

The Assembly met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, today it is my privilege to welcome six distinguished Saskatchewan people seated in the Speaker's gallery. These individuals are the most recent recipients of Canada's highest honours. Five have been invested into the Order of Canada in recognition of their outstanding contributions to our country, and one was awarded the Star of Courage for his extraordinary bravery.

The significant accomplishments and the selflessness of these individuals is a source of pride to every one of us here in the province. They have spoken, Mr. Speaker, by their actions, that the people of Saskatchewan can and do leave their mark on all segments of Canadian society.

On behalf of this government, Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my congratulations to each and every one of the individuals. Your achievements and the honour you bring to Saskatchewan fill us all with a deep sense of pride and satisfaction. The people of your communities and your province and your country thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have had the opportunity to pay tribute to these outstanding citizens, and I will now leave the honour of introducing them to the members of the legislature. Welcome the outstanding people here today.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rousseau: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, Mr. Frederick W. Hill, D.F.C., member of the Order of Canada.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rousseau: — After distinguished war service, Mr. Hill embarked on a career in real estate development in the Regina area which earned him a reputation for business acumen across western Canada. He is equally well-known as a supporter of his church, generous contributor both financially and personally to many charities and causes, and as a major contributor to the success of Notre Dame College in Wilcox, Saskatchewan. Mr. Frederick Hill, member of the Order of Canada.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Currie: — Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, Mr. Douglas A. Lee, C.M., C.D., member of the Order of Canada.

Director of administration and community relations for CKTV in Regina, he has for many years been a leader in fraternal, civic, and veterans organizations, the military and ecumenical projects in both the Regina area and

provincially. One of the key volunteers in the community, he is dedicated to helping others whenever and wherever the opportunity presents itself.

Mr. Speaker, I present Douglas A. Lee, member of the Order of Canada.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Embury: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my privilege to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, Myrl Leyton-Brown.

Mr. Speaker, Myrl Leyton-Brown became known and respected in every town and city in the province through her work as president of the highly successful Regina and Saskatchewan Canada Week committees. She has since further distinguished herself as director of the Council for Canadian Unity and Saskatchewan president of the Terry Fox Canadian Youth Centre.

Mr. Speaker, Myrl Leyton-Brown, member of the Order of Canada.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rousseau: — Monsieur le Président. Au nom du député, pour la circonscription de Kinistino, c'est un plaisir pour moi de présenter à vous, Monsieur le Président, et au député de cette Assemblée, Monsieur Mederic Zephirin McDougall, membre de l'ordre du Canada.

Ancien employé de la municipalité de St. Louis, commissaire d'école et conseiller du village, il a travaillé au développement de sa communauté. Fidèle toute sa vie à son peuple et à la langue française, il a été membre fondateur et délégué de la société des Métis et président du cercle local de l'Association Culturelle Franco-Canadienne de la Saskatchewan. Bien que la retraite il s'occupe du mieux-être des personnes du troisième âge, et a pris une part active au centenaire de Louis Riel.

Monsieur Président, je vous présente Monsieur Mederic McDougall, membre de l'ordre du Canada.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my privilege today to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, Dr. Robert Williamson of Saskatoon, member of the Order of Canada.

Founder of the Eskimology Centre of the Department of Northern Affairs, of the Innu magazine, Inuttitut, and the University of Saskatchewan's Arctic Research and Training Centre, this anthropologist has devoted his life to researching and solving the problems of the North. Over the past 35 years he has spent much of his time in the North working to provide the Innu with social, economic, and political opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I present Dr. Robert Williamson, member of the Order of Canada.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Baker: — Mr. Speaker, today I'm honoured to introduce Howard Richter.

Shortly after midnight on December 18, 1984, Howard Richter of Asquith saved three-year-old Travis Reid, who was trapped in a raging fire in his parents' home. When he arrived on the scene, Mr. Richter hurried to the back door, broke in, and went into the hallway and to the child's room. The flames and the intense heat forced him back. He immediately went around the house, found a ladder, armed with a piece of wood broke the window, and went upstairs to the room. He heard the faint crying of the child, blinded by the thick smoke leaned inside, tried to grab Travis. It was in vain. He brushed away the broken glass, and without regard to danger climbed into the room and found the toddler, grabbed him by the leg, hoisted him out the window to safety to his mother's arms. Flames completely engulfed the room moments after Mr. Richter had crawled outside.

Later in June this year Mr. Howard Richter will receive the Star of Courage. I am pleased to introduce Howard Richter.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Pickering: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to all members of the Assembly, 13 grade 1 to 6 students from the Parry elementary school, which is down in my riding. They were to be in here on — I think it was — Tuesday, but they couldn't make it because of the snow and the rain, which was more than welcome, I'm sure.

They're accompanied here today by their teacher, Brenda Arnold; chaperon, Doreen Filmore; and bus driver, Reg Zieg. I hope they find the question period entertaining and perhaps educational, and I will be meeting with them for pictures right after question period, and refreshments. I would like all members to welcome them to the legislature and wish them a safe journey back home.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a word of commendation on behalf of my colleagues in the opposition to the words of congratulations and appreciation expressed by members with respect to the recipients of Canada's national honours.

I think no one can question that in each and every case the honour was well merited. It's been my pleasure to know a number of them. Mr. Fred Hill, whose contribution has been noted; he is certainly a business man of acumen, not only in western Canada, but throughout much of Canada and the United States, serving on the boards of major financial institutions and having real estate and resource development enterprises in Canada and the United States. I have known him perhaps best with respect of his work with the Father Athol Murray College of Notre Dame at Wilcox, in respect of which he has been a generous, indeed unstinting contributor of both his time and his money. We join with the others in congratulating Mr. Hill.

Doug Lee is a person who is known in this city to make things happen. He has been a tireless contributor to many, many efforts of this city — efforts in charitable and community affairs. And we perhaps do not often enough recognize the major contribution of these animators and facilitators like Mr. Lee, and I'm very happy to see that he is being appropriately honoured.

Myrl Leyton-Brown is a person whom I have worked on many — countless perhaps — Canada Day celebrations throughout the 1970s, at a time when, if we will cast our mind back, we were wishing to emphasize the character of a united Canada when there were other voices abroad in the land. Mrs. Leyton-Brown took a major role in focusing the attention of people in this province on being Canadian and what it means to be Canadian.

Mederic McDougall is an old friend. The biog indicates his contribution to his community and to the Metis society and the Association Culturelle Franco-Canadienne. May I also recommend Mr. McDougall as a person to take you around the museums in the Batoche area. I have fond memories of going about with him and saying, that came from my great-grandfather's home, this one came from my wife's grandmother's home. He has a very, very great knowledge of the Metis in Saskatchewan — when they came from the Red River, where they settled, and who they think they are, what is their sense of being as a community in Saskatchewan. Much of the sense of being a community, which the Metis people in this part of Saskatchewan are, much of that sense has been developed by Mederic McDougall.

Dr. Williamson has been a leader in the study of the North, and his work along with others has made the University of Saskatchewan a centre of research and the garnering of knowledge about Canada's North. Dr. Williamson has worked on the anthropological side; some others have worked on other aspects of the North; all of which has contributed to the knowledge of all Canadians of this vast part of our country and has made the University of Saskatchewan a fitting centre for that study.

Mr. Richter, I have not known. The simple recitation of why he is being awarded the honour says more than anything I could add, except that I want to express our admiration not only for the obvious courage, but for the very real resourcefulness which was displayed and which led to the saving of the life of Travis Reid.

I join with the Premier and others in congratulating all of the award recipients this afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

Cost of Advertising by SGI for 1985

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for SGI, and it has to do with this government's spending priorities. This

morning in Crown Corporations Committee of this legislature, you revealed that SGI spent just under \$2.2 million on advertising in 1985. Mr. Minister, when your government is preaching restraint to everyone else in this province, can you explain why SGI felt it necessary to spend \$2.2 million on advertising last year?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to respond to that. If the member would have been at the Crown Corporations Committee, he would have heard the explanation. In brief, part of the reasons for the expenditure of that amount was because in 1985 there was significant expenditures for such programs as the Lights On For Life and the program of the rebate for good drivers in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I had an opportunity to read the transcript and in fact it was the reading of that transcript that prompted these questions. Mr. Minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, indeed we did.

Mr. Minister, the figures you supplied earlier today show that in fact nearly 30 per cent of your total advertising budget last year went to the good driver bonus rebates. These rebates, Mr. Minister, were forced on you by the Public Utilities Review Commission because you had gouged drivers in their vehicle insurance in previous years. You spent nearly \$600,000 taxpayers' money bragging about a decision which was forced on you reluctantly.

Mr. Minister, when your government is cutting food subsidies for northern Saskatchewan families so they can't put fresh food on the table, how do you justify spending \$600,000 on such hypocritical and, I may say, dishonest advertising?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Speaker, if I could pick up on a few points made by the member for Regina Centre. Mr. Speaker, he says this government through SGI has been gouging the motorists. Mr. Speaker, it was the government of the opposition right now that gouged the motorists in this province. Rate increases in the neighbourhood of 20 per cent in 1980, 28 per cent in 1981; increasing the deductible from \$200 to \$350; compared with this government through SGI, basically decreasing the rates in four years. Mr. Speaker, as well, under this administration the benefits have accrued. For example, the amount of liability insurance that comes along with it has risen from \$100,000 to \$200,000. Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that it is extremely hypocritical for anybody from the NDP to ever make those kinds of statements.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the minister in charge of SGI. It appears that the Minister of Tourism in this legislature yesterday revealed that last year his department had spent \$2.25 million on tourism advertising, and that much of that had been put through Dome Advertising. You admitted this morning that over 90 per cent of the \$2.2 million that your corporation spent on advertising last year went to Dome Advertising, which is the PC's advertising agency for election purposes.

The question which I ask you is this: was your campaign developed with the interest of taxpayers in mind, or was it developed with the interest of Dome Advertising in mind? And isn't it reasonable to assume that when you're spending over \$2 million, much more than a normal advertising budget, and putting it through Dome, isn't it reasonable to assume that the interests of Dome Advertising in the Progressive Conservative Party at least played a part in the decisions which you made?

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Speaker, in response — what was the main interest in the spending advertising dollars through SGI? — Mr. Speaker, we advertised the good drivers' rebate program, which in fact gave them back money through SGI through their rate stabilization reserve to drivers in the province of Saskatchewan who had good driving records. And we advertised that, Mr. Speaker, because we think it is very important that drivers drive as safely as possible on our highways. And Mr. Speaker, I might also point out significant expenditures on the Lights On For Life program.

And I might add here, Mr. Speaker, that I have had correspondence with the member for Regina North East, and all this morning throughout the Crown Corporations Committee on SGI. And Mr. Speaker, they always bring up: how much did it cost? Where did it go? Not once, not once has a member of the NDP ever asked: what are the results? Is there any reduction in traffic collisions out there? Is the public more aware of it? That's what people out in Saskatchewan ask, but not the NDP. They don't care about safety; we do.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Was it the decision of your board or of Dome to decide that when the Lights On For Life campaign was on television, it ought to feature, first, the hon. member for Regina South, until it was clear that he was no longer going to stand; and then began to feature one Mr. Nicholson, who was widely reported to be a candidate for nomination for your party?

What caused you to use those two people to advertise Lights On For Life? Couldn't you find anybody else?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Speaker, what caused us to use these people on some of the advertisements . . . Mr. Speaker, the Lights On For Life safety program was introduced by this government through SGI. Mr. Speaker, when the program was introduced, the member for Regina South was the minister responsible and he was the minister who piloted this through; therefore I think a very good spokesman to go out in front of the public of Saskatchewan on behalf of SGI.

And Mr. Nicholson, who you bring up, is head of the safety committee through the board of directors of SGI, and very much appropriate, I believe, in developing the program and, therefore, being a spokesman for the program.

And let me reiterate once again, the purpose of the

program is for safety, and I hope that is sinking in a little bit on the NDP benches.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Blakeney: — Final supplementary, Mr. Minister. Can you explain again why it was necessary to spend \$600,000 to advertise the fact that you were sending out government cheques, cheques which you were required to send out by the Public Utilities Review Commission?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Speaker, I believe it's the first time in the province of Saskatchewan, certainly within the last 15 years or so, that drivers in this province get rewarded for good driving records.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Folk: — And through the good driver rebate program, there were pamphlets put out with their cheques and their envelopes, and there was advertising programs. Because I think it is laudable, Mr. Speaker, that every driver in Saskatchewan should aim towards the best driving record possible, and if ever another program like this comes out, that they will get a rebate cheque.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Supplement to the minister, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could outline the procedure that went into choosing this ad agency. Was it done by a proposal or tender process? Can you tell us what the policy of the government is?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Speaker, this has been covered in committee this morning. I made it quite clear that the process that has been followed is one that has been followed in this province of Saskatchewan for many, many years; one that has been followed by the NDP, whereas an agency of record is put in charge, and that is through the agency of record for Saskatchewan Government Insurance, is Dome.

Tenders without Contract

Mr. Lingenfelter: — Mr. Speaker, new question to the Premier, and it deals with another area of awarding contracts, and particularly contracts to Associated Business Consultants, which is owned by one Ron Ryan, a former employee of Dick Collver's in the PC Party.

And I wonder whether the Premier can confirm that in recent months the company owned by Ron Ryan has been awarded first, an \$85,000-a-year contract, without tender, by the Department of Supply and Services to distribute government brochures and other propaganda in Saskatchewan grocery stores and shopping malls; and secondly, awarded an \$11,000 contract without tender by your office to compile a report on NDP convention resolutions at taxpayers' expense, and a \$10,000 contract without tender by the Department of Tourism and Small Business to do something called a summer monitor; and finally, award a \$20,000 contract without tender by the Department of Tourism and Small Business to provide management advice to businesses in Kipling.

I wonder, Mr. Premier, can you confirm this list, and do you know any other government contracts awarded to this company without a tendering process?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm the list but I can say, Mr. Speaker, that certainly from time to time in this administration, and in the previous administration, there are contracts that go out to people in the private sector, and certainly they have taken place without tender if they're small contracts and those that are designed to do specific things.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will gladly get the information. I don't have it with me, but I will respond when I have a chance to look at the numbers.

Mr. Lingenfelter: — While you're taking notice of that question, I wonder whether you would provide the Assembly with the guide-lines, when it comes to tendering to small-business people contracts such as the ones we have mentioned here, because many small-business people in the province are saying very clearly, there's only one way to get a contract from this government, Mr. Speaker, and that's to buy a PC membership.

And I wonder whether you could report back and tell us what your policy is when it comes to tendering, or the lack of tendering contracts to small-business people.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite wants to get into a partisan argument about contracting, we can get into a partisan argument. I can bring to the list here, Mr. Speaker . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order. Order. Order.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, in this province for years Service printers received contracts without tendering. In this province for years, people like Roy Atkinson would receive money without tendering — large sums of money, Mr. Speaker. From time to time the previous administration had contracts with individuals without tendering.

Now in the province of Saskatchewan, most of small business supports our government, virtually all of them have a PC membership, and virtually all of them, Mr. Speaker, may get an opportunity for contracts because they're interested in the kinds of things that we're doing. We're building projects; we're creating economic activity; we're head and shoulders against the NDP in terms of economic activity and projects like paper-mills and bacon plants, processing fertilizer and everything else. Mr. Speaker, they're against them.

So the Government of Saskatchewan deals with the private sector. And they know how to deal with them very well, Mr. Speaker, and they support the kinds of things that they see here. That's why they booted the guys out over there.

Hiring of Private Consultant

Mr. Engel: — I have a new question for the Premier in the

absence of the Minister of Tourism.

At a time when your government is running a \$2 billion deficit and has already hit hard-pressed Saskatchewan taxpayers with the biggest tax increases in our history, people want to feel that you are spending their money efficiently and effectively, Mr. Premier.

Can you tell, or can you confirm, and explain why you had the Department of Tourism pay out a private consultant more than \$7,000 of our money to prepare something called a “dude ranch opportunity profile”?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, with respect to spending money on tourism . . . Mr. Speaker, I’m sure that the young people in the legislature would like to listen to the response. Okay. So if the members opposite — would you like to listen?

Mr. Speaker, listen to them holler. I’m on my feet, Mr. Speaker, and they’re afraid to listen. The whole public, all of Saskatchewan, can listen to the member from Quill Lakes holler from his seat, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, please. Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite will be quiet enough for a minute, I will give them the answer. Okay, the answer, Mr. Speaker, with respect to advertising tourism, Mr. Speaker, is extremely important because it’s creating economic activity in the province of Saskatchewan. We are creating jobs in an industry that’s growing very rapidly across North America, and Saskatchewan is going to get its share.

Under the previous administration, Saskatchewan was the best kept secret in North America. Nobody wanted to come here; everybody was leaving the province of Saskatchewan. We are advertising, Mr. Speaker, to encourage folks to come here, whether it’s Americans or Japanese, or others. They want to come to ranches; they want to come to duck hunting excursions. They want to go fishing up North. They want to go sailing in Lake Diefenbaker. And all these packages are done in other provinces. They weren’t done under the previous administration. The tourism industry here endorses the kinds of things we’re doing to create that awareness of Saskatchewan for people all over North America, and indeed those coming to Expo, Mr. Speaker. To give you a perfect example, there’s one NDP administration in this country, Mr. Speaker, and they don’t even have an exhibit at Expo because they don’t know about tourism and they don’t know about marketing . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order. Supplementary.

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Premier, you came to office claiming that you were going to cut the cost of government and get government out of people’s lives. Instead the government has increased its spending by 45 per cent, and you assume that private investors are not even capable of doing their own market research to decide where they’re going to build a dude ranch. Can you explain why the taxpayers should be shelling out \$7,000 for this kind of market research rather than the private investors who, you say, could handle that kind of a project?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — It’s co-operation. The private sector, Mr. Speaker, wants to co-operate with government, work hand in hand to build the tourism industry, to build projects, to build fertilizer plants, to build bacon processing, to build all kinds of things here, Mr. Speaker. It’s the co-operation; it’s one of attitude.

In the province of Saskatchewan under this administration, the private sector feels comfortable in co-operating in building in the province. They don’t want to see all the tourism go to Alberta. They don’t want to see all the tourism go to British Columbia. They want to see it coming to the province of Saskatchewan.

You don’t understand that. But I’ll tell you, an awful lot of people do, and they know that the fastest growing, renewable industry in the province of Saskatchewan is tourism — a great future for our young people. The young people in this gallery today, Mr. Speaker, on both sides of the House, want jobs. They want jobs, and they want opportunity.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, many of those jobs are coming in tourism, and if we can encourage tourism in co-operation with the private sector, you’re going to see more opportunities for young people here than you would have if we hadn’t have done it and, Mr. Speaker, it shows that we are in the forefront. For the first time in decades, Mr. Speaker, this province will be in the forefront, creating opportunities, and particularly opportunities for young people in a brand-new industry, in a growth industry — tourism.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Engel: — Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Two of your cabinet ministers are living in dude ranches in Alberta — two of them. And in the documents that you tabled, or were tabled by your minister, it says: the dude ranch opportunity profile, the purpose is to access the feasibility of dude ranches in Saskatchewan; amount \$7,000 and 1,100 was spent this year, and 5,900 last year.

My question is: these documents describe the purpose of the contract, to access the feasibility of dude ranches in Saskatchewan. Why were Saskatchewan taxpayers called upon to pay the shot rather than a private investor who might be interested in the future of dude ranches?

Hon. Mr. Devine: — Mr. Speaker, if you want to initiate some programs . . . Let me give you an example. We have a new company starting up in Saskatchewan, in Regina, called Supercart International. That company was started with the help of government working hand in hand to create a brand-new project and a brand-new plant and manufacturing here in the province. As a result of that, Mr. Speaker, we can see the fruits, the benefits of the government working with the private sector, hand in hand, in terms of industrial incentive programs, in terms of investment, in terms of research, and putting a package together with venture capital. So, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact we can have a brand-new company here.

A small investment, Mr. Speaker, in tourism now might lead to millions and millions of dollars being invested, because they say they're aware of the province of Saskatchewan, and they know what kind of economic activity can take place here, because the government is behind business — behind business, not against it.

It's just the opposite, Mr. Speaker. The NDP are against business. This government supports small business in working together to create new opportunities, particularly in tourism and many other things that are happening now in the province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Air Travel — Frequent Flyer Plans

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, on May 6th the member for Quill Lakes asked a question, of which I took notice. The question was as it relates to Agdevco and the Air Canada Aero Plan.

The member for Quill Lakes alleges that according to *Public Accounts*, Mr. Speaker, that this government spent \$1.1 million on Air Canada last year. And I accept that; I don't quarrel with that at all. I think he can likely read *Public Accounts*, and I accept that he did that. I should point out that that compares to \$1.1 million spent in 1981 and '82 on Air Canada by the previous administration. I just point out that.

But the question quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, quite specifically: was the Aero Plan associated with air travel, the Aero Plan of Air Canada, and were there any employees of Agdevco that belonged to that plan; what was the policy of this government and Agdevco as it relates to benefits that accrue from those kinds of plans; and were there any personal benefits taken from the accrual of those benefits to those plans?

Now that he knows what the question is, I'll give him the answer, Mr. Speaker. The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that there are four people at Agdevco who belong to the Air Canada Aero Plan. They are the president, they are the vice-president of international services, and they are the manager of livestock and livestock products, and they are Karen English, project administration who, by the way, has just joined in the last couple of days.

Now have any awards been taken by any of these members? In the case of Karen English, the answer is no. All of the benefits . . . I will get to that part later. In the case of the manager of livestock and livestock products, the answer is no. In the case of the vice-president, international services division, the answer is no. In the case of the president, the answer is as follows: on June 1985, at the invitation of the Bulgarian government, Mr. Wells, and the delegation that included the then minister of Agriculture, went to Bulgaria . . . I would point out that in the last four years we have sold \$4.5 million worth of cattle to Bulgaria. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wells, in fact, did take his wife on that trip. He did take his wife on that trip. He used the benefits that had accrued to him under the aero plan to partially pay for his wife's airfare.

Mr. Speaker, he, at that time I believe, did it in all innocence because he was not aware of the policy that existed at that time. He has, however, Mr. Speaker, immediately upon learning of the policy that shows that all benefits of these plans accrued to the government or the corporation, reimbursed the corporation. Mr. Speaker, those are the only members of aero plan at Agdevco (agricultural development corporation) and that is the only benefit that has been used for any purpose except to the benefit of the corporation, and that has been reimbursed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Koskie: — I understand that the minister has new information from what he had the other day. But I want to ask you, Mr. Minister, if you would in fact, since you said that there is a government policy in respect to it, whether or not you would be prepared to indicate whether it's in writing, and would you be prepared to file the policy in respect to this with the legislature?

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — I'm sure the policy is written — well, as a matter of fact I'm very sure it's written, and I can read it into the record. I can read it into the record. And it reads as follows:

The use of flights paid for by government for credits can only be permitted if the government is the direct beneficiary of any travel rewards. Benefits to the government would . . .

That's it. The benefit of any travel plan cannot be beneficial to the individual, but only to the Government of Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, if reading it into the record isn't good enough, I'd be more than glad to provide the hon. member from Quill Lakes with a written copy, and perhaps he can find one of his colleagues that could read it to him.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order.

TABLING OF REPORTS

Mr. Speaker: — Before orders of the day, I would like to lay on the Table and annual report of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, Saskatchewan branch.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 34 — An Act to amend The Highways and Transportation Act

Hon. Mr. Hodgins: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. By way of introduction, it does give me a great deal of pleasure to speak to the amendments now before this Assembly regarding The Highways and Transportation Act. In very simple terms, Mr. Speaker, these amendments establish the legal authority for the Minister of Highways and Transportation to allow business and community signing adjacent to a provincial highway.

This authority, Mr. Speaker, is within reason in regards to both safety and visual appeal, and the intent and the integrity of this legislation as it now stands will remain intact.

What we are really doing, Mr. Speaker, is responding to a relatively new trend that has developed in recent years. In the past, Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago, signing adjacent to a provincial highway was very, very limited. Businesses and community signing for goods and service was restricted to urban limits only.

But as you know, Mr. Speaker, there has been a change in direction and a change in philosophy in our province. There is a new climate in this province's small business sector and rural communities. And for the purpose of this legislation, that new climate has resulted in a need for greater expression. Small businesses located within our rural communities want to extend their invitation to do business. Rural centres want to promote their events and express their various community attributes in a more direct manner. As government, we have noticed this trend and now we are taking the appropriate action.

(1445)

I would like to acknowledge the efforts of my colleague, the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. He has assisted in bringing to focus the desires of our small business sector and rural communities on this matter. Consequently officials from my department and his met with community representatives to develop appropriate signing options.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the Act will allow this government to implement a new policy regarding highway signing. And that policy will satisfy the wishes and the desires of hundreds of small-business people and rural communities.

Mr. Speaker, in the past this government has responded to the special signing needs of its citizens. Last year amendments were introduced that provided directional highway signing for rural businesses located a distance from a provincial highway. This year, Mr. Speaker, we are now responding to the highway signing needs of businesses and activities located within corporate limits. In effect, Mr. Speaker, these amendments will allow permits to be issued to allow advertising signs to be erected along a provincial highway within the controls established by regulation and by policy.

I want to assure the members that regulations and policies will ensure that both aesthetics and safety are retained, while still allowing in the adjacent communities to make the highway user more aware of services available in that town.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my remarks to you today, and I do look very much forward to a more detailed discussion during committee of the whole.

Mr. Lusney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I listened to the minister's comments with some interest, and I'd have to say that it appears that they spent a lot more money on signs and advertising than they have on highways. I

would like to, however, have the opportunity to review the minister's comments in second reading. I therefore beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mrs. Smith that Bill No. 22 — **An Act to amend The Education Act** be now read a second time.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated when the minister introduced this Bill in second reading, I wanted to take some time and consider the remarks that the minister had made, as well as consult some other people. I have had an opportunity to do both of those, and therefore I'm prepared to make just a few comments on the Bill and then have the minister conclude debate if she so wishes.

First of all, Mr. Minister, I have looked at section 7(2) of the Act which is being repealed, and I see no great difficulty in that amendment. The Act is being repealed because . . . It seems to me that it could have very well have been put into The Department of Education Act initially when there was a consolidation of education legislation several years ago. So I think that I would say that that probably is a good move and certainly has not raised any questions in my mind.

The other portion of the Bill deals with rural school divisions. And as you know, Mr. Speaker, having been involved with school board work, that school divisions are divided into school districts, each of which has a board of trustees. And as I understand it, this section, the amendment here is a provision . . . Being amended provides for matters related to the holding of a first election after a school district is established, and the appointment of a returning officer therefore seems necessary. And I think it is clear from, as I understand the Bill, and from the few comments that the minister made, that in a discussion on the principle of the Bill that that is something that I think is necessary.

I do have some concerns about another portion of the Bill. And if I just may refer to the section, so that I . . . because I'm going to ask the minister to . . . I'm not going to talk about the section itself, but simply because I'm going to ask the minister if she would, in her remarks, clarify some of the questions that I'm going to ask.

What the Bill does, Mr. Speaker, is change a provision in which parents who had students in a school below the age of 18, who could get the school records at request according to school board policy, as established by the school division board. What the amendment does, Mr. Speaker, is change that now, so that parents or guardians . . . The reference to the age of 18 is removed, and the amendment now will say that parents or guardians of a student would be able to make a request to get and see the record of the student.

Now neither the explanatory notes nor the minister in her comments explained what it is that has brought about the need for this amendment. If I recall, Mr. Speaker, the minister did say that this phrase has not been a problem, referring to the way that the legislation is presently written. If there is not a problem, and there has not been the problem, I hope that the minister will, in her closing remarks or, if not then, then during committee, explain why it is therefore necessary to have this amendment brought in.

One of the things that I think is significant here, Mr. Speaker, in this Bill is that it talks of the pupil as a dependent. That leads me to understand — and if I'm wrong, I would appreciate being corrected — that if I had a nephew or a niece living with me, going to school, having been out of school for several years and therefore maybe 21, 22, or 23 years of age, and if I was putting up the board and room, which therefore I suppose would make that person dependent on me and my wife or our family, that I would be able to have access to that person's records from the school if this amendment is passed.

Now I'm not sure whether I want to say that I'm in favour of it or against it because I would really want to know what the explanation of "dependent" is in this kind of a case. The thing that was lacking, I think, in the explanatory notes and in the minister's remarks is that, has the department — and I would like the minister to consider this and maybe respond to it — has the department and the minister considered all of the possible implications of this new amendment and this lack of a definition of what a dependent is?

I think it's obvious, although I know that in committee of the whole last year, or the year before, this issue was raised. I understand that. But I think that there are some rather broad implications here that need to be considered, and certainly during committee we are going to want to consider them with great care.

But I really think that maybe not enough thought has gone into the preparation of this amendment when one asks the question which I have asked: one, what is the definition of a dependent or what is the definition of a dependent going to be? I don't see it in the amendment.

And two, does this mean that anyone who may be living with anyone else, regardless of age — because the references to the 18 years of age has been removed — will, whoever he or she lives with, have access to that person's record? Because without a definition of dependent, I think that possibility is there.

Mr. Speaker, the other amendment that is in the Bill, which the minister explained, deals with equalized assessment. And I think one of the things that is not clear in the legislation — and I will want the minister to respond, if not in the closing of the debate, then certainly when we get to the committee — is: what is meant by the idea of a stage, when she refers to "staged" introduction of reassessment?

There is no explanation in the remarks of the minister or in the explanatory notes, nor in the Bill. What is meant by "staged" introduction of reassessment in a number of

rural municipalities? That is, I think, needs some explanation. And I'm sure than not only I, but people who might be affected, will have some interest in it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the idea that a school board or school division board should be able to amend a by-law by resolution strikes me as really, I think, putting the whole concept and the process of how you go about passing a resolution and giving the taxpayer an opportunity to have some say in it . . . the idea that a resolution may be able to therefore amend the by-law, I think is quite questionable, and the proposal that the minister has put forward to do away with the concept that you can change a by-law by simple passing of a resolution, I think is a good amendment. I think we certainly . . . I have no concerns about that. I and my colleagues will welcome it.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I want to say on this particular Bill. I know there is another one that comes along with it, and I will have said all of my comments in this case, and I shall await both the concluding remarks of the minister and the committee when we can pursue the issues that are here at greater depth.

Hon. Mrs. Smith: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member from Regina North East raises some very good questions today, and as committee of the whole is the time to get into a great deal of detail and specifics, I would gladly have that information available at that point in time.

Perhaps, though, a few remarks on two of the issues that he has raised. Section 146 of the Act, in dealing with the year — the 18-year-olds — it is my understanding that when we had an amendment before this House last year, it was considered non-controversial and, therefore, went to the committee which is also made up of the members of the opposition.

At that time, the committee asked the department to monitor and reconsider the phrase that we had in there at the time which was: the pupil "is 18 years of age, or less, and . . ." Now that phrase, Mr. Speaker, has not created any problems that we could see with boards of education, nor with the department. And we suggested that it neither added nor did it detract from the intent of the section.

And the intent was that the key element is whether or not the pupil is dependent on the parent or guardian, not whether the pupil was of 18 years or less. And, of course, the member will be well aware that 21 years is also covered in legislation as to the age category that a board of education must be responsible for educating, if that's what the 20- or 21-year-old within the divisional boundaries insists upon.

However, as I said earlier, some of the questions that he has raised are very good questions, and I will make sure that we have the answers when we get into committee of the whole.

Just on the issue of section 279, Mr. Speaker, and reassessment, it is my understanding, for the benefit of the member of Regina North East, that assessment has normally been on a 10-year cycle, and that, in fact,

councils and R.M.s have had the opportunity to phase in over that period. For example, the city of Saskatoon, I believe, chose to do a three-year phase-in. Well this year, Mr. Speaker, is the last year of the reassessment, and some have not even began the phase-in. And what this does is allow a phase-in for next year, which many of them have already had the opportunity to do. It's nothing more than that.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

(1500)

MOTIONS

Recess to Greet Distinguished Guests

Hon. Mr. Berntson: — Mr. Speaker, by leave of the Assembly, I move, seconded by the member for Kindersley:

That this Assembly do now recess for 30 minutes to greet our distinguished guests, the recipients of the national honours.

Motion agreed to.

The Assembly recessed until 3:30 p.m.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

SECOND READINGS

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Hon. Mrs. Smith that Bill No. 23 — **An Act to amend The Department of Education Act, 1983** by now read a second time.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Thank you for waiting, Mr. Speaker. I just want to simply say that the amendments in this Bill are consequential to the previous one, as I indicated with I spoke on that, so I will not repeat what I have already said. They're necessary because of the amendments to section 7(2), in particular, in the previous Bill, so I simply will indicate that we are quite satisfied with the amendments because they're simply consequential.

Motion agreed to, Bill read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole at the next sitting.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

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

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to introduce the deputy minister for Culture and Recreation, Mr. Bill Clarke, seated to my immediate left. Behind us we have our two assistant deputy ministers: Mr. Keith Rogers, in charge of programming; and Mr. Dave Babiuk, in charge of operations for our Department of Culture and Recreation.

Item 1

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you'd begin by giving me the - you may supply this in writing if you like — the names, salaries of your personal staff.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, we have that for the member. We're just going to get a copy of it and we'll sent it over to you shortly.

Mr. Shillington: — I gather, Mr. Minister, that's something you're going to photocopy and send over as soon as you can photocopy it. I see the minister nodding his head. I'll leave it at that.

Mr. Minister, I wonder if you would give us the details of your out-of-province trips in the last fiscal year.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I'm sending a copy of the information required over to the member right now.

Mr. Shillington: — Did you say that you're supplying this, Mr. Minister? I'm sorry. I didn't hear you for the interference, for the static.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I did, to his last question. I sent over the information he asked for, and I have the information from his first question in front of me right now that I could send over.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order, please. Go ahead. Why don't you just let him ask his question.

Mr. Shillington: — Do I take it, Mr. Minister, the first two named, they're executive assistants; the last two names are secretarial staff?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, yes, that's the case just as last year. They are all classified as ministerial assistants, but the way we're most familiar with it, the first two names are executive assistants, if you wish; the second two names are secretarial staff.

Mr. Shillington: — Were any of these individuals awarded any increase in pay during the last 12 months for any reason?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, to make sure we have the information exact, I will take notice of that and make sure. My understanding is that it's just the regular increments that have accrued. There was no percentage increase, but I will take notice of that and come back to the member with the exact information.

Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much. Mr. Minister, some time ago you announced, if I recall correctly, some new plans, I'll put it that way, for the MacKenzie Art Gallery. Could you give me the current status of that? I may say by way of background, it wasn't at all obvious what the status was when you made the announcement. It was not obvious to what extent the proposal depended upon federal government financing and it wasn't obvious to what extent, obviously, till now that you have it in place. So I ask you for an update on that.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I'll give you the information. I'm not exactly sure what you're getting at. Is it the financial contributions of each of the parties involved? If that's the case, when the announcement was made, I'll give that to you here.

The federal government . . . Mr. Chairman, if the members opposite would keep it down a little bit so the member can hear the answer. The federal government is contributing to this project \$2 million; the city of Regina, 1.05 million; the provincial government for their share of the natural history museum, 4.5; and for the provincial government's share for the Norman MacKenzie Art Gallery, 3 million; for a total provincial contribution of 7.5 million. And also the friends of the MacKenzie, or their fund raising, will be raising \$2 million. That's the status as it stands.

Mr. Shillington: — I'm having some difficulty, Mr. Minister, hearing you. You're dropping your voice in the beginning, in the middle, and at the end. I want it known that the chatter which surrounds me has nothing to do with my inability to hear your answers.

Could I, Mr. Minister . . . Could you tell me what the federal government's portion of the funding is again. You may have said it; I couldn't hear you.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if my voice was dropping or if the voices of some of his neighbours there were raising. The federal government contribution was \$2 million.

Mr. Shillington: — And that is in place, is it?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — That is in place and announced.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, when do you expect construction of this to start?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, according to the plans that have been developed through all parties concerned, and I'm reading from the schedule that was submitted at the announcement of the project, construction is scheduled to start in August of 1987.

Mr. Shillington: — And what do you anticipate as the completion date?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — The completion date here is listed as June 1989.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I want to move on to the item of funding of the arts. This comes about from your department. Funding for the arts comes through a number of spigots, if you like, from your department. But by fair, I think, the most important to the arts community is the Arts Board itself.

I have, Mr. Minister, estimates for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1983. Those are fond memories for your government. They were the first year you were in office and your incompetency in a number of areas had not yet been as fully demonstrated as it has now.

I also have the estimates for this year. I compare the two

figures. Mr. Minister, there has been a 14 per cent increase in funding to the Arts Board over the four years, now going on five, at a time when there's been 27 per cent inflation, at a time when your government's revenues have increased by 32 per cent and your expenditures have increased by 33 per cent.

Put very plainly, Mr. Minister, the arts have not got their share of the bounty of this province, such as it is. Mr. Minister, the Arts Board were, I think, critical — I think that's not putting it too strongly — of the level of funding which was provided under the former administration. Their situation has actually deteriorated in the four years you've been in office. You have . . . Their funding has dropped by 18 per cent, I suppose, in real terms.

That's a very significant drop to a group for which there was no fat. Artists have one of the lower standards of living of any occupational group in Canada. We pay any number of groups — no doubt merited — a great deal more than we pay artists. And I think it's fair to say that the talent needed by artists is a good deal more.

Let me give you an example. We pay zoo keepers about twice, on the average, what we pay artists. I've got nothing against zoo keepers; they no doubt perform an important role. And I'm not being critical of . . . Well I leave aside the role of the whip in government caucus. He no doubt qualifies for the same occupation — that of a zoo keeper. But I wasn't particularly thinking of him.

I was addressing my concerns to those who harbour animals which there's some hope of taming; not the whip of government caucus. Mr. Minister, the issue is not your government caucus, the issue which I want you to deal with is the funding to the Arts Board.

(1545)

In real terms it has dropped very substantially and, Mr. Minister, I want to know why you think it is that the artistic world should be singled out to make a contribution to your government's extravagance in other areas when others, such as members of Executive Council, are not?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, let me respond to that by saying that indeed the funding for the arts and the cultural activities that have gone on in the province of Saskatchewan has increased rather dramatically in the three or four years since we have been government.

But to address the questions more succinctly on the point that the member raises to do with the Saskatchewan Arts Board; he quotes a figure of 15 per cent. But I'd like to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that there has been a lot of consultation go on between our Department of Culture and Recreation, between the Saskatchewan Council of Cultural Organizations and the professional arts community through their representatives on the arts alliance.

And, Mr. Speaker, even though it shows up in the blue book this year as expenditure, I believe \$2.153 million . . . In fact through these consultations and in conjunction with the Saskatchewan Council of Cultural Organizations

which received the lottery money in the province of Saskatchewan, that through these consultations agreements have been worked out within this process that indeed some moneys from the lotteries are going to the Arts Board, and it's an arrangement that has been worked out for the Summer School of the Arts out in Fort San. So, in fact, if you add to last year's figure an amount of \$250,000 to what is in the blue book and then for the coming year, this year, the 2.153, if you would add \$350,000 to that, that is really the contribution that is going into the Arts Board this year.

Mr. Shillington: — I'm going to get those figures from you more specifically later on today or tomorrow or at some time?

Let me tell you, Mr. Minister, that even if your figures are accurate, the increase to the arts is still pathetic. I said 14 per cent. I'd opened the books and done the calculation mentally, quickly, and I made it in error. I was unduly generous to your government. The increase in the figure from the first year you were in office to your fourth year is not 15 per cent but it's 7 per cent. If you add in the figures — and I'm going to get to that in a moment — if you add in the sums you suggested, you still just get up to about 14 per cent. So in real dollars the arts community are getting along with a lot less now than they were. So I ask you, Mr. Minister, to address yourself to the question I asked, that is, why you think it is that the arts community should be singled out for treatment which you haven't accorded the government generally.

Let me remind you again, your government spending during the period of time you have been in office has gone up by 33 per cent; your revenues have gone up by 32 per cent. But you have increased the funding to the Arts Board by a niggardly 7 per cent. I ask you to address yourself to that discrepancy, Mr. Minister, and stop wandering off on a whole lot of other areas which are only remotely related.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I don't think that's really a fair comment to say that I was wandering off. Indeed, it is addressing the very question that he has asked, that over the past few years there has been a number of consultations that have gone on to parties interested in this specific area of culture and the arts in the province of Saskatchewan.

And I think if you look at the amount that is being expended on cultural spending, it is really rather phenomenal. The member keeps bringing out just one area, as in the Arts Board, and I've explained that indeed that figure should be inflated by \$350,000 this year. And indeed the Arts Board, we're in consultation with the Arts Board. And if the members opposite would remember that the Arts Board is an arm's length organization from government, and that indeed they do with the money, if you wish, as they wish. So indeed we don't have any direct say in how their money is expended, rather we give them the total blanket amount, and it is up to that Arts Board to pay it.

And as I explained earlier, in the last couple of years we've had extensive consultation with the groups concerned. And, Mr. Chairman, I'm very proud to say

that, indeed, on the amateur side of culture in the province of Saskatchewan, through the Saskatchewan Council of Cultural Organizations, they've been able to sit down and recognize, along with the professional artists, that there is some problem, and they have bent over backwards to help.

And if we go back in history . . . and I'm sure the member opposite will remember that in approximately 1982, I believe it was, that when the crisis was hitting under the former administration, a choice was made by the professional artists in the province of Saskatchewan, and their choice was between going to lottery revenues or going to the Arts Board. And they chose the Arts Board, and it worked out quite well.

But as we're all aware right now, lottery revenues are increasing, and therefore to the benefit of the amateur cultural organizations and professional artists, even though they've had increases of not being as great. So therefore the importance that I believe, that the two groups can consult with each other and try to alleviate the situation for the betterment of the whole cultural and arts scene in our province.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I wonder if you're going to deal with the question I raised. I'm delighted to know you've been consulting, Mr. Minister. That's really heart-warming. I'd be interested in your views, though, on the funding. There's no question, and I gather you're not disputing it, but in absolute terms, even assuming you can add in the extra funds from the lottery, there's no question that in absolute dollars, in constant dollars, you're funding has dropped. Would you please address yourself to that issue and stop avoiding the subject by talking about a whole lot of things which are only marginally related.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I don't think we should be narrowed down too much when we look at arts spending or cultural spending throughout the province, as I've alluded to. The member looks at figures, which are just that — moneys expended by the Government of Saskatchewan to the Arts Board. I've indicated that in fact those figures are higher because of the lottery funds that are coming over to it.

But I think we have to look at the whole cultural scene in the province of Saskatchewan as it relates to the arts and cultural expenditures, and you know there's been numerous projects that have been funded. One of which is a benefit to the professional artist is what's going on now out in Vancouver — it's called Expo '86 — where a million dollars is being provided by this government for performers to go out and show their wares to the whole world. So I think it's rather narrow to look at it just in the one scope of the Arts Board.

And I look down here at cultural spending: 1982-83, of approximately \$8.8 million; 1983-84 of \$12.5 million; 1984-85, \$17.2 million; 1985-86, estimated at \$20.2 million; and estimated for 1986-87, another \$13.54 million. And the reason for the . . . (inaudible) . . . in there of course was the heritage year, which was in 1985, and a few other items. But indeed when you look at cultural funding across the province of Saskatchewan, which

includes funding to the Arts Board and funding to professional arts, has indeed fared out very well.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, would you send me, just so we can all use the same figures, would you send me the detail of what you believe has been provided to the client groups of the Arts Board through the lottery foundation?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, if the member is asking how much went from the lottery to the client groups, we don't have that information specifically with us right now, and we'd have to send that over later.

Mr. Shillington: — When will you be able to supply that to me, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that the annual meeting for the lottery groups is going on right now, or will be coming up very shortly, and until that final meeting ratifies the actual expenditures going out there, that information will not be made public. But after that, when it is public, I will certainly see that member gets that.

Mr. Shillington: — Where did you derive the figures from you gave me a moment ago? You were using a figure of 300,000. What were you making public then?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I thought that was fairly clear. Those were a special arrangement that has been arrived at in the last two years, where the amateur cultural organizations who receive the lottery funds have entered into an agreement with the Arts Board for the operation of the Summer School of the Arts at Fort San, whereby they would split the operational administration costs out there, which last year amounted to \$250,000, and this year to \$350,000. And the effect that that has is that the Arts Board would not have to pay out that amount of money for the Summer School of the Arts, but rather could use it.

And I am informed that they have used that for the specific area that I believe the member is getting at, and that is the funding of professional arts in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister even with that included, the fact remains — to which you will not address yourself — the fact remains that in constant dollars you're spending less now than you were then. You're providing less money through the Arts Board. It is the Arts Board that provides funding to artistic groups in this province. And in constant dollars they're getting less — a good deal less — in constant dollars they're getting about 16 per cent less now than they were in 1982-83 when you first came into office. And that, Mr. Minister, simply won't do.

Why is it that your government feels that this is not a priority, that extravagant trips to China by the now Minister of Tourism and Renewable Resources is a priority, taking 11 people with him; that \$2 million advertising to SGI is a priority; that another sum in excess of \$2 million with Tourism and Renewable Resources is a priority? But the artistic community, through which this province and the people of this province attempt to come to terms with themselves and their environment and their society, why is it that the artists are not the priority that

self-serving government advertising and elaborate trips to China are?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I think the member is trying to compare apples and oranges, to a large degree, here. Indeed, funding has been increased to the professional arts, to the Arts Board in Saskatchewan over the past few years. And indeed, if the member wants to talk about priorities, and I think our Premier and many others have alluded to what the real priorities are — they're agriculture, they're job creation, they're health, and they're education. And the members can maybe dispute that.

But I've also articulated that indeed the professional arts community has been receiving increases over the past few years, and now that there is a distinct willingness for all the groups involved to work together so that these problems can be addressed, rather than the way it was through the former administration where the only money they got was through the Arts Board. Now there are other avenues, and indeed it's rather narrow to talk about culture in the province of Saskatchewan and keep it to just the Arts Board expenditures.

(1600)

Cultural activities are going on around us throughout the whole province, and indeed they're enjoying, I think, increases in funding through the lotteries that are just really unsurpassed. And they're putting them to very good use. They're conducting activities; their organizations are flourishing all the way out the province, and that is really of benefit to all the communities, to the major centres and, as I've explained, it is also of benefit to the professional artists in our province.

So I think when you look at other jurisdictions who some may have cut, others have frozen, indeed, if you look at the pure black and white, which the member just wants to do, there has been increases in the province of Saskatchewan. But as I have explained, those increases are really much higher, and I only allude to special projects such as the \$350,000 that is coming over to the Arts Board this year, the \$1 million that is going to fund Saskatchewan performers out in Expo '86 this year.

We look at the expenditures that have gone on for . . . You know, Western Development Museums. For the past few years there's been a lot of money spent on culture under the broad text of culture in the province. I don't think it's really necessary to look at just one area, because it is much larger than that.

And if we go by our consultative approach with the professional arts community, they seem to be rather happy. I think anybody would like to see more funding come. But I'm sure they would take quite a large bit of exception if they heard the example that the member for Regina Centre gave, of comparing Saskatchewan artists to those tending zoo.

Indeed, Saskatchewan artists have a tremendous amount of pride, and they go out there and they expend their wares. They're proud of it. And they're not on a set wage, my friend, and the government does not pay them

directly. Rather, they are out there for the benefit of their community, and the community supports them as well as through avenues such as the Arts Board.

Mr. Shillington: — The minister knows very well I did not — I was not being in any sense derogatory to the . . .

An Hon. Member: — Yes, you did. You were so. We're going to let them know.

Mr. Shillington: — Well the member from . . . Trust the member from Qu'Appelle-Lumsden to attempt to twist words out of their meaning, yelling from his seat, making no sense, and being, I might add, quite dishonest in the allegations he's attempting to make.

Mr. Minister, if you take out the \$6 million which is now in your estimates for a culture and recreation facilities grant which wasn't there in '83-82; take out the \$500,000 for the Young Canada Games; your department has received over the four years you've been in office — now going on five, to the chagrin of everyone — now into its fifth year, your department has gone a 3 per cent increase in funding, a 3 per cent increase in funding. I have not gone through these things department by department, but I will bet . . . I would venture to say this is the lowest increase in government.

I'm going to get on to some of the other areas in due course, Mr. Minister. Nothing will hide the fact that your department is the forgotten child of the Conservative government. Your funding to the Arts Board — notwithstanding some changes which I want to get to in due course, in which you moved in some relatively high-profile supporters into that Arts Board — notwithstanding that, you gave them a 7 per cent increase. The figures which you allude to from the lottery are not a permanent program. And even if you add them in, it only comes to 12 per cent. Mr. Minister, you have frozen this department.

There are other areas I want to get to afterwards, but I want to deal with the Arts Board. And I wish you'd deal with that and stop tripping off to Expo and repeating what a great job you've done in consulting. I may say, I don't agree with that. I may say, I just do not agree with the success you claim in talking me into somnolence.

It may have worked at one point in time. You may have been able to talk your way out of this freeze at one point in time. But my experience has been in dealing with the arts community, that after four years you've got to quite blaming it on somebody else. You've got to get out of the paralysis by analysis syndrome that you experienced during the first year, which some of your colleagues have shaken off but which you have not. You are still consulting them after four years, when the time for action is long since past. It is long since past.

Mr. Minister, a 7 per cent increase in funding to the Arts Board over three years simply isn't enough. The artists are saying that, and all the consulting you're doing is wearing awful thin. They believe it's time for some action. Goodness knows, you might get around to doing something in this department a month or two before an election. That might not be considered precipitous — to

finally getting around to doing something at what is not just the 11th hour but the 11th hour and the 50th minute in the 11th hour.

As my colleague from Regina North East said, the only significant change that anyone can see is that you changed the name.

Mr. Minister, I would ask you to address yourself to the funding for the Arts Board, to the fact that it's been a 7 per cent increase, and stop dealing with every other issue. I know you'd dearly like to talk about Expo or about your consulting or about anything else. Please address yourself to the Arts Board, just for a few minutes, and tell this Assembly why you think the artistic community is not deserving of the largess that so many others have received.

And I will name some of the people who have done very well under this administration. The advertisers, not the least of it. So I ask you to address yourself to the arts community, and let's get to Expo '86 when the conversation naturally gets there.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Chairman, you know, we've gone around this already numerous times. The member makes specific reference to the arts community. I have explained, I think in some detail, that indeed the funding to the arts in the province of Saskatchewan is much larger than that one expenditure of \$2.153 million to the Saskatchewan Arts Board. And indeed that figure is higher through an agreement worked out with the cultural organizations. Add \$350,000 if you want to look at it narrowly.

And I think if you want to expand on that argument . . . I don't know what kind of comments you're looking for me to come up with unless you come up with some specifics. Name a group, name a series of groups, and what their concerns are. We go through out mail every day in my Department of Culture and Recreation. We have consultations with the Arts Board. My department people have consultations. We're not aware of any tremendous, overpowering burden that is being placed out there.

Rather, the community seems rather positive. Nobody's going to say that everything is just great, but rather it's adequate. Their needs are being looked after through the system we have set up through the Arts Board and through the lottery programming.

And once again, when you're looking at the arts community in the province of Saskatchewan, it is much larger than the figure of \$2.153 million. Rather, it's all the moneys that come in from lotteries, through our Department of Culture and Recreation, as well as through the Arts Board. And indeed the funding is there. And if the member wants to pursue this, then please bring up specific examples and we'll address ourselves to it.

Mr. Shillington: — Well, I would be delighted to pursue this, Mr. Minister. You say that there is other funding available to the arts community; that has always been the case. I wonder if the minister would tell me when the SaskSport fund first began to give grants to people other

than sports. You claim that they're now getting money from the lottery fund. Would you tell me when artistic groups began to get money from the lottery fund?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, in response, when this agreement that lottery funds would be used for sport, culture, and recreational groups and the funds are split, as the member knows, 50 per cent sport; 40 per cent culture and 10 per cent recreation; and indeed that started I believe in approximately 1972-1974.

But I will point out, seeing that the member has brought it up, that the money has already been going there; that in 1982-83 the amount of money paid to cultural organizations from the lottery trust was \$1.191 million. In 1986-87 it is estimated to be \$4 million, which I'm sure the member will even agree is a rather large increase. So when we're looking at the cultural community as a whole, they are receiving quite a large amount of money.

Mr. Shillington: — Has the formula changed since this government has taken office for division of the money between the various groups?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — No it hasn't, Mr. Chairman. As I've just explained it is still 50-40-10; sport, cultural, recreation.

Mr. Shillington: — But the government's contribution to the lottery is not the government's contribution to the arts. The lottery is a contribution which the artistic community get in this province and don't in many others because of the foresight of a previous administration. If it had not been for the foresight of a previous administration, I doubt that this bunch of spendthrifts sitting opposite would have ever given those lottery funds away.

Mr. Minister, I want to talk not about the contribution of lotteries in this province; but I want to talk about the contribution of the government. The artistic community throughout time has never been entirely free-standing. They always depended upon patrons. That was true in ancient times in the royal courts; it was true in medieval times; and it's true in modern times.

In modern times in many countries it's head offices, major industrial and commercial and business concerns which provide the funding. In this province for a variety of reasons, which I think a majority of people are anxious to get back to, the government and the Crown corporations comprise virtually the only large head offices we have. There are some exceptions, the wheat pool and so on, but they tend to be rare exceptions. And with this government in office, there's getting to be fewer of them as Pioneer Trust and others disappear.

Mr. Minister, there is a role for the government to play. It is a role which historically has always been played by someone in the position of the government. It was true in ancient times; it's true in modern times. It's just that in this province, the industrial and economic activity operates a bit differently than it does in some other parts of the world. So, Mr. Minister, I ask you to concern yourself with the government's contribution to the arts. That is by and large through the Arts Board.

Oh, there's some exception. There's grants, subvote

number 13: grants in support of the arts, multiculturalism, heritage, and museums. That, Mr. Minister, is down by 7 per cent. Let me restate that, Mr. Minister. The grants in support of the arts, multiculturalism, heritage, and museums in 1986-87 is only 71 per cent of what it was when we took office. It's down very considerably. And not all of that money goes to the arts. Some of it, of course, goes to museums and multiculturalism. And I want to get to that subvote in due course, but some of that money goes to the arts.

Mr. Minister, I want you to deal with the government's contribution to the arts. It is down very considerably.

Mr. Minister, you stated a moment ago that the Premier had said your priorities was agriculture, health, education, and I think you stopped there. Do I take it from that that cultural activities are not your government's priority because the Premier didn't mention those, and that's why your department is, as I said, the forgotten child of the Conservative government?

(1615)

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Chairman, we can go back and forth here. The member once again, to quote, says "cultural activity" in the province of Saskatchewan, which I say is much larger than what appears in that expenditure of \$2.153 million through our department and through the lottery trust, which the member, as former minister of this department, should know full well that the government directs the lottery funds. They specify who gets what percentage, etc. He should know that.

And indeed when we look at total cultural and arts expenditures, let me just go through this for the past four years: 1982-83, and I'll give you a tip that these are the items that I have listed here: Arts Board, Centre of the Arts, Centennial Auditorium, Western Development Museum, Museum of Natural History; heritage conservation; cultural and multicultural support; grants to arts, multicultural heritage, and museums; facilities; the regional offices; and Heritage '85 in the years '84 and '85, of course.

And I'll give you those totals: 1982-83, \$7.6 million approximately; 1983-84, \$8.8 million approximately; 1984-85, which is the start of Heritage '85, so the figures go up rather dramatically, \$11.7 million; and this past year, '85-86, which was heritage year '85, approximately \$13 million.

So when you're looking at funding for the arts and for the culture in our province of Saskatchewan, those are figures which I believe are relevant — which takes in much more than just one subvote you might want to look at.

Mr. Shillington: — Will the member give me a copy of that document you are referring to?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I'll not be sending this over, but I'd be pleased to specify whatever question you might have on it. I'd listed the categories that I was quoting from and the total figures, and I'd be pleased to go over them.

Mr. Shillington: — Why don't you give us the sheet? Mr. Minister, you read that far too fast to copy down. We will be able to deal with it tomorrow when *Hansard* comes out; we'll can't deal with it today. Why don't you just send the thing across? Why be so devilishly secretive? Is there something on that paper that you're deeply ashamed of?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, in a spirit of co-operation I'll be glad to send a copy over, and we can discuss it if he wishes. But I hope he remembers the point that we have been discussing is the total cultural funding in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Shillington: — At the moment I think a paucity of pages. One, I guess, is passing water around. Mr. Minister, while I'm waiting on that, let us go to another issue then, the Centre of the Arts. Centre of the Arts, first year you took office, got \$494,310. This year they're getting \$300,000. They're getting 60 per cent of what they got in 1982. I wonder, Mr. Minister, if you'd deal with that cut in your budget.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the Centre of the Arts. I have the history of it in front of me right from 1970 to '71, the funding that has come to that institution. And in 1985-86, the total figure that was given was \$350,000.

As the member well knows, since he was minister at one time, that there's a couple of variables that go into this. There's the annual appropriation, plus the supplementary funding, which is in fact to cover the deficit of the operation of the Centre of the Arts. And I think when we look at it this year, or 1985-86, the \$50,000 that was paid for the supplementary funding to cover the deficit should really be a feather in the cap of the board of directors of the Centre of the Arts, as well as their management, because they have managed the facility at a smaller loss than usual.

So I think it's a misnomer when you look at the funding of the Centre of the Arts. And if you say that we're not supporting it by not giving enough money . . . If we have to give it more, that means that it's costing the taxpayer more because of the operations that are incurred. Rather I would like to see that go down every year because that signifies better management in my view.

Mr. Shillington: — With this government we have come to understand that what it normally signifies is skimping on maintenance.

Mr. Minister, when the amount you're spending in that building goes down I suspect that what you're skimping on is long-term maintenance. You can do that for a while. You can do that for a few years, but you soon, Mr. Minister, meet yourself coming around the corner. You soon meet yourself with a deteriorating building.

I think it's fair to say that Saskatoon, in the Centennial Auditorium, had that problem — may have now met it — but certainly had that problem at one point in time. That building deteriorated to the point where it was sadly in need of some additional funding. And I suspect that's the case here, Mr. Minister. I suspect that when you're asking

them to get along on less, what you're doing is you are not continuing proper maintenance of the building. You can do that for a period of time but after a while it is always being penny wise and pound foolish and after a while the foolishness of it shows.

Mr. Minister, I suspect that we're going to find — when this government finally has the courage to call an election, and is excused shall we say from further duties — I expect we're going to find that there is some long-run problems which have developed which the minister has not been dealing with, which this government has not been dealing with.

I say, Mr. Minister, if you have reduced funding to the Centre of the Arts to 60 per cent of what it was and you can't specifically point to the savings — and I think I know where they are — I think it's maintenance.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the comments of the member for Regina Centre as he explains how this goes on about long-term renovations that are needed. Surely as a former minister, he would remember that the Department of Culture and Recreation, or the department of culture and youth as it used to be called, is responsible for the operation through the board of directors of the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts, and any project of maintenance over \$5,000 is not the expenditure of the Centre of the Arts, but rather comes through the Department of Supply and Services.

And also as I'm informed that the Wascana Centre Authority also is responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of the grounds around the Centre of the Arts. So I think to suggest that they are being neglected is not in fact true, when you look at the figures that show up in our budget, and I think it's rather a feather in the hat of the management over at the Centre of the Arts that they're only in this part year incurring a funding deficit of \$50,000 which had to be picked up at the end of the year. So we could go down the whole list. We could go right back to 1970-71 if you wish, if we follow your rationale, and I could give you the supplementary funding if you so desire.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I want to go back to the area of the arts. I've had a look at your figures. You have included in here a figure of 1.6 million for facilities. That, Mr. Minister, isn't of great assistance to the artist directly. It doesn't put food on the table nor does it contribute to their income. Even if you include that, I may say, even if you include the figure, the expenditures have only gone up by 23 per cent, and government expenditures have gone up by 33. So they've only got two-thirds of the increase in the expenditures of this government.

If you take that figure out, then there's virtually no increase in funding to the arts, and I go back to my original point. Mr. Minister, if you take out the \$1.68 million listed under facilities, then you have a virtual freeze on funding to the arts.

The item under facilities does not find its way, under normal circumstances, to the artist. But I ask you to deal with the issue, Mr. Minister; stop trying to avoid it. Why have you singled the artistic community out for a freeze

on funding?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm absolutely amazed at the comments of the member for Regina Centre. he said: why would you put facilities in for cultural funding? Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't recollect too many professional arts groups performing on Second Avenue in Saskatoon out on the street. Rather they need facilities to perform in and to carry on cultural funding.

(1630)

As a matter of fact, I remember distinctly one of the first functions, when I was appointed minister in 1983, was to present a cheque in the amount of \$180,000 to Persephone Theatre in Saskatoon for their facility. So for the member to say, why is facilities in there, is absolutely ludicrous.

And for his information, the number of projects that have received, or cultural facilities that have been funded by the cultural and recreational facility grant program since April '83 is 322. So I can't quite follow the logic of the member opposite saying, facilities that are used for cultural purposes should not be included in cultural spending.

Mr. Shillington: — But the funding does not go to the artists. The funding does not go to the artists, nor does the funding from the Arts Board go to the artist; facilities are something different.

I want, Mr. Minister, to deal with the funding which goes to the artistic community, professional or amateur. I say, Mr. Minister, the funding which finds its way into the hands of the artistic community, not in any sense arguing with the facilities, aren't needed. But the funding which finds its way to the artistic community has increased by 7 per cent, if you concentrate on the funding through the Arts Board. That's less than a quarter of the increase in the provincial budget since that year. That's a decrease in constant dollars. That's less money that's available to the artistic community.

Please, Mr. Minister, deal with that issue and stop traipsing off into a lot of irrelevancies to avoid the issue. The funding which finds its way into the hands of the artistic community, in constant dollars, is down very considerably. Would you deal with that issue?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, we've been dealing with that since we started — the funding. And I've asked the member on a couple of occasions to give any specifics. He doesn't want to give any specifics, obviously. I'm saying, when you look at cultural activity, cultural expenditures in the province of Saskatchewan have gone up considerably. He asked for the list. I furnished it to him. It goes down in detail, year by year, for the last four years; projected for this year.

The member says, facilities are not cultural. I guess he figures the Persephone Theatre that got \$180,000 towards their facility, which you're very aware of, Mr. Chairman, that's of no benefit to them. I'd be very interested in hearing the comments of Persephone Theatre on that. Persephone Theatre, as well, receives

funding through the Arts Board, through their allocation.

Mr. Chairman, all I ask is that he bring up a specific. He wants me to address it; I've addressed it. He wants to go with the figure of 7 to 14 per cent. I'm saying cultural expenditures have increased much more dramatically, and that through our department, through the Arts Board, through lottery funding, and through sponsorship of corporations, if you want to get into that, your long historical diatribe on how the arts are funded. I've attended numerous functions where such corporations as Xerox, Imperial Oil, have supported the arts. There are more benefactors for the arts in Saskatchewan than the government. And I think that should be encouraged.

Mr. Shillington: — I never said that, Mr. Minister, nor will my words bear that interpretation. If you think it will, I invite you to send those comments to Persephone Theatre.

Mr. Minister, I again want to . . . I want to make a comment to you about specifics. Every time that I have risen in estimates and I have said, people are complaining about this, you ministers always say, give me the name. I say that the one thing this government has become renowned for is its vindictiveness. If I gave you the name of the artistic groups who suggest that there was room for improvement it would be the last grant they'd ever get, if you people had anything to do about it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Minister, you know full well that even with governments which have a sense of fairness — that you lack — discussions which are held in that context are confidential. And you are being silly, and I could put it a lot stronger than that if I wasn't in the Legislative Chamber. You're being silly to keep raising the suggestion that I should give you specifics.

Let's deal with what is before the Assembly, Mr. Minister, which is your estimates. Your estimates are up in spite of the hyenas opposite who are trying to shout me down. I'll say to you, your estimates for the Arts Board are up by 7 per cent; that won't do.

Mr. Minister, I say the government has an important role to play in the funding of the arts. If you disagree with that fundamental statement, then let's start from there. But you haven't said, so I gather you admit it. You do not . . . The lotteries are something separate and apart from government. You stated a moment ago that the government directs the lotteries. There's not a word of truth to that and never has. One of your officials may well be a director of the lottery foundation, but he has earned that on the basis of merit, and not sitting there in an ex officio capacity.

So I ask you, Mr. Minister, to deal with the government's funding of the arts, that is down very considerably. The government's funding of the arts, through the Arts Board, was \$2,012,340 in your first year in office. In your last year in office, and believe me it's going to be your last year in office, it is \$2,153,200. If you wish to add to that, Mr. Minister, grants in support of the arts, multiculturalism, and museums, you'll find, of course, Mr. Minister, that the sum total of those is down.

So let's deal with your role — not the lottery foundations, not the corporations, not whatever it is you're doing at Expo; let's deal with the government's role in funding of the artistic groups. You've been short-changing them, Mr. Minister, and I say that you're short-changing the public of this province when you do.

Every society has a story to tell. Those story-tellers are largely to be found in the artistic community and you're short-changing them. And when you do you short-change the public of this province who haven't the same means by which to come to understand themselves, their heritage, or their future.

So I ask you, Mr. Minister, to deal with the government's role in the funding of the arts, and not every other subject under the sun which you think of.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously the member does not want to deal with any specifics. And, you know, certainly since I've been Minister of Culture and Recreation, I've been more open to meet with any group, professional, amateur; anything to do with culture or sports or heritage groups throughout the province of Saskatchewan. And where they're going to him — and he can't seem to remember their names, and he won't seem to furnish them to me — then I cannot comment specifically.

But the member says arts funding is being cut. I should indicate to the House that in 1982-83 the figure he was very correct on was \$2,012,335. Indeed, that was our first year of operation, which he knows. But I should point out that that year was a 23 per cent increase in the funding to the Arts Board. And the figures that I have presented to him, if you want to use, you know, simple figures: from 1982-83, culture and arts expenditures, which you have right in front of you, \$7.6 million; 1985-86, estimated \$13 million. That is almost 100 per cent increase in funding to the cultural and the arts. Obviously if you don't want to deal with specifics, then let's deal with the figures that are in front of us, and I'll deal with the whole cultural scene across the province, and you can deal with whatever you wish.

Mr. Shillington: — Mr. Minister, I'd ask you to deal with your government's role. What on earth does the funding from the federal government have to do with your government? Mr. Minister . . . and some of those are. Those items, Mr. Minister, are not your government's role in the arts. Your government's funding of the arts comes about through the Saskatchewan Arts Board and to a lesser extent the subvote number 12, grants in support of the arts, multiculturalism, heritage, and museums. That's your role. That's down. Would you deal with that, Mr. Minister, and not deal with every other figure under the sun.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — I'll deal with that figure if you'll give me some specifics. The member distinctly said that there was federal funding involved in here. Could he please point that out?

Mr. Shillington: — I ask you, Mr. Minister, to deal with your funding. I ask you to deal with your role. I ask you to deal with your role.

Mr. Minister, I don't have the figures in front of me which you're using. What I have in front of me is the estimates, and I ask you to deal with the estimates and not a whole lot of figures which we don't have access to.

And when I get the figures, after a great deal of badgering, I find you've included a number of things which aren't strictly relevant to the subject. So I ask you, Mr. Minister, to deal with your estimates. Deal with subvote number 8, subvote number 13, and if there's other subvotes in here which go to assist the arts, then I wish you'd point it out to me.

We're not dealing with a whole lot of other subjects and a whole lot of other moneys which I don't have. We are dealing with your estimates. So if there's something in your estimates which we've missed, then point it out to me. Otherwise deal with the estimates, and not with a whole lot of other figures which you're snatching out of the air which we don't have.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, there is no snatching out of the air at all. I explained approximately an hour ago that that figure that you're pointing to for the expenditure from the Government of Saskatchewan to the Saskatchewan Arts Board, which reads \$2,153,200, is in fact the figure. Plus if you add to that for direct contribution another \$350,000, if you want to look exactly at that subvote, that is the amount of money available to the Saskatchewan Arts Board this year.

Mr. Chairman, I remember him distinctly saying there was federal contributions on the sheet I gave to him. Perhaps I'll go down the list and he can point out, stop me where the federal contribution is: Arts Boards; Centre of the Arts; Centennial Auditorium; Western Development Museum; Museum of Natural History; heritage conservation; cultural and multicultural support; grants to arts, multicultural, heritage, and museums; facilities, regional; Heritage '85; multicultural books; Saskatchewan university museum; Expo; operation of administration centre; Ukrainian encyclopedia; Western Development Museum; heritage; Louis Riel diary; grand total — grant total at the bottom, the member asks, right at the very bottom — 1982-83, \$8.8 million. At the end of 1985-86, \$20.2 million.

Name one figure in there that is federal. He made the statement. Please point it out.

Mr. Shillington: — You didn't give me any figures, then or now. You simply read off the items. My point was that about half . . . A goodly percentage of those institutions also get federal funding, Mr. Minister, and that's also true of the artistic community. They also get federal funding. They also get private funding.

But these estimates are an attempt — it's ill-starred with this minister — but these estimates are an attempt to deal with this government's role, not with what Xerox does, and not with what the lotteries do. Although you're answerable in the legislature for that, these estimates are supposed to deal, not with the lotteries, but with your own estimates.

I say, in your estimates, the funding which you have set out in your estimates, the funding to the artistic community has gone down. It has gone down in constant dollars, and depending upon how you break out the figure, the subvote, item number 13, it may have gone down in absolute dollars.

So I ask you to deal with your estimates. Your estimates suggest, in constant dollars, less money now than you gave them in 1982-83.

We dealt for some six days, Mr. Minister, with the Minister of Urban Affairs. I suggested the same thing to him — that the urban municipalities are getting less money now than they did. For you to suggest that the lotteries make it up is a little like the Minister of Urban Affairs suggesting that the deficiency was made up in property taxes. It may well have been. It may well have been. But we were dealing with the government's role in funding of municipalities. We are now dealing with the government's role in the funding of the artistic community.

In the list you gave me, Mr. Minister, previously, when you said that it had gone from 7 million to 13 million, you had included the Centre of the Arts, the Centennial Auditorium, the Western Development Museum, the Museum of Natural History, heritage conservation. Mr. Minister, none of those items are of direct assistance to the artistic community. I want to deal with the funding to the artistic community.

(1645)

Members opposite suggest the audience is large or small. I think members opposite are going to come and go without ever appreciating that this is not intended to be entertainment. It is an attempt, supposedly, to hold a government accountable for what it does with tax dollars. It is not supposed to be providing entertainment, nor am I trying to do that. I am attempting to get from this minister some answers. And I'll admit that I am failing badly.

So perhaps, Mr. Minister, you can give us some answers with respect to your estimates, why they've gone down, and leave to another forum, another court room, some other day, whether or not Xerox is doing an adequate job of funding the arts.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, certainly the member was minister of this department at one time, and I don't know what he saw as his role, but I think support and the facilitation of the cultural activities in the province of Saskatchewan is a role for the Minister of Culture and Recreation, or as in your case, the minister of culture and youth.

When we look at it, and you freely admitted that we have responsibility for the allocation of the lottery dollars, the figures I give are for the cultural expenditures in the province of Saskatchewan.

You make reference to what happened in Urban Affairs, and I sat through those and my colleague had the distinct pleasure of having somebody ask him questions that were specific in nature so that he could give a reply to.

The only thing that you have come close to being specific in nature is subvote number 12, is that correct? Grants in support of arts, multiculturalism, heritage and museums. And in that case, the figures in that estimated 1986-87 is \$1.080 million; and last year, '85-86, estimated at \$1.283 million, and I'll explain that; that in fact there is one prime example of the co-operation that's going on between our departments of Culture and Recreation and the lottery trust. And indeed one of the programs that has been no longer with our department is being picked up and funded through the trust. So if you want specifics, there it is.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, let me indeed get specific. I'm going to deal with subvote 8, and I wish that you would, in response to my questions. Subvote 8, grants to the Saskatchewan Arts Board. Mr. Minister, would you not agree . . .

Mr. Chairman, if the members on the Conservative side of the House would settle down, the minister might be able to hear me. So would you please settle them down. You've been known to do that from time to time. I can't hear what I'm saying; I'm sure the member opposite can't hear what I'm asking. The member from Kindersley is a little unruly here but I will attempt to ask the question anyway, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Minister, would you not agree that in 1982-1983, and if you want me to confirm it I can quote to you from the annual report, the grant to the Saskatchewan Arts Board was \$2,012,335.

Hon. Mr. Folk: — I will confirm that figure. As I mentioned about five minutes ago, that was the first year of our government and that was an increase of 23 per cent to the Arts Board.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Well, Mr. Minister, in 1986-1987 the grant to the Saskatchewan Arts Board is \$2,153,200. Over four years, your fifth budget, an increase of \$140,965 — 7 per cent. Am I not correct in those calculations?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — I would say if you're going by those figures alone, probably. But as I indicated, there was a 23 per cent increase in the first year. And when we started out the questioning I also indicated that moneys for use by the Saskatchewan Arts Board, at \$350,000, that they directly used for that purpose.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, your comment about the increase from 1981 to 1982 is rather irrelevant here. We're talking about the period of time in which you have been the government. And you have been the government since April or May of 1982.

In 1982-1983 the Arts Board, an independent agency of well-renowned tradition, and well-reputed, admired throughout all of Canada and indeed by some places in the United States, where people have come up to take a look at the way it was structured, the way it was organized, and what it was achieving — it was a model. It was started here in Saskatchewan, Mr. Minister.

When you took over in 1982-83 the budget was for the Arts Board, \$2,012 million, and I'll round it off. Now in your fifth budget you are showing over that period of time, over that five-budget period of time, an increase of 7 per cent to this independent Arts Board.

Now you stand in the House, Mr. Minister, and you talk about the other places in which you're providing funding to the arts.

Well let me tell you what you have done. What you have done is you've taken the decision-making on how some of the arts community will be funding out of an independent Arts Board, into which the artistic community had some input, and you put it into the political hands of your government. That's what you've done. And that's what the arts community objects to and that's what we object to.

We have had a recent situation in Ottawa with the recent election two years ago of a Conservative government. The same kind of process took place. The minister was under severe attack from the arts communities throughout Canada, and he still is, Mr. Minister, because the government in Ottawa decided to reduce the funding to the Canada Council and make the decisions as to how the arts community would be funded — political decisions. That's what you have done.

The fact that you have reduced in real terms — when you take into account inflation — the fact that you have reduced in real terms the funding to the Arts Board, is that you have, like you have done with almost everything else your government has touched, politicized the funding to the arts.

You want to be able to sit around, around your cabinet table with your colleagues, and say, well that looks like a pretty good place to provide funding this year because they haven't rocked the boat very much. Now this other group, we're not going to provide funding because we think maybe there's a Liberal member on that committee who happens to support another political party. That's what happens when you take funding away from something like an organization like the Saskatchewan Arts Board and put it into your political hands.

That is the issue here and that's what my colleague has been getting at all afternoon. And you have tried to deviate from it and talk about all kinds of other funding such as funding from Xerox. Now, Mr. Minister, wouldn't you agree that what you have done is put more decision on where the grants are going to go in the hands of your government and less decision in the hands of the Arts Board?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — No.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Would you explain that, Mr. Minister, since now you are making the decisions in your department and no longer in the Arts Board. How do you rationalize that?

Hon. Mr. Folk: — Mr. Chairman, the function of the Arts Board, which I thought the member had a fairly good handle on . . . the Arts Board . . . the members of the Arts

Board are appointed by the Government of Saskatchewan through our cabinet. Is the member saying that that has changed since 1982? Certainly it has not. If he can mention one instance where I have directed money that has come to the Arts Board, please say it right now; or I believe it should be incumbent on you, seeing that you said there was political involvement, give up your example right now, otherwise apologize.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Minister, you have totally once again, as has the Minister of Urban Affairs and has the Minister of Health, tried to twist the thing around in order to defend your political backside.

Now, Mr. Minister, I did not say that you tried to influence the Arts Board, although I wouldn't be surprised if you may have tried. I'm sure the Arts Board would have told you where to go. I am saying, the fact that you're reducing the funding to the Arts Board and channelling more of your funding through other sources where indeed you do have influence — you are turning over the decisions of the funding to political decisions, Mr. Minister. I don't question the decisions of your officials; I happen to know they're pretty good officials. I'm saying that your officials will determine how the funding is going to go and who gets them on your approval.

Members opposite, Mr. Chairman, are sort of interrupting again. The member from Prince Albert-Duck Lake, in particular, thinks that this is a funny exercise. I, as my colleague from Regina Centre, don't believe it's a funny exercise. We're here dealing with a serious matter.

Mr. Minister, let me restate again as clearly as I can what has happened. You have the Saskatchewan Arts Board. You have, in real money, reduced the funding to the Saskatchewan Arts Board, when you take into account inflation. Because, when over five budgets you increased the funding to the Arts Board by over 7 per cent, you cannot stand in this House and say that you have provided funding to the Arts Board so that they can at least . . . so they can even keep even. They're not staying even.

What you have done, Mr. Minister, is provided more funding in some other areas — not a great deal more — not through the Arts Board, and therefore you're able to direct the way that money is allocated, politically, because it's no longer decided by the Arts Board.

The Arts Board can decide \$2,153,000 worth, I'll grant you that, but the other subvotes of funding to the arts, you decide. And that's one of the reasons why the arts community is worried and concerned, because they know that the history of this government in the last four years has been one of rule by fear. If you threaten enough people that they may get cut off if they stir the boat, they get cut off. That's what's been the story of your operation in this government.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. The member is indicating that the government threatens people. I don't see what that has to do with estimates for Culture and Recreation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order! I would ask the members to my left, the opposition members, please to be

quiet and not challenge the Chair from their seats.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Mr. Chairman, I wish, Mr. Chairman . . . Let me slow down so that you can hear carefully the point I'm making. The point I'm making is this: that in the arts community one of the principles that has been defended for generations is the principle of the independence of the way that the funding is allocated through the Arts Board to the arts community.

What the minister has made very clear in this House this afternoon with his answers is this: that more and more of the decisions as to how the funding goes to arts communities and artists are now made by this government and not by the Arts Board. That being the case, Mr. Minister, there are individuals and there are organizations out there that now are looking around and saying, we can't go to the Arts Board any more because the Arts Board doesn't make the decisions; the government does.

The Assembly recessed until 7 p.m.