



STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 39 – March 30, 2015



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-Seventh Legislature

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL
AFFAIRS AND JUSTICE**

Ms. Laura Ross, Chair
Regina Qu'Appelle Valley

Mr. Doyle Vermette, Deputy Chair
Cumberland

Ms. Doreen Eagles
Estevan

Mr. D.F. (Yogi) Huyghebaert
Wood River

Mr. Paul Merriman
Saskatoon Sutherland

Mr. Warren Michelson
Moose Jaw North

Mr. Warren Steinley
Regina Walsh Acres

[The committee met at 14:59.]

The Chair: — Well thank you very much, and welcome, each and every one of you. Today we have a substitute, Cathy Sproule who will be sitting in for Doyle Vermette. This afternoon we have with us Ms. Doreen Eagles, Mr. Huyghebaert, Mr. Merriman, Warren Michelson, and Mr. Steinley.

And pursuant to rule no. 148(1), the following main estimates and supplementary estimates were deemed referred to the Standing Committee on Intergovernmental Affairs and Justice on March the 26th, 2015 and March 18th, 2015 respectively. Main estimates: vote 30, Government Relations; vote 3, Justice; vote 27, Parks, Culture and Sports. Supplementary estimates, March 2015: vote 30, Government Relations, and vote 3, Justice. If everyone here is in agreement, we will proceed with the agenda as planned.

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Thank you.

Bill No. 141 — *The Archives and Public Records Management Act*

The Chair: — First on our agenda is Bill No. 141, *The Archives and Public Records Management Act*. We will now consider clause 1, short title. Mr. Minister, if you have any opening remarks, you may proceed with remarks regards to the archives.

Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thank you, Madam Chair. Let me begin by introducing the officials that are with me. I've got Morgan Bradshaw somewhere with me. He's my chief of staff. I've got Lin Gallagher, deputy minister of Parks, Culture and Sport. I've got Nancy Cherney, assistant deputy minister and Provincial Capital Commission. And I've got Linda McIntyre, Provincial Archivist, Saskatchewan Archives.

The Archives And Public Records Management Act is a new Act incorporating substantial amendments to *The Archives Act* of 2004. *The Archives And Public Records Management Act* will improve the institution's visibility as the province's archive, advance government accountability for the management of public records, and provide the framework for effective delivery of the Archives' mandate, particularly in the electronic records environment.

The legislation provides for a name change for the agency to the Provincial Archives of Saskatchewan. This change will more clearly identify this province's archive and will distinguish the role of the institution as the custodian of Saskatchewan's documentary history. The name change of the legislation identifies the important central agency role of the Archives in providing records management advice and in maintaining the effective management of public records created by the Premier, ministers of the Crown, government institutions, Crown corporations, the Legislative Assembly, the Legislative Assembly Service, officers of the Assembly, and the courts.

The Archives and Public Records Management Act more explicitly defines public records; clarifies the role of the Provincial Archivist in establishing policies, standards, and guidelines for the management of public records; strengthens the prohibition relating to the destruction of public records other than through an approved records schedule; and reinforces the role of the public records committee in terms of records schedule development.

This legislation facilitates the important mandate of the Archives. It provides the framework for all government institutions — Crown corporations, the Legislative Assembly, the Legislative Assembly Service, officers of the Assembly, and the courts — to be compliant with the Act in terms of records management. The public records committee oversees this process.

Similar to legislation in other provinces or territories, the bill makes it an offence to alter, remove, or destroy a public record unless pursuant to an approved records schedule. With the goal of deterring such offences, a conviction will carry a maximum fine of \$25,000. This fine is comparable to that of Quebec and is higher than the maximum fine specified in legislation in New Brunswick, the Northwest Territories, and Nunavut.

The public record created by the Government of Saskatchewan is almost entirely electronic record and has specific management and preservation needs. The Saskatchewan Archives provides the expertise and works with the government to put in place the necessary protocols for managing electronic records.

This legislation clarifies that all public records, regardless of format, are subject to the Act. In terms of electronic records, this includes the maintenance, updating, and migration of records as necessary to ensure usability and accessibility from the point of creation through active use and, if of historical value, transfer to the archives by the established records retention and disposal process. Proposed changes in *The Archives and Public Records Management Act* clarify terminology and application and ensure the availability of the electronic record for capture by the Saskatchewan Archives as required by its mandate.

The bill also clarifies the role of the board of directors by updating the responsibility of the board and setting a strategic direction for the institution. This reflects current practice. The board examines ways in which the key objects and functions of the Archives can be most effectively delivered, studies options for long-term planning in areas of accommodation and operating budgets, and analyzes impacts to service delivery. This ensures accountable management of the annual grant allocation from the Government of Saskatchewan while exploring external funding opportunities and partnerships with other interest groups. Membership on the board is broadened by the bill to allow for academic representation from the Canadian academic community involved with the study of social or archival sciences.

The Archives and Public Records Management Act exempts certain records from *The Health Information Protection Act*, or HIPA for short. The proposed exemption will allow for

reasonable access to historical records of the province for research purposes while maintaining necessary protocols to avoid breaches of privacy.

Records that have not been created by individuals or bodies involved in health services delivery, but that may contain only minor references to personal health information, will not require the detailed review as set out under HIPA. Historical records containing significant personal health information, however, will continue to be subject to a full review as required by HIPA.

Since April 1st, 2014, the Archives has received 82 access requests involving the review of 60 metres of records, over 300,000 pages of archival material. A request can include a single file or thousands of sheets of paper representing several metres of records. If HIPA requirements continue to apply, this necessitates a detailed review by archivists of a large volume of material. The current method can significantly delay responses to requests for access.

The HIPA exemption includes safeguards to ensure that personal health information of individuals is protected where it exists in the archival record. The exemption does not pertain to any other trustees or designated archives, and it does not free them from their obligation to apply section 29 of HIPA to records in their custody.

The Saskatchewan Archives has been working closely with the Legislative Assembly Office, court services, the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner, and the Ministry of Health, where impacted by *The Archives and Public Records Management Act*.

Changes in terminology encompassing public records management are the result of detailed and ongoing consultation with records managers and government legal advice, and discussion by the public records committee.

The accompanying legislation, *The Archives and Public Records Management Consequential Amendments Act, 2014*, provides updated references in both *The Evidence Act* and *The Education Act*. These Acts are bilingual and therefore require a separate Act to make consequential amendment. The change to *The Education Act, 1995* is required to accommodate the name change of the institution to the Provincial Archives of Saskatchewan. The change to *The Evidence Act* reflects the name change of the legislation to *The Archives and Public Records Management Act*.

So in conclusion, I welcome any questions you may have on these Acts. Thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Minister, for your comments on the archives. Are there any comments or questions on this bill? Ms. Sproule.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and thank you, Mr. Minister, and officials, for coming out today and receiving these questions.

I think just for the record I want to thank the minister for his comments and just to indicate they're fairly similar to the ones provided on November 24th in second reading. But I appreciate

the extra information on the impact of HIPA on some of these. So that was additional information for people that are looking at these records in the future. And again, most of the questions I have are just for further clarity on changes that have been made to the existing Act just for the public record, so that folks can see what changes have been made.

I've done a basic comparison of the existing Acts and although I know you've indicated it's significant changes, I think we can sort of follow along. There are a lot of similarities with the previous Act. So I just wanted to get on the record why some of these changes are being made. And I guess the first one is in . . . The first definition is new. It's called an administrative record of a court, and I'm just wondering why that definition has been included in the new bill.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll start with this answer, and I'll see if that's sufficient. If not, I'll pass it on to the Provincial Archivist for discussion. But the definition has been recommended by legal counsel for court services based on definitions included in draft record retention schedules for Queen's Bench and the Provincial Court.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you very much. That's sufficient. The next definition, ministerial record, talks about what is not included when it comes to ministerial record. And in the previous bill, there were four items that were not included. The first two are retained in this version of the bill. But there was a couple of extra ones that were included in the previous Act that I'm just wondering why they're not included now.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — I'm going to have the Provincial Archivist address that question.

Ms. McIntyre: — Okay. I think what you're referring to is the surplus copy for convenience copy of reference?

Ms. Sproule: — And the record that's under the control of a government institution. There was two . . . [inaudible] . . . there was two different definitions.

Ms. McIntyre: — The record that is under the control of the government institution, that's encompassed now in the definition of a public record. And the public record definition has been expanded, so it's not just a government institution but it's other bodies that create a public record. And regarding the surplus copy of a record or a copy of a record created for convenience or reference, that's been expanded under the definition of not a prescribed record. So a prescribed record deals with transitory records, records of a temporary nature, and the regulations are going to go into greater detail as to what constitutes a prescribed or a transitory record.

Ms. Sproule: — So basically the reason for removing them from this definition is that they are covered elsewhere in the Act?

Ms. McIntyre: — Yes.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. Thank you. Okay, I guess then I would like to talk about public record. It seems to be substantially changed and probably partly explained by your previous comments. Why was a court record, it used to be not included

but now it is included?

Ms. McIntyre: — The court record was included before. This gives greater definition to the administrative record of a court. So what the differentiation is, there is one is the day-to-day record that's created in the administration of court-related activities and the other ones are records that would be submitted during a court action. So the various courts are working towards record schedules, and those will have different retention periods depending on what types of record are created. So they felt that it was important to differentiate between those two so that, when it came time for the approval of the record schedule, it would actually match the retention and the requirements for those records.

Ms. Sproule: — So if I understand correctly, it's basically streamlining the way court records are being managed?

Ms. McIntyre: — Yes.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. All right. The next question I have then is just in relation to the change of name. It used to be called the Saskatchewan Archives Board and now it's the Provincial Archives of Saskatchewan. Would you want to explain why that change is being made?

[15:15]

Ms. McIntyre: — There's been a lot of confusion over the years in two levels. One deals with the board. So when are we talking about the institution and when are we talking about the board of directors that manages the institution? That's created a lot of confusion within just general working circles.

The larger issue though is when we call ourselves Sask Archives, no one knows whether we're talking about the various archives within the province, of which there are several, or us as the Provincial Archives. So this name gives greater definition to the fact that we are the archives for the province of Saskatchewan; so we manage the public record and also that we collect the private records. It just gives clarity to the fact of who we are.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. I'm just wondering about Saskatchewan Arts Board. Is the minister considering a similar name change there?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Not at this time.

Ms. Sproule: — Under section 4 there's a new section being added now, section (d), and that's "to promote and facilitate good records management respecting public records in order to support accountability, transparency, and effective operations." Why was it felt that this clause should be added to the objects and functions of the Provincial Archives?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, thanks for the question. The new object, or the function, strengthens the purposes of the Act and recognizes the importance of public records management role and ensuring responsible government.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. Moving on, the new clause, section 6. This is a brand new addition, and I don't think the minister

talked about it at any length in his comments. So I would be interested in knowing why the minister is being provided extra powers at this point in time that are fairly new. I've had concerns raised about the ability of the minister to now override the Provincial Archivist as a result of this clause. For example, section 6(3) where:

The minister . . . [can] give directions that must be followed by the Provincial Archives of Saskatchewan, the Provincial Archivist or both in exercising their powers and fulfilling their duties and purposes . . .

One of the particular concerns that was raised was whether or not this would allow the minister . . . Well, it does allow the minister to override an archivist's decision in relation to section 18 which is, particularly 18(3), under the powers of the archivist to have access to records. And I'm just wondering why it was felt to have this oversight and actually extraordinary power granted to the minister.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. Section 6(3) does not undermine the third party status of the Archives. The board of directors sets the strategic direction for the institution and directs and supervises the activities of the Provincial Archivist — section 17(6). It is an implied limitation that the minister would not act in a manner contrary to legislation nor request the Provincial Archivist to do so. The legislation clearly sets out the Provincial Archivist's powers to determine what records hold archival value, section 8 and section 18(2)(a), and what records no longer have archival value, section 18(2)(j). All decisions concerning records are documented in the Provincial Archivist reports to the board at regular quarterly meetings.

Ms. Sproule: — Mr. Minister, if that's indeed the case, then why was this power given at all? If I can add to that, under what circumstances would you exercise this type of responsibility or power?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. It was actually one of those examples I was particularly interested in myself in relation to archival or non-archival and the differences between the two. So in this particular case, we'd be talking about non-archival that would fall maybe under the . . . pursuant to the Archives. So in that case I would be interested in, as minister, the return of those particular items or at least a conversation in relation to a non-archival piece.

Ms. Sproule: — Well, I think, Mr. Minister, you've said earlier that this would not undermine the third party status. But I think section 6(3), clearly does. I don't see how you could argue it any other way:

The minister may give directions that must be followed by the Provincial Archives of Saskatchewan, the Provincial Archivist or both in exercising their powers and fulfilling their duties . . .

There's nothing in this section that suggests it's limited to non-archival material. It's very broad. I think it's very comprehensive and I think despite, maybe, your intention as minister to not ever exercise it in that way, really it's pretty broad. In fact it encompasses all the powers that the Archives and the archivist have.

So I think for the record, I think it's important for people coming after us to understand what the general intention of this clause is. And perhaps maybe there may be an amendment that perhaps limits it to the circumstances that you're describing. Because I guess I can't, I can't agree with you when you say it doesn't undermine the third party status. I think it very clearly does.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — I'll have the . . . I'll talk again to the member in relation to . . . So the legislation, I've said this in a previous answer, the legislation clearly sets out the Provincial Archivist's powers to determine what records hold archival value. And that's the section in section 18, where records no longer have archival value. So the board, the Provincial Archives Board, would still report to the minister. And we're talking specifically about those items that are non-archival, that fall outside of that purview.

We're talking specifically about non-archival.

Ms. Sproule: — Again, Mr. Minister, the section doesn't limit it to non-archival material, section 6(3). So unless you are willing to amend it to reflect that it's only in relation to non-archival material, I don't think that's what you're passing. So I, you know . . .

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Sorry, let's . . . I'm going to have one of my officials, the deputy minister, let's take another run at this and see if we can help clarify.

Ms. Gallagher: — So, Lin Gallagher. I think what the minister has outlined is that the legislation does set out what are the archivist's powers, and so this is not to supersede that. Those . . .

Ms. Sproule: — It does in the wording: "The minister may give directions that must be followed by . . . the Provincial Archivist . . . in exercising their powers . . ." So it clearly supersedes the powers of the archivist, which is concerning. Now this may be subject to a legal interpretation, but I am suggesting that it could be interpreted that way. And I will leave it with you and your officials to let that stand or not, but I think there's definitely an interpretation. So at this point I'll just move on; I think I've said all I have to say about that clause.

Ms. Gallagher: — So I just would clarify that we did get legal opinion that this didn't supersede the third party status of the Archives, and that the legislation clearly sets out that the Provincial Archivist's powers are not undermined by this clause. So that was the legal opinion.

Ms. Sproule: — I guess all I can say at this point is that I would recommend that you revisit that because it already is being raised by members of the public about how this is going to be interpreted. And if it's clearly intended to apply to non-archival materials, the clause should indicate that. That's just my own view.

All right. Shall we move on? Section 7 . . . Or did you want to further comment on that?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — No.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay, section 7. Now the transfer of public records indicates in section (1) — and this has been amended slightly — that they're to be transferred, all public records go to the Provincial Archives. Now in no. (3), it says:

Public records, other than records made or received by the Legislative Assembly, the Legislative Assembly Service or an Officer of the Legislative Assembly . . . are the property of the Crown in right of Saskatchewan.

In the previous version, it didn't specify or it didn't exempt the records made by Legislative Assembly, Legislative Assembly service or officers. So why are these now not included as public records?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. I think this should answer it, but the section, it clarifies that records of the Legislative Assembly are not property of the Crown but of the Assembly itself and are managed under the authority of the Speaker of the House and the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly. So it's recognizing, it's recognizing the name change.

Ms. Sproule: — I think I've just learned something, so that's very interesting. I didn't realize records of the Assembly were not records of the Crown. So that's good that's clarified.

Section 7(4) and (5) are new, and perhaps you could just indicate why these were being added.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Section (4) is a new provision, recognizes the authority of the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly to manage records of the Assembly. And then section (5) is a new provision again, clarifies the custodial and preservation management role of the Archives in relation to the records of the Legislative Assembly.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay, thank you for that. In section 8 there has been a bit of a change just basically, and I think you referred to this section earlier, where it now identifies at the very end that the Provincial Archivist has determined it to be of archival value. Could you clarify why that change has been made?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Sure. This recognizes the authority of the Provincial Archivist to determine the archival value of material acquired for the permanent collection of the Saskatchewan Archives.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you very much. Just as we're going through here, quite often when we get bills that are basically amending old bills we have explanatory notes, and these explanations are often found within there. And I don't know why it wasn't provided this time around. I certainly don't have those comments, so maybe that's why I'm asking questions. I don't have those comments, so that's why I'm asking all these questions. So thank you for being patient with me.

Moving on then: part III, administration. I know you indicated in your comments — this is section 12(2) — that you're expanding who may actually be appointed on the board of directors. But I'm kind of wondering why you wouldn't also insist on University of Saskatchewan, University of Regina as being mandatory. Currently there must be members from the

University of Saskatchewan, University of Regina, obviously they have a very close relationship with the Provincial Archives. And so why is that requirement being removed?

[15:30]

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks. Thanks for the question. In the past, we've had a little bit of difficulty in attracting nominees from both of those universities. Presently we have a representative; we have one, again, one from each. But the intent was to broaden the scope in order to ensure and attract others.

Ms. Sproule: — I'm surprised and disappointed to hear that you'd have difficulty attracting individuals from those institutions. I understand the broadening, but it would be nice to have that representation as well. However if that's the reason, then so be it. And that's on the record, so that's good.

Moving on now to section 15 where we see the responsibilities of board of directors. In the previous iteration of this Act, section 14, at that point the responsibilities were limited to supervising. Now, as you indicated in your opening comments, you are also, well in this case, switching that for citing the strategic direction. I understand that. Modern boards are responsible for setting strategic direction, and it's important that that's there.

My question is, why did you take the role of supervising out of the responsibilities? It does show up later in the bill, I guess in section 17(6), but why wouldn't you consider supervision to be one of the responsibilities of the board?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — I'll have the Provincial Archivist respond.

Ms. McIntyre: — Okay. So the role of the board to supervise the Provincial Archivist and to direct the activities of the Provincial Archivist is now under section 17. It was just brought there because it made more sense to include it in that section than to have it at the beginning. It's a formatting . . . It hasn't been removed from the board.

Ms. Sproule: — Yes, I know it's been moved, as I indicated. I think I would just beg to differ. I think supervision is a very important responsibility of the board and should be included under the responsibilities of the board. But it used to be there, and now just . . . somebody obviously thought it should be there at some point, but I think it's important. And it's now hidden in section 17 where it's only supervising the work of the archivists and not the Archives themselves. So I would think this is a lessening of the responsibility of the directors, and I'm not sure that that's an appropriate move. No more from me. I have nothing more to say at that point.

I see you've gotten rid of the requirement for a new system, Provincial Archivist. I think this is in line with a number of the other officers. I know the other officers of the Legislative Assembly are wanting to streamline their management and so having these types of positions is cumbersome. Is that the same for the Provincial Archives? It used to be section 16(2) of the previous Act where you would appoint an assistant provincial archivist, and that's now not there anymore?

Ms. McIntyre: — What that was replaced with was the provisions for having an acting provincial archivist role. It's very rare in the operation of the Archives these days that we've had an assistant provincial archivist appointed. And what the old Act didn't have was provisions for an acting role.

Ms. Sproule: — And then I guess that goes with what I was saying as streamlining and reflecting modern operations. All right. Similar for other officers of the Legislative Assembly; that's why I was asking.

Okay, let me move on then. On section 18, powers. Under section 18, which used to be section 17, there's a new subsection (3) which reads:

Notwithstanding any other Act, the Provincial Archivist is entitled to have access to any public record for the purposes of exercising the Provincial Archivist's powers, fulfilling the Provincial Archivist's responsibilities and carrying out the Provincial Archivist's functions pursuant to this Act.

Why was it felt necessary to add this general clause to this section?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. This particular section clarifies the right of access to public records in terms of the roles and the responsibilities of the Provincial Archivist.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. Can you give me a situation where the Provincial Archivist would have had trouble accessing some of these types of materials, public records?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Okay, yes. I'll refer to the Provincial Archivist on the technicality of this piece.

Ms. McIntyre: — It deals with circumstances where the records have not come into our custody primarily. So if in order to appraise the record and determine that they've met the required retention period and/or that they are eligible for disposal, we have to be able to sometimes go into the record to determine that. So this provides . . . It's just more explicit that the powers include the right to go into any public record.

Ms. Sproule: — I'd like to thank the official for that. Moving on, I'm going to keep moving. There is a number of changes I guess to prohibition, section 22. But section 23 I just see as a new clause where you can now apply to a judge for a compliance order. What was the rationale for including this section?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. This provides the Provincial Archives with authority to act in cases of noncompliance with the preservation, custody, and control of public records.

Ms. Sproule: — I understand that. I'm just wondering why it was felt necessary to include it in the Act.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, this would be in reference to primarily electronic records where you would have to preserve them quickly.

Ms. Sproule: — So electronic records are considered to be compellable then under this? Okay, good. I wanted to ask that question as well. Thank you.

I'm moving on now to section 27(2). This is a new section as well under the order for transfer or destruction of public records. It says, "Notwithstanding [a couple other sections] subsection 21(1) and section 26, the Legislative Assembly, the Legislative Assembly Service or an Officer of the Legislative Assembly may destroy a public record if . . ." it's not subject to . . . And there's three or four things there.

Why was it felt necessary to include this section in the order . . . this section regarding transfer or destruction of public records?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Well thanks for the question. This particular piece provides for the disposal of public legacy records of the Legislative Assembly, Legislative Assembly Service, and officers of the Legislative Assembly where the record has been determined to hold no long-term historical value.

Ms. Sproule: — And what is a public legacy record?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Okay, so public record is not subject to a record schedule. The public record is then in the control or custody of the Legislative Assembly, the Legislative Assembly Service, or the officer of the Legislative Assembly. And then at least 25 years have elapsed since the date on which the public record was created.

Ms. Sproule: — All right. So you basically have just shared sections (a), (b), and (c) of the clause. So that is the definition of a public legacy. Oh, okay. Thank you.

Moving on to section 29, and this is to me the most exciting section of the Act. This is the personal health information portion . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . And the minister says he's not excited about it at all. I really am pleased to see this.

I know that I've had correspondence with the Provincial Archives in terms of some of the difficulties people are having in terms of accessing information, the staffing that's required to scan these documents to ensure that there's no personal information . . . So I don't have a whole lot to ask about it. I just wanted to thank the minister for including this because I think for people that are doing research in Saskatchewan this is going to make things incredibly easier, and certainly I hope for the staff of the office as well.

Any concerns, I guess my only question is any concerns about, you know, when people do get access to these records and divulge personal health information that they shouldn't, despite the fact they've promised not to, I think you have some punitive clauses in the Act as well. But just any comment on how you're going to be able to monitor this or what sort of steps you're going to take to ensure that this is not improperly used.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Okay, yes. Thanks. Yes, we wanted to take a pretty hard look at this. And we think that the amendment does not put at risk any personal health information that is held in the Saskatchewan Archives collection. It facilitates access to collections that contain only very limited personal health

information. Adequate safeguards protecting access to this incidental personal health information will still be applied, including age of record restrictions; approval of the Provincial Archivist; and detailed non-disclosure agreements for the de-identification of records, records containing comprehensive personal health information. So for example, patient files are not included in the proposed provision. So the Privacy Commissioner has reviewed the relevant section of the proposed legislation and the wording meets with his approval.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you for that. So just a general question then. Do you have a sense when materials come in, are within your control, of where the personal health information is to be found? Like, I'm just thinking of your staff. When somebody requests, you know, 30 years of records from 1920 to 1950 of labour unrest in Saskatchewan, would you have enough information without having to have your staff go through every page to be able to determine whether there are no personal health records in there?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, that's interesting. I'm going to defer to somebody that actually be doing this on a day-to-day basis.

Ms. McIntyre: — So in an ideal situation there is a finding aid tool to the records, and that gives at least a file-level listing of what the file contents are. We look at the functions of the body or individual or organization that created the records, and if there's any flags that go up, then those types of records are more closely examined to determine the level of personal health information.

What we're up against here is records coming into our custody that are not records of a trustee in any sense of the word under the HIPA legislation, but because we are a trustee, they are required to be examined at an intensive level, and researchers are required to undergo an ethics committee review. So that just adds all kinds of time for records that often are incidental.

A good example is a woman who has submitted diaries from, you know, her activities within a local organization and it mentions that health . . . get-well-wishes cards were sent to an individual because she broke her leg. Well technically speaking that's personal health information. But it's not a level that is deemed to be overly sensitive, and nor would it occur throughout those types of records. So the non-disclosure agreement is required to be signed by the researcher in this proposal and that would cover the release of any kinds of information.

[15:45]

Ms. Sproule: — The terms of the non-disclosure agreement, will they be included in regulations or is that just a form that your ministry will develop?

Ms. McIntyre: — It's a form that we . . . It's very similar to what we currently use for personal information. And it has been reviewed by the privacy office to determine that the clauses would match these clauses.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you very much then. I guess the main concern, just in summary again, is the wide scope of powers

being given to the minister in section 6(3). And despite I think your indications that it wouldn't be used to undermine or supersede the third party status, I'm afraid the wording is very broad and general and could be interpreted that way. Perhaps not this minister, but you never know, another minister might decide to order destruction of records or, you know, abuse the powers that are given here. So I find it to be very general and very broad and would strongly recommend that the ministry consider at least reining it in and to make it more in line with what was indicated here today.

Other than that, Madam Chair, I have no further comments on this piece of legislation.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. Are there any more Archives questions or comments from any committee members? Seeing none, we will proceed to vote on the clauses. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 48 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Archives and Public Records Management Act*. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 141, *The Archives and Public Records Management Act* without amendment. Mr. Michelson moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

Bill No. 142 — *The Archives and Public Records Management Consequential Amendments Act, 2014/Loi de 2014 portant modifications corrélatives à la loi intitulée *The Archives and Public Records Management Act**

The Chair: — Next on our agenda is Bill No. 142, *The Archives and Public Records Management Consequential Amendments Act, 2014*. I would like to remind members that this is a bilingual bill. We will now consider clause 1, short title. Minister, if you have any opening remarks, you may proceed.

Clause 1

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thank you, Madam Chair. I've already given my opening remarks.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. Are there any comments or questions on this bill? Seeing none, we will proceed to vote on the clauses. Clause 1, short title, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried.

[Clause 1 agreed to.]

[Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.]

The Chair: — Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows: *The Archives and Public Records Management Consequential Amendments Act, 2014*. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I would ask a member to move that we report Bill No. 142, *The Archives and Public Records Management Consequential Amendments Act, 2014* without amendment.

Mr. Steinley: — I so move.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. Mr. Steinley moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. Minister, do you have any comments or questions before we close?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thank you, Madam Chair. I do. I would like to thank the member opposite for her questions and the attention to this Act. So thank you for that. I would like to thank the committee for their attention to this as well, and I'd like to thank my officials for all of their work on this particular Act; it was significant. And we're happy that we're proceeding on behalf of the Archives.

The Chair: — Thank you, Minister. Now that we have completed the bills . . .

Ms. Sproule: — Could I just make one comment.

The Chair: — Oh, sorry.

Ms. Sproule: — That's all right. Just wanted to thank the minister and his officials. I also understand that the number of times somebody says "archives" means pizza and beer. If that's not true . . . So anyways thank you very much, and I look forward to meeting with two of the officials later tonight and the minister in estimates for the budget. So thanks to the committee.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. Sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off. Now that we have completed the bills portion of our agenda, we will recess until 7 p.m. this evening.

[The committee recessed from 15:51 until 19:00.]

The Chair: — Welcome back, everyone. We will now be . . .

A Member: — Yay!

The Chair: — What was that? Yay?

A Member: — Three and a half hours.

**General Revenue Fund
Parks, Culture and Sport
Vote 27**

Subvote (PC01)

The Chair: — Okay. Considering the estimates for the Ministry of Parks, Culture and Sport, we will now begin our consideration of vote 27, Parks, Culture and Sport, central management and services, subvote (PC01).

Mr. Minister is here with his official. Minister, please introduce your official and make your opening remarks.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks. Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm pleased to answer your questions regarding the estimates for my ministry. And first I'd like to do some introductions and make some brief remarks.

The officials I have with me today from the Ministry of Parks, Culture and Sport are Lin Gallagher, the deputy minister and CEO [chief executive officer] of the Provincial Capital Commission; Twyla MacDougall, the assistant deputy minister; Scott Brown, the acting assistant deputy minister; Nancy Cherney, assistant deputy minister; Gerry Folk, executive director of cultural planning and development branch; Darin Banadyga, executive director of sport, recreation and stewardship; Christina Herauf, corporate services; Bob McEachern, executive director of park services; Morgan Bradshaw, my chief of staff; Leanne Thera, executive director, policy, planning and evaluation; and Byron Davis, director of the facilities branch. And I'd like to thank you all for joining us here today.

Madam Chair, as you know, the theme of this year's budget is keeping Saskatchewan strong. Just a couple of weeks ago, the Finance minister stood in the House and detailed the ways in which our government will do just that. I look forward to sharing with you today how my ministry will contribute to that goal.

The Finance minister explained that in his budget we are keeping taxes low, controlling operational spending, investing in infrastructure, identifying incentives for new job creation, and of course balancing the budget. This is our government's eighth consecutive balanced budget, and it is a budget that supports our strong quality of life in Saskatchewan.

In terms of our ministry's budget, I want to first explain why it looks a little different this year. Our 2015-16 budget submission included a recommendation for a revised subvote structure and restated estimates. That is what you see today. The new structure demonstrates a clear alignment with the ministry's strategic plan and intended outcomes. It also distinguishes between programs that are directly delivered by government from programs that are delivered by third parties and funded through grants. The new structure combines nine subvotes into five, which creates more consistency with the way this type of information is presented in the Estimates document for all

government.

But, Madam Chair, I do not want you to feel like you're missing out on any details, so with my opening remarks, please allow me to share some of the most notable parts of our 2015-16 budget.

This year's provincial budget for the Ministry of Parks, Culture and Sport, which also has responsibility for the Provincial Capital Commission, continues to support a high quality of life and helps keep Saskatchewan strong. The first change we see is in subvote (PC18) under the brand new resource stewardship and the Provincial Capital Commission. Subvote funding has either remained stable or increased slightly for Main Street Saskatchewan, the Royal Saskatchewan Museum, the Provincial Capital Commission, and Government House. All of these items help us serve the citizens of this province. They help us create an enviable quality of life, and they help us in keeping Saskatchewan strong.

Main Street Saskatchewan doesn't appear as its own line item, but it continues as an important program for our province. We actually announced the expansion of the Main Street program just this past November. Main Street Saskatchewan is an ongoing, community-driven program that works to revitalize historic downtowns and commercial districts. It combines community organization; economic restructuring; heritage conservation; and design, marketing, and promotion to conserve and capitalize on the unique strengths and assets of Saskatchewan communities.

There are now 15 participating communities, six at the accredited level and nine at the affiliate level. The accredited level is for those communities who are prepared to fully implement the Main Street four-point approach to downtown revitalization and commit to maintaining a high standard of performance. The affiliate level is for those communities interested in Main Street and more focus on building their local capacity to fully implement the approach.

Since its launch in 2011, Main Street Saskatchewan has seen 66 new jobs created, 22 new businesses opened, \$4.9 million committed to historic building and streetscape improvement, and \$6.5 million in property acquisitions in its participating communities. I expect those numbers to keep growing as the program continues. This is a smart investment that will help in keeping our Saskatchewan communities strong.

You can see that funding for the Royal Saskatchewan Museum has increased slightly this year. The other thing that has increased slightly in recent months are visitations to the RSM or the Royal Saskatchewan Museum. That's exciting because the RSM tells the fascinating story of our province's natural and cultural heritage, past and present, and helps us all to envision the possibilities for the future.

The newest exhibit at the Royal Saskatchewan Museum, which opened in the fall and will be on display until May, is called A Roar of Wings. To commemorate the loss of the passenger pigeon, the RSM developed this new exhibit about extinct and threatened species. One hundred years ago on September 1st, 1914, the world's last passenger pigeon, a captive 29-year-old bird named Martha, died. Her death marked the end of a species

that once numbered in the billions.

In addition to the passenger pigeon, visitors will also view and learn about nine other extinct species, including the Tylosaur, an ancient marine reptile that once lived in Saskatchewan. New temporary exhibits and related programming planned for 2015-16 include one with a Polynesian theme and one with a First Nations theme. As well, we are gearing up for the summer season at the T.rex Discovery Centre in Eastend. The centre opens May 16th, and I'm sure it will be a great summer out there.

Research at the RSM continues and is expanding our knowledge in many areas, from dinosaurs to the role native bees play in Saskatchewan agriculture. The work the RSM and the T.rex Discovery Centre do on both the tourism side and the research side helps keep our province strong.

Also in the resource stewardship and the Provincial Capital Commission subvote, is of course funding for the Provincial Capital Commission and Government House. That funding remains stable, and that is good news for the citizens of our province.

Madam Chair, last year visitors to the annual Old-Fashioned Victorian Christmas event at Government House were lined up out the door, dozens of people deep, waiting to experience a part of our Christmas traditions, including horse-drawn sleigh rides, carolling, and the ever-popular gingerbread cookie decorating.

With more than 1,200 visitors of all ages, this annual event has become a tradition itself for many Saskatchewan families. We see a lot of new Canadian families enjoying this event and many other events at Government House. Events like this one add so much to all of our quality of life.

Because it is so popular, the Provincial Capital Commission will be looking at options to expand the Old-Fashioned Victorian Christmas event this year, and I look forward to that work. Additionally with the significant 125th anniversary of Government House in 2016, there may be federal funding opportunities available to continue the revitalization of Government House. We will watch for that in the coming year.

Very recently we had grade 8 students from three different Saskatchewan schools visit us here at the Legislative Building to learn about the province's democratic governance processes through an interesting education program we call A Day in the Legislative Assembly. More than 50 students from Hillcrest public school in Estevan, St. Michael's school in Weyburn, and St. Augustine School in Wilcox had the opportunity to sit in the House during question period, attend a panel discussion led by the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly involving both government and opposition MLAs [Member of the Legislative Assembly], and tour the Legislative Building. Budget 2015-16 maintains funding for this program, which we plan to offer twice a year. It supports a mandate to educate youth about the history and governance of our province while inspiring pride in Saskatchewan's capital city.

Another new subvote for us this year is the community engagement subvote. Funding for the Saskatchewan Science

Centre, Wanuskewin Heritage Park, the Western Development Museums fall under this subvote, and I'm pleased to say budget '15-16 maintains steady funding to these organizations. These organizations reach our Saskatchewan citizens and our visitors directly, and with this budget they'll be able to continue their good work.

Also under this subvote is the Community Rink Affordability Grant. This budget, '15-16, we will be delivering the Community Rink Affordability Grant for the fourth consecutive year. The Community Rink Affordability Grant provides funding to Saskatchewan's municipal indoor skating and curling rinks. Communities, schools, non-profits, and First Nations are eligible to apply to the program. Successful applicants will receive a grant of \$2,500 per indoor ice surface. The grant may be used to help offset the cost of rink operations and minor capital upgrades. Skating and curling facilities play an important role within Saskatchewan communities. Continuing to offer this funding helps make those communities stronger. Once again we've budgeted \$1.7 million for this program.

Also under this subvote, funding to the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation remains stable. For 23 years the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation has played an important role in preserving Saskatchewan's unique heritage. I'm proud to say that through their grant programs they've invested more \$9 million in 1,194 projects across the province. Some of this year's recipients include the restoration of the Commercial Hotel, a project that not only saved an iconic building, but created 25 full-time and six part-time jobs while bringing in significant outside investment to Maple Creek; archaeological investigations at the Farr site near Ogema; and funding for the Saskatchewan Youth Heritage fairs.

I'm also pleased to see the introduction of a one-time grant to help with the restoration of historically significant commercial buildings which not only support small business owners but also help to ensure our downtowns remain vibrant places to live and work. With steady funding, I look forward to the foundation's continued investments in our Saskatchewan communities in 2015-16.

You can also see Creative Saskatchewan under the community engagement subvote. Funding for Creative Saskatchewan remains stable, and I think that is good news for all of our creative industries. Earlier this month Creative Saskatchewan announced that Saskatchewan musician Andy Shauf has been signed by one of the most well-connected booking agents in the United States: Tom Windish of the Windish Agency. Andy Shauf is a Regina-based artist known for his honest, self-reflective songs, captivating lyrical works of fiction, and an intimate live show. Being on the personal roster of Tom Windish, who has booked Lorde, alt-J, and M83, will be a game changer for sure.

Creative Saskatchewan has supported Shauf through its market, travel, and tour support grant programs including Andy's most recent US [United States] tour launching *The Bearer of Bad News*. It is through the success of this US campaign that he caught the attention of Tom Windish, who has signed Andy for representation in the US, Mexican, South American, Australian, and Asian markets. This is just one example of the exciting

work Creative Saskatchewan is doing to raise the profile of our artists. Their work in supporting our creative industries also helps in keeping Saskatchewan strong.

Madam Chair, I should also mention right now that funding to the Saskatchewan Arts Board remains stable in this budget as well. That is on top of an 8 per cent increase to the Arts Board over the two years previous to this one so that they can continue to support our province's artists. Recently some of that funding has allowed the Arts Board to help the Globe Theatre present live professional theatre throughout the province. That is exciting for both the artists and the residents of the communities they were able to visit. Supporting our arts and culture creates a vibrant quality of life and truly keeps Saskatchewan strong.

Madam Chair, you know what else keeps Saskatchewan strong? Great parks. I'm proud to say that the budget 2015-16 the Government of Saskatchewan will fulfill its commitments to invest an additional \$10 million on expansion and growth opportunities at provincial parks over four years. Budget 2015-16 includes \$14.6 million for capital projects and upgrades in Saskatchewan provincial parks to ensure visitors have a great experience and encourage even more visits to Saskatchewan.

Projects to be undertaken this year with the additional capital investment include completion of a new campground at Greenwater Lake Provincial Park with 68 fully serviced campsites scheduled to open in the summer of 2015; development of a new campground at Blackstrap Provincial Park with more than 60 electrified campsites and a new campground service centre scheduled to open the summer of 2016; the addition of electrical service to more than 200 campsites throughout the provincial park system for a four-year total of more than 800 electrified sites; and completion of full-service campsites at Buffalo Pound Provincial Park and development of more full-service sites at Moose Mountain Provincial Park.

[19:15]

In addition to the enhanced investment to support expansion and growth opportunities in provincial parks, the Government of Saskatchewan continues to invest in projects to maintain and improve its existing infrastructure. Significant projects planned for 2015-16 include upgrading electrical service in 125 existing campsites; replacing existing day-use service centres buildings at Moose Mountain and Blackstrap provincial parks; constructing a new visitor reception centre at Douglas Provincial Park; upgrading water and sewer infrastructure systems at Greenwater Lake Provincial Park; and improving and upgrading park roads within Cypress Hills Interprovincial Park and Blackstrap Provincial Park.

From 2007-2008 and including the 2015-16 forecast amount, a total of \$92 million will have been spent on new park facilities and capital improvements in provincial parks. These improvements are customer focused. They improve quality of life for Saskatchewan residents. They strengthen the tourism industry. They are part of keeping Saskatchewan strong.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention that funding to our urban parks and to our regional parks remains stable as well. Those

parks also increase quality of life for Saskatchewan residents and we are pleased that with continued funding they can continue to deliver great experiences for residents and visitors alike.

Madam Chair, there are a few notable decreases in our budget this year. The film employment tax credit was reduced to zero, the active families benefit decreased by \$6 million, and the Regina stadium project does not have a payment in 2015-16.

Before I take questions, perhaps to head off some obvious questions, I wanted to address these items. As you know, the film employment tax credit was discontinued as part of the 2012-13 provincial budget. We allowed some time for that to wind down, and as of December 31, 2014, the program was fully phased out. Any final payments have been made.

I do want to mention that we do support the film industry through Creative Saskatchewan. Since Creative Saskatchewan's inception, they've provided \$4 million for screen-based media. That includes 56 different development and production projects, 17 market and export development grants, 6 business capacity and research grants, and 31 market travel grants.

The active families benefit is a program that has provided a refundable tax credit on eligible costs of up to \$150 per child for children under 18 years of age who are registered in sport, culture, and recreation programming. Starting with the 2015 taxation year, the active families benefit program will become subject to income testing, and active family benefits will only be available to families with combined net incomes up to \$60,000. This change will target the benefit to those families that require financial assistance. The benefit continues to make cultural, recreation, and sports activities more accessible and improves quality of life by offsetting registration and membership costs for Saskatchewan families. This change will reduce the cost of the program from \$11.5 million to \$5.5 million.

The ministry's 2015-16 budget shows a \$50 million decrease for the stadium. As part of the stadium construction and maintenance memorandum of understanding, the Government of Saskatchewan committed to providing \$80 million over four years towards construction and maintenance of Regina's new stadium. The key tenant for the stadium will be the Riders, who are also financially contributing to the initiative. There are many organizations that will benefit from the new stadium, including minor football programs, field hockey, and minor soccer programs, to name a few.

This project is part of an overall revitalization plan for the city of Regina and it will play a big role in keeping Saskatchewan strong. The province's final payment of \$25 million will be included in the 2016-17 budget. And if you were wondering, the project is on time and on budget. The city provided that update just last week.

Madam Chair, Saskatchewan's population recently set another record. We have, according to Statistics Canada, reached an all-time high of 1.13 million people. This provincial budget and my ministry's budget focuses on those people, all 1.13 million of them. We have kept funding to third parties and to the bulk of our programs stable and in so doing, we have truly put the

citizens first.

This budget contains no tax increases. That was achieved by controlling spending. Even with revenue challenges, this budget makes significant investments in infrastructure. This budget supports employment, training, and job creation, and this budget keeps Saskatchewan strong by investing in people. The 2015-16 budget is a balanced budget. The 2015-16 budget is keeping Saskatchewan strong. My officials and I would now be happy to answer any questions committee members may have. Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. Any questions on these estimates? Ms. Sproule.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Mr. Minister, for those opening comments. I will be bouncing around tonight because there's lots of small questions and some big questions. But I think the first thing — I'll just start at the beginning — and this is the announcement in the budget that the manufacturing and exporting processor tax incentive will be available to the creative industries. I just wonder if you have any estimates on what sort of use or uptake that the creative industries will be able to make of that tax incentive.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. I'll just confer quickly with my officials. Thanks for the question. It's early. We're not exactly sure what the uptake is going to be, but we are pleased to be able to offer this tax incentive to our province's creative industries as another way they can help make Saskatchewan stronger. But the manufacturing and processing exporter tax incentive targets export growth. Government is trying to support export growth to help diversify the economy and believes that creative industries have an opportunity here along with the broader manufacturing and processing sector. The ministry will work with the Ministry of Economy to determine eligibility. We'll also work closely with Creative Sask, as we believe there will be opportunities for many of our creative industries with this incentive.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. Thank you. I guess we'll just wait and see. I did some analysis of the shape of your ministry over the last few years, and it seems that a number of programs have been discontinued or moved to other areas, for example, tourism, which was around 16 million; the building communities program was 37 million at its height in '08-09; SCN [Saskatchewan Communications Network] was 6 million; film employment tax credit was 8 million. So those are all gone.

And in terms of new programs of anything over \$1 million, active families appears to be the only real new program that the department or the ministry has undertaken in the last few years. That's a significant program. It started at 18 million. It's now down to 5.5 million.

So basically what I can see for this ministry is that, for example in 2009-10, it was around 140 million and it's now down to about \$90 million in terms of the estimates for this ministry. So is there any concern on the part of the ministry in terms of having lost over I guess a third of its revenues in the last five years, six years?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. Creative

Saskatchewan is new. Main Street Saskatchewan is also new because it just . . .

Ms. Sproule: — That's less than \$1 million though. Isn't it 500,000? I was just talking of any significant programs.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Let's just get the number for you on that. Yes, it is under 1 million. Yes, it moved off of pilot status. But Creative Saskatchewan would be one that's new.

Sorry for the delay. Yes, there's a number of initiatives that have been funded. So we've got for instance the stabilized Arts Board funding over the last eight years, never below \$6 million a year, a 28 per cent increase in Arts Board funding in the last eight years here; 3.75 per cent went to the GRF [General Revenue Fund] on the five-year agreement. So this is almost, in terms of culture, this is the envy of the nation.

Thirty-seven per cent increase in funding to Western Development Museum in the first eight years; 74 per cent increase in funding to the Saskatchewan Heritage Foundation. \$1.25 million to artsVest. And then 2.75 million to Main Street, leveraging private dollars at basically a 12 to 1 ratio. A 10 per cent increase of funding to MacKenzie Art Gallery in the first eight years. So there are some. And there's also the stadium. We're not making that payment. We won't make that payment again, and that's significant, significant money.

Ms. Sproule: — I guess the point is that although your budget, total budget has decreased by 50 million in the last six years, your FTEs [full-time equivalent] have actually only decreased five, from 126 to 121. And I guess I'm just wondering, also in those six years federal funding has decreased from 854,000 to about 347,000. It's based on public accounts from the last five years. So we see a decrease in funding of, well I guess over half a million dollars per year from the feds. We see a decrease in about \$50 million in your estimates, and yet your staff complement has remained relatively stable. It's down five or six, as I said. So how do you sort of rationalize that one?

We see such a decrease in the amount of money in total. You've mentioned some increase percentage-wise in some programs, I acknowledge that, but I think it's pretty clear that the ministry has seen a significant decrease in funding. It's that \$50 million. And why has the FTEs remained relatively the same?

[19:30]

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. I'm just having difficulty understanding. Maybe if you rephrase it, because you talk about FTEs and the number that you gave was 100 and . . . What did you come up with?

Ms. Sproule: — 121 for '15-16, and '09-10 was 126.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Okay. Because our . . .

Ms. Sproule: — That's not the Commercial Revolving Fund. That's just the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks. That will do it. Sorry, we were including the revolving fund.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. That's next.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Okay. In terms of on the resource stewardship side, we have reduced basically to the limit that we could. So at this point, that's as far as we could go. We'd already gone through a reduction exercise of 15 per cent in previous years so this is as far as we could do in order to continue to operate services.

Ms. Sproule: — I guess the point — and I'm not suggesting you need to cut more staff — but with the reduction of \$50 million in programming, I just don't understand how there hasn't been an equivalent percentage reduction in staff. Were those other programs not staffed, or what happened to the jobs that you would have had in tourism, building communities fund, SCN, FETC [film employment tax credit]?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — I'll tell you what. I'm going to have one of my officials answer the question for you.

Mr. Brown: — In the case of the . . .

A Member: — Say your name.

Mr. Brown: — Sorry. Scott Brown. In the case of the programs that you mentioned, a lot of them, and as per the model that we use in a lot of the ministry, we use third parties to deliver those programs. So when you actually look at things like SCN, FETC [film employment tax credit], those were delivered by third parties, so a reduction in staff there wouldn't be reflected in the ministry numbers.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. One of the things, the next question I wanted to ask was in relation to the salaries in central management and services. For '15-16 the estimate is about, well \$2.362 million. Now I notice that's actually doubled since 2008-09 when it was 1.3 million. It's almost double. Can you explain why this particular area of your ministry has seen such an explosion in salaries? In fact looking back at the number of salaries over \$100,000, and I think in Public Accounts '13-14 there is 5, 10, 15, 17 staff over \$100,000, and in '08-09 there was one. So why is there such an explosion in the sort of high-level staffing positions?

Ms. Gallagher: — Lin Gallagher. I think we don't have all the data going back to 2008, so apologies for taking a little longer answering. But what I would note is that we have had a couple of more members added to this area, to central management and services, because we've taken on additional work. For example, we've taken on the Provincial Capital Commission. We've taken on different facilities like the T.rex. So there have been some added.

But why you would see the significant difference, we think, is looking at previous years, people's salaries would not have met the threshold of 100,000 and, as with increment or with salary increases, they would have gone over the 100,000. So it wouldn't be . . . It looks like a significant number of change, but it would only be that we've added approximately three or four. We can go back and get that exact number of individuals to the central management and services area.

Ms. Sproule: — I note that in Public Accounts 2013-14, page

186, in salaries and benefits, a former ADM [assistant deputy minister] I think, Susan Hetu, was listed at 199,263. I understand she's no longer with the ministry. Was there a severance associated with this or was that her actual salary?

Ms. Gallagher: — Lin Gallagher. That would've included some severance for that individual.

Ms. Sproule: — How much severance was that?

Ms. Gallagher: — We don't have that number here, but we can endeavour to get it for you.

Ms. Sproule: — All right. I guess the breakdown between her salary and severance would be appreciated. Thank you.

I just want to move on now to a few questions about Creative Saskatchewan and their budget for film projects in Saskatchewan. I'm going to assume — and it's hard to tell; we only have their annual report for 2013-14 — but it looks like around \$3 million, and that's a rough estimate, would go to what they call screen-based media production grants and screen-based media content development, and that's a rough estimate. But I did a calculation based on the population of Saskatchewan with \$1.13 million and about \$3 million being put into the film grants right now. That would average out to be about 37 cents per person in Saskatchewan.

Next door to us we have Alberta that has the production grant as well, and right now it's sitting at about \$250 million. I understand that in their budget they actually increased the amount of money, despite an austerity budget, for their film grant. It went up to \$26 million — sorry, from 25 to \$26 million. Now if that was calculated per person in Alberta which is at \$4.15 million, you're actually looking at \$6 per person in Alberta vis-à-vis 30 cents per person in Saskatchewan, and that's just based on a population.

So are there going to be any efforts in Saskatchewan to actually increase the availability of film grants to Saskatchewan companies? And I understand Creative Saskatchewan is for indigenous productions, but when you look at \$6 vis-à-vis 30 cents, there seems to be a real inequity there. And I think if you looked at British Columbia it would be even more stark.

So what are the sort of ultimate game plan in terms of bringing us into equity with our neighbours to . . . I didn't look at Manitoba yet and I certainly could, but I think as far as BC [British Columbia] and Alberta and British Columbia, are there any plans to sort of bring Saskatchewan into even the realm of equivalency so that we can attract productions here?

[19:45]

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, thanks for the question. This government has made a strive to support all the creative industries, including the screen-based media. So that would be roughly \$7 million, and out of that, \$4 million was basically being committed to screen-based media and film. And I'm trying to do the math here in relation to the million people that are in this province, and if it's \$4 million that's been committed to film, then that's almost \$4 as opposed to 30 cents. So that's a piece.

But I think it's important that I talk about the Creative Sask, the film commitments to date. And when I say to date, that's as of March the 4th of 2015, in terms of screen-based development, there was 45 applications received. Thirty-six applications were supported for \$569,000 and change. Screen-based production, there was 21 applications received. Twenty of those applications were supported at just a little over \$2 million. The market and export development, 22 applications were received and 17 applications were supported at \$843,000. Business capacity and research was 11 applications received, 6 applications supported at \$181,000. And market travel grant, 37 applications received, 31 applications supported at \$304,000 and revised as of . . . so here, so another 73,000. So this sector has received \$3.994 million to date, based on the information we've got up to March the 9th.

So I mean, screen-based media and film is being supported to an extent. We are presently working with and meeting with SMPA [Saskatchewan Media Production Industry Association], and they're . . . I mean we're pleased with the relationship that we've established. We do have a shared vision; it acknowledges this vision. I mean it does acknowledge the need for market attendance by Creative Sask for the purposes of business investment attraction. And Sask producers who are attending markets are often experts on their own projects, and experienced, but need the support and backing of an agency like Creative Saskatchewan to provide information on the infrastructure available.

So yes, we can also elaborate. I mean, there's more, there's more to talk about in relation to screen-based media and the support from Creative Saskatchewan, but I'll leave it there for now.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I think I'll just try and keep it simple. And if it is 4 million — I was estimating 3 — but if 4 million in Saskatchewan, 26 million in Alberta, so the ratio there is what? About six and a half to one? And the population is 4 million to 1 million, so the ratio in Alberta is much higher in terms of their support for screen-based productions. And I think my question was, will there be efforts?

And I know SMPA has acknowledged there's a start with the \$4 million, but they're certainly not saying let's stop there. And I think in order for our industry to be competitive, we need to see leadership and direction from this government that will bring us into line with Alberta and Manitoba, which I don't have the figures for right now. And I understand in British Columbia, I think the budget is something like 3 billion in terms of . . . What I'm told by the industry is that we're sitting on the sidelines. So is there any plan beyond what is in place right now to bring us back into the action and not sitting on the sidelines?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — It's difficult to completely answer the question, but we're going to work with, you know, ministry officials and collaborate with other government agencies, creative industry associations, relevant stakeholders to develop a strategic plan to meet culture and creative industry sector needs. And again we're working and meeting with the sector, with the industry to see what potential opportunities are out there. So I can't answer the question completely, but again it's a work in progress and we're working towards it.

Ms. Sproule: — It's now four years after the film employment tax credit was cancelled so, in terms of the strategic plan, do you have a timeline for when the plan will be in place? When will your strategic plan be completed?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, I'll let Scott Brown answer that question for you.

Mr. Brown: — I'm Scott Brown. Creative Saskatchewan is still fairly new in their operations. And they, as part of their program development, did come up with two specific programs designed to help the film sector. Those are the screen-based media development grant and the screen-based media production grant. Both of those programs offer some support to the film sector, but in addition to that there are other dollars that are provided through some of their other programs that are not specific to film, but they're still able to enjoy the benefits of those granting programs.

So the focus of the screen-based media development grant, if I talk about that one first, this is within the broader initial strategic planning that they did as an organization when they first got up and running. As it sits now, the board is having another look as they go down the road about enhancements to their planning that they may need to do. There has been, as the minister said, some work with SMPA around what the sector needs are going forward.

But to start out with, we're having a look at these two programs, and the screen-based media development grant, if I look at that, it's a non-juried program, but it does have continuous intake. It's meant to augment the available resources for qualified Saskatchewan film, television, and interactive digital media entrepreneurs to undertake creative endeavours of eligible projects and to assist them in bringing their production closer to fruition.

The second one is a screen-based media production grant. It provides financial support in the form of a 30 per cent all-Saskatchewan spend to the film, television, and interactive digital media industries for production activities. Both of those programs have been in place now since they got up and running. But in the broader scope of things, there's still ongoing consideration of enhancements or adjustments they may need to make to these programs.

Ms. Sproule: — Thanks, Mr. Brown. I actually am familiar with those two things, and they're very clearly described in the annual report for Creative Saskatchewan. I guess what I was thinking about was the comment made by the minister, that there is a strategic plan in place; you're working with other agencies and with SMPA. And I'm just wondering when that will be delivered because we have the rollout of Creative Sask for sure, but now I'm wondering what's the next step. And I think the minister indicated it's in the works but, at this point in time I understand there's no deadline or sort of target time for when we're going to have the next stage of restoring what was in place in 2012.

Mr. Folk: — Hi, Gerry Folk, executive director of cultural planning and development, I think it is. Creative Saskatchewan, this past weekend, was going through a strategic planning session. This was their second run at developing their strategic

plan. So their first strategic plan was a lot of operational activities: hire a CEO, get their offices up and running, and various other things.

Part of that strategic planning is going to be working with developing their sector plans for each of the individual sectors. SMPIA has come to the table and is really supportive of the process that's going on. Myself and SMPIA and Creative Saskatchewan have been meeting to talk about a vision for the sector moving forward. So there's been some really good work.

In terms of a timeline when it's actually going to be accomplished, their strategic plan will be out sooner than the sector development plans because the development plans will come out of their strategic plan. We all realize it's been a little bit, but they're working through it and they're trying to get that accomplished with the help of the sector organization.

Ms. Sproule: — Of course. All right. Thank you for that, Mr. Folk. I'm going to switch gears completely now and go into the Commercial Revolving Fund. And what I'd like to ask the minister or his staff is to sort of do a primer on it. Because the minister mentioned it last year in his opening comments, but I've been trying to figure out how it actually works in terms of the budgeting and the reporting of it.

So I'm looking at the financial statements for the Commercial Revolving Fund from March 31st, 2014 and just have a few questions on how that operates. So if we look at the budget for '14-15 . . . Oh, this is '13-14 in terms of the most recent available numbers for the Commercial Revolving Fund. I'm just going to look at . . . So it's basically, as of March 31st, 2014 — yes, so one year old tomorrow — and maybe we could look at the budget for 2014-15. I'm happy to look at '15-16 as well. But if we look at the Commercial Revolving Fund, which is in the Parks subvote, we see it as a subsidy of \$10 million. And for this year, last year, estimates at 10.399 million.

So could you just walk through how this is reported in the finances of the Government of Saskatchewan? In particular, I'm wondering if you could explain why there's a subsidy from the General Revenue Fund which doesn't equal the loss from operations.

[20:00]

Ms. MacDougall: — Hello, I'm Twyla MacDougall, and I will do my best to answer your question here. The Commercial Revolving Fund is a fund that does get money from the General Revenue Fund, typically about 40 per cent a year. We get 60 per cent through the revenues generated from our parks each fiscal year. And because it's a revolving fund, there's sometimes a surplus left in there, so it may not year over year equal the actual deficit that's resulted in that fiscal year. Does that help you?

Ms. Sproule: — How do you get the subsidy figure from the General Revenue Fund? How is that established?

Ms. MacDougall: — It's established at budget every year, based on our estimation of revenue that we plan to bring in from campgrounds, from our cottage lease fees. So we actively forecast revenues as well as expenses, and that difference is

what is allotted from the GRF.

Ms. Sproule: — So it's just trying to be as close as possible, based on the information at hand.

Ms. MacDougall: — That's correct. Yes.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. All right. In terms of the expenses in the Commercial Revolving Fund, I see salaries and benefits actually exceed the total revenues that are brought in from parks, and then there's a whole host of other expenses on top of that. Most businesses don't survive if they run it where their salaries are actually more than the total revenue. So is that something that will continue in the future? It looks to be a normal operation..

Ms. MacDougall: — Well what I can tell you is that parks, provincial parks are subsidized. So in the future, will we expect revenue to cover salaries? Not necessarily. Parks is a benefit we offer to the citizens of Saskatchewan.

Ms. Sproule: — And I totally appreciate that, so thank you. I like the parks. It just seems that there's a number of things here that, the commercial leases and the rental incomes, and like, how do you determine those rates? Is there a special . . . Because it's subsidized you give a better deal to those commercial lessees? Or is it the camping that's subsidized? What areas are actually subsidized?

Ms. MacDougall: — Well first off if I could just elaborate a little bit on your previous question, there are also other services within parks that wouldn't be directly related to revenue per se, such as our preventative maintenance and all of the resource management features that we have for the ecosystem.

Ms. Sproule: — So in the 2014 budget, that was \$849,000. What kind of items would be included in that resource management line? Oh, that's revenues. You're saying it's also an expense?

Ms. MacDougall: — So a lot of the expense is considered the pest management, looking after the forestry areas in the park.

Ms. Sproule: — And in terms of the expenses in the fund, where would that fall under? Is that contractual services? Or is that within salaries? Or is it spread out throughout?

Ms. MacDougall: — Spread out throughout, yes.

Ms. Sproule: — Oh, okay. So could you give me an example under travel and business expenses? In 2014 it was, I guess the actual was almost one and a half million dollars for travel.

Ms. MacDougall: — Travel would vary. Well, it's quite significant just because of the dispersed parks and the nature of our business. So even just going out to check on parks, etc. and again the preventative maintenance, all of that requires the travel.

Ms. Sproule: — Is there any way to get a breakdown of all of these expense items in more detail? Is that something that's available?

Ms. MacDougall: — There would be something available, yes.

Ms. Sproule: — Could you undertake to provide me with a more detailed breakdown of both the revenues and the expenses?

A Member: — For which year?

Ms. Sproule: — Well for the most recent, which I believe would be the 2014 actuals, right?

A Member: — Sure.

Ms. Sproule: — Yes, thank you. That's helpful; I'm starting to get it. Okay, I think next I'd like to turn to . . . I'm going to turn to the special advisor Rick Mantey who's, I understand, within the ministry's employ. Is he still employed as a special advisor to the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — No he's not.

Ms. Sproule: — No longer? When did his arrangement with the ministry end?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — I believe it was the end of the calendar year, December 31, 2014.

Ms. Sproule: — And what was his salary for the last fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. As best we can figure at this point, his salary was around 175,000 for the year, but he was with us from June to December. So basically half of that, so 87,000-ish and change. We can get you exact . . .

Ms. Sproule: — Yes, and I'm sure they'll show up on public accounts once they're available. So in that six-month period, what were his duties?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Okay. So during this time, Mr. Mantey had a number of responsibilities, including to advise, support, develop, and implement projects aimed at meeting the Provincial Capital Commission's strategic plan. He worked on files related to the Conexus Centre of the Arts, Government House, provincial historian, Saskatchewan Museum on Democracy, Saskatchewan Archives Board, Wascana Centre Authority. And he was actively involved in advising projects and attending meetings relating to Canada 150 and private sector philanthropic support for the Royal Saskatchewan Museum and Saskatchewan Foundation for the Arts.

Ms. Sproule: — And in this role as special advisor, I guess what was it that he brought that you didn't already have within your ministry? Like why did you feel it necessary to bring on a special advisor for these projects? We already have the Centre of the Arts. We have Government House. We have the museum. We have the archives. You have staff that are involved in those programs. So what was it that you felt you needed to hire him as a special advisor?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. Mr. Mantey brought an awful lot of skills and expertise to the ministry, in particular, Chair of the board for Conexus and specific expertise

in relation to art culture development, maybe around Government House. And in particular he lent an awful lot of assistance and expertise in relation to philanthropic support, for RSM, for the Royal Saskatchewan Museum, and again, Saskatchewan Foundation for the Arts.

Ms. Sproule: — So why did you let him go?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Mr. Mantey resigned and moved on to the private sector, and we wished him well.

Ms. Sproule: — In October, I think in particular October 6th and October 9th, there were documents that he had created to advise you in your ministerial capacity. What was in those documents?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — We'll have to go back and check our records for you. We don't know right now, but we'll go back and check. October 6th and 9th?

Ms. Sproule: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Okay. Yes, we'll go back and check.

Ms. Sproule: — Right now? Or do you want me to, like I can wait if you do it right now. Is that what you're saying?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — [Inaudible] . . . what we are saying.

[20:15]

Ms. Gallagher: — So thank you for that question. I don't, in my records . . . I haven't received a document on either of those dates. And I guess we can go back to our paper files at the office. I know during the time that Rick reported to me, he did produce two documents for us that are on record. That I have. They don't correlate with the dates that you had, but he did produce a discussion paper or, you know, a draft of a document looking at some opportunities around a provincial historian that would complement the work of the Provincial Capital Commission.

And Mr. Mantey also was very actively involved in working with us on Canada 150 and working towards what kinds of initiatives we as a ministry could put forward for consideration, as well as opportunities of federal funding that may be available. So those are the two reports that I've received from Mr. Mantey.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you very much, Ms. Gallagher. I know that you did do a submission to the ministry under OIPC [Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner] file no. 36-2015, and you mentioned those two dates specifically in your statement of facts — October 6, 2014 and October 9, 2014. It's paragraph six in your submission. You said Rick Mantey created documents to provide additional information, policy options, a device for consideration to the minister. So that's where I got the dates, were from your submission. And I'm just wondering if you could table those discussion papers with me.

Ms. Gallagher: — So thank you. Those are the two reports that I was talking about, and I think we have submitted those to the Privacy Commissioner. We had indicated that those were

advice to the minister, and so we will continue to work through that process.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. Can you tell us whether the documents are related to a plan for a Premier's library?

Ms. Gallagher: — Yes I can answer that question, that none of the documents had any reference to a Premier's library.

Ms. Sproule: — I think that's all I wanted to ask about Mr. Mantey. I am interested in Canada 150 though, and quite excited about it actually. And I learned that the real word is sesquicentennial for the 150th, which is a very good word. And I think this is a great opportunity for Canada, obviously, and Saskatchewan as well. So will there be announcements coming in the near future about opportunities for people in Saskatchewan relating to Canada 150 which would be 2017?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. We'll be working with the federal government on opportunities, and the best I can say right now is stayed tuned, because we're going to have some pretty exciting things happening.

Ms. Sproule: — Fair enough. I just want to remind the minister that we now have National Fiddling Day in Canada and I'm hoping we'll have fiddling day in Saskatchewan as well, so just a personal plug for . . . The third Saturday in May is now national . . . The bill was just passed federally, so just kind of putting my plug in. I do want to say that there's, on May 2 in southern Saskatchewan, there's a production called the *Fiddle History of Canada* and it's probably the thing that will make you feel the most patriotic that you will ever go to. So again, another plug.

I digress. All right . . .

A Member: — Not necessarily.

Ms. Sproule: — I guess it's all within the wheelhouse, isn't it.

Next I'd like to go through some comments that were made by your predecessor in last year's Estimates, and I just want to get some follow-ups to those comments. On page 525, April 15, 2014, he talked about capital investments in provincial parks, and he says they've increased quite a bit in the past seven years compared to the previous seven-year period.

I did some homework again, and God knows my math may or may not be working, but I went through the parks budget from 2001 to 2014 because he was referring to the last 14 years. And although he's saying the capital investments in parks have increased, there's a number of questions I want to ask around this, though I don't quite know how I'm going to start.

I guess the first thing is a statement, and what I've done in terms of the math is that I've taken the actual parks budget under public accounts, which is the real numbers, the actual numbers, over the past 14 years or 13 years, and then have compared them to provincial revenues also found in public accounts. And despite the fact that your predecessor said there's a huge increase in the amount of capital investment, when we look at it, it's actually decreasing as a percentage of the revenues of this government. So that's just a statement that I

wanted to make.

As of 2006, your parks budget was actually point two one per cent of the revenues and is down now, a few years later, to point one seven. So I think the dollars are actually shrinking in relation to the revenues that your government is bringing in. So that's my statement.

But what I wanted to talk about was the actual numbers in terms of your estimates and vis-à-vis the real numbers that are showing up in public accounts. So for example in 2013-14, your estimates for your parks vote was \$31 million, but it was only, in reality, \$19.382 million. So I'm just wondering what I'm missing. Because in the parks public accounts, so for example in that '13-14 — I have to find those pages, sorry — Parks, Culture and Sport, so it's page 184 of Public Accounts '13-14. That's the most recent figures that we have. It shows that the sub-vote total for parks, PC 12 was 19,000,382, but your estimate was 31 million. So what am I missing? Why do these numbers . . . Why are they not close?

If I could add to that, parks capital projects were budgeted I think at several million dollars, but in the public accounts they only come in at 500,000. So what happened to all those dollars?

Ms. MacDougall: — Hi. I'll try my best to answer that question for you. The number that you see in Estimates is the amortization. And the numbers that our minister of the time last year would have quoted would be our actual, what we had expensed and then set up as a capital asset in that fiscal year '13-14. Does that . . .

Ms. Sproule: — Estimates were 31 million and the actuals were 19 million. Like, in your estimate document it was 31 million for that vote, (PC12).

Ms. MacDougall: — So I'd have to look back at our Estimates book for '13-14, and I'm sorry I didn't bring that today. But it, I believe that vote includes more than capital, but I'd have to check.

Ms. Sproule: — I have it here.

Ms. MacDougall: — Do you?

Ms. Sproule: — Madam Chair, I'm just going to share a document with the ministry . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Perhaps that might help. Yes, thank you. Thank you. We'll just wait for those copies.

There seems to be a repeating figure. So what you're saying is that the actuals are always amortized and they don't ever look the same as what the estimates are. Because for the last six years that I looked, and I'll share this document with you, there's several million less in the public accounts than what you're estimating in the estimates. So it's misleading for sure . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . I think they're even . . . Okay, or I think the officials are . . .

Mr. Davis: — Just to explain the . . . Byron Davis. The capitalized portion of projects is set up at the time those projects are finished; the amortization begins. So sometimes projects span one or two years, possibly even three years for a major

project. So the amortized amount has probably no direct correlation with the yearly expenditures under the capital budget. The amortization process is a separate process, a financial process.

Ms. Sproule: — So the numbers that we find in the public accounts are not the actuals, but they're the amortized figures?

[20:30]

Ms. MacDougall: — I believe that to be the case, but I will get back to you and confirm that. I could add, now that I've seen your table as well, I could add that the 19 million is a combination of . . . Just a minute here.

Ms. Sproule: — I would hate to think that you could amortize, you know, \$12 million or \$31 million in one year. Like that just doesn't seem to be possible.

Ms. MacDougall: — Right, which is the budget. So it's an expense budget in estimates that we then, at the very last page of each estimates, it talks about how we amortize our assets. I'll look into it for you and get some more information so that it does align there.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. I mean I'm just really trying to see whether estimates and actuals match up, and in every other category in Parks — I've only looked at Parks in depth — they all seem to match up. But this one figure is startlingly different.

Ms. MacDougall: — This one figure is in fact assets. So I am almost certain that the difference is between that expenditure or expense that we list at estimate time, compared to the amortization we do at the end of a fiscal year.

Ms. Sproule: — I guess I'd be interested in more detail on actual dollars expended as well and not the amortization figure, because that's what's really important. And you know, I worry that the ministry is making announcements — they're going to spend \$31 million — but for whatever reason the projects don't get completed, and then what happens to that budgeted allocation? So okay.

Ms. MacDougall: — I do have that list right now for the last seven years if you would like that now.

Ms. Sproule: — Is that the actual expenditures?

Ms. MacDougall: — That's the actual expenditures.

Ms. Sproule: — I would really appreciate that. If you can get a copy, yes, that would be great. Okay, I think I can move on then.

One of the things the minister indicated in his comments last year was that the new lotteries agreement had been signed. And somewhere I was reading that there was a recommendation, I think it was from the auditor, that the lotteries also include payees over \$50,000. Now I'm wondering, is that going to be implemented right away or is that something that will be implemented at the end of 2019 when this agreement is completed?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — We are working, presently working with Sask Sport, and we're going to implement all the auditor's recommendations.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. So you anticipate that their next annual report would include the \$50,000 payees, or people over 50,000?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — \$50,000 . . .

Ms. Sproule: — Payees.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Payees.

Ms. Sproule: — Payees.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks. This agreement puts down all the requirements that the auditor has put down for Sask Sport. So it satisfies, the new agreement that they're working on satisfies the auditor's pieces.

Ms. Sproule: — We'll look to see that, or I'll look for that when we get the annual report. He also indicated that I guess . . . Well this is the Saskatchewan Arts Board. We know that the previous CEO has stepped down; there's now an acting CEO. When do you anticipate that the new . . . Is there a staffing process or a search, candidate search under way and when do you think the new CEO will be announced?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes. The hope was that the acting CEO wasn't going to be in place for more than six months. They're presently putting a staffing action in place.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. artsVest for '15-16, is it now, is it 250,000 again? Yes.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, it stayed the same.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. The minister indicated that there was a \$100,000 funding for a capital renewal study for the RSM. Has that capital renewal study been completed and has it been released?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — It's under way, that report. We haven't got a final report as now. Still under way.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. T.rex Centre. I know that the government stepped in last year to ensure it continued operations. There was difficulties at a local level. Can you give us an update? Will the government continue to provide that additional level of support for that particular centre? And if so, for how long are you planning to and how much are you spending on it?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, thanks for the question. We've taken over the program and we're leasing the building. So far I think it's a five-year lease, and it's going to continue.

Ms. Sproule: — I think I saw the visitation was up once the province took over. Is that correct? I saw that somewhere in your plan.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — What are we at? In 2013 the centre had

just over 6,900 visitors between April and late September. I guess that's when the centre closed for the season. In 2014 the centre had just under 6,800 visitors between May and September long weekend. This attendance reversed the previous trend of declining summer visitation to the centre.

Ms. Sproule: — I guess the question would be, under what circumstances does the ministry step in when museums are in decline like this one? Like why this centre and not others?

Mr. Brown: — Scott Brown. The centre has been actively used by the ministry even before this change took over, and in fact our scientists are active in a fossil site quite near there as well. So it becomes in effect a base of operations for a lot of the fieldwork that the RSM does anyway. So there are already some unique synergies in place that led to this partnership I guess going forward.

Ms. Sproule: — And how much has that cost the ministry?

Mr. Brown: — The budget that we have right now is \$518,000 per year over the five years.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. Moving on, the community rink affordability grant: is that still in operation and what is its budget for this year, if it's still available?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — The rink affordability grant is still in operation and the budget is 1.7 million.

Ms. Sproule: — And where is that located in the estimates?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Under community engagement.

Ms. Sproule: — Oh there it is. Okay. Is it intended that this would go on in perpetuity? Is that the goal of the ministry or how long will it take to get community rinks up to snuff?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — This would be continual work, right, so if rinks — hockey rinks, indoor rinks, curling rinks — they can get \$2,500. So this would be ongoing. They could apply every year and so it's operating. It's some improvements and that, so \$2,500 is helpful. But it's ongoing. I mean there was . . . This is the third year that we had the community rink affordability grant and so 381 communities benefited from the program. And as we have already said, we'll be offering it again, the program again. And it's all corners of the province so yes, it's something that every community can benefit from, and we encourage that.

Ms. Sproule: — I was thinking it was a capital expense but I see now it's operating costs. So it's the same rinks every year basically, right? Or generally.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, thanks for the question. There'd be overlaps. Yes, there'd be a lot of rinks that would apply year after year but there's also new entrants into applying for the grant. Yes. So including on-reserve and First Nations.

Ms. Sproule: — I'm glad to hear it's on-reserve as well. Moving on now back to, I guess, a finance question, but it's the Community Initiatives Fund. And if I understand correctly, these are gaming revenues that are distributed through the Community Initiatives Fund. So these are proceeds from

casinos. How are those deemed to be revenue by your ministry and then expensed out of your ministry? Like how does that work?

Mr. Brown: — Scott Brown. Yes, it's a revenue-neutral program. So basically the ministry is just a flow-through for that; as those funds come into General Revenue Fund, they then flow through the ministry to the program.

Ms. Sproule: — It just seems to be a bit misleading because like, for example, this year in the estimates you have \$9.2 million as an expenditure for your ministry, but it really isn't an expenditure for your ministry at all. So why does it show up in the books? That's what I'm confused by. You merely funnel the money, right? Like it comes in from the casinos and you just distribute it.

[20:45]

Mr. Brown: — Scott Brown. Generally one of the reasons, it's common accounting practice, obviously for a number of other examples across government. But there is also a conscious choice by government to have these funds directed in this way. So the fact that they are redirected from General Revenue Fund, it fits with the broader strategic objectives of the ministry and consistency in terms of programming.

And if we get into the actual running of the organization, there is a board appointed and those kinds of things that are directly affiliated as well. So there are some strong ties to the ministry, and that's why it's reflected there.

Ms. Sproule: — Yes, just when you think of general revenues, these are not general revenues at all. So it's an unusual way of characterizing them, but I understand if it's a general practice. I'm sure it's not new and it's been done in other contexts. I'm just trying to understand it.

The federal funding I mentioned earlier — I'll see if I can find that paper again — it seems to have declined quite dramatically in the last several years. I think, yes my figures show that in '08-09 it was 854,000. It's now down to I think around 300,000. Why is that dropping and are there any sort of hopes that it will increase? I think it's for Sask Sport, is that correct? The federal funding?

Mr. Banadyga: — Hi. Darin Banadyga. I just wanted to explain the federal transfer payment of \$303,000 in this year's budget. It will be used for what's called the Canada-Saskatchewan Bilateral Agreement on Sport Participation. And that money is flowed through to Sask Sport where they put in more than \$300,000 matching amount every year. And in general those programs address things like Aboriginal coach and officials program development, Aboriginal community sport development, and also funding for the Dream Brokers program.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. Sir, I indicated in my question that it was 800-and-some thousand dollars, and it's now . . . that was about five years ago, and now it's down to 300,000. Is this going to eventually just dry up, or is there any anticipation that it's going to increase?

Mr. Banadyga: — I guess the federal funding for this program, \$303,000, has been stable for the last number of years. And we are anticipating that that funding will continue for the next four years.

Ms. Sproule: — In terms then of the revenues that are indicated in the public accounts, what was the other \$500,000 that was received in '08-09? It was \$854,000 from the feds. In '09-10, it was \$739,000; '10-11 was 420,000; '11-12, 376; '12-13, 306; and in '13-14, 347. That's called transfers from the federal government in your budget.

Ms. Gallagher: — So for our records, the sport bilateral agreement has stayed the same, and it will continue to stay the same. I think what you're referencing is that we've received other federal transfer monies. So for this year, we have identified another 92,000. That money would be coming actually to the RSM for a program to support the exhibits and some work that's going on there.

We can go back through previous years. We don't have all of the different federal funding we've received since 2008, but last year we would have also received about \$100,000, again from the federal government for the Royal Saskatchewan Museum.

And so I believe the answer Darin Banadyga has given you is the correct answer, that that funding for the sport bilateral has stayed the same. But on an annual basis we may submit requests for federal funding for a variety of different projects, and that would be reflected in that number that you're talking about.

Ms. Sproule: — And my question is, why is there a decline in that amount? So if you could go back and sort of provide me with some information on what was being received as early as '08-09, where it was \$854,000, I'm just curious as to why that amount is declining. It seems to be a trend, so I'm concerned and just would like to understand that.

Ms. Gallagher: — So why has the amount of federal funding over the past number of years changed? Yes? Okay.

Ms. Sproule: — The minister last year also indicated that there would be commissions based off the MMA, mixed martial arts events. Has the ministry received any revenues yet, and if so, how much? And then what are you anticipating for the next fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. The short answer is no. I mean we've just passed regulations, and so we're in the early days. When we're up and running, the expenses budgeted for the Athletics Commission are strictly tied to operations and training, so all expenses associated with putting on an event are the responsibility of the promoter.

Ms. Sproule: — I was talking about the revenues. Do you have any budgeted for this year?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — The Athletics Commission is anticipated to generate approximately \$10,000 in annual incremental General Revenue Fund revenue in a typical year, which could increase to an estimated \$120,000 if for instance UFC, Ultimate Fighting Championship hosts an event in the

province.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. We talked a little bit last year about the CEO search for the Creative Sask CEO, and I was told that a firm out of Toronto . . . The board hired a group called the Bedford Group. I'm just wondering if you can tell me how much that CEO search cost. Do you have those figures?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. Creative Saskatchewan, their annual report wasn't specific in terms of that, but we can go back and ask them again.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. Yes, I have the report in front of me and it's not here. So I'm just curious; I'll get back to that later. I'm sorry, I'm jumping around, but I'm back at Creative Sask.

I just want to talk about the sound stage here in Regina a little bit. Last year the minister indicated that it would cost about \$731,000 to operate last year and that the intention of the ministry was to enter into a formal arrangement with Creative Sask to manage the sound stage. I guess first of all, has that formal arrangement been made? And what are the basic terms of that financially?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes. Thanks for the question. We're in the middle of finalizing that agreement. The plan to utilize the sound stage more fully is under way. The short-term plan is to offer space in the building to provincial creative industries sector organizations and a longer term strategy for future use will involve consultations with key stakeholders, existing tenants, creative industries, sector organizations, and creative producers.

[21:00]

Ms. Sproule: — Again we're now into three years after the elimination of the tax credit, and there's still consultations ongoing. So when do you anticipate that this will be complete and we will know the plan for the sound stage?

Mr. Brown: — Scott Brown. There's already been a significant number of changes in terms of what the sound stage is being used for, so you've started to see some events like Fashion Week, some music events, different kinds of activities there. The focus initially with Creative Saskatchewan was to try to find ways to make the building accessible for the entire creative sector, so they've been working through that. There continues to be some film work that's happened in there as well, but the broader effort here is to develop a plan with the sector that will support all of the creative industry over the long term.

Ms. Sproule: — Can you give me an example, outside of Fashion Week, where this would be an appropriate venue for other creative industries? I mean I can see putting musical events there, but that's not unique. I mean there are other places in Saskatchewan, so there's no need for an additional music venue. So what other kind of uses would creative industries have for the sound stage portion, not the offices because again there's offices everywhere.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks. We're in consultations presently with the different sectors, so we'll continue to again

consult with them, so at this point it's ongoing.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I will hold my breath. Thank you.

The intent of Creative Saskatchewan, as we discussed earlier, was to provide funding for indigenous production companies here in the province. As you will be aware on the screen media productions, as a result of the collapse of the industry in Saskatchewan when the tax credit was eliminated, most professionals working in Saskatchewan, living here, indigenous to Saskatchewan have now left the province. So I think there's some hope from the industry that this would be relaxed somewhat, this requirement that the production be indigenous. Have those discussions proceeded at all, or are these rules going to be relaxed a little bit? There's nobody left here to do the work, so we need to get the work from somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks. It would be premature to make an announcement today, so we're in discussion.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I will continue to hold my breath.

Next discussion, and this is something, I don't know if you had a chance to look at last year's estimates, but we had talked about the community rinks affordability grant, and then we went on to discuss seniors' centres. And I had received correspondence — I don't know if you'll remember this, Ms. Gallagher — but I had received correspondence from the seniors' associations who were saying, look, community rinks are important. You give them money. Will you also afford the same kind of support to seniors' centres? We had quite a discussion about that last year in estimates. The minister said, and I'll quote him at this point, he said:

And what I would say, you know, and I don't want to raise any false expectations, and the Premier decides who's in this chair for the next budget process, but if I'm in this chair for the next budget process, it's something I'll undertake to take a look at.

So I don't know if he passed that on to you, Mr. Minister, when you took over in that role, but are you looking at seniors' centres and affordability grants for them as well? Is that something that's on the table?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — I mean it's an interesting premise. We'll keep it in mind, but it wasn't included in this budget.

Ms. Sproule: — What I will undertake to do is to resend the letter that we got from the seniors' centres. I did write to the minister last January, and he said he would look into it, but I can just restate the comments I made last year.

There was a resolution made by the Saskatchewan Seniors Association, and they very much agree with statements made in terms of the community rink affordability grant. And what they're looking for, they made a resolution urging the government to include seniors' centres in any future funding grant program that would help to sustain and support the philosophy of your program, which is:

Saskatchewan is built on the strength of its communities and ... Healthy individuals and communities are dependent upon a recreation infrastructure that provides attractive and safe places [and spaces] in which to play, socialize, rejuvenate, and challenge the mind, body, and spirit.

And I'm sure the minister's been in some of these seniors' centres. Certainly in my hometown it's a very active space and used for all kinds of things from, you know, playing cards, to shuffleboard, to whatever, pool, those kinds of things. So I'm just reiterating what we talked about last year and bringing it to your attention, and hopefully that's something that you would be responsive to for the seniors in these communities.

Another thing we discussed with the minister last year was the Prince Edward Island event that was held in 2014. It was a week-long event in the summer, and I understand, I know that Creative Sask was part of that event and that there were Saskatchewan artists that attended. I know the CEO of Creative Sask actually made his way out there as well.

And what the minister said last year, we talked about the cost of that event and I had asked him whether or not it was ... whether your ministry was covering all the costs or whether Tourism was involved, and he said it was going to be shared at that point. And I said, what I said is, I think I can ask questions next year about the costs on that because it will be real at that time. So I am now asking about the costs for that event and what your share of the costs were.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes. Thanks for the question. It was about \$150,000, and that \$150,000 went to the Government of PEI [Prince Edward Island]. And then we had a number of opportunities and initiatives to showcase the province of Saskatchewan including, which you probably know of, but The Sheepdogs were there. Symphony was there, RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police] sunset ceremony. So yes, it was \$150,000.

Ms. Sproule: — Was that 150 solely your ministry's portion, or was that the total cost and you cost shared it?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, \$150,000 was our ministry's cost. Tourism had some minor costs, and they had some staffing costs as well. They showcased the green screen, the same thing that they utilized for the Olympics.

Ms. Sproule: — Since I have the good fortune to be the critic for Tourism, I'll be able to ask them those questions as well. Thank you. Madam Chair, I'm ready to move on to the active families benefit, but I was wondering if we could take a brief, five-minute break?

The Chair: — Okay. We will break now for five minutes. It is 9:11.

[The committee recessed for a period of time.]

The Chair: — It's 9:20. We will proceed.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you very much, Madam Chair. As I indicated, I want to move on to the active families benefit and

ask some questions about that. When the plan was first introduced, I think the first year it showed up on the books was '09-10, 2009-2010, it was originally estimated to cost \$18 million and I believe that was for a limited age group at the time, 6 to 14.

It looked like the original uptake and the actual uptake was about 12 million in the first year. So then the estimates dropped down to 11.2 the next year and the uptake was only 7.7 million. Then it dropped to 9 million in '11-12, and then it bumped back up to 13 million — I think that might be the year it was extended to children under six and to teenagers up to . . . children under 18. So it seems to have rested at 12 million for the last couple of years. I believe last year's estimates were 11.5. I don't know what the actuals are yet. And then now with the change in the means test, it will drop to less than half of that at 5.5 million.

So I think my question is, what has changed in terms of the philosophy behind this program? Originally you know, it was . . . And I guess the original estimates have been significantly changed as well. So why did the government extend it to the greater ages and now put a means test on it?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — This government wanted to ensure that low-income families or vulnerable families would continue to receive the benefit. So it was income tested for families to continue to receive the benefit under the \$60,000 threshold, and we wanted to, you know, just ensure again that vulnerable families continue to receive the benefit. So that's the exact, that's the rationale.

Ms. Sproule: — I certainly get that part of it, that you've . . . [inaudible] . . . but why did you take it away from families over 60,000? And why 60,000? How did you come to that test or that level?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. The active family benefit is only one program that seeks to reduce barriers to participation in the arts, culture, sport, and recreation. We know that kids really benefit when they participate in activities.

In addition to the active family benefit, this government has renewed the lotteries agreement which funds several programs at community level that attract participants from all walks of life, such as Dream Brokers; community grant program; funds program; participation at the community level including First Nations member assistance programs MAP; grants to support sport development at the grassroots level; KidSport; Creative Kids; Aboriginal community sport development grants; First Nation recreation grants. The list goes on and on. And these are examples of a wide range of programs that seek to reduce barriers to participation. So that's where we're at.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. Again how is the figure of \$60,000 determined?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — It was a tough budget year. We had to draw the line at some point, and we drew the line at a point that would continue to apply the benefit to low-income and vulnerable families. So that's how we arrived at the \$60,000 threshold.

Ms. Sproule: — This of course, I know, the minister's indicated the concern is to ensure that low-income families are not cut off. Many of those families wouldn't even have a significant number of taxes to pay. So I would assume that most of the people that are availing themselves of the programs are the ones with a tax range that the deduction could actually apply to. And so if you could tell me in terms of numbers, maybe we could approach it from that angle. How many, I want to say children but maybe how many families benefited from the \$12 million tax break in '13-14?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Okay. Thanks for the question. Based on the previous tax year, 45,000 families would have received the benefit. So about half of those would have made the \$60,000 threshold and would have received the benefit.

Ms. Sproule: — And I'm not sure if you can answer this, but in order for a family to actually have enough income to require this or to be able to access this benefit, because there's so many personal deductions as there is for families, what would be the lowest threshold of income . . . I don't even know if I can phrase this properly, but with all the personal deductions that you could have, what would be the lowest amount of income that would be where someone could actually avail themselves of this benefit? I think the basic personal exemption is about \$12,000 right now, and then for each dependent child there's additional exemptions.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes. So as long as they pay the registration, the \$150, they would get it back as it's refundable.

Ms. Sproule: — Even if they had zero income, they would get a cheque, an actual cheque for 150?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — As long as they paid in advance.

Ms. Sproule: — Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — As long as they paid in advance.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. So those 45,000 families, you're saying about half now, say 27,000, will no longer be eligible. We know that childhood obesity is a huge issue in this province, certainly one that our counterparts, your counterparts in the Ministry of Health talk about. This seems to be cutting off your nose to spite your face quite frankly, Mr. Minister, and I just wonder how it is, you know, the \$60,000 mark is going to really affect a lot of families in a negative way.

This is a program that is designed to improve quality of life. It is designed to help children participate. It is designed to reduce barriers. If you think about a single parent with a \$60,000 income and a mortgage payment and increasing costs, in all sorts of walks, I just think this is sort of an arbitrary line that's going to impact significantly a number of families who have availed themselves of this benefit.

[21:30]

And so I guess there's not a question here. It's a concern that I'm raising that I think this is short sighted. And certainly when you look at the 18 million that you were willing to spend only five years ago, and now you're down to \$5 million, I think that

the way this program is being guided is incredibly unfortunate.

And in terms of, you know, primary health care and all the indicators, upstream indicators of health, this is one that actually was making a difference. And will you be making . . . I guess my question would be, in the '16-17 cycle, are you hoping to restore these levels and to get rid of this income test?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thank you. Active families benefit, as I've said, I mean it's only one program that seeks to reduce barriers to participation in the arts, culture, sport, and recreation. And I mean it's also important to recognize that the active families benefit wasn't just sport and recreation related, so there was the arts and the cultural piece as well. So that wouldn't necessarily tackle obesity, but it's just for interest's sake. But we know that kids really benefit when they participate in all of these activities.

In terms of some of the key actions, we target investments in leadership and training opportunities through Saskatchewan Parks and Recreation Association to lead and engage children and youth in sport, recreation, and cultural activities. Another key action would be to renew the Can-Sask sport bilateral agreement to address barriers to children and youth participation in sport activities, and support opportunities for persons from under-represented, marginalized populations to participate in sport as athletes, coaches, officials, and volunteer leaders.

And based on the endorsement of the framework for recreation in Canada in 2015, the ministry will collaborate with recreation sector partners on next steps for introducing the framework into Saskatchewan. We are partnered with other ministries and stakeholders to explore our options to develop an online resource for workplace wellness. We're going to ensure strategic investment in arts, sport, recreation, culture, and heritage activities through the Community Initiatives Fund.

We're going to direct an estimated \$1.8 million in snowmobile registrations to the Saskatchewan snowmobile trail fund for ongoing safety programs and to improve maintenance and operation of trails throughout the province. We're going to provide financial support again up to \$2,500 for ice-surfaced skating rinks and curling rinks through the community rink affordability grant. And those are just a number of the programs and initiatives that we're currently involved in.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I'm not sure how the snowmobile program relates to this, but anyways I'm going to move on.

The Lac La Ronge Indian Band wrote a letter to Kevin Weatherbee, who is a parks manager in La Ronge, on March 4th, 2015. I'm not sure if it's been forwarded to the deputy minister or not, but I'll share it with you now.

This is from Tammy Cook-Searson, who is the chief of the Lac La Ronge Indian Band, and the re: line is the discussion of the closure of provincial sites at MacLennan River and Montreal River. And what she's brought to his attention is that the Lac La Ronge Indian Band is now aware of the potential closure and removal of site services for two important recreational sites at MacLennan River and Montreal River. It was noted in, I guess,

the minutes from the Lac La Ronge Provincial Park advisory meeting in September. At that point the band had put forward a recommendation that the sites not be closed and remain open, and they are writing an official letter to ensure this recommendation is put forward in the official format. They are certainly wanting to discuss the issue and are hoping, I think, to discuss it tomorrow at the lands and resource management board meeting.

But I just wonder if you could, or the deputy minister could comment on the closure of these important recreational sites, whether this is indeed going ahead or whether they will remain open and, if so, the reasoning for closure if they're going to be closed.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks for the question. The decision was and continues to be to keep the sites open because they're important rest stops in conjunction with the Ministry of Highways. So they're important rest stops; the decision right now is to keep them open.

Ms. Sproule: — And are the costs being assumed by Highways at all, or is this still a cost that's managed by your ministry?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — We maintain it within our parks budget.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. I'm sure that will be good news for the chief, and I assume that will be passed on to her if it hasn't already.

Next item I would like to raise is the Meewasin Valley Authority in Saskatoon. And February of 2015 they had a meeting with a number of Saskatoon officials, including myself and the mayor and the president of the University of Saskatchewan, all of whom are, I guess, interested in the Meewasin Valley. But certainly, as you know, it's a provincial asset and an urban park in many ways. They're in very serious decline at this point because of the decline in the value of the money they've been getting. And there's a picture here that I could share, if the minister's interested, of the statutory and supplementary funds per capita based on the Saskatoon population adjusted to real dollars. And what they're basically saying is that there's been a decline in the value of their dollars over the last, since '81 — so is that 35 years? — from \$33 down to \$9 per capita. This is unsustainable, and Mr. Isaak, who's the head of Meewasin Valley Authority, is very passionate and eloquent when he makes these points.

I spoke to the minister about it last year. He said there was nothing in the budget last year and basically threw it on the cities to pick up the responsibility for that, based on the revenue sharing, which I kind of felt was throwing the cities under the bus. And I think the mayor of Saskatoon agrees. Right now their payroll alone is going up, I think in the same time period, from 55 per cent to 75 per cent just based on inflation, not increasing their staff numbers. So the situation that Meewasin Valley Authority finds itself in is quite desperate.

The statutory amounts I don't think have been changed for many, many, many years. There has been supplementary funding from year to year, but it's irregular and it's not sustainable. We also know that one of the really sad things is

that there is federal money available for the Trans Canada Trail, but they can't even access it because they need matching dollars. So they're actually saying goodbye to \$800,000 from the Trans Canada Trail funding because they cannot match the dollars. Private sector targets have been exhausted, and so therefore they cannot complete the last trail section between Chief Whitecap Park and Beaver Creek Conservation Area.

And the other concern of course is, as the city gets larger, they're also . . . Riverbank lands are being added, and they should be brought into the conservation zone. They have not been brought in. So basically this plea from the Meewasin Valley Authority has gone on deaf ears. I don't know, one of your colleagues actually sits on the board, and perhaps he has brought that to your attention as well. But they've got a new formula that they think is quite viable which would require new wording in the legislation, and it would be a formula based on the assessed value of taxable property.

And their recommendation is that a funding formula be reinstated in *The Meewasin Valley Authority Act* and that then . . . Certainly the city of Saskatoon has shown leadership, but they're saying that the per capita contribution should increase at the rate of 50 per cent applied to the consumer price index for Saskatchewan for the next five years. So their conclusion is that doing nothing leaves the Meewasin organization in a situation of decline and that they have to seriously consider closing public facilities.

So I think basically I would just like to hear from you on the record what your intentions are with respect to this and the fact that Meewasin, without any support from your ministry, will have to start closing public facilities, and what your reaction is to that.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thank you. This government has consistently funded the supplementary funding. Supplementary funding has gone up every year starting in . . . No, sorry. It hasn't gone up every year, but it's been rather stable anyways in the last few years compared to . . . so 169,000. Yes, about 169,000.

Government is pleased to continue to provide the same level of funding as last year to Meewasin Valley Authority and six other urban parks and conservation authorities in Saskatchewan. Provincial funds help ensure good management and development of parklands that encompass important waterways running through the seven largest cities in the province.

The ministry has been engaged with Meewasin in a review of the statutory funding over the past year. Late in December 2014 Meewasin proposed a 42.6 per cent increase over 2014-15 levels for 2015-16. Meewasin Valley Authority has been advised that the proposal came too late to be considered for '15-16. Our government continues to focus on managing spending while also keeping Saskatchewan's economy strong. The minister has indicated his interest in working with Meewasin in advance of the 2016-17 budget call to determine an appropriate budget proposal.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. Thank you. I'm going to turn now to the annual report from your ministry for '13-14 which, I believe, was released in July of last year. And I just have some questions

about some of the progress indicators there.

Page 8, first of all I just had a question about Culture on the Go. This was an Arts Board program for a number of years. I believe that it's now being jointly ministered between Creative Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Arts Board. My question is this: for the jury process on this particular grant, will it remain the same as it was under the Saskatchewan Arts Board?

[21:45]

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Well thank you. So the program began as a pilot in 2009 with a annual budget of 800,000 and it's split between two organizations. So Creative Sask's allocation is \$600,000, which supports artist groups touring for commercial intent. Creative Sask is also tasked with developing a coordinated touring network. And then the Arts Board, their allocation is \$200,000. They're supporting touring artists and groups that are non-commercial in nature but provide Saskatchewan residents with greater access to performances and exhibits. So there's a little delineation between both, how those funds are dispersed, one for commercial intent and one for non-commercial basically in nature.

Ms. Sproule: — My question was, how is the jurying being done for that? Are you aware . . . Like I've been involved with the Arts Board version of it. Is the jury situation the same for Creative Sask, or is it a different approach?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — No, there's been no change to the jury process for the Arts Board.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. Because one of the concerns we hear about the operations at Creative Saskatchewan is the failure of accountability for the jury process. And there's no clear delineation, there's no transparency in terms of how the juries are being selected or who the juries are even.

For example the Arts Board will always divulge the names of the jurors after the jury process, not during or before, but certainly after they have it on their page. And all that Creative Saskatchewan does is a combined list of all jurors for all programs, so the feeling is there's a lack of transparency and accountability in the jury process in Creative Saskatchewan. That's where this question's coming from.

But certainly I would like to know what the ministry's response is to those concerns and fears about the transparency of the jury process in Creative Saskatchewan.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — It's coming up, I guess it's been a year since Creative Sask has been in operation.

A Member: — One full fiscal year.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — One full year? Yes. As suggested by the Premier, a review of Saskatchewan's approach to creative industry funding and support is due. So this means assessing Creative Sask's progress to date and the agency's ability to provide services to stakeholders and achieving its mandate.

Creative Sask's mandate involves creative industry growth planning; support for innovation, promotion, and marketing of

Saskatchewan cultural product; administering financial assistance; and increasing the contribution of creative industry to our economy. So this review aims to highlight Creative Sask's achievements and provide recommendations for future activities, including the jurying.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I note you didn't mention the jury process in your comment, so perhaps you may want to add that as part of the review because I think that is something that is of particular concern to participants in the program. I hear stories of people that don't live here getting funding. That is not in line with the objectives of the program, so there's lots of concern from the creative community about just the accountability of this program, and I would certainly encourage the minister to include that kind of analysis in the review that you mention.

Further on the page 8, there's a reference to something called the creative industry growth and sustainability program. I'm not exactly clear on what that is, and I'm wondering if the minister could explain what that program is.

Mr. Folk: — Hi. Gerry Folk again. So you're referring to the CIGS [creative industry growth and sustainability] program.

Ms. Sproule: — The which?

Mr. Folk: — The CIGS program, creative industries growth and sustainability.

Ms. Sproule: — Good acronym.

Mr. Folk: — Yes, that's the one that we use for it. That's the money that's being used, and it's actually been transferred from the Saskatchewan Arts Board over to Creative Saskatchewan. It's used to support the creative industry associations, so SaskBooks, SMPA, and SaskGalleries, and so on. So that's where that operational support comes from for those organizations.

Ms. Sproule: — I believe the minister had mentioned that last year. This is a one-time-only fund then — correct? — that the Sask Arts Board was using for a loans program that was underutilized, or is that something different?

Mr. Folk: — I think you might have the two funds confused. Am I allowed to say that?

Ms. Sproule: — Yes.

Mr. Folk: — Okay. There was the transitional fund that the Saskatchewan Arts Board had, and then there was, for the last number of years there's been the CIGS funding for the industry associations. So as Creative Saskatchewan was getting up and running . . . Prior to that the Saskatchewan Arts Board, as the minister mentioned last year, put together the transition funding for the creative industries, and it was about \$1 million, but the CIGS funding has been in place for quite a number of years.

Ms. Sproule: — And so the Arts Board no longer establishes working relationships with these industry associations. Like what's their role now?

Mr. Folk: — Well the industry associations are now supported by Creative Saskatchewan, so the funding as well as the responsibility for them has been transferred from the Saskatchewan Arts Board over to Creative Saskatchewan.

Ms. Sproule: — So when we talk about the Creative Sask budget, it's seven point something million. This was 1.5 million as part of that?

Mr. Folk: — Yes.

Ms. Sproule: — So the 5 million is for the grants and then this would bring it up to six and a half, and then there's other operational funding.

Mr. Folk: — Yes.

Ms. Sproule: — When you talk about increasing funding to the Arts Board, is that over and above this taking away? Like you're taking away 1.5 million from the Arts Board original funding, so how does that get factored in?

Mr. Folk: — I'm not sure what you're referring to in terms of reduction of funding to the Saskatchewan Arts Board. They have maintained their funding, and actually their funding has increased over the last number of years by 8 per cent. But as part of the development of Creative Saskatchewan, we wanted to have all the creative industry associations grouped together, and so the money that was being allocated to the Saskatchewan Arts Boards for support for the creative industry associations was transferred to Creative Saskatchewan as well as the responsibility to fund them. So the Saskatchewan Arts Board, it was a net zero. It was neutral for them.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. That's a good answer. So I mean SaskBooks recently wrote a letter to the minister talking about how wonderful Creative Saskatchewan is and this funding, but it really isn't new funding at all. It's been around for years, and the Arts Board was doing it before.

Mr. Folk: — There's two parts to that. The first part is this was operational funding, but actually now that Creative Saskatchewan is operating, they're able to provide project funding to the various creative industry associations. And so on top of their base funding, they can apply for project funding. So when you say that \$1.5 million, it's not new funding for them. Their base funding has remained relatively stable. It changed a little bit depending upon some adjudication, but at the same time they're able to apply for project funding.

I think if you read that letter, it talks about the fact that funding for their sector has increased quite dramatically since the establishment of Creative Saskatchewan. I've got the letter here and I can find it, but I think they talk, there has been an increase for support for their sector.

Ms. Sproule: — So that's through the project funding.

Mr. Folk: — Yes.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. And they've been accessing that. Next question I have is on the top of the page, second column on page 8, and this is the windup of SaskFilm. There was an

indication that both the assets and liabilities were transferred from SaskFilm it looks like to . . . I don't know if it's to the ministry or Creative Saskatchewan. It's not entirely clear. I'm just wondering, what were the total assets and liabilities that were transferred?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — It's about 236,000, but we'll get you the exact number.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. That's actually good if it's in that area. I was wondering if it was millions or just, like you say, a couple hundred thousand dollars.

The next one is the discussion on exploring new options to use the Canada-Saskatchewan Production Studio facility, and I know we discussed that earlier. It says in this statement that “. . . the facility remains a vital support and continues to be used by the arts and cultural sector including film.” Just a further detail on that I'm wondering is, can you describe, other than *Corner Gas*, what film projects actually used the sound stage last year?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes. Thanks for the question. Besides *Corner Gas*, *WolfCop* utilized some of the production space in the offices.

Ms. Sproule: — The stage, the sound stage itself.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — They utilize it for some storage and some other pieces but the actual shooting would have occurred at the production office. That would be it.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. Moving on to Parks and the next page, there's a number . . . I guess the first question is the Porcupine Hills area. There was engagement work indicated by the ministry with First Nations and Métis people regarding the proposed park in the Porcupine Hills area. I did receive a number of concerns about that process from people in the area, and I'm just wondering where those discussions are right now or where that engagement work is at.

[22:00]

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thank you. We've got a lot of support from different sectors, and we're presently in engagement with First Nations. The proposed park in Porcupine Hills area will respect all treaty and traditional uses. The park proposal for Porcupine Hills area has had general public support, and we're continuing to engage with Aboriginal groups and local stakeholders regarding their specific interests.

In addition to fulfilling our legal duty to consult, the ministry is interested in fostering a long-term relationship with First Nations and Métis communities in our management and development planning and ongoing operation of provincial parks. So we are presently in the process of putting together our consultation plan for that park, and we're working in direct consultation with First Nations.

Ms. Sproule: — Page 13, there's a discussion of the Main Street program, Main Street Saskatchewan program. There's a claim in the middle of the page that the demonstration project has resulted in the creation of 21 new businesses and 41 new

jobs. I'm just wondering if there's any way I could get a list of those 21 new businesses and where those 41 jobs were created.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thank you. We don't have the information with us right today, but be happy to provide you with the businesses.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. And further to that in the next line it talks about leveraging of nearly 3 million in private investment. Could you give us a breakdown of that \$3 million as well? Is that information that you have?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Again we don't have that with us right now, but we'd be happy to provide that.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. Moving on, page 15 is a chart performance measure and results of visitors to RSM and WDMs [Western Development Museum], and it indicates that there is a drop in the RSM visits — looks like 23,000 people in the last couple of years — and it says it's due to decreased casual visitation. Any indication on how the RSM hopes to turn that around or is that a number that they're satisfied with?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thanks. Yes we're interested in a plan in order to attract more visitors, and part of that would be we're renovating. It will be renovations in terms of the building itself and enhanced programming, and you're probably aware of some of the temporary exhibits that we've got going on, which is also helping with those casual drop-ins, so to speak, and enhancing the marketing and a very aggressive social media campaign. So a number of pieces.

Ms. Sproule: — We'll look for results on that. On page 18 it reminded me of another question on the active families benefit I was going to ask earlier, and that is, in the last two years, fiscal years, the amount that shows up in the public accounts is exactly \$12 million. And I'm just wondering, why is it exactly 12 million if it's based on actual usage? Like is it rounded or . . . I'll have to find the page in the public accounts but I think it's the same page we talked about earlier. It was page 184 of Public Accounts 2013-14, yes.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, thanks. It's an accrual. We had to put it in because we're two years behind.

Ms. Sproule: — Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — It's two years behind in terms of the accrual.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. All right. Because in the previous years it was not a rounded number like 12 million, so I just was wondering why it ended up being exact to what the estimates were. Because you don't know how many families are going to apply in that year. That's what I am asking.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Sorry, we have an idea based on, you know, previous years and have to make an assumption based on that but it's, but yes, it's never exact.

Ms. Sproule: — It does show up as exactly 12 million so . . .

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, so it's Finance making that

assumption based on numbers, based on previous numbers.

Ms. Sproule: — Merely curiosity, so I'm just curious . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes, it's kind of interesting. The Community Initiatives Fund, there's an indication on page 18 that you were hoping to work with them to implement program changes recommended by the program review in 2012 that will increase the amount of dollars available for grants. Has that happened? Have you been able to increase the amount of dollars available for grants?

Mr. Banadyga: — Darin Banadyga. When the programs were streamlined within the Community Initiatives Fund, they went down from about five different programs into two different programs. The two main programs currently in operation are the community granting program and the community places and spaces program, which is the program that assists small infrastructure projects.

With the adjudication systems changing and with the reduced number of programs, they're able to save about \$150,000 which was then turned back into the granting programs themselves.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. I'm having trouble . . . Oh here it is. Community Initiatives Fund, I see the revenues are actually going down, and I assume that's because of the decline in casino revenues. Will that impact the amount of grants available? It should, shouldn't it.

Mr. Banadyga: — So the CIF [Community Initiatives Fund] is fortunate to have a reserve fund, and so that does help to mitigate some of those drops in gaming revenue that happen from year to year.

Ms. Sproule: — Well I understand that in terms of Casino Regina and Moose Jaw, there's no sign of the revenues increasing, that it is in fact on a decline.

Mr. Banadyga: — That's something we don't have good information for. We get numerical information when it's available at the end of the fiscal years. So the trend has been, the last couple of years, is that the grant that we're flowing through to the CIF is dropping.

Ms. Sproule: — I'm also the lucky critic for Sask Liquor and Gaming, so some of the information I'm getting from that area is that in fact there is concern about the revenues coming through the casinos. And if they're digging into reserves, certainly that's concerning. I guess the question for your ministry would be, if that continues, would you be starting to cover that shortfall if it indeed becomes significant?

Mr. Brown: — Scott Brown. In general terms, the reserve is designed to bridge these years when we have shortfalls in the expected revenues. As we understand, the casinos would be looking to increase the revenues and trying new things to do that. So at this time it'd be too early for us to have a look at that. Certainly we're watching it closely though.

Ms. Sproule: — It's one of the concerns that I understand for Moose Jaw and Regina is that as we add further casinos through SIGA [Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority Inc.], then that definitely has an impact on the usage of those two particular

casinos. But thank you for that answer.

I will move on, and just a question on page 19. There's a percentage of residents who are physically active. And I just have a question about this chart because it also has museum attendance along the side, and I'm just wondering what that has to do with physically active Saskatchewan residents?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, thank you. It's a typo. It should say percentage of active children.

Ms. Sproule: — I just had pictures of, in my mind, of people running up and down the hallways of the museum, so I wasn't sure what that meant. Thank you. Okay. The English teacher in me feels vindicated.

Page 21, under ecosystem management planning in the parks, I understand that for example Weyerhaeuser and Hudson Bay has been given a contract to do some forest removal in Duck Mountain. In terms of the request for proposals process, was this done through SaskWorks, like in terms of the lowest bidder kind of tendering?

[22:15]

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes, if Duck Mountain was . . . It was done through invitational tender, through three different . . . through the different companies.

Ms. Sproule: — Was the lowest bidder, is that the . . . We're talking today, the minister was introducing a new plan for procurement, so I'm just wondering if this was a lowest bidder type of process. Or were there other factors that were taken into account?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — We're not paying them to do this job, so the criteria would be qualified and experienced and they'd be making money through the harvesting.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. So they just would . . . Their revenues would come through the sale of the timber that they take out. So what were the criteria then for the RFP or the request for proposals? You know what, I'm going to pass on that question because I feel like I'm quickly running out of time and I have some other areas that I'd like to focus on. So I'm okay with that. I'm just going to carry on here.

Quick question on page 31 of the annual report and that is, in terms of Twyla MacDougall, that you're . . . the five people that are listed under you, are those direct reports to you? Or would Kyle report to Harold who would report to Carlos who reports to Darin who reports to Gerry who reports to you?

Ms. MacDougall: — Oh, those are all direct reports.

Ms. Sproule: — They're all direct reports?

Ms. MacDougall: — Yes.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. I assumed that but I just wanted to clarify that.

No opposition critic in their right mind would let the evening go

by without mentioning lean, so I'm just wondering if you could comment on page 24 and 25. You talk about your lean initiatives, the ministry's leaning the way initiative. And I'm just wondering if you have any costs that you could share with us for the lean events in that report? And I guess this is already kind of dated because that's a year, two years ago essentially.

But what were your lean costs for the last fiscal year, and then if possible '13-14? I don't know if you have '14-15 yet. You may not have those numbers. You won't have those numbers.

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — In 2014-15, the ministry spent \$4,181 to have the Saskatchewan Safety Council facilitate a lean 5S [sort, simplify, sweep, standardize, self-discipline] event at Buffalo Pound Provincial Park. Implementing 5S is a simple tool that will likely have impacts on improving the productivity and safety of the work environment within the parks.

Ms. Sproule: — And that's the only learning event this year?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — We've had other lean events, but we used employees within our system to host.

Ms. Sproule: — Do you track the loss of employee time when those events are taking place?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — We don't track the time, but the benefits to the program would be tracked.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. I mean it would be . . . I'm getting tired but . . . The entire cost of lean of course also involves the people away from their desk doing the work that they're hired to do, so those are numbers that would be important to include. And that's just a comment.

On page 24 you indicate that you're reviewing all your regulations to examine their impacts and costs, improve their overall effectiveness, and this is through the government's red tape reduction initiative. It indicates that in that year, '13-14, the policies were under review. Is that review complete and is there a report available?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — It's ongoing and we'll be reporting back to the committee.

Ms. Sproule: — Do you have a time frame for when you expect it to be completed?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Sometime later in the spring, going back to committee.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. Thank you. Page 28 on your revenue statement for '13-14, there was a jump in other revenues. I'm just wondering if you could indicate why there was such a variance there. Between the estimate and the actual, it's about 4 million.

Ms. MacDougall: — I believe that that change is due to the change in fact that we've changed reporting to the summary financial statements, and so we've captured our third party revenue in there. But I will still double-check that I am accurate on that for you.

Ms. Sproule: — Thank you. I was just getting used to the other statements so I thank you for that and I look forward to understanding it better.

I think I'll use the remaining few minutes that I have just to talk a little bit about the annual report for Creative Saskatchewan. And I think I may jump around a little bit. But anyways, on page 22 of that report, they talk about the . . . It's the notes to the financial statements. No. 8, I wanted to ask you about. This was the SaskFilm transfer. Now I think we talked about that earlier, but it looks like it's substantially more than what we were talking about. SaskFilm transferred to Creative Saskatchewan development loans of 2.6 million and equity investments of 11.3 million. What exactly would those equity investments entail?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — It's an accounting exercise to keep track of old investments. We can, yes, we can supply that to you.

Ms. Sproule: — I think when we talked earlier, we had come up with the figure 250,000, but that looks to be the annual — I just saw it here — SaskFilm programs payable and commitment under note 4. It would be helpful to get more clarity around how this arrangement with SaskFilm is unfolding. Because it shows up, for example, on page 18 it shows up as revenue. There's SaskFilm grant programs. So is that revenue from SaskFilm or is it revenue from the ministry, the 258,000? And then that's described in note 4. It looks like there's a number of transfers. It doesn't say from whom. Oh I guess that's from SaskFilm, for . . . That's for its program commitments. So once it's wound up, Creative Saskatchewan's taking over its responsibilities? Is this an annual grant of \$258,000, or is that just for this year?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — It's one time.

Ms. Sproule: — One time. So just going back to the revenues then on page 18, we have for that fiscal year, which was July 2nd to March 31st last year, the SaskFilm grant program of about 258, that's a one-time only? The film employment tax credit of 40,000 would be a one-time only?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes.

Ms. Sproule: — Yes. So in this fiscal year we will see the 5 million, the 1.5 for creative operations programs and then the 600,000 for Culture on the Go, and that's it?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Yes.

Ms. Sproule: — I see the CIGS program is listed as a liability on the financial statement, but it doesn't show up anywhere else as revenue, or anywhere else. I guess this is . . .

A Member: — [Inaudible] . . . Do you mind if I clarify an answer?

Ms. Sproule: — Absolutely, yes.

Mr. Folk: — Thank you. So going through the revenues for Creative Saskatchewan from previous, you have grant programs at \$5 million and you have the CIGS program, creative industries operation programs at \$1.5 million. But then we . . .

Last year we transferred over the operational fund from SaskFilm over to Creative Saskatchewan.

So you're looking at, in these financial statements, the '13-14, I believe, financial statements. Yes. So in the '14-15 and the '15-16, the allocation . . . Creative Saskatchewan is actually higher because it was the funding from SaskFilm that was transferred over, correct? So if you look at these statements, these are accurate for the '13-14 fiscal year. If you pull your estimates for the '14-15 fiscal year, you'll actually see an increase of \$1.19 million.

Ms. Sproule: — Which is?

Mr. Folk: — It was the funding that was being directed from SaskFilm, or directed to SaskFilm, and then when SaskFilm was winding down, we redirected it over to Creative Saskatchewan. So there was no loss to that community and that fund was directed directly over to Creative Saskatchewan.

Ms. Sproule: — I'm sorry. What's the estimates for Creative Sask this year?

Mr. Folk: — Yes, so if you take a look at the estimates for Creative Saskatchewan this year, I'll just pull that up. One second, please. This year and the previous year, and this does not include any funding for Culture on the Go, but it's \$7.699 million.

Ms. Sproule: — Without Culture on the Go?

Mr. Folk: — Without Culture on the Go because that comes from a different location. And then the film employment tax credit, that \$40,000, that was some administrative money that they were given to help wind down the program and moving that forward.

Ms. Sproule: — So what you're saying is that for April 1, 2014 to tomorrow will be around \$7.7 million?

Mr. Folk: — Yes. What I'm saying, if you take a look at the Estimates book for the last two years, for '14-15 and '15-16, it's the 7.699 that's in the estimates moving forward. So that's the combination of the money — the 5 million investment fund, the 1.5 for the CIGS program, and the 1.199 transferred from the SaskFilm operations.

Ms. Sproule: — Essentially SaskFilm is not wound down at all. It's just been absorbed by Creative Sask.

Mr. Folk: — They were an independent, not-for-profit organization, so they wound down their operations. Absolutely they did. So they weren't absorbed by Creative Saskatchewan, but their board of directors determined that it was the best for them to just dissolve.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. And why was that?

Mr. Folk: — Because some of the operations were moved over to Creative Saskatchewan, but they were an independent agency so some of . . . Their funding was moved from them over to Creative Saskatchewan.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. Perhaps you could just shed a little light though on the equity investments of almost well over \$11 million that were also transferred. Where do those show up on the . . . must be in assets and liabilities?

Mr. Folk: — Yes. I'm sorry. I don't have that information handy. We will get that to you, absolutely.

Ms. Sproule: — It certainly does not show up in the statement of the financial position.

Mr. Folk: — No. And we've got our accountant behind me saying, yes, it's recorded as nil. It's at note 8.

Ms. Sproule: — So due to the uncertainty regarding the collection or recoupment of these amounts, Creative Sask recorded it as a net book value of nil. How does \$11 million become nil?

Mr. Folk: — It's the same accounting process that SaskFilm was using for these as well because of the uncertainty of recoupment. And the CPA can maybe help with that. It's an accounting . . .

Ms. MacDougall: — I would suspect, but I can't confirm that. Is it KPMG that did their audit? I think it was. But they recommended that they recognize that at nil because of the uncertainty of collection.

Ms. Sproule: — So the uncertainty is related to the collection of the loans. And the equity investments of 11 million, is that a loan as well, or is that something else?

Mr. Brown: — Scott Brown. The equity investment would only have value if you have a possibility of recovering it. So just like any other investment, if there was an ability for you to cash that out at some point there would be a value there, but because there isn't an immediate possibility of cashing it out, the value is zero.

Ms. Sproule: — I just find it hard to understand how 11 million becomes zero. Would these equity investments be in film projects that disappeared because of the shutdown of the tax credit?

Ms. MacDougall: — I believe it would still be considered uncertain and nil if SaskFilm were still in existence and doing their annual report. So again, it's an accounting practice. It has nothing to do with the fact that it was transferred from one entity to the other. Yes, I think SaskFilm would have recorded it that way as well.

Ms. Sproule: — I guess I'd still like to understand how this \$11 million came to be on their books at some point. Like what kind of equity investment would it be?

Ms. MacDougall: — So they do take, SaskFilm did take ownership position on some films, as I believe one of Creative Saskatchewan's programs does as well. But they haven't ever utilized that program or fund, and the likelihood of recouping any profits or equity off of those particular films is so uncertain that it's not captured as an asset on their balance statement.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay. I think I better leave this for now because it's . . . I just watched \$11 million go poof. I'll need to think about this, and maybe next year revisit it again.

Ms. MacDougall: — I guess I could just add just one more piece further to that. A lot of effort . . . SaskFilm and now Creative Saskatchewan, in a lot of instances they would consider that as a grant. It has an equity component, but they're not, when they're providing it they're not really realistically thinking they're going to capture all of that. So I think it's probably simplest to figure it, think of it as a grant.

Ms. Sproule: — Where would they have got the \$11 million to give that grant?

Ms. MacDougall: — So SaskFilm, to answer your first question, SaskFilm has that annual operating grant money that they gave out annually, and that 11 million would be an accumulation of over several years. So it's not just any one fiscal year. And so the real reason for it is if we happen to have a very successful film and there's a large profit made, then they would reap some benefits.

Ms. Sproule: — Yes, winning the lottery.

Ms. MacDougall: — Yes.

Ms. Sproule: — So the go forward position then is that they're called SaskFilm grant programs, but SaskFilm doesn't exist anymore. That \$258,000 that showed up in the . . . You may have already explained this, but I'm going to try it again because I'm not sure I understand. That \$258,000 now was just a continuation of how they got to that \$11 million — what do we call it? — equity investment. And because that 11 million is now written off as nil, are we back to square one?

Ms. MacDougall: — So I believe we are talking about two different pieces here. The 258,000 that was transferred over was any outstanding commitments that SaskFilm had. Yes.

Ms. Sproule: — Sorry, I thought you had touched on that. Okay, so going forward in the next year when we see the annual report, the grant program of 258 will not be there but there will be, I think you said 7.7 million. So there will be . . . Does that come from your ministry then or from the taxpayer, that extra 1.7 million?

Ms. MacDougall: — That extra 1.19, it comes from our ministry, yes. At the time we did estimates we were very concerned about those stakeholders, so as opposed to giving up the 1.19 million from SaskFilm back into the General Revenue Fund, we asked if we could bring that forward to Creative Saskatchewan to utilize it in the creative industries.

Ms. Sproule: — And would that 1.19 be considered a grant program as well now?

Ms. MacDougall: — That would be considered part of their core budget now and included in some of their grant programming, yes.

Ms. Sproule: — So why wouldn't you just call it all a grant? Like how much of this is a grant for Creative Sask. and how

much is operations?

Ms. MacDougall: — It is all considered a grant to Creative Saskatchewan, similar to what we do with the Saskatchewan Arts Board. We give them a certain amount of money each fiscal year. Then we hold them accountable for a percentage being for administration, and the rest is to go to their programs.

Ms. Sproule: — Okay, so it's up to them how they describe it in their annual financial statement then. You just look at it as one lump sum?

Ms. MacDougall: — That is correct. Based on also their strategic planning documents, we do seek guidelines as far as what types of programs they're focused on.

Ms. Sproule: — Madam Chair, I think that's the extent of my questions. I know I have three minutes still left, but I have no further questions.

The Chair: — Are there any other final questions? If not, could we have final comments from the minister?

Ms. Sproule: — Just before we do that, I guess I'll bump in and say thanks very much to everyone tonight for your patience and thoroughness and helpfulness, including the minister. Thank you.

The Chair: — Okay, thank you. Final comments?

Hon. Mr. Docherty: — Thank you, Madam Chair. I would also like to thank the member opposite for her questions as well, and thanks for that. And I'd like to thank the committee for . . . It's been a long evening, but thank you so much for that. And I'd like to thank all of the officials with me. They did a remarkable job in terms of dancing around and answering the questions, and I appreciate that completely.

We have a very diverse ministry, and it certainly was put on display tonight. I again, I'm thankful for the expertise that's in this room and going to continue to move forward with providing what I like to call the reason people stay here in this province, the reason they settle and the reason they want to continue to make Saskatchewan their home.

And we had a very successful park launch this year. And that park launch resulted in, again it was over 10 days, that park launch. We didn't really talk about it this time, but it was very successful. That launch went over 10 days. The queuing system was also viewed as very successful, and people liked the fact that they knew what position they were in line. And that was a very good piece that we added into the situation this year. And I'd like to commend the officials that were involved in that park launch. They did a magical job. And with that, Madam Chair, I'd like to . . . Can I conclude my remarks? I'd like to conclude my remarks, and thanks to everybody for being here tonight.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Minister, and I'd also like to thank your officials for coming out this evening. I know it's a bit of a long day for many of us, but we really appreciate the time and the energy and the commitment that you've made to both the ministry, but also to this government and the province. So thank you very much.

And the time is now 10:44, so we have reached our time for adjournment for this evening. And our committee stands adjourned until tomorrow at 4:00 p.m.

[The committee adjourned at 22:44.]