Shillington: — All right. Mr. Minister, in passing you gave me the deficit of the Centre of the Arts, but I didn't make a note of it, Mr. Minister. Would you give me the

deficit of the Centre of the Arts for '85-86, and what you estimate the deficit is going to be for '86-87.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, as we touched on earlier this afternoon, the amount paid for '85-86 towards the deficit was \$50,000. That's in addition to the original allocation of the 300,000. For 1986-87 the allocation is \$300,000; and of course it's our hope that it will not be run at a deficit. So therefore no money can be forecast for that.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I want to know the amount spent by the government on advertising, and what portion of the money spent was funnelled through Dome Advertising.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Is that for this year?

Mr. Shillington: — Both what you spent in '85-86, and what you propose to spend in '86-87.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I have the figures here for '85-86 as it relates to department advertising and specifically for Dome. For Dome actually: \$87,502, which includes development, placement and publication, and as well, the Dome media buying services of another \$9,645 for a total, \$97,147. For Heritage '85 which was completed last year, of course, the total amount spent through Dome and for Dome media buying services: \$543,705.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you'd tell me what, if any, buildings during the last year were declared to be heritage buildings by the government, not by the municipalities?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, in response to the question, to our knowledge there was no provincial designations for 1985, but there were a number of municipal designations that we'd be pleased to bring together and give to the member for his information.

Mr. Shillington: — You're going to send that to me in writing then are you, Mr. Minister — the figure with respect to the municipal designations?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Yes, what we'll do, Mr. Chairman, is we'll get them for the last few years. We'll give you both the municipal and the provincial designations that have gone for the last few years.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 9 inclusive agreed to.

Item 10

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, the Saskatoon Centennial Auditorium had difficulties in the last — I think it was in the '85 fiscal year — when it was closed down due to a labour management dispute. Was it 1985 or 1984? Was the government of the province in a position to assist the auditorium financially, because obviously they had not got the kind of revenues they had been able to gain in the past. Did the government assist with picking up some of that.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well in fact they received the \$300,000 that was designated, and that's according to the formula that's been worked out over the years.

Item 10 agreed to.

Item 11 agreed to.

Item 12

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, there is a significant drop here, Mr. Minister. Can you tell me the reason for the decrease in the funding provided for '86-87 as opposed to '85-86?

(2130)

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, in fact, under that subvote, it's one of the ones we were alluding to earlier where one of the programs that used to be in that subvote, the museum assistance program, is now being taken over and funded by the lottery trust. So the program is in effect, except rather than being funded by Culture and Recreation, it will be funded through lottery proceeds.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, I could have asked this next question under either 4 or this one, because I'm interested in the funding for multiculturalism. Can you tell me what the total funding in the department is for multiculturalism for this fiscal year? And you might as well give me what it was for last year as well if you can.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, we don't have that exactly broken out, but I'll endeavour that we will get both last year's and this year's, for the Department of Culture and Recreation, for actual amounts spent on multiculturalism. And would the member also like expenditures that are for multiculturalism through the trust, through the lotteries?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Yes, I would indeed appreciate that. And if you're prepared to give me that commitment, I will not pursue it. I just . . . and I'm sure other members feel the same as I do, that one of the greatest strengths in the province of Saskatchewan is our multicultural nature, because we have here a population composed of people who have come from literally every place in the world and every country you can find in the world. We're the richer for it.

I know that in the '70s there was a lot of emphasis put on that. Much activity that's began, it still continues. And I think that any government in this province ought to be interested in that and be very supportive. And so I will be interested in the amount that you have in the budget for this year and the amount that was there last year, so I can make a comparison.

One of the things I know, I suspect, is not in — and I hope that . . . certainly the New Democratic party is interested in it, and I would hope that the member opposite, the minister, might become interested in it, is that one of the things that multicultural groups or people of different ethnic backgrounds have provided for themselves are centres, cultural centres, halls and so on. Sometimes they

find it very difficult when they need to do capital work on it, to raise enough money, although they do because of the spirit of the people who are involved. I think it's time that government began to look at some way to provide some assistance so that we can allow them to better be able to do things for themselves and continue to develop the rich heritage which we have here.

So I won't ask further questions, I will take your word and wait for you to send me the information.

Item 12 agreed to.

Items 13 to 17 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 7 agreed to.

Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Employment Development Agency — Culture and Recreation Employment Development Fund — Vote 65

Nil vote.

Supplementary Estimates 1986 Consolidated Fund Budgetary Expenditure Culture and Recreation Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 7

Vote 7 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. At the completion of our estimates I would like to certainly thank our officials that have been here today, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Babiuk and Mr. Rogers, for their supplying of information and their patience throughout.

And also the members opposite, I believe the people that have been asking the questions, the member for Regina Centre, the member for Regina North East and, as well, the member for Shaunavon, are the ones who have been asking the questions. And I thank them for their co-operation. Thank you.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, this is a sharp break with the tradition of this session. Your estimates started at 3:30 and we're finished at 9:30.

I only want to say, Mr. Minister, while I disagree with your . . . with many of the comments you made, at least you dealt with the issues. Had some of your colleagues in Urban Affairs and Health been as forthcoming and been as prepared to engage in debate as you were, their estimates would not have taken eight days. So while I disagree with the positions you've taken, and I think you're going to pay for it when you call an election, at least, Mr. Minister in the Assembly you attempted to deal with the issues. If your colleagues will do the same, the session might not last for ever, the way it's looking as if it's going to.

I also want to thank you for your staff. As has been the case . . . The arrogant opposition wants to thank the staff, as well. As has been the case every year you've been in here, you've been reasonably well organized, had your questions. We get them in little tear-offs when we ask a

question. That's partially due to the minister, but it's also partially due to the staff. So I want to thank everyone who was here today.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:41 p.m.