

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
April 28, 1981

EVENING SESSION

MOTIONS

Resolution No. 33 — Self-Determination for El Salvador (continued)

MR. SPEAKER: — Order, order! The member for Regina South.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — On a point of order, I imagine, at this point. At the time before 5 o'clock when you called for other speakers, the Leader of the Opposition was on his feet when you recognized the member for Rosemont. I don't know whether you saw him or not, Mr. Speaker, but I believe the member for Rosemont saw him. And I would ask you to rule on whether or not members are still allowed to speak on this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: — Well, the members will be aware of the fact that I gave the reminder to the members that the mover of the motion about to exercise the right to close debate was in order. I don't want to cut off debate on the subject any more than anyone else does. I realize the Leader of the Opposition was on his feet. I was under the impression he was trying to give notice that it was 5 o'clock, and had the member for Souris-Cannington said something, I would have allowed him to debate it. I'm quite prepared to go back and allow the member to debate the issue.

HON. MR. MacMURCHY: — Mr. Speaker, as I recall, the Leader of the Opposition was on his feet to speak. He was checking the time, and certainly we agreed to have the opposition member speak to this resolution.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you very much. I personally will not be debating this motion. I know there are members on this side of the Assembly who have indicated their intention to do so. Unfortunately, they are detained tonight and, as such, Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to adjourn debate.

Debate adjourned.

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS

ADJOURNED DEBATES

MOTIONS

Rules and Procedures Committee

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. Banda:

That the final report of the special committee on the review of rules and procedures of the Legislative Assembly be now concurred in.

MR. BANDA: — Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saskatoon Centre:

That this Assembly approves and adopts the amendments to the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan* as they appear in appendix A of the final report of the special committee on the review of rules and procedures of the Legislative Assembly, and that the rules and procedures as amended shall come into effect on the first sitting day of the next session, and that the Clerk and Speaker be instructed and authorized to supervise the printing of the first, second, and third reports of the committee and the reprinting of the *Rules and Procedures of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan* as amended, and that they shall have such number of copies printed as deemed to be necessary for the service of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. KATZMAN: — Would the member allow a question of clarification before he takes his seat, just so I can understand one issue? No?

MR. SPEAKER: — “Questions before members take their seat,” usually means immediately before they take their seats and I’ve already put the question, I think the member is a little bit late with the matter.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 79 — An Act to amend The Veterinarians Act

MR. MOSTOWAY: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this bill, Amendments to The Veterinarians Act were requested by the Saskatchewan Veterinary Medical Association, and I will very briefly give some of the reasons. It is primarily to accommodate graduate students, and it’s thought that it’s necessary in relation to the kind of work that they do. If I could just read a paragraph from a letter from their solicitor:

Counsel (that means the association) wishes to have the flexibility to grant pro tem registration of full-time graduate students in veterinary medicine at the Western College of Veterinary Medicine without the necessity of having the graduate students otherwise fulfil the terms and conditions of registration under the act.

I believe that has something to do with the fact that a lot of the students come from outside the province, keeping in mind that there are three provinces involved in that school of veterinary medicine located on the Saskatoon campus University of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 79 — An Act to amend The Veterinarians Act.

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

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY CASH OUTFLOW

INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 19

Item 1 (continued)

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister to give me a little information on FIRA (foreign investment review agency). I notice, according to your report, that the federal foreign investment review agency had referred 39 applications to your department. My first question on that is how many were approved?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, there were 21 approved.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Would you repeat that please?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — 21.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — It indicates in the report that federal-provincial and interprovincial meetings to discuss the policies were attended. How many meetings were attended? Who attended them from your department?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Some of the department officials attend about two a year. Unfortunately, the chap in charge is not here this evening, but he was one of the chaps who had attended these meetings.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — As I understand the FIRA program, it's a federal government decision. Do you have the list or can you provide the list of applications that were approved and rejected?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Just for your information, I would imagine those that are approved are gazetted — they are already announced. It's a public document so it's available . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, but it is available. We can provide a list of it.

MR. SWAN: — I'd like to ask the minister if he's aware of the request by International Paints. There was an article that I spotted in the *Leader-Post* today. Their building evidently burned down in Regina and they've been waiting for an opportunity to rebuild. They are having a lot of difficulty getting a building permit. There's an indication that we could lose 35 jobs if this company moves out of Regina. Their threat is that they are going to move to Edmonton if this isn't cleared fairly quickly. Has your department done anything on that particular one?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware that there has been any request made by International Paints to my department. My people here are not aware that there was one received in the office, either. Should there be a request made, I'm sure my people will act immediately.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, when a company has been in Regina for a long time and there is an indication that it is prepared to leave because of a building permit, are you not willing, as a minister, to take a look at it? I don't think you want to lose an industry from Regina which has been here for 28 years. I don't believe you want to lose 35 jobs in the province, either. So, are you prepared to look at it?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Well, I would like to make the hon. member aware that giving a

building permit is the prerogative of the city of Regina. If it is having difficulties getting the building permit from the city of Regina, it really has nothing to do with our department. But I will assure the hon. member (having seen it in the paper just this evening, as you did) that my department will be in touch with these people tomorrow morning to find out if we can be of assistance to them.

MR. SWAN: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. I think it's important to the province that we try to retain every industry that we can, especially those which have been viable for some time.

I would like to ask a question or two about the bottle collection agency. You were disappointed last night that I wasn't here to ask this. I know that you have established three collection depots in the province on a trial basis. Have you had time at this point to ascertain what amount of glass is coming through these three depots and what the costs to the department appear to be?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, had the hon. member been in last evening, he would have heard that question asked. For your information, we have only established one trial project and that one project is SARC (Saskatchewan Association of Rehabilitation Centres). They, in Saskatoon, may have two or three depots established. But as far as we're concerned, we have only funded one pilot project.

That project has only been ongoing for two months or a little more, so we don't have an actual report. We have verbal reports on what is going on because we are constantly in touch with SARC on that project. When the last information was received three weeks to a month ago, they had only been started for a very short time (maybe they'd been in operation for a month). At that time they had already shipped out one semi-trailer load of glass, which was 35 tonnes. We really don't know what the dollar value is. The project, in total, is a six-month trial project. We have to give SARC an opportunity to spread their wings in the city of Saskatoon, which they haven't done as yet. They may have two or three various little projects in the city. They hope to have a complete report given to us in six months.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, last year, if you recall, we discussed this same area in your estimates. You indicated then that you were going to start four depots as a trial base. Now you mean to tell me that you did not live up to the agreement, the commitment of the department? You backed away from it?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, yes, I may have said last year that it was our intention, no doubt, to set up four, or maybe even more, projects in the province. But after we had made the proposition to SARC and after their board had met and decided to agree with our proposition, they made a submission to us. We accepted that submission and went that route because we feel that it would be much better, if the project proves viable and is satisfactory for everybody concerned, that they be the operators and look after the program.

MR. SWAN: — When you report to this legislature that you are going to do something and then you don't do it, I think that it's not a very good example to set. This side is not surprised. I think, perhaps, we almost expect it from you. I would hope in the future that that's not going to be the pattern you set — to stand up in this legislature, say anything that comes to mind and then do something entirely different.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Would the hon. member rather have had four projects and four of them to go down the drain and not be progressive or would you rather have one project and have it prove profitable so that we can establish others? We looked at it in that light. We feel that we have been responsible to the legislature and that we did the right thing.

MR. SWAN: — Do you see this project expanding this year to cover more areas of the province, or is it going to be limited to just the major cities?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, that all depends, of course, on the progress of this particular trial project. Having said that, if this project should prove to be satisfactory, yes, we are prepared to establish projects across the province. As a matter of fact, I am told just now that, in a telephone conversation my deputy had with SARC people, they would be meeting with him very shortly to discuss possibly some rural areas to move into on a trial basis.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, do you still have market for pellet glass within the province? Is the Moose Jaw operation still healthy and able to go? There was an indication last year that they were not going to stay in the province and that they had built a new plant in Alberta. At what stage is that at this point?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — No, Mr. Chairman, the glass that is being collected by SARC in Saskatoon is being sold to Canasphere Industries Ltd. In Moose Jaw and, at this point in time. Canasphere has either shelved its thoughts of going or is not making any overtures at any rate. And I might tell the hon. gentleman that if you know the operation of Canasphere, Canasphere does not intend to leave the province of Saskatchewan. Canasphere feels that if we can supply a good quantity of glass that it requires, it will be able to stay in operation in Saskatchewan. Its major supplier, though, has been Alberta. Alberta is forcing it to stay there in order to utilize Alberta glass.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, I understand that Canasphere did, indeed, build a new plant in Alberta, a plant large enough to handle all the glass from the two provinces, if necessary. It was Canasphere's intention last year (unless it has changed) to leave the province altogether. That's why I am asking you, because it's going to be a little bit late if you're starting to collect glass after the purchaser is gone. So I wanted to be sure. I would hope that you're going to check into that to be sure that you do have a buyer.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I might tell the hon. member that we're in constant touch with Canasphere Industries. Canasphere is quite happy with out pilot project and is monitoring it as we are.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, let's get back to the FIRA program. Just reading it here again, I want to delve into it a little more. It says:

The division prepared analysis of these cases for the Government of Saskatchewan and the province's recommendations were transmitted to FIRA.

I guess my question would be: were the 21 approved by FIRA because of your recommendations; were some of them that you recommended refused; and were some of them approved that you hadn't recommended, and so on?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — In the majority of the cases they accepted our recommendations. In other cases they did not accept our recommendations. In some cases they made the

decision on their own contrary to our decision.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Could you give me a breakdown of how many they accepted from your recommendations, how many they accepted without recommendations, and how many were refused that you recommended?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not so sure whether that information is to be made public. I want you to know that any FIRA application is very confidential, both federally and provincially. I don't know whether we even have that information or, if we divulged that, whether FIRA in Ottawa would object. I would much rather not do it at this time to be on the safe side.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, in the first place I didn't ask you for the names; I asked you for numbers.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Well, I gave you numbers.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, you didn't. you gave me the number of 21 having been approved. I asked you . . . Oh, I guess I did ask which ones. All right. Okay, I'll accept your answer. How many were rejected that you had approved; how many were approved that you had not recommended; and how many did you recommend totally? Can you tell us that?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — My people don't have that particular information here, but we can get you those — just numbers. We'll get you numbers.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — After you've given consideration to my request of which ones, will you advise me as to whether or not you can, or have you made your decision that you can't?

HON. MR. VICKAR: —No, I haven't made that decision. We'll find out. I'll do that much for the hon. member. If we can make that public now that it's a fact, we don't see any reason why we shouldn't.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yesterday I asked you for certain information to come back to us with, for example: how many of the corporations incorporated in 1980 were farms? I believe that your deputy would have a list of those. Do you have some answers for me tonight? Do you have some documents you can table?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We don't have it as yet. We said we'd have them in a couple of days, but they don't have it as yet.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I might mention to the member for Regina South that yesterday I said to you that we had sent you or given you a report on the bottle recycling program last year. We were in error, or I was in error. The report went to the member for Rosetown.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I wondered if I was losing my marbles because I never recalled seeing it. So that accounts for the error. Okay, thank you.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — last night I asked, Mr. Minister, if these other three studies that were missing would be tabled tonight and you said you would see what you could do.

Have you got them to table?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — You are looking for one report that was apparently made in 1976 and it has been stored away in dead storage. It may take us a little while to get it but they will get it for you.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — What about the other ones? The other two?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We have them here.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Table them so we can have a look at them now, please. The one you gave here is one we never asked for. It's not on here but that's fine; we thank you. The other one is on a shopping mall. That's here but the two missing are on the possible closure of the refinery, and a further study relevant to the refinery situation. Those are the two that are missing; those are the two we want.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We are aware of one other report and my people tell me they are not so sure whether that's even the refinery you are talking about; however, we will be looking for it because we do have on record that we have a report dating back to 1976. I am wondering if the hon. member is not confused, and maybe that report was done by the Saskatchewan Research Council and we wouldn't have it in our records at all. I don't know.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Chairman, this letter signed by you on March 8, 1979, says:

The initial work done by the department was in response to a request from the Kamsack Town Council, and was cost shared 50-50 with the department. Further studies (this is a relevant section) relevant to the refinery situation, industry profiles, and the shopping mall proposal were funded by the department.

Okay? It's the refinery situation funded by your department — that study — that's the one we want.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — You are talking about something funded by our department which is quite possible, but I'm saying it could have been done by SRC. Yes, okay. This is why I'm saying it may take us a little time to get it. If we don't have it, SRC may have it. We may have to go to SRC to get it.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Minister, this is the guts of estimates right here. This is the report we want before we leave estimates, and you know we could be finished in five minutes if you'd just send a report across now . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, the Minister of Health is having a problem with his own department; I would suggest you leave him to run his own. But the fact is that surely you have something some place that will at least tell you who was commissioned to do this study on the refinery situation, when it was completed, and when the report was filed. Surely you have some sort of records that will tell you those things.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Just for the member's information we do have information on file that there have been some studies. Whether we were involved in studies or whether the study is with another department . . . We just can't lay our fingers on that particular study, because we don't think we have it. Our records don't show that we have it. Now, I'm not saying that we could have been involved, but SRC could have done the study.

Fine, then SRC has got it; SRC is in Saskatoon. We don't have it here, and we will get it for you. There's no problem.

MR. BERNTSON: — I'm saying tonight that this refinery situation study was funded by your department. I simply asked you a minute ago whom did your department commission to do the study; when was the study commissioned; what did it cost; and where is it? You said it may have been the Saskatchewan Research Council. Well, that's not good enough, quite frankly. I want to know who did the study. You say it may have been the Saskatchewan Research Council, and that's wonderful; it does great work. But then you will come back tomorrow after we let your estimates out, and say, "Well, I'm sorry, it wasn't the Saskatchewan Research Council and I never ever said it was. I just said it may have been, "I want something firm as to who did it and when. And when can we get our hands on it?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I just can't tell that to the hon. member because it may have been Touche Ross and Company that we had funded. It may have been. But in all likelihood it was SRC. I say that with tongue in cheek because I really don't know and we don't have any proof for that. But I will assure the hon. gentleman that we have the information. We have information that there was some in-house work done as far as we were concerned. There was some input into that study. Wherever it may be, we will locate it and produce it.

MR. BERNTSON: — It's your study; you funded it. Some place in your happy little department you have a record which will tell you whom you commissioned to do the study relating to the refinery situation in Kamsack. Surely you can tell us, by looking at your little record some place, who was commissioned to do the study. It doesn't seem like such a complicated thing to me. Although it doesn't surprise me that it confounds you guys.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — It is very complicated. As we said earlier, we helped fund the project. That's very true. We helped fund it. We don't deny that. We are saying that there must be a study or some documentation on in-house work. We don't have it, but we will get you the study. If that study was made, we'll get it. The Saskatoon Research Council must have it, or whoever was commissioned to do the work.

MR. BERNTSON: — You've already said that the study was done. You've already said that you've paid for it. I want to know who did it. If you paid for it, somebody signed a cheque. A requisition went out. Who was commissioned to do the study? If you like, Mr. Minister, we're more than willing to allow you to pull your estimates and bring in the next department, until you can bring that report in. Quite frankly, we are just going to insist on having that report before we leave these estimates.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — There's not a thing I can do about it. We don't have the report. We're prepared to present the report. You have our word that the report will be available, if it's there. I don't know what else you want. I don't know what else you're looking for.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, do I understand you correctly? If I went to your department and said that I'd prepared a report which was going to cost you \$50,000 and I wanted a cheque, you wouldn't get a copy of that report?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — No.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, that's exactly what you have been saying here. You funded it. Your department paid for it. Do you mean to tell me that you paid some money without evidence of work being completed and that you did not get something in return for the dollars you paid out? If that's the case, I suggest to you that your department needs a pretty comprehensive audit. If you paid out some money to somebody for a report, you must have received in return a document as evidence work done, a record of payment you made for services rendered to your department. If you have paid out money without that evidence coming back to your department, then man, oh, man, do we ever need an audit in your department!

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, you have to remember that the information which we have is that there was a study commissioned in 1975. that's the information we have. We probably have a receipt for the cheque which we issued on behalf of the study. We were commissioned to do a study. We forwarded our money when we got the receipt for it and so forth. That was in 1975. Do you expect our people to remember that we issued a receipt or something in 1975? We don't have a report in our files. I'm again telling the hon. member that, from the information we have, the study could have been done in 1974. I don't know.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'm going by the comments and the remarks which you made. You said that somebody has a report. You said that you didn't know where it was or who had it, but somebody had it. What I'm saying is that, if your department paid some money for a report that was done by somebody and all you got in return was a receipt with no evidence of work being completed, I say that we need an audit in your department. We need a lot more than an audit in your department, because nobody pays money without evidence that the services were completed. Nobody does, except industry and commerce, obviously.

What did it cost your department for that share of the funding of this report? Will you answer that question?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — No, we don't have the answer to the latter question. We don't have that information here at all. It was done back in 1975 and not in the year under review. We didn't bring that information with us and we don't know what the cost of that report may be.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I want to remind you that the information was requested of you by the member for Arm River last night and you said that you would provide that information. Now, obviously, one of several things has happened. You've apparently lost the report or couldn't find it. You don't know when it was paid for; you don't know how much was paid out. You were supposed to come back tonight with some answers. You were supposed to have this available. You didn't comply with our request at all. Now, you're trying to back out of it and make excuses by saying that you don't even know where the report is. You don't even know who did the report, yet your department paid for it.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would check *Hansard*, I said last night that we would provide the information that we have and we are doing just that. We provided you with three reports. That's what we have. I didn't tell you last night that we would provide the reports today, either. I said that we would provide them just as soon as they are available — as soon as we get our hands on them and that could be tomorrow or next week. We did provide you with the information that we have today. We don't have the other one and we don't think that we have it in our files. How many

times do I have to repeat this to you? I know it's pretty thick but I have to make that clear to you.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Obviously, the thickness is coming through from your head. I'm going to say again that if you indicated that you apparently researched it today or somebody in your department researched it, you now know that you paid out some money. Again, I'll come back to you. How can you possibly pay out government money or taxpayers' money for something you don't get? You didn't get it. You admitted that. You say you don't know where it is. You didn't get a copy of the report. You have no idea where that report is, yet you paid out some money — taxpayers' dollars — for something that may or may not exist, may or may not have been done. You claim that all you have is a receipt. Who did you get the receipt from? If you researched this at all today, then you must have a receipt. Who signed the receipt?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, I said we could have had a receipt. I want to remind the hon. gentleman that the Government of Saskatchewan pays out cheques every day for value received. When we send out a cheque for a skating rink or something, do we have the skating rink in our pocket? We don't have the skating rink in our pocket. It's in the community. We may have funded a portion of the study, which is in Saskatoon, Regina or some other place. It's not in our department.

AN HON. MEMBER: — How do you know it's there?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I don't know, that's what I'm telling you. We will be looking for it. We can assure the hon. member that if it's found — if it is there — it will be in your hands.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, when you fund a skating rink, a curling rink, a park or anything else, you happen to know that that skating rink, curling rink or park is there. That's quite obvious. You fund a report. You don't even know where it is. You don't even know to whom you made out the cheque. You don't even know whether the report was, in fact, completed. You don't know anything and yet you paid out the cheque. You paid out the taxpayers' money without knowing to whom you paid it, why you paid it out, whether or not it was done, and where the report or anything is today. Now that doesn't make very much sense. Don't use the comparison of funding a curling rink or a skating rink; we happen to know they are there. But you don't know where your report is.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Well, Mr. Chairman, all that I can say is that we will go back and look for it, and we will supply the report when we can find it, whether it's with the Saskatchewan Research Council, Touche Ross and Company, or whatever private consulting firm. It could have been commissioned to anybody. If the report was commissioned by somebody, we helped fund that report. That does not necessarily say that we have the report in our possession.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Chairman, as this letter clearly indicates, this report was commissioned by your department. It says so. Well, it says:

Further studies relevant to the refinery situation, industry profiles, and shopping mall proposals were all funded by the department.

That's you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay, so it doesn't say commissioned. You paid them. You said just a minute ago that you would table the report and give us the

report the minute you found it. Now, we've had some experience in the past with those kinds of commitments. The member for Arm river, in fact, waited a year from the last promise you made for information. Now, I would ask the minister, since he's willing to go out and look to see if he can bring this report in tomorrow if he would stand his estimates and bring in whatever is following — I think it's mineral resources. Well, it's up to you. There are only two hours until 10 o'clock. We'll play it any way you want.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman I would like the hon. member to read that letter or table it in the House because he has said that we commissioned the report and that's what it says in that letter. I don't believe that. You said that; it's in *Hansard* and I would like you to read that letter or table it so we can see that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We are not denying the fact that we were involved in funding it. We say that; we're not denying that. As soon as we find the report, wherever it may be, we will deliver it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, I don't know how you interpret this, but the letter to which my colleague refers, signed by you, says, "The studies done in the Kamsack area were in response to both local and government concerns (government, I presume, means you) for the effects of possible closure of the refinery." Done in response to . . . So, Mr. Minister, the members for Souris-Cannington and Arm River are asking for that report. We can do a lot of work in this Assembly tonight, between now and 10 o'clock on a department with which we might achieve some degree of success. Again, would you reconsider withdrawing the estimates and we'll complete them some other time, and go on with another department tonight.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — The letter says that it was commissioned by the governments which were concerned, and I agree. The government could have been the local civic government or the provincial government. I agree with all that. I agree that the local citizens were concerned. I have no qualms about that. We probably have done just what we say in that particular letter. But I can't tell you when we will be able to find that report for you. We are not denying the fact that it is around somewhere. We are not denying it. If it is available, whoever did it must have a copy, and we will get it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, will you get it and then we'll come back to your estimates later on?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — No, I don't think that's necessary, Mr. Chairman, because I don't think those estimates in the House this evening have anything relevant to do with that particular report. We are prepared to provide the report.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Minister, we're not prepared to wait till next year to ask you questions on that report. We want the report to be able to ask you some questions now. We won't be doing this because we've made the request to move on to something that can be productive. You can waste the time of this legislature. The Attorney General, not too long ago, claimed that it cost something like \$4,000 or \$5,000 an hour to run this Assembly. If that's what you want to do, and if you want to spend the extra \$10,000 or whatever the case might be to keep this thing going for nonsensical reasons, then that's going to be on your shoulders, because we want the report. We are prepared to adjourn these estimates and go on to another one, be productive in that and come back to yours to complete that at no cost to anyone. You are refusing to do that. Now that's irresponsible on your part. We want the report. The report is important to us and to the people of Kamsack. It's important to know what's in it, so that we can ask you questions on it. You are absolutely stonewalling. You are refusing to do that. You are not allowing us the opportunity to do the job properly that we want done — to represent those

people.

Mr. Minister, again I ask you, will you adjourn this? We'll come back to it when you have all the information that we require and requested. We will carry on with a very productive evening in another department and not waste any of the taxpayers' money.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows very well that the report was done that many years ago, if we have to start looking for it, it may take a day or two to find it. He knows very well that there's nothing in the report (as far as we're concerned) that is really relevant to the estimates this evening — nothing whatsoever. You were just stonewalling. You were just being obstinate about the whole thing because we said that we don't have the report in our hands. You are misleading the whole thing because you are saying that we were part of the act. If you read the letter it says that we helped fund. That's right; we helped fund the report. That's what I'm saying.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well you denied that a few minutes ago.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I'm not denying that. I'm agreeing that we funded it. If the hon. member can't read English, I want him to table that letter. I don't think he can read English. I don't think he can understand it. Put it on the Table and tell me exactly what it says.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — He wants me to table a letter that he signed. You have a copy of it. Why don't you table it yourself if you want to see it. If you don't understand what's in it, I'll read it again to you. You, yourself, just admitted a minute ago that it was something you commissioned, and you argued with the member for Souris-Cannington that it said nothing about being commissioned. Get on the same wave length and you will know what you are talking about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! The member is rising on a point of order, so I would ask him to state his point of order.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is accusing me continually of misleading the House, and I am not misleading the House. I asked him to read the letter; I want him to read it as it is written, and not to omit some words.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! That isn't a point of order; it is a point of debate.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — There can only be one reason why you are not tabling these documents that we have asked you to table. Why is the same letter . . . There are four studies. Why did you find the shopping mall so easily? That has been taken care of; there is already a new shopping mall built there. That is the issue I was trying to bring to you last night, the one Mr. Mosiuk wanted to build. He pleaded for that study and he didn't receive it. Someone from another province came in and built the mall. He didn't have a chance because he never saw the study. That's what we are talking about. You can find that in a hurry when one of our people in Kamsack, who are involved in this, are involved in the shopping mall — but the people in Kamsack are certainly involved in the refinery one. If we are going to get rid of this cloud in Kamsack, we must have those studies. There is only one reason why you are not tabling them: you know there is information in there that we need.

What kind of an outfit are you running, Mr. Minister, that you can't put your hands on documents instantly? You were asked last

night. Twenty-four hours have gone by and I know the way you handle things. You have that smooth way of yours and you will just take us off this, and I will have to wait exactly one year like I did on Circle 4 Feeders. It was proof positive when it came to me so we have reason to look into all these things. Make up your mind, Mr. Minister, because we are going to sit here and ask questions all night, all day tomorrow, right through. That is what we are going to do unless you pull your estimates and go on to something else.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, I committed the department to provide the report when we put our hands on it. Again, I have to say we helped fund that report; we did not necessarily do it ourselves. That does not say we have it in our possession. The people in Kamsack, the town council or whoever asked to have that report — somebody has that report, and we will provide a copy when we locate it.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Minister, I am going to ask you to do this right now. We did it with the Minister of the Environment, and he obliged when I asked him to send one of his men out, to leave the House and find the information. It was over Federal Pioneer and PCBs, and we had it back within an hour. Now put one of your hacks on a plane to Saskatoon if you have to, but we want it, and get it in your head we want it.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, I don't know what we can do about it. I am trying my best to accommodate the hon. members across the way and apparently I am not succeeding. Yesterday, I promised to deliver what we had and I did that. We don't have this other report. We don't have it in our possession. I have committed myself to deliver it when we find it. We have already (prior to your request) sent a chap out to see if he could phone one of the people who were around in 1975 and that chap doesn't know of any others at this time. He is at home and just doesn't have anymore information, but we will get some information for you.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, you indicated a few minutes ago that you committed your staff to find that report. I presume you meant you did that last night (and you nod in agreement that that is what you did.) I want to ask you this question: what inquiries were made today to find that report? Where did the search occur? What phone calls did you make? Whom did you ask? What investigations have you made today as to the location and whereabouts of that report?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — The boys in the department tell me they did all the searching in our own department. As we just finished telling you, the files indicate that there is some more information and files (that were made prior to 1978) down in the basement in the storeroom. For your information, I want you to know that part of our department was moved from the Saskatchewan Power Building to another location last summer and it could be in the boxes in the storeroom because they were not necessary at that time. So we did not go out of the department to search for any information. We will now; we'll go down and see if that file is in the basement. If it's there, we'll find it. If not, we'll have to phone elsewhere to see where we can find it.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like the record to show that, at this point in time, my questions will be strictly a matter of intentional delay simply because we are being stonewalled by the minister and the minister refuses to pull the estimates in order to get on with more productive work in this Assembly. Therefore, I am going to be asking questions, at this point in time, to which I am really not that anxious to have answers. I am going to be asking questions just to stall for time. It's unfortunate that we

have to resort to those tactics. It's unfortunate that the minister cannot see fit to co-operate with the opposition in order to provide the documents for which we've asked. I can appreciate it's going to take you some time, so big deal. We are prepared to wait for that time by your pulling these estimates. We will carry on with something else in this legislature to make it more productive and worth while to the taxpayers.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Minister, if we wait on this plan, will you promise to have these two studies in our hands before we go into the estimates of the Department of Urban Affairs? If we can have the two studies (the two refinery plans) in our hands before we do the estimates of urban affairs, we'll go ahead, otherwise we sit here.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, you are now asking for two studies. Is that what you are saying? I thought there was only one more we delivered three. I stand to be corrected if there are two more missing. In the words there will be a total of five.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Minister, I will send your letter over to you and I would appreciate it (and this is what we are asking) if you will provide all of the studies referred to in this letter prior to urban affairs estimates. We can proceed with industry and commerce, get it off and get on to whatever it is that follows. I would appreciate it if you would stand up, say that you're going to do that and get it on the record.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Vice-Chairman, perhaps the hon. member will look at the reports that you have already received. I will read them out for you. There are further studies relevant to the refinery situation, which you don't have. Okay? There are industry profiles, which you already have. They were delivered. There is a shopping mall proposal, which you already have. That's what I said earlier. You keep saying there are two. I don't care who it's from. It's you people who are saying that. Please get together. Let's get together with this act.

Now, we have another study here which is called "Manufacturing Industries for Kamsack." I think we delivered that to you. You didn't ask for that. But that may be (and I'm not saying that it is) the report that we're looking for.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No, it's not.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Fine. Then I'm prepared to locate it, if it's on the refinery. Now that I have the letter, I know what I wrote. Don't misconstrue what I put in this letter.

MR. BERNTSON: — You can keep that letter, just in case you don't have one back in your office. It's yours forever, just in case you don't have one on file. If you go up one paragraph it says:

The studies done in the Kamsack areas were in response to local government concern for the effects of possible closure of the refinery.

Okay, there's one study. In the next paragraph we have this other refinery situation or study, as you call it.

AN HON. MEMBER: — That makes two.

MR. BERNTSON: - It may be. I don't know. We don't have this one down here.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Maybe you do have it.

MR. BERNTSON: — No, we don't. Well, I'll talk to my guys. They have a lot of sources out there.

Will you give us your commitment that that will be provided to us in the Assembly prior to urban affairs estimates being called?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Vice-Chairman, I can't give the hon. member any commitment. I don't run the House. I don't tell the House Leader when he calls the department for their estimates, and I don't know when I'm going to be able to put my fingers on that report. I'm hoping that I can put my fingers on it at 8 o'clock tomorrow morning. But I don't guarantee that, because I don't know where we're going to have to go to look for it.

MR. MUIRHEAD: — Mr. Minister, you just finished saying a little while ago that you tabled everything that you could possibly have tabled. Then, you say that perhaps tomorrow morning you can lay your hands on it very quickly at 8 o'clock in the morning. That means you never tried to get these two. It's just as simple as that. If you're not trying to hide anything here, then what would possibly be the reason? I don't suppose maybe you are, Mr. Minister. It's just that you don't understand the relative impact to the town of Kamsack. I don't think you are; but, if you're not, then what's wrong with going by the suggestion of the House Leader tonight, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, that we pull your estimates and go on? We're just wasting time here, because we will not move . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It's up to him! We are the opposition! We have the right to ask the questions. Listen, you turkeys, you had better start listening, because that's what we're here for: to ask questions. You people are here to answer . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, come on now, I . . . (inaudible) . . . a few . . . (inaudible) . . . ago. I'll throw this glass of water right at you!

MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN: — Order, Order! Surely we can have order in the Assembly. Could we have order in the Assembly, please?

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Vice-Chairman, let cool heads prevail for a moment or two. On item 2 of your estimates, Mr. Minister, the indication is the amount of money is up on your personnel services. The number of employees is down from last year. Would you like to explain the reasoning for that?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — That occurred, Mr. Vice-Chairman, because there was additional funding put into that subvote for contractual research work that we are hoping to do during the course of the year.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, I always thought that anything that wasn't permanent staff came under the second part, under other expenses, not under permanent staff . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No. It's \$680,270 for 28 employees where last year it was \$612,000 for 30 employees. I mean, there's an increase in funds and fewer employees.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — That figure is increased this year with a small staff component because of the personnel who were put in the departments. There were some senior management people who we hired this year, rather than lower salaried people. As well, it takes care of the regular increments during the course of the year.

MR. KATZMAN: — What you are saying is that you have rearranged the staff within the department and have placed higher paid staff into this category (administration) than you had last time. Is that what you are trying to say?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — It is as a result of some people who were transferred in, and others who were taken out. We have one particular case where we brought in a higher paid person, which shows up. otherwise, it is ordinary and incremental.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, Mr. Minister, if that's the case, out of what vote did you move those people who were higher paid? Did you move them from vote 2, 3, 4 or 5 into vote 1?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — These people were already in that vote. What actually happened was that one secretarial position was changed to a senior management position.

MR. KATZMAN: — But there are two less people here as well — 28 this year and 30 last year. The secretarial position. I would assume, was the bottom end which you dropped. It still does not make it relative to your figure.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Yes, it is very true, Mr. Chairman, that it shows two fewer staff. But it was just a normal shifting of staff within that department — higher increments and switching of positions within that staff. Really, there was no change other than that.

MR. BERNTSON: — Mr. Minister, earlier you said that you would send one of your officials out to see if he could find out where this report was and if, in fact, there was one available some place this evening. First, has the official returned?

Secondly, you also said that the report was done in 1975 or 1976. That never came from this side of the House. How can you be so sure it was done in 1975 or 1976, when the rest of these reports which you sent over were 1977 and 1978?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I said earlier that some of the files the boys had found in the department today indicated there was a report done at that time, and that may be the report we are looking for. I'm not saying that it was done at that time. Those are the reports we are looking for. Now you asked about whether I sent somebody out. I didn't send him out but the gentleman behind me left before the hon. member earlier made the suggestion that he go out. I reported to you when he came back that he did make a phone call to one of the people who was around for a lot longer than some of these other people were, and they can't remember where it is at this time. So the phone call was irrelevant; it didn't produce anything.

MR. BERNTSON: — Do you have anyone out there looking right now as to where, and why not? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it's your department. I can't tell you where to go to look.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Well, I have all the people from the department, who have access to that, sitting right here. These are the people who know what we are talking about. These are the people who will be looking for the report.

MR. BERNTSON: — I wonder if you could send one of them out to look for the report. That's the only thing that's holding us up. We could be off these estimates in 10 minutes if we could get out hands on that report.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — No, Mr. Chairman, I'm not prepared to send any of my people out to go to work all night to look for a report for tomorrow morning. If one of you people would be prepared to go and help him look in the basement in all those boxes and work there all night, I might ask him to do that. But I wouldn't be so hard on you people and ask you to do that.

MR. BERNTSON: — Well, you've asked Mr. Minister, and I accept your offer.

MR. KATZMAN: — Are you coming with an answer to a question?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — He didn't have a question.

MR. KATZMAN: — I just heard the Leader of the Opposition accept your proposal. We are waiting for your answer.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, I won't lower myself to that degree to ask my people to go out there to work during the night. I made an offer like that in jest. It's silly and absolutely ridiculous.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, it wasn't us that suggested it; it was you. The minister of two-by-fours is back on his high horse again. Mr. Minister, you indicated earlier in reply that you have put special funds into vote 1 for some special consultants. Would you like to tell us what that's all about?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Yes, that was in the total figure that we were looking at earlier. It didn't apply to the \$680,000 that you were talking about, because we corrected that.

MR. KATZMAN: — You indicated under vote 1 that the total figure of \$897,950 had additional funds for some special studies that you were going to do. Obviously, that must be in the \$217,680 then. Therefore, I'm asking you: what are these special studies that you plan to do under "other expenses"?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I'm sorry. My department tells me that they made an error. The research funding will be in subvote 4. the "other," in subvote 1, is just normal increases and increments.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, do you have any temporary employees in this department? Are they classed under personal services or under other expenses?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Yes, we have and they're classed under personal services. They're listed on the next page.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, would you explain to me the difference between a temporary and a permanent position within your department?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Temporary refers to a person who can work any given number of months during the course of a year, but no longer than one year.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I understood that temporary personnel could work in a department for up to two years in a period of three, but that their positions are not permanent and can never be made permanent. Am I wrong or right within your department?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — My people think it's a maximum of one year. However, we could be mistaken. These people are not on permanent pay roll. These are temporary positions where they work for a specific period of time and then are let go. They may be hired again at another point in time, if and when it becomes necessary.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, let's assume you have a job classified as temporary and the job is there for two, three or four years. Is the person in that job always a temporary? Do you therefore have to replace him after so long or make him permanent as the SGEA (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Association) contract calls for?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — My people still think that a one-year time lapse is a temporary position. Should that job for which we hire that person require him to be on staff for two or three years, then we have to go to the public service commission for permission either to extend that leave or it will instruct us to go to treasury board to require permanent staffing.

MR. KATZMAN: — So what you are saying to me, Mr. Minister, is that of these 5.5 non-permanent, none of them are exceeding a year in temporary positions within your department?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Yes, none of these listed there are beyond the year.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Minister, further to the questions from the member for Rosthern, are any of the program which you have in your report on a temporary basis, or are they a permanent program?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — All the programs which you see in the report are permanent government programs, with the exception of the Special ARDA program which is a federally and provincially funded program. That agreement is up in 1982 for negotiations again. So whether you class that as a permanent one or not is debatable.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — How long has Special ARDA been in existence under the present contract?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — In 1982, it will conclude its fifth year. It was a five-year contract.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — So, you would really call that a temporary program. It has a termination point. My next question then would be: are any of the employees, hired in that program, under temporary employment?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We don't have any extra staff for the Special ARDA program. The workload is absorbed within the department and is delivered in that manner. There is no particular extra staff for that program.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — I presume, though, that you would have a policy outlining the employment conditions of the temporary staff (or non-permanent, I guess you call them here). Let's start with that question of the five and one-half person-years that you are showing in your annual report; it would indicate five people on the non-permanent basis. Why are they on the non-permanent basis?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Only for the simple reason that we don't really require them to be on a permanent basis. They are temporary staff for temporary work.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — So, they will, sometime during the year, be released. Is that what you are saying?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — They may be released and others may be hired depending on the workload and depending on what else happens.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, you made reference earlier to contract employees as well. How many contract employees do you intend to have under your estimates, and for what projects?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I said for contractual research. By that I mean we will hire out to the private sector a lot of our research work that we could have to do during the course of the year.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, are these what you would call three-month projects or two-month projects? If you are hiring somebody under contract, why would you not hire him within your own department? Or are you saying that these special experts you need for special reasons?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Yes, you are right. They are special experts who are required to do special types of jobs. We find that it is much easier for us to hire that type of worker on a contractual basis. In answer to your first question as to whether it is a two-month job or a three-month job, that depends on the nature of the work.

MR. KATZMAN: — I would assume that some of these people would be doing studies like we've been asking for tonight. Under a contract, you'll be paying them for their services, I assume.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — That could very well be.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, I note last year in your total employee summary there were 90 employees and 13.8 non-permanent employees. Now you have jumped to 101 permanent employees and 5.5 temporary, which basically means almost the same amount of man-years. Why are there more permanent now that you had last year? Do so many of these temporary employees work so many hours, or days, or months, or whatever the contract calls for, so that you've had to make them permanent employees?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Two positions were converted from temporary to permanent, and nine positions, in total, were added to our department due to the transfer of the economic development program from social services to industry and commerce.

MR. KATZMAN: — Would it be under vote 3 that you transferred them?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — They would be divided among votes 1, 3 and 4.

MR. KATZMAN: — Vote 4 gets one new staff member. Vote 1 takes a cut of two staff members. How do you get nine new staff members? Those numbers don't make sense. Do you want to try it one more time?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — The hon. member may look at a particular subvote and find a

reduction. Yet, if he looks at another one, he'll find an increase. That's quite true. The figure which I gave you was the total — the end figure. It's true that we lost some positions in some areas, but we picked up these 11 new ones in other areas.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, from what you're telling me, I would read between the lines that you had positions last year which were vacant and weren't filled. Therefore, you were cut back on positions. Then you also moved nine positions over from social services. Am I reading that wrongly or is that why you're down, then up again?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — You're reading it wrongly. I said that we transferred some of those positions from social services. They were not around last year.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Minister, your department is down in total numbers even if you add the new nine in. you had 103.8 man-years last year. This year you have 106.5 man-years. Yet you say you transferred nine in from social services. Therefore, you have had to lose some somewhere. Where did you lose them?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Maybe I can explain it this way: there was an increase of 11 permanent people in the 1981-82 budget. There was a reduction of 8.3 person-years of non-permanent employment, for a net increase, therefore, of 2.7 man-years.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, I would like to have you tell us what assistance you can provide when a family business changes hands. I have been talking with your department. I know a young man who wants to buy a business his father had owned (his father died). Is there any assistance you can provide under those circumstances?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We don't have any specific program that you can put your finger on, but we do have consulting services and advice or assistance we can give. We are always willing to assist any new entrepreneur who wants to take over an existing business.

MR. SWAN: — You just have advice; you don't have any money. They need money. Do you have any of that kind of assistance?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Not specifically from industry and commerce, although there is the Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation that one can turn to if it is the type of business which should be funded through Sedco. This could very well be, depending on what the business is, what the potential of that business may be and so forth.

MR. SWAN: — What type of criteria do they have to meet in order to fall into Sedco's capabilities?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — It should be a business that is going to increase employment — increase its staff. Taking over an existing business which is maintaining its staff is not developmental. It has to be in the developmental field, so if the person can show that he is going to increase his staff or expand his business, we will look at it.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, I am talking about a local garage business. I think it is a case of doing something to get some money into it or the business will likely close. It is not a matter of increasing staff, but of maintaining a staff which is not large — it is a staff of three. Can you do something under those circumstances?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We would take a very serious look at a case like that, because one of our criteria is to see that a business which already exists in a town is maintained in the town if it provides a necessary service. If you are telling me that it happens to be a garage, that there is only one garage in that town and it's doing a proper service to that town, we certainly will look at that.

MR. SWAN: — All right. I'll be in touch with you with the details on it.

Mr. Minister, I'd like to touch on a different area completely and this one is not an area where a business is operating, but I think there's a lot of potential. The Minister of Mineral Resources is talking about an upgrading plant. If that's going to come into the province, there are a lot of other businesses that will be built into the infrastructure — businesses that at this point in time do not really exist but could exist within the province. Is your department doing some work to encourage business, and if so, what are you doing?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Yes, as a matter of fact, if the hon. member had been in the House last night when that same question was asked, which is related to various resource developments in the province, he would know that I already answered that. We are providing and we have provided the necessary information material to tell the people of Saskatchewan what we actually require as secondary industries related to the resource development in the province. And in those same brochures that we have, we related to various refineries and what have you. So we are available. And if we have any particular developer that is interest, we're prepared to go all out to assist in helping him establish, with feasibility studies, programs and financial assistance, if need be.

MR. SWAN: — I like that when you say you're willing to "go all out." Now, could you define what you mean when you say "go all out"? You mean if he comes to you and he goes down on his hands and knees and begs a bit, you might give him a few dollars? Or are you going to do something more than that? Just what do you mean when you say you're willing to "go all out"?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Well, I didn't think it was that difficult to get through to the hon. gentleman. When I say I'm going all out, I mean I will do everything possible to assist whoever the entrepreneur may be.

MR. SWAN: — Can you define that a little bit? When you say "go all out," what do you really do? Give us an example of the things that you do for a new business inquiring about establishing in the province. Can you outline it?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — It depends on the type of business that we're talking about, but we will assist in feasibility studies and in market analysis. You have to have a market in order to have a business. We'll assist in finding a market; we'll assist in preparing financial packages, whether it's with a private institution or it's through Sedco; or if that program will qualify for DREE (Department of Regional Economic Expansion) grants, we will assist to help the entrepreneur qualify for that grant. This is the type of assistance that we will provide.

MR. SWAN: — Do you assist them with data on what population base, what resources and what things are available in different communities? Do you give them indications of which communities might be able to use the service and have a market or that sort of thing in the feasibility study?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Feasibility study is four. I'll go one step further. We provide the community profile, which every community in the province already has. If a particular person is interested in establishing in Rosetown, if he just went to our department or to the town office in Rosetown, they should have (I'm sure they have) the town profile available that we provide.

MR. SWAN: — Mr. Minister, I realize that you provide the town profile. Interestingly enough, you spoke of Rosetown, and I'd like to raise one concern.

Last year I raised with your department one of those so-called profiles. It was done for a business that wanted to establish in Rosetown. You advised them that there was a demand in Rosetown for a small appliance repair depot. When they went into the town to have a look, that small community already had five businesses covering that area. Now, I'm wondering who does this study, and what kind of study is it that will produce that kind of result? Because anybody following it would have gone in and gone bankrupt because there wouldn't have been business for him.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, I would find it very difficult to believe that our department sent somebody out and said, "You go to Rosetown, because you can establish such and such a type of business." On the contrary, we don't do that. We will send the person to Rosetown, and say, "If you're interested in going to Rosetown, go out there. They will tell you what is a good business for that area." I'd be very disappointed if that information came from my department, and I would like the hon. member, if possible, to talk to me about that sometime. Because I would like to pin that down and find out if any of our people said, "Go to Rosetown and establish, because they need that type of business."

MR. SWAN: — This particular item had quite a bit of coverage in the Rosetown paper, and I believe if you would like to go back into last year's *Rosetown Eagle* you would be able to get some very embarrassing comments from the paper. It's in the library here, and it's quite available to you. Indeed, the article will tell you that that was the recommendation from your department. And here there are five of those businesses. I wasn't going to raise that tonight, but when you raised Rosetown. I thought perhaps it should be brought to your attention. Because it didn't show to me that your department was doing a thorough job when they gave that market study and town profile.

Could you tell the Assembly which businesses you are encouraging to come into the province to work around the upgrader infrastructure? Which businesses do you now tell the people of the province are needed? I haven't one of your brochures.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We are talking, Mr. Chairman, about secondary industries as they related to food products, to iron and steel, to leather goods, to many varieties of programs that relate to the industrial development.

MR. SWAN: — Do you have any specifics? You answer in a very general way, but could you give us specifics?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Well, it's pretty difficult for me to give specifics. I can just give you a couple of examples if you so wish. We are looking for, and we have already found, conveyor equipment in heavy industry for mining development. I might tell the hon.

gentlemen, as a result of our trip last fall, we've already located an industry that is prepared to settle in Saskatchewan to provide that infrastructure. We have an industry in Saskatchewan, in Regina, that provides rollers for that particular type of manufacturing. So, that's the type of area that we look at. In various areas, we look at different projects. It is pretty difficult for me to spell them all out.

MR. ANDREW: — Following up on the question from the member for Rosetown-Elrose, could the minister be somewhat more specific? What we are talking about is a billion dollar upgrader, and by anyone's standards, that's a pretty big capital expenditure. How much of that capital would you anticipate would be manufactured and produced in Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — If and when the refinery is built, we are hoping that a lot of the products that will be required in that plant will be built in Saskatchewan. I don't know what they require. We are now encouraging many manufacturers to look at that particular plant and the secondary industries which will be a brush-off from that plant.

AN HON. MEMBER: — And there are many.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — There are many and varied. It could have various welding shops, machine shops and what have you, to assist in the operation of that infrastructure.

MR. ANDREW: — On a project that size, I would guess that the Minister of Industry and Commerce would be conducting a pretty extensive study with regard to the labor force that would be needed. I take it that would be one area of your department which you would look at. You don't look at that? Okay, you would be looking at a study as to the components of this upgrader and where they would be built. I would think you would do a pretty extensive study into that whole question. I would think that you would make representations to the consortium with regard to the matters which touch industry and commerce. Are you doing that?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Yes, any time there is a large-scale manufacturer or resource industry that develops, our department is in touch immediately with the people involved in that structure, to see what brushoffs we can attain in the province of Saskatchewan.

MR. ANDREW: — Have you done or are you in the process of doing a study into the implications for Saskatchewan on that upgrader, as it relates to your department?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — If there are any studies being done on the upgrader, they are done by CIC (Crown Investments Corporation). However, CIC people use some of our departmental people to help them in any of their study programs.

MR. ANDREW: — Your department, I take it, is doing nothing then. Is your department doing any studies with regard to industrialization and its impact as it relates to tertiary recovery in the heavy oil fields?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We do studies, really, in-house on an ongoing basis as it relates to any development. One of them could be heavy oil development. We are doing some studies as it relates to secondary industries in the sense that they may require some special type of pumping equipment, or what have you. These are the things that we are continuously looking after.

MR. ANDREW: — Well, when you say in-house, I take it what you mean when you flag the word in-house is that that is something for your eyes only and not something to be made public. Is that correct? A lot of good that is going to do to the guy looking to establish out there.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — It's for us to identify various opportunities to be able to go out to promote. As a result of some of these in-house studies these brochures, which I was talking about last year, were developed. That was done in-house and we produced a brochure which is a public document. We do these things for the public. We may be doing them within our department; that's what I am referring to. I'm not saying that it's a secret or anything, but we are doing them for the assistance of the public.

MR. ANDREW: — All right, can you tell me then from your in-house study, what items you have identified as being potential manufactured products for heavy oil development or for tertiary recovery?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We have two, right now, that we can think of at this moment. One of them is pumps and the other is valves. We also did the study, as I mentioned a little earlier, on conveyor idlers. This was already done and we already have a conveyor idler plant in the city of Regina.

MR. ANDREW: — Did you identify the need for pump jacks and pump jack parts?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We didn't do a study on the pump jack itself, but we did do the study on the pumps and identified the opportunity for the pump jack.

MR. ANDREW: — Well, I think what you are telling me, Mr. Minister, is you're really not doing a great deal of anything under your department as it relates to that. The only thing I would say to you is that there is a great deal of potential up there for manufacturing. At present, a lot of the manufacturing and service industry in that heavy oil field is being serviced out of the province of Alberta, as you're probably aware. I think it's something like 80 per cent. I think that there should be some emphasis put on Saskatchewan so that we can see some of the secondary manufacturing in our own province. What are the minister's views on the question of the "buy Saskatchewan" policy as far as industry and commerce is concerned, as it relates to the heavy oil development in Lloydminster?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Could you repeat that? I was looking at the brochure and didn't hear it.

MR. ANDREW: — What is your policy relating to a "buy Saskatchewan" policy, particularly as it relates to the heavy oil development in the Lloydminster region of Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Our general policy is to buy Saskatchewan products first as long as everything else is equal. As I mentioned last night when I was questioned on the tendering process of our products, we believe in the tendering process. I also believe that we have to look at the Saskatchewan-manufactured product first. We have to give it preference, depending on whether it is feasible or not, I for one, from a personal point of view, would certainly agree that we have to promote even further Saskatchewan-made products to be bought in our own province.

MR. ANDREW: — Are you prepared, Mr. Minister, to put those kinds of requirements into leasing agreements prior to development of the wells and tertiary recovery?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We don't have anything to do with the purchasing of any equipment in that area. It's done by the Department of Revenue, Supply and Services. There's nothing we can put in the agreements. All we can do is promote and recommend to that department that we buy Saskatchewan products.

MR. ANDREW: — I wish to make only one point and then I'll turn it over to my colleague. Quite frankly, we have great potential in this province. I think one of the areas to develop is industrial strategy. Unfortunately, your department is where that should be developed. It seems to me that all you're doing, through your department, is putting out the odd brochure. You have to do far more than that if you're going to attract that infrastructure and secondary industry to this province. It would seem to me that you're sort of sitting in the cold. Your department is one which should be upgraded so that we can attract some of that secondary job-creating and wealth-creating industry.

The question I asked you was with regard to tertiary recovery. Have you investigated any possibility of setting up plants to deal with water softeners needed to purify the water, boilers required for steam injection and those types of things? Have you looked at the possibility of developing that in Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Mr. Chairman, we are continuously looking at various areas as they related to secondary manufacturing through resource development. One of the questions which you asked a few moments ago was in regard to what we are doing to advise our people in Saskatchewan on the requirements of secondary industry as they related to resource development. Well, in our brochure of May 1979, volume one, we suggest that in this particular area we need trailers, loaders, dozers, graders, cranes, compressors, compaction equipment, welders, generators, tires and pumps. We need all those for this particular resource development. Since this has come out, we have proven the fact. In Swift Current, we've established a trailer manufacturing plant. We've established another one in Tisdale. I think there are some welders manufactured in Saskatoon. We are using information from our studies to spread it around the country so our people will know what is required to be manufactured in the province.

MR. ANDREW: — I take it that you will send that pamphlet over so we can have a look at it . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Fine, I acknowledge that.

How much advertising does your department do in Ontario and central Canada to attract industry to Saskatchewan? You do a fair amount of advertising in the province. Do you do any out-of-province advertising, particularly in the Ontario market?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Yes, we do advertise in eastern Canada, perhaps not as often as one thinks one should. We have advertised on a periodic basis.

MR. ANDREW: — What kind of budget are you spending in central Canada?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We don't break our budget down. We just have one advertising budget.

MR. ANDREW: — I expect that probably it's miniscule compared to the money you spend in Saskatchewan advertising your department, rather than trying to find new industries. You are trying to promote your government rather than trying to promote industry, and that's probably the problem. Do you have anybody in central Canada as an agent of your department or your government to try to encourage businesses to

move out here or to explain the potential of the oil industry? Do you have anybody down there trying to hustle some business for us?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — No, we don't have anybody there but we're two and one-half hours away from central and eastern Canada. If and when we make contacts, our people are only two and one-half hours away from them. It takes no time to get down there.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — You might consider that perhaps it might be a good investment to locate offices in various parts of the country to attempt to attract industry on a continuous basis. I'll cite an example. I don't know whether you're familiar with this or not, but I understand that the state of Georgia in the United States has an office in the city of Toronto to do nothing but attract industry. In a couple of years, they have attracted 40 industries from Canada down to Georgia. Are you aware of that fact?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I wasn't aware of that, but my people tell me that there was a Mr. Foulds who came up from Georgia, put on a seminar in the department and told them that that's what they were actually doing.

But to reply to the first comment that the hon. member made as to whether I thought it would be feasible or beneficial to have somebody in eastern Canada stationed permanently; no, I don't think it is absolutely necessary to station anybody permanently in eastern Canada. As I said earlier, Canada is a very large country, yet it's small because it doesn't take very long to get from one place or the other. If anything, we should be stationing somebody in Europe. That's probably where we should have any office. We have an office in London where we can converse, but I think maybe we should be stationed in Europe where we can attract something in the future.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — As a matter of fact, I believe you have someone in Europe. Your agent general happens to be in England and is supposed to be covering all of western Europe. Your annual report, of course, indicates your lack of interest in attracting industries to the province of Saskatchewan. It's something that I talked about last night. It's something my colleague behind me from Kindersley has expressed a concern about tonight. It really indicates a lack of interest on your part, Mr. Minister, in attempting to do something to attract industry to this province. You referred several times this evening to feasibility studies, in-house studies, outside consultants, etc. to assist industry to locate and come up with these feasibility studies which you keep referring to. Specifically, let me ask you this: how many of these studies did you do, for example, in the past calendar year of 1980? How many studies were done by your department? How many industries were successful? How many of them were in debt? How much money did you spend on these studies? How many were done in-house and how many were done by outside consultants? I will give you a few minutes to dig up that kind of information.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — In the year 1979-80, we had 18 contracted studies and 15 in-house studies.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Start with the consultant studies. What was the cost and the nature of the studies? How many of them resulted in an industry either expanding or locating in Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — All right. In the year under review, we don't have it broken down as per contract, but we have the total figure on the 18 contracted. We paid out \$146,000 on the total. Now, in that 18 my people tell me that as it was only done last year, at this point in time six of those projects look very favourable. That's not saying that there could be another two or three added to that at a later time. And some of them, no doubt, will fall by the wayside.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — That answer would indicate to me that, in other words, you've had none come in and no results at all. You said six looked favourable, which indicates to me that nothing has really happened on the 18 (I think you said 18) that were done by outside consultants. So you spent the \$146,000 so far with absolutely no results other than some strong possibilities or promises that may or may not happen in the next little while. And by the way, while I'm on my feet, you're confusing the estimates here with the Crown corporations. We're not discussing the year under review. That's for Crown corporations.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I didn't mean it that way. I meant that we have the figures here for 1979-80. This is what I'm talking about. And I might further say while I'm on my feet that we did these studies in 1979 and 1980; that does not necessarily say that two months later we're going to have an industry development. No, the study could have been made a year ago, and it takes three to five years for an industry to develop, and you well know that. It just doesn't happen overnight. Some of these things happen very quickly; others take a little time to progress, and although we only have six that look promising at this time, as I said earlier, we could have an additional amount come on stream and, by the same token, some of those could fall off.

MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, of course, that could lead into another question. Very simply then, let's go back to 1979 or 1978, whichever year you want to pick. How many did you do that year, and how many of those resulted in businesses establishing. I don't expect you to have the answer for that tonight. I suggest to you that it was probably one or none. So, it's the same old excuse; while it hasn't happened yet, down the road it's going to happen. It has been 27 years that the socialists have been around in this province, and that's how long we've been waiting for some action to take place. And it hasn't happened yet.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — You're absolutely correct but you've only had progress since the socialists have been around here. Prior to that there had been no progress.

MR. BERNTSON: — You indicated earlier in your response to the member for Rosetown that you had profiles on all the communities or that your department had profiles done on all communities in the province. Can you indicate to me when those profiles were started by your department and when they were finished? How are they kept current and how often are they updated, etc.?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I wouldn't like to mislead the House and say that we do them for every community. We consult with the community involved and it's by request from the community that we provide these profiles. We're now doing, apparently, 170 of these profiles and we upgrade them on a two-year basis.

MR. BERNTSON: — So, I misunderstood you earlier when I heard you to say that you had profiles done for all communities in Saskatchewan. How many communities, in fact, have this?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I said we were providing 170, yes.

MR. BERNTSON: — And that's all that have been requested to date?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Yes, that's all the requests we have had up until this year, although this year we are putting on a campaign to introduce the profiles into many other areas. That's part of our developmental program.

MR. BERNTSON: — Okay, who has done the majority of these profiles for your department?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We use 100 per cent of the community input. If we are going to be doing a community profile for, we'll say, Rosetown, we will get all the information from the town of Rosetown.

MR. BERNTSON: — For instance, in Kamsack, the Saskatchewan Research Council did the profile for you. Now, what about the other 170? Who did the profile? I know where the input comes from but who did the work for you? Who was the consultant or whatever?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — You are talking about two different programs here. That's an industrial profile that SRC did. I am talking about a community profile, which we do. They are two different programs.

MR. BERNTSON: — Okay. How many industrial profiles were done for your department, either in-house or out-of-house last year and how many by the Saskatchewan Research Council?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We don't have a special program, as such, to do industrial profiles. Any time that one would be done, it would, naturally, have to come from that particular community. We don't, as such, do any. We don't really think that we did any last year in the industrial field. Now, the Saskatchewan Research Council may have been asked to do some. It may have done some — I don't know.

MR. BERNTSON: — Going back to your letter of March 8, 1979 (the one that we provided you a copy of), it says the studies done in Kamsack were in response to both local and government concern about the effects of possible closure of the refinery (that was in the second paragraph). The third paragraph said:

Further studies relevant to the refinery situation, industry profiles and the shopping mall proposal were all funded by the department.

Am I to be led to believe from this letter that there was a study done by someone (either in-house or by someone you consulted) at the request of the town of Kamsack, dealing with the possible closure of the refinery (that's one study)? The second study would be "Further Studies Relevant to the Refinery Situation." The third study is "Industry Profiles," and the fourth study is "The Shopping Mall Proposal." Is it my understanding that there were, in fact, these four studies done in Kamsack?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I went through that a little while ago and maybe if you read *Hansard* tomorrow you'll find out exactly what I said, but I'll repeat what I said if the hon. member wants me to do so. It says here that there was a 50-50 cost-shared

program on the refinery situation. There was another one on the possible closure of the refinery that you're talking about — the effects of the possible closure. That, as I said earlier, could be one and the same study. It could be. I don't know. It could be two. The industrial profiles — we have already delivered them to the hon. member. The shopping mall — we already delivered that to him. So, we are assuming that there is actually only one. But, I don't know. There could be two, if those are two separate programs. I doubt that very much; I would think that that's one study.

MR. BERNTSON: — If my memory serves me correctly, the refinery shut down in 1977, and the minister was talking about looking back to '75 or '76, and I stand to be corrected on that. But I remember it being a fairly significant issue in the by-election of 1977. It seems to me it shut down just prior to the by-election. So that might give you some indication as to what time frame you should be looking at.

Secondly, I wanted to thank the minister for sending copies of these studies over. The one about the town of Kamsack development, the shopping centre study (as we've called it here tonight) is a new material for us. But these other two studies that you've tabled for us are not, in fact, two studies at all. They are excerpts from a study done by the Saskatchewan Research Council. You just pulled them out of this study and tried to pass them off as two separate studies, but in fact, this is the study from the Saskatchewan Research Council that includes these other two. I just want that to be understood. So, we're still looking for the refinery studies (if there are two) one being the effects of the closure of the refinery, the other relevant to the refinery situation. Those are the two studies that we're looking for, and I wonder if the minister has received any word from his officials that were out looking as to whether they have found them yet or not.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I might as well repeat it again. If this indicates to us that there are two studies, and if we can find two studies, you will have them. No, we have nobody out looking for studies at this time.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister a few questions. I don't intend to be dealing in dry wit or humor.

During the fiscal year, Mr. Minister, 1978-79, the Department of Industry and Commerce spent a total of \$89,469.41 on advertising. I want to follow up on some questions that were asked by the member for Kindersley. Now, there are two things. For the record, we need to again reiterate that there is not even a marginal increase relative, at least, to the potential in Saskatchewan in terms of industry and its development. As I was attempting to explain to you last night (I believe, just at the time the House shut down), looking at Alberta relative to Saskatchewan. I see that 16,000 more people entered the province of Alberta in one year than entered the province of Saskatchewan. Some of them were your own figures. So we have established that there is a need to concentrate on development of industry in the province of Saskatchewan. We realize, on this side of the House, that we must advance that particular notion to you, Mr. Minister, not once or twice or three times, but maybe a dozen or twenty times, in order for you to understand that the need is imminent.

Mr. Minister, again for the record, I want to make it clear that it makes good common sense for the department to advertise Saskatchewan. On the other hand, I am sure that all of us, as taxpayers, would like to be sure we are getting value for advertising dollars spent. Now it says in your report, that the department spent about \$3,680 on television,

so I presume very little out-of-province advertising is done on TV, at least. I want to be somewhat specific, in light of your response to the member for Kindersley, that you don't break down your advertising, that you have a sum of money you have allocated for advertising and that is all you indicated you know about it.

Surely, you must know where those advertising dollars are spent. Surely, that information is not difficult to obtain. If you are advertising in another province or another country, you must have receipts from advertising agencies that handle the advertising for you. I can't accept that you don't break it down and that information isn't available. Could you tell me just a bit about the TV ads? Basically, what they were about? Who produced them? Where they were produced? What was their purpose? If I were you and you are talking to them, I don't know how you can hear what I am asking you to answer, but I am going to repeat it. I want to know precisely, with reference to advertising, what the ads are about; who produced them; where they were produced and what their purpose was. You might include whether or not they achieved their specified purpose.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Did the hon. member ask that question for 1980-81 or '79-80? We have '81-'82. We will provide that one now. We are digging up that information.

MR. BIRKBECK: — What you are going to provide is '80-'81? Provide '80-'81 now and '79-'80 when you can. Can you give me that commitment?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — In the report on page 12 under the communications branch, that is in part of our advertising dollar. However, under advertising, to be specific, I can spell out the dollars and cents as it relates to particular advertisements. For instance, these are mainly print ads.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Mr. Minister, I didn't ask for the print ads. I'm going to ask for the print ads. What I asked for was the TV ads. Now, if you have the print ads, hang on to them; don't lose them in your mess of files over there because I'm going to ask that too. I have my questions at least marked out clearly. I know what I want to know and it's here and it's TV ads that I want to know now. Can you provide that information?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We don't plan any TV ads in 1981-82.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Did you have any in '79-80?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — If we did, we'll provide you with that information. We don't have it here.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Thank you. That's what I wanted to know. Now I note that \$17,340.39 was spent on newspaper advertising. What I want to know there is the ratio between in-province and out-of-province advertising.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — That was for '79-80, did you say, or '81-82?

MR. BIRKBECK: — Both if you have it.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — What figure are you using?

MR. BIRKBECK: — I find it unusual, Mr. Chairman, that I have to describe what figures I'm using. My goodness sakes, you're the minister and you have a whole staff around you. When did you spend \$17,340.39 on newspaper advertising? Don't ask me what year it was? I could tell you if you like. If I'm going to do that, we might as well be government.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — We don't have any of that information here. If the hon. member wants the information for anything prior to 1981, if he opened the public accounts documents, he would find it. If he wants us to deliver it to him at a later date, we will. However, in 1981-82 this is what we propose to do in our advertising budget. Now that's what we are talking about this evening. I asked you if that's the figure you're looking at. If that's the figure you are looking at, I can provide you with some figures here from our 1981-82 budget.

MR. BIRKBECK: — What I want you to do, then, is to provide to me the projected amount of money that you intend to spend on newspaper advertising and I want you to indicate how much of that will be spent in-province and out-of-province. Now, can I have your assurance on that?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — I will see that my department provides for you the total advertising budget for 1981-82, broken down into what we propose to do in newspaper, television, brochures, pamphlets — the whole thing. We will also provide to you what we expect to do on a ration basis as it relates to eastern Canada, central Canada, Europe (you name it) and Saskatchewan. That's going to take a few days, but we will try to work something up for you.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Okay, that's good. I appreciate that particular offer. I want to know, as well, when you are providing that information, the name of the firm or firms which will be preparing the advertisements and how much they are going to be paid, on a breakdown basis. I think that that would be sufficient in terms of providing the kinds of information I want regarding your advertising program. There is a specific reason, of course, for asking that particular question. We want to know if there is any real effect in terms of advertising. Some advertising is effective and some is now. We want to know if advertising is going to have a positive effect in terms of bringing industry to the province. I had to take note and wanted to take the opportunity to ask you; how does it make sense that you have an office in England, but you don't have one in Canada? I wonder if there is an explanation for that.

HON. MR. VICKAR: — The office of the agent general in London is an office of the government, actually, and serves the total government and not necessarily the Department of Industry and Commerce. It does serve to assist us in certain areas to attract and promote industry. But to say why do we have one there and we don't have one in Canada — as I explained a little earlier, we don't think, at this time, that it's really necessary for us to have any offices other than in Saskatchewan because the distance is not that great. You can cover the whole country in half a day, if you have to.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Yes, I appreciate that, but I still feel that there could be some positive merit in having an office in central Canada, in terms of attracting business to Saskatchewan. Possibly it could be a reciprocal agreement whereby we could find markets for our Saskatchewan products as well, in particular, our own small business — it is thriving here.

I am still interested in the advertising program of your last current year. I would like to know (I don't know if you have that information or not) if you could tell me where

April 28, 1981

Saskatchewan industry and commerce advertised in out-of-province newspapers? Is that information available? I'd like to know where the province concentrated its advertising — on any particular theme? Is there any main thrust there? Do you, as minister, have any notion at all? You've been minister there for a number of years. You must have some idea as to what your advertising program is attempting to achieve, and where it was being focussed. Do you have any information that you could enlighten me with?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — When we provide the hon. member with all the information he requires in the advertising program we will provide the detailed emphasis as to why we spent that money on those areas.

MR. BIRKBECK: — Great. That's good. I have just one thing that I want to raise with you. I have here in my hand a copy of the 1981 *Prairie Implement Buyers' Guide*, which I understand was the first publication like this to be produced by industry and commerce. It is also my understanding the response to this publication has been good. Now, I have to compliment some of the civil servants because it was a result of their dedication, and a step in the right direction, to promote Saskatchewan products. It was a concept that was really conceived by the public service, so I would want to compliment them in that particular regard and I support the concept of the 1981 *Prairie Implement Buyers' Guide*.

Now, I have one question regarding this. Would the Department of Industry and Commerce be prepared to produce catalogues to promote other Saskatchewan products in the same manner? Could you look at cataloguing them and making them available? What has been done in that regard?

HON. MR. VICKAR: — Yes. We are prepared to look at that area. As a matter of fact, we're doing that right now; we're looking at different sectors to see if it would be feasible to provide that type of information in that type of brochure. I would like to correct the hon. member. He says that it's the first time that publication was produced. Well, I might correct him and say it's the tenth time that publication was produced. This is the tenth year and we had previously produced 400,000, but because of the acceptance of that particular brochure, we have now increased it to 500,000.

MR. BIRKBECK: — I'm sorry. We just had a misunderstanding on that particular question. I wasn't saying it was the first time it was produced. All I was saying was the concept was a first-time idea. It was innovative; it was new. It was a good idea. I didn't say that this was the first one. I meant it was an innovative step that had been taken. I suppose initiatives like that we would like to see in the future. I think that likely is the best advertising that the Department of Industry and Commerce has. Thank you.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 10:02 p.m.