

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
February 25, 1983

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

HON. MR. LANE: — Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure I introduce through you to this Assembly some representatives of the Inuit committee on national issues. I need not draw to members' attention in detail the importance of the so-called section 37 constitutional conference to be held in March. The representatives are here to discuss with the government the upcoming first ministers' conference on aboriginal peoples' rights in the constitution. I will be meeting with them for a brief while a little later today, as will the Premier. On behalf of the government I welcome the following members of the delegation, and once I've introduced them I would ask them to rise and be acknowledged: Charlie Watt, chairman of the Inuit committee on national issues; Mark Gordon, chief negotiator; Jeff Richstone, legal adviser; and George Erasmus. I'd ask that the delegates stand and be acknowledged and recognized.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. LANE: — We welcome them to the Assembly and look forward to the meeting a little later today. Thank you.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the official opposition I would like to join in the welcome to our guests. Our guests will know of the importance which the official opposition, the then government, placed on having this conference and on having those provisions in the constitution, and I trust that their meetings with the Attorney General, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and the Premier will be fruitful in forwarding the common objectives.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

QUESTIONS

Transfer of Sharon Young

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Government Services. Yesterday in the House I understood the minister to say that she denied that a forced transfer of a clerk-steno 2 from Prince Albert to Regina had anything to do with politics or the fact that that particular employee was the sister-in-law of the New Democratic Party candidate in the recent Prince Albert-Duck Lake by-election. My question is this: on what date did your deputy minister decide that an extra clerk-typist 2 was needed in Regina and that the most efficient way to provide that extra clerk-typist 2 was to transfer someone 400 kilometres against their will?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Speaker, in response to the Leader of the Opposition, as far as I know the transfer was not a forced transfer as he alleges. As far as I know, Miss Young has not objected to the transfer but accepted the transfer. As far as the date of

the decision, I would have to take notice on that, but I also might add, Mr. Speaker, that the three other employees that came down to Regina on January 3 were all accounting clerks 1.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — It's interesting to note, as I understood the minister to say, that the other three employees to which you referred in the House yesterday did not come down at the same time as Sharon Young, but on January 3, I ask this question, is the minister aware of whether or not any grievance has been filed on behalf of Sharon Young with respect to the transfer?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I understand that Miss Young has filed a grievance with social services on the failure of her probationary with the corrections. As far as I know, she has not filed a grievance with DGS.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Supplementary to the minister. Could the minister advise how much notice was given to Sharon Young with respect to the transfer of location?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — She was informed on January 7 . . . February 7, I believe, Mr. Speaker, and was to be here on February 14, and took a few extra days to come down.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I just want to get this clear, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister advising (1) that Sharon Young was informed on February 7, and (2) that she did not report on February 14?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I understand she was informed on February 7 to be here on the 14th. Whether or not she arrived on the 14th I don't know but I understand she took a few extra days to come down here.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — My next question is to the Minister of Government Services, and it is this: would she please inform herself on the facts with respect to this case, and find out when this employee was informed verbally, when this employee was informed in writing, when this employee was required to report to work, and whether or not she reported at the time she was required to report to work.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Well, I've indicated to the Leader of the Opposition the information that I was supplied with by my deputy.

I also would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I find it rather amusing that the opposition members try to make some case out of this. It seems to me we can't satisfy them any way. If we fire someone, it's political; if we hire someone, it's political; if we transfer someone, it's political. And I can say to the members opposite: if we wanted to have political overtones within the civil service, I would like to say that I have the former minister of labor's son working in my department, and doing an excellent job. I have a former minister of industry and commerce's son working in my department, and doing an excellent job. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition's daughter is still employed in SMDC, and I understand, doing an excellent job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister again whether she will tell this House that that particular employee was advised of her transfer one week before she was required to work, or a shorter time. I ask her to check that. If she's not sure of it, check it; if she is sure of it, tell us.

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I indicated in my response, Mr. Speaker, that the information I have transmitted to the opposition is the information that was given to me by my deputy. If the Leader of the Opposition thinks there is a discrepancy, yes, I will check further.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in charge of government services. It is my understanding that there were two clerk-typist 2 positions in the public works branch of your department in the Prince Albert office. Of these two positions, Sharon Young's position was the senior position. How is it that the person with the senior position in that office was chosen as the one to be transferred from Prince Albert, against her will, to Regina?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — I will reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I know, Miss Young did not object to the transfer. She accepted it, so the allegations made by the member for Shaunavon don't quite ring true. I would imagine the senior position was required in Regina because it is a senior position and would be more needed down here.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I will ask the question again. We are not now talking about senior in terms in status, being clerk-steno 3's or clerk-steno 2's. We are talking about the employee with the most seniority.

The question that is directed to the minister is: was Sharon Young the employee with the least seniority in the office when she was transferred, or was there a person doing similar work with less seniority, who was not asked to transfer?

HON. MRS. DUNCAN: — Mr. Speaker, I will have to take notice of that question.

Press Briefing Held by PCS

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labor, the minister in charge of the potash corporation. Last Wednesday, Mr. Minister, I asked you whether you were aware that in fact an informal press briefing was being held later that day in Saskatoon by senior management of the potash corporation. I want to advise the minister, in case he has missed the news coverage on that event, that I have a copy of the invitation to that event that went out to the press about two weeks prior to the event. It was specifically a briefing invitation to the press. I just want to inform the minister. It says:

The Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan invites you to Update '83, a press reception and informal briefing on PCS and its subsidiary companies. This is an opportunity for you to meet informally with the PCS management to discuss the potash industry, in general, and the PCS plans for the coming year.

Mr. Minister, you indicated that you were not aware of that. Can you advise the House, then, who in fact authorized the management to call the briefing? Was it the Premier or the Deputy Premier, or were you incorrect at the time in advising the House that you were not aware that the event was taking place?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that the event was taking place. I have complete confidence in the management of PCS. If they so desire to talk and have informal meetings with the press, they have my blessing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Minister, since you have complete confidence, I would like to ask you whether in fact your senior management have arranged for similar informal briefings to meet with representatives of the working force, or representatives of the unions representing the miners at the various centres, because I want to say that the workers have a very deep concern and I would have thought that it was important . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Order. I would ask the member, when he is dealing with a supplementary, that he come directly to the question.

MR. KOSKIE: — I'll rephrase it. As a supplementary, Mr. Minister, since you have provided, or senior management has provided an update press meeting with the press, will you indicate whether or not management will be having a similar briefing with the workers in those mines which are so drastically affected by the policy of PCS?

HON. MR. McLAREN: — Mr. Speaker, if it's the wish of the union to come and talk to us, our doors are open at any time for them to come. The fact is that we have already met with Mr. Stevens a number of weeks ago. He came right into my office here in the legislature. So the doors are open any time they want to come, and I told them so. This is a chance for them to come and talk. We're here, we'll listen to what they have to say. And if PCS management want to do the same thing, good for them. They will do it also.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Changes in the Pepin Plan

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question I'd like to direct to the Premier. I refer to an article in the *Globe and Mail* of February 24. It reports on the Premier's discussions surrounding the crowrate in eastern Canada. It quotes the Premier, saying that, "Mr. Devine wants a number of changes in the Pepin plan." I would like the Premier to outline what changes in the Pepin plan would make it acceptable to his government.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I could reiterate the points that I went through the other day, but I don't think that's necessary; they're in *Hansard*. We've said that we have to have some guarantees that the farmer can handle the costs. We don't want to see the upper limit in 31 million metric tonnes; we don't want to see us lose a comparative advantage due to artificial subsidies to central Canada, and so forth. Those are the areas that we're taking a very hard stand on. And as a result of the very hard stand that we've taken, it's my understanding that the minister, Mr. Pepin, will be here on Monday to negotiate as a result of that stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we're all delighted to hear that the Premier will be negotiating with Mr. Pepin. The question that I ask the Premier is this: what is the position of the Saskatchewan government going into those negotiations? Is it the position outlined by the member for Weyburn that the farm can't pay a penny more, or is it the position put forward by several others, including yourself just now, saying that whatever extra the farmer pays it must be related to the price of grain? And those are two quite different positions and I would like to know what the position of your

government is.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, we've laid out the position and it's clearly in *Hansard*, the concerns the farmer and the farm organizations brought to us about the burden of cost. And we put it — we brought it to the floor of the legislature. It was unanimously passed by this House. And it's now being negotiated between the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Transport, federally, and I don't want to jeopardize anything that may go on between them on Monday. It's laid out clearly in the records of this legislature. I mean it's there. It's clear. The burden of cost is something that the farmer has to have some insurance that he can handle. And I can't add any more to that.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, would the Premier advise whether or not it is the position of his government that the farmer is not to pay a penny more, to use the phrase of the member for Weyburn? Is that the position?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — My preference is the following, and I've said it several times, I've said it earlier, and I'll reiterate it here: (1) the farmer shouldn't have to pay at all. The federal government should pay the whole shot. Under the Pepin plan, it looks like the farmer is going to pay a whole bunch. The farmer is saying, "We can't pay that." So they want to know they can have some assurance, either have some cost increases tied to the price of wheat or tied to traditional costs and transportation or something if they're going to be forced to pay. My preference is the federal government pays the whole thing. And I've said that many times. If they just unilaterally say, "No, the farmer is going to pay it all," then it's clearly a problem, and we've said no. So that's where it's at.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Premier. I read with very great care what you said in the House on Tuesday, and we look at an article and it says here: "Saskatchewan to Fight Crow." Saskatchewan to Fight Crow. I thought you were going to Ottawa to fight the Pepin plan. Did you change your mind? Have you got one story for Saskatchewan and another one for eastern Canada?

If I can have your attention, my question is: have you got one story in Saskatchewan, to say to the farmers not one cent more, or no trade at all, and then you go down to eastern Canada and negotiate with Pepin for the Pepin plan? I thought you were going to save the crow, not to fight the crow. Would you please respond to that. I get two stories from . . .

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Mr. Speaker, I didn't talk to Mr. Pepin when I was in Ottawa. I visited with several people and I spoke to the Canadian Club and I spoke to the national press corps. I did talk to people who were connected with eastern manufacturing and so forth and they have some concerns.

I will say it again. It's our preference all over Saskatchewan, and I'm sure on your side of the House as well as ours, that the farmer doesn't pay any more at all. We don't want them to pay. We can't afford to pay, particularly because it's a national transportation system. Their suggestion in their proposal says that we have to pay. So the farmer's coming back and saying, "Well if these fellows are going to do this in some unilateral fashion, we better be in on it, so that we know that we can afford any increases if they occur at all." And that's what you agreed to by passing it unanimously in this House.

The farmer has to have some protection against this burden of cost. We all agree to that. So what we're trying to defend is the farmer's right to have some protection against any costs that are unilaterally transported out, transferred on us, from eastern

Canada from the central government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — New question, Mr. Speaker. When this caucus voted with you on Tuesday, we voted to defeat the Pepin plan. We had a plan of strategy to defeat that and I appreciate your concerns and that's another question.

In the *Globe and Mail* just yesterday, the *Globe* reports you speaking to the national press conference and said: in a speech to the national press conference and "in answers to reporters' questions, Mr. Devine seemed to adopt a contradictory stance saying, the province wants a number of changes to the Pepin plan." Are you saying in Ottawa you want to change the Pepin plan, or are you saying you want no Pepin plan, that you are going to save the crow? Which is it? You have one story in Saskatchewan saying the farmers can't pay more, so that means save the crowrate. Here you are saying you want changes to the Pepin plan. That means there is built-in increased costs, period.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I guess what I want, if I can say, we want to change the Pepin plan so we don't pay. That's what we want to say. How's that?

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, I want one final supplementary, if I can get that through the Premier — one final supplementary. The only change to the Pepin plan is no Pepin plan, period. Leave the crowrate as it is. That means the farmer will know he has a guarantee. That's the motion we agreed to. The reasons you outlined why the crowrate should be maintained were in there. And that's it, period. You can't adjust a . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

MR. SPEAKER: — Would the hon. member ask his supplementary? And supplementaries do not authorize a speech. Would you please get on with your question if you have one?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — If they didn't carry it in the article, I was asked very clearly, "If there's no change, would you just scrap the plan altogether and leave things as they are?" And I said, "Yes, unequivocally."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I didn't write the article, but I was asked twice. Twice reporters came up and said, "If you don't get your concessions, would you say, Scrap the whole idea?" And I said, "Absolutely."

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Premier. When he was in Ottawa, did he have an opportunity to discuss this issue with Mr. Clark and Mr. Nielsen?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I didn't have the opportunity to discuss it with Mr. Clark, but I did meet with a large number of the Tory caucus for dinner. And we talked about the freight rates, about the crow, about energy, about water, etc.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, the question I direct to the Premier is a fairly specific one on what steps he took to get commitments from the Progressive Conservative caucus in the House of Commons.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — Well, I spent a fair amount of time explaining the unanimous proposal that came out of Saskatchewan. They thought it was a good proposal, a solid one. There were members of parliament there from, indeed, across the country, certainly from Ontario, Alberta, Manitoba and so forth. They thought it was a sound proposal, and they endorsed it. Now what they do with it in terms of their strategy I don't have that much control over, but I encouraged them to take it as far as possible.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is this. He will know that the Leader of the New Democratic Party has held a press conference announcing the support of his entire caucus in opposition to the Pepin plan.

What I am asking the Premier is this: may we expect a similar press conference at which Mr. Nielsen announces the opposition of his caucus to the Pepin plan in a similar way?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I doubt it. I can't dictate what the opposition will do in Ottawa from here in Regina. It is difficult to do, yes.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, just one final supplementary. No one was asking the Premier to dictate. We are asking him to use his powers of persuasion, and we are asking how he got along.

HON. MR. DEVINE: — We got along well. We have a nice dinner, shook hands a lot. We did talk about the fact that if it hadn't of been for the NDP we wouldn't even be in this position, because they supported it. We got along well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ENGEL: — New question to the Premier. Did you, when you met with the Tory caucus in Ottawa, plan some strategy and what steps they might take to stall the bill, and did they suggest that it's possible to carry on the debate at least up until when there's going to be a June break so we'd have more time to mount some support for it? Did they promise that kind of commitment that they'd at least fight it out, and see if they could carry it beyond June 30?

HON. MR. DEVINE: — I believe that the perception is, and the reality is, that Saskatchewan, as a province, is leading the fight against the Pepin plan. They are looking for leadership, and they appreciate the guidance and the leadership that this House has put together. They know we are mounting a lobby from coast to coast; and we are. They endorse that lobby. I would think that they realize, and many people do, that everybody is about two steps behind us in taking that fight to Ottawa.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to introduce to you, and to this House, a group of 25 students from Mossbank, Saskatchewan. They are led here by their teachers, Garth Ward and Dave Tauch, and their bus driver, Tod Binner. I hope you all show them a great welcome. I wish they'd have a good stay here, and I'm looking forward to meeting you in a few minutes.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. MR. PICKERING: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg in welcoming these students today. I understand a portion of them are from my riding in the northwest corner. I hope they enjoy their stay here and I look forward to meeting with them with the hon. member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg later on.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Funeral of Arthur Thibault

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I advised this House of the passing of Mr. Thibault, and I gave tentative arrangements with respect to the funeral. It has now been confirmed through the Clerk's office that the funeral will be at 10:30 a.m. rather than 10:00 a.m. as I earlier indicated, at the Roman Catholic Church in Wakaw, Saskatchewan, tomorrow, Saturday.

COMMITTEE OF FINANCE

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 19

Item 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would you introduce your officials, please?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would be happy to introduce my officials: my deputy minister, sitting with me to my left . . . Mr. Jim Hutch — Thanks. My mind went blank — My assistant deputy minister, Mr. Wayne Lorch; to my left at the back, Mr. Bryce Baron; behind me, Mr. Harvey Murchison; and to my right on this side at the back, Mr. Ken McNabb. How about that, eh?

MR. KOSKIE: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I want to begin in respect to the review of the department. I want to go back to the record of *Hansard* and quote the minister as he commenced the proceedings of the review of the Department of Industry and Commerce last year. I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, and I am quoting Mr. Rousseau:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know how much time we'll be spending on the estimates of industry and commerce. But if we went by the effectiveness of the department and the results of the department, I suppose we'd be here for about four minutes.

I want to say that that is an ideal beginning of the review of this department. I think that during the past year we have seen less action in the Department of Industry and Commerce than in the history of this province. But I want to, first of all, ask the minister to outline the basic philosophy of his department, and if he would comment on some of the results that he has been able to initiate as a result of the introduction of this somewhat apparently new philosophy that was introduced by his government.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I am going to take a little more than four minutes to reply to the hon. member's statement. He talks of no results in the Department of Industry and Commerce since April 26 (I think he said the last year, but we haven't been here quite that long) or so little action. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is with pride that I stand up today in this Assembly to inform the hon. member of some of the achievements of my department. The officials who are with me and all the others who work in that department . . . Never in the history of this government — and I don't only mean the one that's here today — has the Department of Industry and Commerce been as busy, and never has as much been accomplished as there has been in the last 10 months.

Just to give you an idea, Mr. Chairman, since last April 26, the province of Saskatchewan has 84 additional manufacturers. That's not quite right — there are more than that. That was one list. I can add to that another four or five. And those are only the ones that my department have been directly involved with, or that Sedco has been involved with as well, or in addition to. So it works out to about 90 additional manufacturers in the province of Saskatchewan. And never ever before has that number been achieved in that period of time.

Now, directly, these firms have created 504 additional new jobs. Indirectly, if we use a multiplier effect of two, we're looking at 1,000 more; if we're looking at four, we're looking at 2,000 more, and if we're looking at six (which may be a little high, admittedly), we'd be looking at 3,000 additional jobs created by my department.

In January alone of this year (and I'm sure the hon. member has these figures), there was an increase of 32 per cent in business corporations incorporated in Saskatchewan. Business names registered, there is an increase of 88 per cent. And that's making a comparison between what we've done and what your government did a year ago.

I said earlier those are only the ones that we were directly involved with. We don't know about all the others, but those statistics that I just quoted would give you some idea what is in fact going on in the province of Saskatchewan today.

Our government's aim, Mr. Chairman, is to ensure that the private sector leads the economic development of the province. And that's quite a departure from the philosophy of the previous administration. Goals of our government to increase employment — the quantity, the quality, the diversity, the stability. That in turn, Mr. Chairman, will broaden our tax base. The Government of Saskatchewan today will ensure that the proper environment is created to allow the development and the growth of the private sector to achieve these goals.

I'd like to take a few minutes, and I told the hon. member when I stood up that I'd take a little more than four minutes to reply to his opening remarks . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You'd better write then down, as well.

Mr. Chairman, today, even right today, we have the lowest unemployment rate in Canada, and it's two percentage points better than second-place Manitoba, which is an NDP government, a party the members opposite represent.

The latest labor force statistics show that Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island are the only provinces in Canada which can claim to have maintained total employment at the same level as last year. In every other province, total employment has actually

dropped. In spite of the recessionary times that we live in, we have maintained employment levels. As late as last November, that figure was dramatically different. As a matter of fact, there were 8,000 more employed in the province of Saskatchewan than a year before in the month of November of 1981.

We hope that that employment level, of course, will increase. We expect it to increase very shortly with the recall of 1,100 people by the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Just a few more statistics to indicate to the hon. member what my department is really doing, and not just my department but the Government of Saskatchewan. The hon. member should applaud rather than criticise our accomplishments. Saskatchewan's total housing starts in 1982, Mr. Chairman, increased by 37 per cent over 1981, when they were the government. In contrast, no other province west of Quebec will experience positive growth in total housing starts for the same period.

I've indicated to the hon. member what the department has been doing in creation of jobs, in the attracting of new industries, and the statistics I mentioned were strictly and only the manufacturing sector, not including service or retail or others. I'd like to announce to the hon. member that at the present time my department is actively working on a total of 86 new projects. With the estimated new jobs that these 86 projects will create — and I make no prediction that we will in fact accomplish all of those, but we are working on 86 at the present time — we're looking at a total employment of additional jobs of almost 3,000.

In addition to that we've commissioned a manufacturing opportunity study for all sectors, which is ongoing at the present time. We have also commissioned, under the auspices of the crown investments corporation, but which involves my Department of Industry and Commerce, an energy optimization study. We have a project on at the present time for identification of mining equipment manufacturing opportunities. The fourth one is import replacement, and the hon. member knows of the recent Saskatchewan manufacturing opportunities show which was held on February 1 and 2. We are now at the present time publishing or printing a catalogue to outline all of these products and the companies who manufacture. In co-operation with the Prairie Implement Manufacturing Association, Alberta, Manitoba and the federal government an export promotion of agricultural equipment is another project, and furthermore, the promotion of Saskatchewan for large eastern manufactures to manufacture here rather than ship equipment. We are working for assistance to smaller communities to identify in full economic development needs, and another one is the development of an investor information system.

Mr. Chairman, I will allow the member to respond to those comments, and if he wants to continue discussing the activities of my department, I'd be very happy to debate that with him all day long, and longer.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of comments in respect to the opening remarks by the minister. I think the minister must admit that he cannot take total credit, as he seems to, for some of the facts that he has alluded to in respect to the province of Saskatchewan having the lowest unemployment. I want to state unequivocally that when he inherited the government on May 8, the province of Saskatchewan was leading the rest of Canada. We had the lowest unemployment rate in all of Canada. We had the best growth in all of Canada, of any province in Canada. I want to say that we had had balanced budgets throughout the 10, 11 years that we

were in office. I want to say that we had the second lowest per capita debt in the nation. I want to say that he entered office on a base that no other government in Canada could ever inherit — a situation as favorable as what he inherited.

I want to also say, as he indicated, about 90 additional manufacturing plants in the province. I would also like to draw to the attention of the minister some statistics in respect to the bankruptcies during his period in office. In consumer bankruptcies in Saskatchewan from May 1, 1981 to January 1982, there were 195 consumer bankruptcies. From the period of May 1982 to January 1983, under the present government, there were 421 consumer bankruptcies — 116 per cent increase.

I want to say in respect to business failures during the period of May 1981 to January 1982, there were 117 bankruptcies. During the period of this government, May 1982 to January 1983, there were a total of 209 business bankruptcies in this province — a 79 per cent increase. I want to say to the minister that I undoubtedly welcome any initiatives which the department is taking in order to create job opportunities and opportunities for the business community in this province.

I want also to indicate in respect to that philosophy to which he is alluding, indicating to the people of Saskatchewan that it's going to be such a crashing success — this open for business policy. I want to say first of all that this policy of involvement of the private sector is not indeed a new policy. It has been tried not so long ago in this province, from 1964 until 1971. I want to say that while he seems to indicate they have a bright and new course of action, I want to draw to the attention of the minister a document which I have. It says, "Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan, Saskatchewan," and in black writing, "Open for Business." Now that was not a policy that was initiated by the Devine government. I want to say that if you open up this folder you will find, "Saskatchewan for Business." Guess who is the premier: Mr. Ross Thatcher.

I want to say to the Assembly that what we are having presented to us is a rehash of a policy that was tried from '64 to '71. That was a dismal failure, a dismal failure, to develop this province . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Ah, you're hurting, are you? I want to say that if you want to go through this pamphlet, I suspect that some of the terminology has been changed, but the philosophy is the same.

So, basically, what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that what the minister is alluding to is not a new philosophy. It is a philosophy that is inherited from the Anderson days, Premier Anderson in the province, never to return for 50 years. It is a policy that is copied from the former Premier, Mr. Ross Thatcher. It is a policy that is adopted with Reaganomics tied into it; it's a policy that goes to the state of Georgia, the Busbee plan, where the minimum wage is about \$3.35 and where the legislation in respect to labor is that individuals in the workforce are not compelled to join the particular union.

So I want to say, let us be clear on one thing. What you are spreading around is really a rehash of what failed in '64. And I think, when you look at the statistics of the bankruptcies and the failures in businesses, that it's evident that to date you have, indeed, been a great failure.

The minister indicated that he has some 90 additional manufacturing. What I would like is a list of those 90 new manufacturing plants that were established. Also I would

like him to indicate the date when the project, the manufacturing, was initiated. In other words, what I'm saying is, many of those manufacturing that you are alluding to, the 90, many of those were in progress at the time when you assumed government, because I know that you went to many of the openings shortly after you were elected, and took a lot of credit for a new manufacturing plant, when, in fact, all the plans had been laid and all that remained was the announcement.

Can the minister provide me with a list of those 90 manufacturing? Can he also give me a record of those in which the government was involved in commencing, or assisting in getting started? And, also, would he indicate in fact the first initiation with the government for the commencement of some of those plans?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, a few brief remarks before I reply to the questions he's asked. I wasn't aware of the document he produced. That's why I hollered across and asked who produced it, and he did confirm that it was certainly not a socialist government. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad he brought it out, glad that he showed this document in this Assembly to show that Saskatchewan was open for business before they came to power. Then they shut the door to all the businesses in Canada from coming into this province. That's what happened and that's why I wasn't aware of it, and I'm glad he brought it out. I'm glad he showed it to this Assembly to show that when they came to power in 1971 they closed the door and then said, "We will own everything. We don't want private sector investment in this province." And that's what they've been saying all along and that's diametrically opposed to what we want. That's completely opposite to what this government on this side wants. They'd turn around and they'd say, "Well, it's nothing new." Of course it's nothing new. It's nothing new for us. We want private sector investment in this province. They don't. Their philosophy, Mr. Speaker, was to have total state ownership, total state ownership in everything, from farms to businesses to airplanes to our homes to anything that they could put their hands on, it was going to be state ownership in that party.

We've taken a different approach and we're very proud of that fact. We're very proud of the fact that we have been saying to the business community, "We are open for business, and we welcome you and we'll put out the red carpet, and we'll cut out the red tape." That's what we've been telling the business community, and that's why the manufacturing companies and businesses that have established here since April 26 are coming to Saskatchewan. That's why. You may have been working on some of them before. Yes, I'll admit that, but they wouldn't come. You've been working on them for years and they wouldn't come . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . They moved out. Exactly — they moved out. We can talk about some of those examples of the ones that moved and left — all kinds of them — while you were in government. Ninety — I'm very proud of that fact that we established 90 new manufacturing. I will supply you with a list of those partly. I will tell the hon. member now, part of that list is confidential . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, if you want to accept it on a confidential basis, I'll send it to you on that basis.

Mr. Chairman, I will give the hon. member the list of 84 that I referred to from industry and commerce. It's not that one. That list is not confidential. The list that I'm asking him to keep confidential is the list from Sedco, all the loans and the amounts and so on and so forth. So if you understand that, then I will provide you with that as well, on a confidential basis . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay. Thank you. I have that assurance.

There was another part of the question . . . You talked about business failures. I'd like

to respond to your business failures. Since the beginning of May to the latest period available, I am informed that we are aware of 288 business failures in Saskatchewan. Now on, as a comparison period of time . . . I'll come to that in a minute. These include official bankruptcies, firms in receivership and branch plan establishments which have closed.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that this is considerably better than the national rate of failure. As reported in the latest figures, the business failure rate for Saskatchewan is only 0.83 per cent of the province's total businesses, which is half — please note — the national rate of 1.55 per cent. There are no accurate records available on jobs lost. Unfortunately we can't give you that information. Unemployment figures do not distinguish between job loss due to layoff or business failures. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the unemployment rate in Saskatchewan is still the lowest in Canada. An observation is that former employees are usually hired first when a new owner takes over a failed business, so again we don't know what that information is. Maybe the member would like to ask me something else; I'll find the other information in a minute.

MR. KOSKIE: — Just so that I'm clear, Mr. Minister, in respect to providing that information, I would like a list of those . . . You indicated that you would go on a confidential basis, and where Sedco is involved, certainly I agree with that. I would also, however, like to know the basic record of when these companies (which you claim credit for having got into operation) initiated the action and discussion with government, and at what stage they were in development at the time that the new government took over. Could you provide that information?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I believe we can provide that information, and I would be very happy to provide that information. Let me just make this comment. I'm afraid many of them were probably started eight years ago. The problem with what was happening, Mr. Chairman, is they were on the shelf; they weren't being closed, they weren't being brought in, they weren't being encouraged. And what we did, we took the list and said, "Let's get them. Let's bring them in here." We did that. We're working on another 100 — approximately, close to 100 — more. Some of the ones we're working on today were started then. Some projects have been going on for some years. Some are new since we've become the government.

The point to remember is that you can talk to thousands of businesses, you can talk to thousands of businessmen, about locating in Saskatchewan, but if you make it so difficult for them to locate here, they will never do so. That's what happened, and that's why they weren't coming to Saskatchewan. I think it's time the hon. members acknowledged that: that it was under their regime, under their administration, that the businesses were not coming to this province — cite plant after plant after plant, business after business, for that same purpose.

I'm going to confirm whether or not that date is available. I'm informed that that information is not available today. I can make it available to you at a later date, but we'd have to compile that information. We don't have it with us here. However, my officials tell me, if you want it we can get it to you.

I wanted to finish up the statistics on business failures in Saskatchewan, and I quoted a figure of 288 a little while ago, and I was a little high in that, unfortunately. In 1982 Saskatchewan had 252, not 288, and just for your information — I'm sure you have it, but I thought I'd get it on the record — Manitoba was at 347. I am also informed that as a

national increase, we were the lowest in Canada in the increase of business failures.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Minister, I just am somewhat surprised with your comments that Saskatchewan is so completely going to be turned around with your red carpet treatment to business.

I draw to the attention of the minister that you have I suppose what you would call the red carpet treatment in Alberta, and unemployment is rising and bankruptcies are increasing. I draw the attention to the minister that Ontario, the heart of the industrial heart of Canada, where they have a Tory government, a Progressive Conservative government, where the red carpet is out, as a consequence there are more and more business failures in Ontario. And I want to say that in contrast to those other provinces where unemployment is high, in other Tory jurisdictions, what you had here in Saskatchewan under a planned economic strategy of public and private investment was a record unequalled in Canada.

And so what I want to say: what do you intend to give to the business community, the so-called red carpet treatment, which is going to be more successful than Alberta, which has a higher unemployment rate than Saskatchewan? What red carpet treatment are you going to give to business which is more enticing than, say, Ontario or the other eight provinces? And I include British Columbia because that's an aberration there, a so-called Social Credit, really a Tory government. And certainly the red carpet is out in British Columbia.

So can you be more explicit? What are your particular plans for red carpet treatment? Set out in detail what in fact you are going to be offering the business investment community to come to the province.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Let me start out by saying, Mr. Chairman, that many, many investors, both from within Saskatchewan and from outside of Saskatchewan are coming forward to us, to the department, to my office and to my officials to discuss investing in Saskatchewan. Many of these, and I would go so far as to say, Mr. Chairman, that most of these, admit that they would not have considered meeting in Saskatchewan under the previous administration, but today they want to come and they are now coming forward and talking to us.

What we are doing for small businesses in Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman, is to make them feel at home. We are going to focus on economic growth in general and improve the climate for that growth, and that, Mr. Chairman, will help the small business. We intend to help Saskatchewan firms sell their products here at home, and abroad. We are helping them to get a larger share of government purchasing; we are helping them to take advantage of import replacement opportunities, and we're going to cut out a lot of the red tape that you created.

You know it's interesting — I just would like to comment on the import replacement opportunities — in the 11 years that the NDP were in government there was absolutely no attention paid, Mr. Chairman, to the import replacement opportunities in Saskatchewan. Their own crown corporations that they were so proud of, that they continually increased and expanded, were doing business with outside of the province of Saskatchewan people and outside of the country manufacturers and suppliers rather than encouraging those investors to come to Saskatchewan to sell to their own crown corporations. We are addressing that issue; we have been addressing it for some time, and we will continue to do so.

I would like to carry on a little bit more on what we're going to do for the business community in province of Saskatchewan. Perhaps — and I say perhaps, it's more than perhaps — I should say that this is the attitude that we're going to take. We will develop a tax and royalty regime which will provide the opportunity for fair business profits. In our dictionary, Mr. Chairman, profits is not a dirty word.

We will get business, labor, education and government communicating and working together. We will minimize the direct involvement of government in business activity. We intend to develop the infrastructure: utilities, transportation, research facilities and other public services. We will provide a high quality relevant educational capacity to meet the needs of Saskatchewan business, its labor force and its youth. We will reform the regulatory structure to remove unnecessary obstructions and encourage business investment by attracting investors and encouraging local businesses to expand. We will develop a data bank service in support of business investment. We will assist business in developing new export and local markets for Saskatchewan products and services including, I might add, the government purchasing. We'll assist business to improve productivity and expand by providing information on productivity and facilitating the availability of management and technical services.

Let me just add to that what we've already done to encourage the business community thereby creating new jobs, new wealth, and a new broader tax base. We introduced a new oil royalty and tax structure. We restricted the growth of the crown corporations. We eliminated the provincial gasoline tax. We've implemented a mortgage assistance program. In addition to that, we've implemented the build-a-home program.

In addition, I will add one more point. What the Department of Industry and Commerce is not going to be is what it was before. The Department of Industry and Commerce in the past under the administration of the NDP was there as bureaucrats for the purpose of filling out forms for very small grants and rebates to the business community, who by and large didn't either need it, or want it, or would have done so anyway without it. And that's where the efforts of industry and commerce were directed in the past. In the future, the efforts of industry and commerce will be to promote the province of Saskatchewan, to attract investors, to have dialogue with investors, to look for markets, to assist them in establishing and investing in their plant or building or whatever is required to make it more attractive, to make it easier for them to come to Saskatchewan, to locate here, to expand those that are already here and therefore to create jobs.

So there is the difference between what it was and what it's going to be. What it was was strictly for the purpose of looking for an extra vote by the NDP, by handing out very small ineffective rebates or grants. We don't intend to be in that position in the future. In the future this department will be doing what they should be doing, and that's selling.

MR. KOSKIE: — You've outlined some of the basic strategy but what amazes me is that that is the strategy I presume of Alberta and other Tory provinces, and I want to indicate that there seems to be a considerable lack of success throughout this nation . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, in Alberta. Indeed in Alberta. And I want to say that today, endorsed by the Progressive Conservative Party of Ottawa, and by the Premier of this province, is that government, the federal government, should increase deficits in order to stimulate jobs. And what you are doing is that the Premier is endorsing the federal government to get into the economic activities of creating jobs. In contrast, what you are saying that you are going to be able to achieve with this red carpet, feel-at-home feeling for the business people is a complete reversal and

rejuvenation of the economy here, which other provinces have been able to do. I would just like you to explain why you are so confident of your success, in view of the fact that even your Premier is urging the federal government to increase the deficit, providing it's used to create jobs.

I want to say that whether you agree with it or not our philosophy was a mixed economy. We felt always that there was a place for government, particularly when the economy went into a slump, and our budget tried to address that with a considerable amount of investment. Now you are taking, apparently, government completely out of any role in economic affairs. But at the same time your Premier is endorsing a larger budget deficit, Ottawa-wise, to create jobs. Can you clarify for me the thinking; do you have any explanation for these contradictory approaches?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is very simple. The answer to that is that we as a government will continue to take advantage, every advantage possible, for the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan. That may be the federal government spending some of their money, which it's time they did in the province of Saskatchewan, which they haven't done and which they didn't do when you were a government. A good example of that is the level of per capita grants received in the province of Saskatchewan for research and development, which was the lowest in Canada — the lowest. In other words, you never bothered to go after the grants available to create jobs and to provide research and development. You forgot about it.

You didn't want to be bothered with that because you had your own style of government, your own style of what you call a mixed economy. You talk about a mixed economy. You said you had a mixed economy, a mixture of both. Well, your mixture was, "Yeah, as long as you could own it all." That was your idea of mixture. You own it all or control it one way or another. That was your idea of mixture. It's not ours. Certainly there's a place for crown corporations, and I'd be the first to admit that. Of course there is. But not at the rate of acceleration that you people were heading into. That is absolutely the difference between what we think and what you thought, and probably still think today.

And let me say also, it isn't going to be easy; it isn't going to be easy, but it's the direction we're taking. And we're not going to turn around 44 years of socialism overnight. We've got no intention of being able to turn that around overnight. Forty-four years of socialist thinking by your party over there have been drilled into your minds, and you've been brainwashed with it. It's not going to happen overnight, but we're making progress and we are going to take the steps.

We've already done it: we have created the jobs; we have maintained a lot more than any other province in Canada; we have brought in more manufacturing already in Saskatchewan to date than you ever thought was possible. Sure you talked, and you may have had discussions, but you had no action, and that's the difference between what you guys did and what we intend to do over here. We are getting the action, and that just hurts.

MR. KOSKIE: — Before we leave this area, I just want to say . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . If you want to stay with it, I'll tell you Mr. Minister. If one looks at the history of the development of this province, this province was built on the individual initiative of the people of this province. It was built by them banding together to form co-operatives throughout this province — the wheat pool, the credit union, and the co-op movement.

I want to say that it was built with the co-operation of all those segments co-operating together, including the business community of this province. I want to say that much has been achieved. I want to say this is a marked departure from the history of the development of this province, that is, the co-operative movement, the business community, that we have here presently. Throwing that essentially aside to the international investors, I will tell you, is not going to be very well-received in Saskatchewan.

You know, he talks about how they had an open for business conference and they brought in the international financiers. One small promise was made in the Tory election campaign by the now Minister of Industry and Commerce. He said he would provide the business community with 9.625 per cent interest like the T. Eaton Company in the downtown development. I want to say that I have asked him a couple of times, at least once or twice. "Under review." I am saying that here he has not even kept a firm commitment to the business community of carrying out that election promise. Now he is talking about a red carpet treatment to the international financiers. Can the minister indicate whether he intends to carry out the policy of the interest rate to business at 9.625 per cent and when?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member talks about the province being built by the people of Saskatchewan and he is absolutely right. Of course that's right. There is no better statement to be made by members opposite. He should have added to that, that last year they forgot that. That's what happened to them. That's why there are only eight of them over there. They forgot that it was the people of Saskatchewan who built this province. They thought they had done it. The people of Saskatchewan finally told them, in no uncertain terms, that it wasn't that party, but it was the people of Saskatchewan who built this province. They may have stopped the growth — the members opposite — they may have stopped the growth, but they certainly didn't build it. It was the people of Saskatchewan who built it. That's right.

You talk about the co-operative movement. Let's talk about that. It was I in this House, three years ago or four years ago, who said (I'll paraphrase what I said) that there is no better form of free enterprise than the co-operative movement, and that's a fact. You may disagree with that. You may not like to think that, but that's a fact. They are free enterprisers. We will support that movement as long as we are a government and as long as we have the philosophy that we have.

The biggest efforts to be made by my department will not be for international investors, but will be for the small business community of Saskatchewan because they are here. They are the builders. They are the ones who built this province, and they will be the ones who will build it from now on and they will expand it. That's where the efforts, in large part, will be directed by the officials of my department, to the 30,000 small businessmen of this province, including the co-operative movement. The members opposite should remember that it wasn't them, it wasn't their party, because the people of Saskatchewan told them at the last election. It wasn't the NDP that accomplished; it was the people of this province. We know it. An evidence of that is the 56 elected members of this House on this side.

In reply to your nine and five-eighths program, yes, let me say that we delivered on all of our major programs, or campaign promises. We have not delivered on our nine and five-eighths as yet, but we will. You have my assurance it will be done.

Unfortunately, there were some areas of priorities that our government had to look at.

The program that we instituted, for example, on the home building — the \$3,000 grant — that was a priority over and ahead of the nine and five-eighths. The oil royalty structure changes that were made was a priority, because of the situation of the oil industry in this province as created by your party when you drove them all out of here. When it was down to 40 per cent activity, we had to do something about that to get them back to work, and today there's 100 per cent activity in the oil industry. All right? . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Which do you want?

We'll deliver our nine and five-eighths program. You took that nine and five-eighths money. You didn't care about the people of Saskatchewan, the small businesses of Saskatchewan. You took that \$45 million and sent it to Toronto. That's where you put your money — at 9.625 per cent when everybody else was paying 15. So that's the difference between what you people did and what we're doing. Yes, we will deliver the nine and five-eighths as outlined in our campaign promise.

AN HON. MEMBER: — When?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — In due course, and before too long.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, the minister is the Minister of Industry and Commerce and therefore responsible for stimulating business and industry in the province. He's been that for nine months. Can he tell me whether or not the number of people employed in the non-agricultural labor force has gone up or down during this period of nine months?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I believe it has gone down.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Indeed it has . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, you can get the figures. It's down about 10,000. The question I ask is: is the minister aware of any other similar period in the last 10 years when the non-agricultural labor force went down?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — It will take us a little while to get the statistics here, Mr. Chairman. They are all broken down. All I can tell you is that the total employment, January 1983, versus 1982, is exactly the same, 415,000. The non-agricultural is down by 10,000. Therefore, everything else is up by 10. I don't have that information at hand at this point.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — That's just about right, what we've seen, and I think we all know what's happening. I can't recall the figures from mine, but it's about 79,000 agricultural labor force last year, and about 89,000 this year, roughly. And what we see is people going back to the farm because they can't get jobs in the city and the town, and they work. Nothing wrong with it. It's better than having them unemployed, but as soon as there are jobs they'll come off the farm again, and that was the history in the 1970s.

Nobody believes that we need 10,000 more people to operate our farms in January of 1983 than we did in January of 1982. Nobody believes that. People have gone back to the farm. They're doing some useful work, and that's better than being on welfare, better than joining the other people on unemployment insurance and welfare, but it's not as good as having a paying job in the city or the town, as they will demonstrate as soon as there are paying jobs in the city or the town. They will move off the farm, to numbers of 5,000 to 10,000 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, we will see about

that, whether or not there will be any more operating farms.

The member for Weyburn is asserting that a year from now there will be more census farms in this province than there are now, and we'll be watching to see whether that trend does or does not continue. And if the member for Weyburn and others will put their prestige on the line in saying the number of census farms is going to go up and not down, then we will be very interested in the results over a four- or five-year period . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, a better record now meaning only 8,000 lost instead of nine or something. Good for him. I want to respond to a couple of arguments by the member for Regina South who seems to want to create the idea that there are a whole lot more government employees in this province than there are in other provinces. Oh, the crown corporations are into everything. How are they into everything without employees? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I'm glad the member is not making that point because the statistics simply don't bear him out. The facts are that with our government employees, with our crown corporation employees, we don't have as many people who work for the government and its crown corporations per capita as does the province of Alberta. We don't have as many people who work for the government as the province of Alberta does, taking the government in the broad, taking it in the narrow — split it any way you like, and on a per capita basis. Obviously we wouldn't have as many, but the all-in number in Saskatchewan is about 31,000 and the all-in number in Alberta is about 81,000. And we are certainly just about half Alberta's population.

One looks at a place like Nova Scotia — Tory government there — where they have a total labor force of 306,000 of which 27,000 work for the government. And we have a total labor force of 430,000 of which 31,000 work for the government. We have got not quite twice as many and just a few more government employees.

So the idea that there isn't a great role for the private sector in this province is not true. There are a great number of private sector jobs here; they grew enormously in the last 10 years and I hope they will grow at a similar rate in the next 10 years, but we don't see much evidence of it. It's not much point to talk about what a great thing it would be if there were more private sector jobs unless you deliver some more private sector jobs, and that you're not doing. On your own admission, the number of private sector jobs in the last nine months has gone down by about 10,000. And that's not very impressive. It's not very impressive . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, we all know that there is a recession in Canada. We freely concede that. But there was a recession in Canada last year. There was a recession in Canada last year. This is not something that has arrived . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, it wasn't in Saskatchewan. That's right. The member for Meadow Lake is quite right that we didn't need to talk about a recession in Saskatchewan because we didn't have a recession in Saskatchewan in the sense that private sector employment was still growing in Saskatchewan, but private sector employment is no longer growing in Saskatchewan.

Now you may argue that, oh, the recession just happened to coincide with the coming of the Tory government. That may be. But others are less charitable and suggest that the actions of the Tory government had something to do with it. And when you go around and ask, let's say architects around this city, how things are going . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . And he told you, if he was frank, that 1982 was one of the worst years he's had in practice . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We are talking about . . . This is certainly a farm Friday when they expect that healthier animals are going to make jobs for architects.

AN HON. MEMBER: — Building feedlots.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I think I'll just allow the member for Weyburn to make his speech and then I'll get in. What I'm really saying is this: you are not doing a good job of creating employment. You have done a bad job on the record. And your policies are not such as likely to create very many. Sure, we hear about lots of things going to happen. But it's time that some of these things begin to happen.

We had the Minister of Industry and Commerce going off to Europe and telling us in this House that he was going to sell some steel and some coal and some potash. I think it would be useful if he would report to this House now just how much steel, how much coal and how much potash he sold as a result of his trip. And no doubt I'll get an answer saying, "Oh, we got commitments for everything, all the widgets you can think of." But what I'm simply asking him now is: are there any additional orders for steel or coal or potash as a result of his trip to Europe?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition doesn't like to understand or accept what is being told to him. Unfortunately you were not in the Assembly when I started earlier today, but just let me reiterate again what I indicated to the hon. member behind you.

Since we have taken office we have some 90, give or take a couple, that we are aware of, because we were directly involved in new manufacturing plants starting up in Saskatchewan — new ones, not expansions. That's a record which you can't claim nor did you have it when you were in. Give me the figures.

You talk about government employees; I don't know why you did. In fact, you lost me on that because I wasn't referring to government employees. I was talking about government attitude — your party's attitude. In your statement (and I can't recall exactly what it was that we were talking about), government employees vis-à-vis the private sector . . . What you did with your attitude, in fact, was discourage the private sector from coming to Saskatchewan. I can give you many, many examples of that.

Also from your actions, you talk about the economy in 1982. You had 11 years to decide on a water pipeline for Regina, for example, and every year you promised it when you campaigned. You never did anything about it; you never did anything about it. Those were jobs that Ipsco people, who today are laid off, could have had if you had moved at the right time. It didn't take us that long to move on it; we moved on it very quickly.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes, yes, yes! It didn't take us 11 years to take action on that. You were the people who built up the inventories and the stockpiles in the potash industry and killed the markets. When we arrived they were gone . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I grant you, in addition to the economy of the time. Not everybody recognizes that, and I am sure you do as well. Those were jobs that were lost; not permanently, but temporarily, yes. It's part of the recession. Of course we are down in jobs in the manufacturing sector, or non-agricultural sector as you call it, which includes government, which includes everything else. But in the 11 years that you had the opportunity to build you didn't do a damn thing about it. Excuse me, I withdraw that.

You created the situation that was here when we arrived — the stockpiles at Ipsco. You knew when you ran in the election what was going to happen to Ipsco; you knew that. There was information given to you way before you called the election. You could have done something while you were government, but you didn't take any action in that respect at all. Did you lobby the federal government to give us our fair share of the grants for locating in Saskatchewan or for development research? No. The lowest in Canada. These are things that create jobs. You expect us to do 180 overnight, after 11 years of your mismanagement. That's what you are saying; you've had 10 months to increase it. When every other province in Canada has gone down, total employment I'm referring to now — and we would at least maintain.

I don't know why you want it. We have done, in my opinion, a better job in industry and commerce than had ever been done before. My officials tell me (the figures that I have quoted) that the attitude has changed within that department because now they're there to do the jobs that they should be doing, not for the sake of seeing what kind of a grant can we give over here so that it might buy us a couple of votes. You had the people of industry and commerce buried under paperwork for the purpose of rebates, grants — paperwork. They did nothing else . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Yes, I went to Europe. The words of selling potash and steel were yours, by the way, not mine.

AN HON. MEMBER: — No, yours.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — You're taking that out of context because I recall what I said when you asked a question in question period, "What are you going to sell?" I think I replied something along the lines of, "Well, the hon. member obviously forgets what we have in Saskatchewan — what we have." That's right. We have all these things. I didn't say I was going to go out and sell steel to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay. Show me where I said that. I didn't say that. As I say, you're taking that out of context.

So, I will continue to search out markets and investors. I know you don't like international investors coming into Saskatchewan. You've said that many times. You don't like them. In fact, when they get here, you kick them out. You did it with the potash takeover and you've done it in other cases. You don't want them here. That's obvious. Well, that's your position. It's not ours. Our position is that we welcome investors. Let me tell you why we welcome investors, whether they be international or whether they be Canadian or whether they be local, who are also Canadian.

We want them because whenever we get a new company coming into this province we get their capital, we get their technology, and they create jobs and wealth. That wealth is taxed so that we can provide the services that we as a government want to provide. That's why we want investment. I don't put any tag to what kind of investment. I don't say that it should be only Canadian. I welcome international investments with open arms, and I always will. They can come to Saskatchewan and live under our rules and regulations and laws and become good corporate citizens like anyone else.

The people of this province were from other parts of the world at one time or another. I myself am an import into Saskatchewan. I will continue to welcome others to this province, particularly, I say to the hon. member, those young people who left when you were the government because they couldn't find anything here. Why is it that every other province in Canada has, in some cases, doubled their population? Ours is down from what it was 50 years ago because of attitudes. We feel that way. We say that as

long as we're a government, we'll continue to attract investments; we'll continue to market our products to the best of our ability by creating trade offices. There are many reasons for my trip to Europe. Some of them . . . Some successes already. We located people who are willing to work for us in Europe in trade and trade offices. We have companies who are interested in coming who have made applications to FIRA, to DREE, and I can't give you that information. You know full well that I can't give you that information. That information is very, very confidential until such time as the federal government approves any applications for FIRA or for DREE.

I might also want to tell you this: I've had three trips to date, since minister, to Ottawa, to meet with my colleagues and the other ministers in Canada and my federal counterpart. And in each case I've asked, and we've all, except for one minister, being your minister from your party, asked for a two-year hoist on FIRA so that we can tell the business community from around the world that we welcome their investments and their technology that we need in Saskatchewan to create the jobs. I'll continue to pressure the federal minister for that. We will continue to do that. We've asked him to make many changes. Some we were encouraged with. Some changes are coming about, and it is only through that kind of pressure that we'll achieve a change in attitude with the federal government, and perhaps maybe even, let's hope, a change in attitude on your part.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, we all I'm sure are happy to hear about the attitudes and welcomes, and this sort of thing. But people can't eat attitudes. They need jobs. In the last 10 years there was an average of 9,000 new jobs a year created in this province. Do you think you will achieve that in calendar year 1983?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, I hope we can achieve many more than that in the year 1983. I don't know that. I don't know how successful we will be in our attempt. I don't have any guarantees that they are going to — all of a sudden tomorrow I'm going to — have General Motors build a plant in Saskatchewan, and I use that because it's not that far out. So, no. I hope the answer to your question will be many times that number, and I'm going to be working toward achieving many times that number. Our success will depend on many things, including the economy. But certainly, if we fail in it, it won't be because of a lack of attitude by my department, or a desire of trying, or a desire of bringing them in, because never before has my department in its history been as anxious to get involved with the job that industry and commerce should be involved with as they are today.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister, I know, as I say, I've no doubt that the minister believes it's all a matter of attitude. Most of the businessmen I talked to, when they've tried to decide whether they'll put up a plant, are interested in attitude, but they're interested in the profit potential a good deal more. The facts are that people aren't making money with their businesses in Saskatchewan this year. They're not making a whole lot of money. I'm not saying that they're all losing or anything like that, but, by and large, this is not going to be a profitable year compared with three years ago, say.

And the minister has talked about investment. Will he tell this House that he believes that investment in capital goods in 1983 will be as high as it was in, let us say, 1980, in constant dollars? Will this attitude lead to capital investment, or will it not? And I think that's the key. We want to hear his projection of whether or not capital formation in this province, capital investment in this province, in 1983 will be as high in constant dollars as it was in 1980.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I have dollar figures, but let me advise the hon. member of this fact: a recent federal report, I believe put out by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in Ottawa, estimates that while capital spending in Manitoba and Alberta will increase 2 per cent and 6 per cent respectively, in 1983, it will increase by 13 per cent in Saskatchewan in 1983.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, we're not interested in comparisons with 1982, which was perhaps the worst year that Saskatchewan had in a long time. Increase over 1982 is not very impressive. I don't want to use 1982 as my bench mark, but I will use 1980 as my bench mark.

AN HON. MEMBER: — A good year.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — You're talking about that terrible 10 years. Pick any of the last five, if you like. Any time since 1975, pick a year. But I'm picking 1980, and how are you doing, compared with 1983?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, first of all, I don't have the figures for 1980. But if we consider that other parts of Canada suffered even worse in 1982 than we did, then I say to you that the job of 2 per cent in Manitoba, which is run by your party, over a supposedly worst scenario — worst year ever — in 1982, then a 2 per cent increase in 1983, as compared to our 1982, which wasn't nearly that bad, or nearly as bad as anywhere else in Canada and is going to be up by 13 per cent, I think is very significant. I think that's very positive. I think we're moving in a darn good direction when we look at that increase, that improvement.

I don't know what 1981 was. Maybe you don't want to talk about 1981; I don't know. But I'm not interested in 1980-81. I'm interested in today. I'm interested in progress, in positives. I think 13 per cent increase over 1982 is very positive. So why don't you make comparisons with 1929? I don't know. What difference does it make?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Then would he tell us, since he's got the figures there, what the increase in 1982 was over 1981, because obviously if we had a decrease, then a 13 per cent increase over '82 is not very much. I just had the one that suits your purpose. It wasn't fair enough.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — If the hon. member wants me to have my officials bring the statistics for the last four or five years, I'd need a wheelbarrow and a couple of trucks in here. So these estimates are for the current year. Let's be reasonable. I'll provide you what I can, but let's be reasonable.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, the minister is busy saying how bad things were in the past, and how good they're going to be in the future, and we ask how. Right? Tell us how they were in the past and how they are in the future. You say, "I don't have any statistics for the past. We're talking about the future." Well, I think if I were you I'd talk about the future too, and I wouldn't want to compare with the past.

But the facts are that capital formation has been high in this province for the last five years. You have done worse in 1982 than we did previously in either capital formation or job creation. That's true with respect to outside capital as well. The minister has to face the facts that during many of those years in the late 1970s and early 1980s, a

great deal of capital came into this province from other places. And what you have to do is not say you're welcoming it, but get the stuff in here. Get it creating jobs. And if you'll tell us the figures I'll sit down and listen.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I don't know whether this is what you're looking for, but I'll give you the figures on new investment. How's that . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Would that help you? Okay. 1980. I have it. New investment in Saskatchewan was \$3.324 billion. In 1981 you had an excellent increase that year. You went to 4.143 billion. In 1982, which you claim was so bad, 4.207 billion — higher than 1981, significantly higher than 1980. And we're talking about a 13 per cent increase in 1983.

Now, new construction. And I have those. In 1980, \$1.874 billion; in 1981, 2.340 billion; in 1982, 2.371 billion, an increase again . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, an increase. But you were here. You're the one that said 1982 was so bad. We were a lot better than what you were, unless I'm reading something wrong. I'll send it over to you if you want to look it over.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Well, I'll be happy to have the figures, but it's interesting that he would think that a couple of per cent increase is in fact an increase when we're facing 10 per cent inflation. I asked for constant dollar figures . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Yes, that's right. And the proof of the pudding is in the fact that you are not creating the jobs, and you are not getting the investment. Our construction industry is down, as you well know. The job creation is down, as he well knows. And the manufacturing sector is down, as he well knows. As he well knows, the employment and the manufacturing sector is significantly down . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

The hon. member suggests that what we should do in the face of clear difficulty with our economy is pretend that all is well, and criticize anyone who suggests problems on the grounds of purveyors of doom and gloom. I think it's not a case of purveying doom and gloom, but having a little realism and not believing that things are changed by saying, "Well, we've got a new attitude." We will get business in here when they can make some money, when profits go up. And that's what we need to have.

The government has a role in promoting profit for private business. The government has a role, and I hope you don't deny that.

AN HON. MEMBER: — You're repeating my words.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — That's right and why aren't you then getting out there and building some buildings so that the private sector can make some profit? Why aren't you building a technical institute at Prince Albert, for example? Why aren't you doing many of the things which have created the profitable climate that private business has enjoyed in this province? Why are the number of bankruptcies double what they were last year? Because they aren't making a profit. That's pretty obvious. Why aren't they making a profit? Partly because the government is not acting in any way to stimulate the economy. And we are simply asking the minister, who is pursuing his particular philosophy of encouraging outside investment . . . Fine. No one is objecting to that. What we are saying, however, is that that is not enough. The government must continue to take steps to create jobs, and I'll be interested to see whether in the budget that the Minister of Finance brings down in a month or so, we're not hearing about what I am

saying, that the government is taking steps to create jobs.

And I think that that ought to be said by this government. They ought not to pretend that the government can withdraw from the economy and that the private sector will somehow create these jobs. It has not happened before, and it's not going to happen again. The combination of some government activity and a great deal of private sector activity has created close to 10,000 new jobs every year in the 1970s. Every year. That's an average. Now we are not doing that. Now, everyone is saying, "Oh! it's the recession." They say that the agriculture industry is going well, but we've got a recession. The oil industry is going better than it ever did, but we've got a recession . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Yes. I don't know where all this recession is. We had the greatest crop in the history of Saskatchewan in 1982 . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . And that's right. In no way is that a responsibility of the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. Will you allow the member to make his point?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, my point is that the government is pleading recession in the face of the best crop this province ever had. They are pleading a recession in the face of an oil industry which they say is booming. And a simple look at our provincial statistics will show that by far the largest generators of economic activity in this province are the agricultural industry and the oil industry. And both of them are supposed to be doing well. And yet, the minister is standing and saying, "No, we're not creating jobs because it's the recession. No, we're not doing well, because of the recession." And the recession is in Ontario. But why should there be a recession in Saskatchewan, when we've had the greatest crop in history, and when allegedly our oil industry is booming? What is the excuse for a recession in those circumstances? And yet, that is trotted out as the reason for the dismal performance of the government during 1982.

And we're hearing it again. And we're hearing that all of this is going to change because of attitude. Well, what I think the people of Saskatchewan would like to see is not a change in attitude, but a change in performance. Nothing wrong with a change in attitude if you want to go that way. But the . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . No, I don't want you up here but . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Oh, who is waving you, who is waving you? Mr. Chairman, I would really have to be scraping the bottom of the barrel if I needed as a debating adversary the member for Moosomin . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, we have the member for Moosomin making his contribution as usual from his seat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — My point is this: you do not have the makings of a recession in this province when the agricultural industry has had its greatest crop in history and when the oil industry, as I am told, is booming. Yet you are trotting out that recession as the reason for your poor performance. The member for Regina North West keeps saying that we are the only province in Saskatchewan to do this or to do that, the only province in Canada . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Okay, Mr. Minister? I was confused as to who was the minister for a moment.

AN HON. MEMBER: — There is no mistake about who the minister is.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Yes. My point is this: you have not created jobs at a time when the two basic industries in this province have, according to your figures, been doing

well. What do you anticipate would happen if either of those industries fell into some difficulties? What steps is your government proposing to take other than “changing attitudes” in order to get something going in this province so that businessmen can make some money?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, it really astounds me how short a memory the member opposite has. Forty years of listening to the rhetoric . . . (inaudible) . . . in this province, 40 years that you had to do something about it, to change the face, and the attitude, the climate, and the economic trends of this province, and you did nothing.

Let me just quote you or cite you some statistics. The number one ranking of the economic sector is manufacturing or processing — in every province in Canada except Saskatchewan. In Saskatchewan it's agriculture. In Saskatchewan, manufacturing and processing ranks eighth in the economic sectors. In 40 years of your administration or your party's philosophy you did nothing to change the drawers of water and hewers of wood attitude of this province. You've stuck to the primary industries and shipped everything out raw without any regard to processing and manufacturing in the province of Saskatchewan. Consequently, today, shamefully, we are eighth. We rank in our economic sector eighth in Canada. Okay, all right, you don't know what that means. Agriculture is number one — GDP in Saskatchewan. Manufacturing and processing is number eight. In all other provinces, that sector in number one. That would have created jobs. That would have created a different economic climate for this province, but you did nothing to improve on that sad state of the economy.

Now you talk about the recession of Saskatchewan, that we're blaming, or we're crying “recession” in the losses of jobs. Again, we have some 70 manufacturers of short-line equipment in Saskatchewan. Every one of them is suffering; every one of them has had some layoffs, not because of the agricultural economy of Saskatchewan, not because we've had a bumper crop in Saskatchewan. I am sure you are aware of the Australian situation and the American situation, which was the market which we could have improved on, or held our own on, or increased or whatever. Those things happen there. A large part of the sales of those manufacturers are for those other countries. The same situation occurred in many other parts of the world. The hon. member is well aware of that.

You ask: why are we building? Again, I come back to what you didn't do. Yet, as an example, every time you had an election, in 1971, in 1975, in 1978 . . . I don't see the hon. member for Regina North East here, for example. Your previous minister kept promising a new high school for that area at election time, but it was never committed after you became government. It was soon forgotten, the same as the promise you made in an election for the P.A. technical school or for other high schools. After the election we said we would do it, and we are going to do that. We are going to build the technical school. We are going to build four new high schools. I am not too sure that we'll build too many new office buildings . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Exactly.

We're looking to the future, for the training of our young people in education — yes, a lot more than you ever committed to, except the commitments you made during the political campaign which you never lived up to after you became the government. But in every election since 1971 you promised a high school in Regina North East, including the last election of 1982. Let's not get sanctimonious about those buildings which you kept promising but never delivered on, other than the Taj Mahals, a few of those which you built for your own crown corporations.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's very fruitful to talk about the rewriting of history which the member seeks to do. The promises of the New Democratic Party are fortunately all there in writing. Everyone can see them, and we can see whether or not we lived up to them. Your manufacturing of new promises doesn't accomplish much. However, I was really interested in one little aspect. You said there are 70 short-line machinery companies in the province. What was the number in 1971?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Do you really expect me to have that information at hand? I am sure you know what it is, so why don't you tell us?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — All I know is that during this period of desolation in which nothing happened, the employment in the short-line farm machinery industry in this province increased by about five times, a little more than five times, with many, many new companies starting in the manufacturing sector — something that wasn't achieved in the pre-1971 period after the open for business conference by the last right-of-centre government. We've had the changes in attitude before, but they didn't produce any jobs in the short-line farm machinery business. There were some; I'm not denying that. I'm just saying that if you look at the figures you will see that the employment in the manufacturing of short-line farm machinery from that period increased by about five times with many new firms. I don't suppose the minister can deny that because it's true.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I can't deny it, because I don't know. I don't have the statistics here from 1971. I don't think the hon. member would expect me to have them.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I don't expect the member to have the statistics but I do expect him, or his officials, to know the general trend of the short-line farm machinery industry in the last 10 years, because it is certainly one of the areas where we have a real potential. I think we all know that there is a real potential in this province for manufacturing for the prairie basin market, that the short-line farm machinery people have — with some assistance from the government, but basically out of their own initiative — developed interesting markets right down the centre of the United States, right down to Texas. There are many, many short-line farm machinery manufacturers in this province who market 35 per cent, 40 per cent, 45 per cent of their product into the United States right down to Texas.

This is a very promising thing. We were delighted to see that growth. I think that we can hope for more growth as the agricultural industry in North America picks up. We acknowledge that it's in a low state, but I don't think it helps at all to suggest that nothing has happened, that there hasn't been growth, that the Degelmans and the Morrisises and the Leons of this world have not grown in the last 10 years, when in fact they had remarkable growth. Many of the smaller ones did as well. So, we're delighted at that. It came about with the right attitude. Something was right. Something was right when industries increased five-fold in 10 years. So, I think that they got government encouragement: some of them got government loans; some of them got assistance in marketing their product.

No one, I think, can go to the farm progress show up at the exhibition grounds here in Regina without realizing that there has been an enormous advance in manufacturing in this province. We would like to think that that will continue under your government. I know of no reason why it won't, but there has been no absence of attitude in

encouraging people to get into industrial production in the past.

Accordingly, my comment is this: don't assume that the attitude was terrible in the past and a simple change of attitude will make things blossom. There were lots of positive things happening in the past. You believe that your attitude will make even more positive things happen — fine. But my comment to you is: don't assume that attitude will do it all. Profit potential is the key, and you as a government must create the conditions as best you can, admittedly operating in a Canadian and North American context, to allow people to make money. When they have a long-term profit potential, they will invest. When they don't, they won't. And it doesn't much matter how many conferences one has, or how attitudes change, it is profit potential which determines industrial development.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I am delighted, absolutely delighted, to hear the Leader of the Opposition talk about profits. That's the first time I've heard that party over there say that profits were decent, weren't . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, I'm very happy to hear that.

I want to tell the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, that . . . As I said earlier, I don't have the statistics from 1971. I do have them for now, and I will be looking at them very seriously in the future. One of the things that the member doesn't acknowledge is the potential that exists even today, and has existed in Saskatchewan, for increasing that many more than five times, if he says five times, and I won't argue the figures because I don't know.

There is a billion dollar market, there is a billion dollar market for the short-line equipment in western Canada. Saskatchewan today manufactures less than 15 per cent of that, or sorry, about 15 per cent. Some of that is exported. So in other words, there is some \$900 million worth of short-line equipment coming into Saskatchewan that's being manufactured elsewhere. So there is a market that you haven't really scratched the surface of, and you know, that's what we're saying. That's what we're saying.

You can cite and talk about examples, sure. They sap off a potential. But you know, you should be more careful about how you talk about profit potentials, or profitability for companies, because it didn't help the business community around the world when you took the attitude that you took back in 1974 and 1975. I'm talking potash. You know, you chased them out. You chase one out and it affects many more. And that's one of the things you forgot about when you did that. You chase them out; you say, "We don't want you here; we're going to take it." Many other companies who may have come to locate, even under your philosophy, stayed home. In every city that I visited while I was in Europe, that was the hue and cry: "What's your attitude? Because we haven't been welcome there, and we wouldn't come there."

That's the difference. And we're going to address the problem of businesses and jobs, and that's a very important facet of this department. When I talk about the new industries and new manufacturing that came into Saskatchewan since April 26, I'm proud of that. And there are going to be many more. Some of them did come because of attitude. Some of them you did talk to before. You were defeated at the polls, but they wouldn't have come if you had been re-elected. And I think you must admit that.

Well, I hope you will continue to take the approach and the attitude that you've taken today, that you want to see companies make profits, because you haven't had that

attitude in the past. I hope you will continue to take that attitude. One only has to dig out a few statements by your leader in Ottawa about profits to remind you of what the philosophy of your party is, has been. Continue with your attitude on profits; we'll both benefit from it. And that's what it's all about.

So, we'll continue to encourage and develop programs, not necessarily grant system, not necessarily handouts, but programs, positive, strong programs, to attract industry into Saskatchewan and to have those that are here expand, create jobs, profits.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — How many new manufacturing plants did you say had been established since you came to office? What was the figure?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Ninety.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Ninety.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Eighty-four in the last . . . Did I send that list over?

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — Yes.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I was going to send it over. I'll be sending it over — the list. Apparently the member behind you has it.

HON. MR. BLAKENEY: — I'll leave it at that, then.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay this a lot longer. I wish I could share the apparent optimism of the minister. But I ask him: how does he square that with the facts that the Leader of the Opposition indicated, that during your first 9 or 10 months there has been a decrease of 10,000 jobs in the manufacturing? When you look at the Conference Board of Canada's report, they indicate that the economic growth in Saskatchewan will be the lowest anywhere in Canada, lower than Prince Edward Island. And I know the Premier has alluded to it, that in fact the Conference Board of Canada is indeed all wrong.

I'd like the minister to do two things. One is to indicate whether he has analyzed the Conference Board of Canada's report, and to indicate clearly and concisely why he believes that the conference board prediction is not in fact valid. I'll leave it at that and let you . . .

The Conference Board of Canada has indicated that the Saskatchewan economy will have the lowest rate of growth of any province in Canada. I think you are aware of that report. And what I'm asking is: will the minister, if he disagrees with the Conference Board of Canada prediction, will he indicate clearly and concisely where he disagrees with that conference board report and does he have a basic prediction of the growth in Saskatchewan?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be responsible for the predictions of the Conference Board of Canada, number one. They predict the growth that you're talking about on top of the, for example, record crops that we had in 1982. It's difficult to predict that those crops would be even higher again in 1983. And they

may well not be. They may well not be. Which in turn affects — it's a rippling effect that it has on the whole economy, whether it be minerals, service, manufacturing, or what have you. It has . . . (inaudible) . . . and I think the member knows that very well. I think predictions are one thing, and facts are another. And next year at this time we'll have to have a look and see what the growth pattern has been for 1983.

We only need to see a change in one of the sectors to see a dramatic change in the predictions made by the conference board. Any one of them could change that prediction that was made by them. So I'd rather be talking, not on predictions or forecasts, I'd rather talk about actual happenings. And that's what's going to vindicate our record, and that's what we'll build our record on.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Minister, you seem to indicate that, first of all, in respect to the Conference Board of Canada report, it clearly indicates the greatest weakness in the growth area of Saskatchewan will be in the manufacturing area. And I don't think it's built on a presumption in respect to agriculture to the extent that you try to lead us to believe. Primarily, the weakness in the Saskatchewan economy is the growth in the manufacturing sector.

You do indicate though that just in your view, a change in one or two things could dramatically change that. I'd be interested to know what those one or two things which you advert to . . . Could you be more specific?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, I'll give you just one example of the change that could happen there, and it's a very significant industry in the manufacturing sector. And that's Ipsco. All we need to see is the oil industry pick up or a pipeline being built somewhere, and a lot of people will be back at work, which will significantly change the prediction that's been made by the conference board on manufacturing. And there are several more. The same thing will happen with a lot of our short-line equipment. I can quote you many manufacturing companies, processing as well, that that picture could change significantly, based on the economy of the world or based on the oil industry, based on many things. It can move up very quickly.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Just to follow that line of thinking on a little further, I am sure that when the conference board was making their predictions, using the example the minister is attempting to use of Ipsco, there was word around that Ocelot would be exporting, the possibility of a major amount of gas, which has since fallen through because of the lack of an agreement between the provincial government in Saskatchewan and Alberta. A world oil crisis has come on the scene since that report has come out. And how does the minister anticipate that there's going to be an increase? If anything, the conference board would have overpredicted in that one area, in terms of the oil industry in Saskatchewan. So, if anything, what we're going to see is an even more dismal performance, and a lot of it because of the lack of an agreement that the Saskatchewan government should have been aware of before they ruled on the Ocelot proposal.

That's one example, and if the minister is saying that oil can affect the predictions, it certainly can, but it's not going to be a positive one, but a negative one.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I indicated when I spoke earlier that the conference board figures could change dramatically up or down. It could go either way: it could go up; it could go down, based on whatever happens. You indicate Ocelot, for example. I'd like to get into that, but I think it's really not my department. You did

make a deal with Alberta yourselves back in 1978. If it hadn't been for that, maybe we wouldn't be in the mess we're in today with it. So, rather than get into that one . . .

For example, if the agricultural sector improves considerably world-wide, well, what? Think about it. We have a lot of our short-line equipment shipped elsewhere. You know I am surprised that the member for Shaunavon should question that one when he has one of the largest manufacturers of short-line equipment in his own constituency, which might have been closed except for the actions of our government, and he knows that. I'm a little taken aback at your attitude on that. We're doing the best we can to make sure that we assist those exports, that the markets will be there, that we'll get those people working, that we'll improve and increasingly expand those manufacturers. Sometimes you need breaks, yes. I'll be the first to admit that, but you don't get them if you don't go after them. And we're going to go after them aggressively.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — On a related matter, I know that the minister will be very concerned about bringing new business into the province from Germany or from the United States, and I agree with him that he should attempt to do it, but I think that there are many small businessmen and manufacturers who are concerned at this time about attitude. We want to talk about attitudes of this government toward existing businesses. I've had a number of complaints from people, small businessmen in the province who have dealt, not with industry and commerce, but part of it, Sedco, and are now paying interest rates of 17 per cent. They have approached his department to have those interest rates renegotiated, because it's fair to say that 17 per cent in this day and age, for a small industry in the province of Saskatchewan, is completely unfair. Many of these small groups of companies are facing bankruptcy at the present time. The minister has requests from the companies to renegotiate those 17 per cent interest rates, and they have been told that they will not be renegotiated.

So, while at one time we are saying we would like to woo all this business in to compete with the existing businesses, they are being forced to pay 17 per cent interest to this minister's department or the crown corporation he is responsible for. How do you square that? These people are now being expected to compete, as you say you would like them to do, at 17 per cent interest, when you are granting loans at the present time, even through your department, at a much lower rate, as well as the banks and credit unions. A company can come in from Europe today, get loans at 12 per cent, and compete with a company that you are responsible to service their loans at 17, and you're unwilling to change it. The business people are having a difficult time understanding what you call the attitude and the open for business. They're beginning to feel that the open-for-business attitude doesn't affect those who were in place at the time of the election in April.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — First of all, he says that I've had a number of requests. I have seen maybe one, maybe two. If you have numbers, then, if you're doing your job, you should also be submitting them to me, which you haven't done. I haven't seen a letter from you since I've been the minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: — I think you have.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I don't think so, but I'll stand corrected; I may have seen one. But I don't think I've even seen one. But you may be right; I won't argue that point.

You talk about the 17 per cent. I'm not too sure that they are all 17 per cent. Some of them may be higher; some of them may be lower. But you know, it was your government

that set the rate, not us . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You locked them in, too. There's absolutely nothing preventing any company from paying out their loan today, if they want to pay it out, without penalty . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You say that the lending institutions are lending money — credit unions and everybody else — at 12 per cent. You just said that — or less, I think you said. You may not have said, "or for less." Nothing's stopping anyone from paying out their loan. And we won't charge them a nickel, not a penny penalty. If they want to pay it out, they may well do so.

You made the loans. You locked them in and borrowed the money at those rates at the time. I'm not too sure that that was so bad, in fact, because let me ask you this: would it work the other way as well? If they had borrowed at 12 and the rates went to 18, would they come and pay 18 per cent? I don't think so. There's such a thing as economics and common sense. I don't think with any company to which we've said, "Well, we'll loan you money at 12 per cent," that we'd have the right to come back to them and say, "We now want 18," unless we do a floating, as the banks do or the credit unions.

Is that what you're suggesting that we should be doing? Why didn't you do it? You didn't do it when you were government. That's not the attitude you had. So, do you want us to change the policies that you established at the time that you were there? If that's what you want, we can review it. I'm not suggesting we're going to do it, but when we're paying the kind of money we're paying for the loans that you made, how are we supposed to cover the losses, if we're going to take them down, unless we are paid out? We can then pay off their loans at those rates, and then they can borrow at whatever rate. Which way do you want to go? Do you want us to increase when they go up? That's called floating. That's not what we had, and that's not what the agreements were.

I think, first of all, you're getting off the subject. Sedco is not under review in this Assembly . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, we'll discuss that in crown corporations whenever you wish, but I don't think this is the place to be discussing loans.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — Mr. Minister, it seems like we have been talking about industry in general and the discussion has floated between the operation of Sedco . . . I understand that that's not what we're reviewing. But we were talking about attitudes and when we get to a point where the minister is having a bit of a problem with the business people, he doesn't want to talk about it. And I suppose we can accept that because when you're talking about giving loans out to companies from other countries at a rate lower than what the business people are locked into by his operation, it's a tough thing to explain. It's something that you really don't want to talk about very much.

But I'll tell you, when those loans were granted to those individual companies, they were set at 1 per cent, I believe, below prime. I think the rate that you are now dealing with (and you can correct me on this) is 1 or 2 per cent above prime that you are lending out. So apparently you changed your policy in what you lend money out through that crown corporation. You've changed it in that area. Why can't you change it in another?

If the minister wants to, he could tomorrow go to cabinet with a proposal that would change the rate on existing loans with companies. He says it could be lower than 17 and I agree, and it could be higher, and is for some companies. If he were to take a proposal tomorrow — your open business theory — to cabinet and say, "We want to lower the rates" . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I've already indicated earlier that I am not here to debate the operation of Sedco. If he wants to get into a debate on Sedco — which is a crown corporation and has no place in this Assembly at this point, today; here we're talking industry and commerce — I'm prepared to adjourn into another place where we can debate that if he wants to do that. I don't know whether that's possible or even whether I'm in order.

I can give him a lot of answers on his concerns over interest rates. But, Mr. Chairman, this is industry and commerce, not Sedco.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The point of order is well taken, as we are on industry and commerce. There are other estimates in here as Saskatchewan Economic Development Corporation, which is Sedco. But at this time we are on industry and commerce.

MR. LINGENFELTER: — The point is well taken, Mr. Chairman, and I well understand why the minister is closing off that section after he has agreed to give, confidentially, lists of loans given out by Sedco, I believe earlier in this debate. And now he's saying we don't want to deal with the problem that business people are facing who have Sedco loans at a rate higher than the existing bank interest rate, and the fact that he doesn't want to deal with it. I'll leave the point and we will deal with it in industry and commerce when it's under review in the crown corporation committee.

MR. KOSKIE: — I want again just to make a couple of final comments, Mr. Minister. I want to say that you've indicated your confidence of great growth. The economic review of your government hasn't indicated that; the Conference Board of Canada hasn't. And I want to say that I am rather surprised that in some of the public pronouncements . . . There was one, I believe, by the deputy minister which indicates that maybe in two years or so we'll start seeing some of the results.

Not long ago you were on the open line (and correct me; I don't want to misquote you), but it seems to me you were also hedging again in that you were indicating great problems in getting the economic development going because the business community is refusing to come and invest because of the imminent threat, apparently, that they assume of the possibility of the New Democratic Party being re-elected. So, there are two things you seem to be hedging on; one, trying to create a time period into the future because nothing is happening — in fact, we're going backwards now; and secondly, you're hedging, it seems to me, in saying that business won't come because of the threat of the re-election of the New Democratic Party.

Now I want to say that if your plan is as successful as you try to pretend, then no businessman would have any problem with that government not being re-elected. But I think the business community is very, very astute and they invest, as the former premier indicated, when there is a profit to be made. It's like the former minister of energy and mines who talked to Getty Oil, inviting them to come into Saskatchewan and invest, saying, "We're going to give you some royalty advantages," and the Getty Oil Company said, "What are you talking about? That is so insignificant in the overall plans of this company that it's not even worth talking about."

So I would like the minister then, primarily, to explain why he tends to be putting these hedges to this great revival of economic development which his open to business policy will induce.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, let me first of all respond to the so-called news report

that you were referring to. If you're talking about what the deputy minister said, it was not said on an open line.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Minister, there are two aspects of hedging, if I can use that term, as to when this development is going to come zooming into the province. One is a report of the deputy (I believe it was in the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*) indicating that it would take about two years before you really saw the effects of it — that's paraphrasing the content of that report. That's the first one. Now the second one is your statements in respect, I believe, to be an open-line show, indicating that there are some problems with getting this new business to come in because of the threat of the NDP coming back in and being stifling to anything that you got started. Two aspects.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, let me first of all cover the one on the statement made by the deputy minister; you want to cover that. Again, that was paraphrased by the reporter and taken out of context. Let me rephrase that. It is not exactly what was said, okay? What was said was that it takes time for businesses and industries to establish. If one is looking for concrete results in terms of hundreds of jobs, or large factories, these things don't happen instantly. The time involved in planning and implementing a major investment is considerable. Just the construction of an industrial building can take from six months to a year.

We've had an open for business conference that we are all very familiar with, and the department is working with many prospects now because of it, who are, in fact, interested in coming to Saskatchewan. I indicated to you earlier that . . . (inaudible) . . . with the number you have, you have the list now of people who have come in. We also indicated that we're working on some 100 (and I'm using the approximate number) other companies wanting to come in — some small, some large, some medium. So we don't, you know, snap a finger and all of a sudden you have a new factory in the province creating 1,000 jobs. You also have to consider the expansion of the local ones, the ones that are here already and assistance in developing those.

What was the second reference?

MR. KOSKIE: — That business may be reluctant to come in because of the, you know, the possibility of the re-election of the . . .

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I think *Hansard* will show that I've talked about that a dozen times already today. I won't change my story. I won't change my attitude. I won't change the statements that I've made. They are still the same. Yes, they were reluctant. There is no question about it. I'm sure that the business community people, businessmen that I've talked to, and many of them, in Saskatchewan, in Canada, in the United States, in Europe, weren't lying to me — I'm sure of that — when they said, "Look, we know what it was like before and there's no way we're coming." They're not going to jump on the plane and come over tomorrow, but we are working on some. Some of them made application. We are working on getting them, and we'll get results. There's no question about that. We'll be getting results. I'm very convinced of it.

I have issued instructions to my staff that this year I intend to visit a minimum of 100 businesses in Saskatchewan, a minimum, and I'm hoping for 200, time permitting, to listen to them, to find out if there is anything we can do, to hear their problems, their complaints, their plans, their projections, and to encourage them. That's where the department will be spending a lot of its time. Again, I come back to you and say that it won't be in the paper work that you've burdened them with when you were the

government. We intend to take a positive approach. We intend to be sales-oriented. And we intend to seek out the investments that we need and we want for the province of Saskatchewan. And I've said it, and said it, and said it, and said it today. So if you can't accept that, well . . .

MR. KOSKIE: — No, I am very surprised with the minister's comment of repeating the reluctance of business to come to the province after the massive win of the Progressive Conservative Party forming the government. Because, certainly, with the story that he is indicating, that things will be so good here in Saskatchewan, I wonder how the business community can come to the conclusion that there is any possibility of an opposition party with eight members suddenly getting re-elected. This is the rhetoric of the minister. I think that the fact is that things are not going to happen.

I want to close this off and finish it up, Mr. Minister, but I want to ask you again . . . This copy is in the library; it's from the Department of Industry and Commerce. You can get a copy of it. It's "Saskatchewan: Open for Business." It was run by the former premier, Mr. Ross Thatcher — son of one of the architects of open business under the new Tory party. I ask, Mr. Minister, are you aware of the 1964-71 promotional operation, "Open for Business in Saskatchewan," by the former Liberal administration? Are you aware of it?

This is what I wanted to get to — the revelation that the people who we have in charge of this government, Mr. Chairman, the head, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who doesn't even know what was taking place in this province in the year 1964. I would invite the minister — since he doesn't even know about this previous open-for-business policy by the former premier, the father of the former minister of mines and minerals, the architect of the Tory platform in the last election — I would ask the minister one thing: would he undertake at least to take a review of the years of 1964 to 1971 under the former policy of open for business in Saskatchewan, in order to determine how well the province has done in comparison to the following 10 years under what you called "the stagnation of the socialists"? Will the minister at least review the years of '64 to '71, because I would like to discuss that with him in the next report.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of taking directions, first of all, from the opposition in that respect. I think what the member is saying is what the brochure, the pamphlet, suggests is that it was a failure. Why should I go back into history and look at failures and at what was a failure, if that in fact is what it was? I don't know what it was; I have no idea. I'm not interested.

I don't live in the past; I live in the future. I want to see a positive approach, a positive action and improvements. Whatever the plans were of that are really of little value or little interest to me, other than perhaps not repeating mistakes; perhaps that might be of some value. If some of my people are aware of the program, I'll ask them to inform me if there was anything that we are doing there that failed then or somewhere. We'll look at that. What you are asking me is absolutely silly, nonsense.

I am saying to you, we have a plan. We know what we want to do. We'll go ahead and do it. We will be positive, we'll work for the betterment of this province in attracting industry and job creation and everything else.

MR. KOSKIE: — I am amazed that the minister is not aware, and aware in some detail, of what was the economic plan in Saskatchewan from '64 to '71. I don't know how a man can live in the province of Saskatchewan and not have remembered it. But I want to . . .

(inaudible interjections) . . . I'll tell you, when I have the floor, I have the floor. If you want to speak in the debate, that's fine.

AN HON. MEMBER: — The chairman isn't doing anything to keep order in here.

MR. KOSKIE: — We'll keep order ourselves. I just want to refer to the minister. You gave in your initial opening statements some rather glowing figures of 84 additional manufacturing, creating some 504 jobs. When you provide me with the list of names of the individual manufacturing firms that you've committed yourself, would you detail the number of employment per the individual manufacturing? I don't think there's any problem with that. Can you do that, Mr. Minister?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'm told that my officials can provide you with that — not today, though. Not today. So we can give you that information. By the way, just a comment. You are amazed, or however you phrased it, about the lack of my knowledge of that proposal. Let me say this: I do know about the policies of your former government, your party when you were in government. I'm aware of those. And believe me, I don't want to repeat those policies.

MR. KOSKIE: — Also, Mr. Minister, you suggested the great prospects of the future — 86 new projects. And I know that you're not going to probably divulge the nature of them because they may be in the negotiating stages and the development stages, and I can appreciate that. But I think that since you try to indicate such great development, some 86 new projects with 3,000 jobs, could you indicate at least primarily in a general way, the areas that this is likely to occur in? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, sectors. That's . . .

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, and for the same reason that you gave yourself. In cases where there may be one or two or three or a few numbers, all it does is alert the . . . Well, I'll give you three, the ones that have several numbers in them, so that . . . And I do so hesitantly, because really, I think what I'm doing is . . . Why don't I give you instead, in confidentiality, the list? I just hesitate to do this because you can well understand that I don't want to be announcing where we're working at. I'll give you the list in a confidential manner.

MR. KOSKIE: — If the minister, on a confidential basis, is certain the general sectors and whatever information that he feels that he can give would be useful, because . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: — Come on, Murray, I'm getting tired.

MR. KOSKIE: — So am I, so am I. I would appreciate that. Just in respect to providing information, can I get a bit of a time frame on providing the information that I've requested, just so that it doesn't come next year, that is, 10 months.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Next week?

MR. KOSKIE: — Fine. I just want to deal with a few areas, Mr. Minister, and I'll try to run through these as fast as possible.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'm prepared to do that and stay until we're finished if it's agreeable with you.

MR. KOSKIE: — Yes. I think about 10 minutes, okay?

I guess just one area of opportunity, I think, that perhaps you could have used, in my view, and I'm trying to be positive here, is that I would have thought that in the very difficult economic times in the province, you might have called together the small businessmen of this province into a conference, perhaps with labor and government, to discuss with them and formulate a plan which would help to address the major problems that the business community was facing, particularly with the very high interest rates. I'm just wondering why the minister didn't take that opportunity. I know it was done in Manitoba, and considerable input from the business community was made to the provincial government in Manitoba.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I take exception, actually, to what the member is alleging. In fact, I personally have met with the farm machinery manufacturers. I've met with many chambers of commerce; I've met with small businessmen individually; in fact, I had a bear-pit in the chamber of commerce in Saskatoon. I am meeting with small businessmen of this province on a daily basis, gentlemen, on a daily basis. This year I'm planning, as I said earlier, at least 100 calls (and I'm referring to outside of the city of Regina; I'm talking about the province), and I'm hoping that I can reach the 200 number, to go and sit down and talk with them and listen to their complaints.

The Open for Business conference was another area. We listened and discussed. I can give you a list, a long list of names of people and associations that I have met with — Saskatchewan Motor Dealers Association, for example. I could go on and on and on. So I don't know what the member is saying.

MR. KOSKIE: — I appreciate that the minister obviously is meeting individually with groups, and I don't want to prolong this. All I was indicating was whether or not it might be meaningful to get all the various groups and the sectors together, including labor, representatives of business, the farming community and the like — an international conference, or open to business. I thought it might have been useful. I just raised that, and if you are doing that, fine and dandy.

The second thing that I just want to raise, Mr. Minister, is that in addressing the basic problems confronting the business community in Saskatchewan . . . Many of the manufacturers in farm equipment and so on . . . While you indicate some areas of assistance, I think that they do in fact have many obstacles to overcome — that is, long distances to market, a lot of transportation — and a fair amount of competition in the more centralized areas of Canada. I think that it's very valuable to have the farm manufacturing development and I hope it increases. I think there are some ways in which the government could help to facilitate the operations in a more competitive way of small business in our province, and I would ask him to consider at least helping small businessmen with improving the methods of communication. Often it's very expensive.

I give you an example. Telex is very important in a modern business day. Some of the manufacturers out there do not in fact have Telex, and I have been contacted and hopefully was working toward looking at it. Improving the communication might be of some assistance in helping them to cope with the competition. There are other areas, I think, but certainly that's one area — computers, perhaps, emphasis on training business people to put their information onto computers, and perhaps a program through SaskComp, or otherwise, which could in fact modernize and give them some of

the managerial advantages or at least equal.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I want to give the member the assurance that that particular concern is a high priority with my department, a very high priority. We are doing a lot of things for the small businessmen. Specifically, I think we would be wasting time in going over the specifics of it, and I leave it at that because, as I said, it's one of the highest priorities we have in our department.

I might just go back to the comment that was made by the member on the international conference, so-called. He alluded to the fact that this was for the benefit of international firms. The statistics or the facts of the matter are that there were 569 delegates who paid to come to the conference, and of the 569, 441 of them were from Saskatchewan. So certainly that was of far more concern to the local Saskatchewan businessmen than it was to the international.

MR. KOSKIE: — Just in respect to the two items, could you provide me, if in fact there were any costs incurred by the Department of Industry and Commerce, any costs in respect to the Open for Business conference. Could you provide me with that, if you don't have it today, the share paid by the department?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — If the member will accept a figure within the \$1,000 range, I will give him the net cost. The net cost to the province was \$80,000.

MR. KOSKIE: — . . . (inaudible) . . . all inclusive, the cost to the province, not just the department. Is that correct?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, I'm informed that that's the cost to the department, but that's the bulk of it. We don't have the figures from the other departments, but industry and commerce assumed the bulk of the costs. And the total cost — if you want that figure, I can give you that as well. The total was \$108,000 but our share of the revenue was \$28,000 so it left a net cost to the department of \$80,000.

MR. KOSKIE: — Another question, Mr. Minister. Could you provide me with the details of your trip to Europe? The cost, yes, and who accompanied you, and whether you covered the costs for all of the participants?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Recovered the cost?

MR. KOSKIE: — Your trip to Europe.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Recovered the cost?

MR. KOSKIE: — No, no. If you covered the cost of all those who participated and went on the . . .

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Should I send it over to you or do you want it recorded? As for the other part of the question, there were two people with us. The costs were not paid by the government. My wife was one and Mr. Malinowski's wife was the other. They paid their own costs.

MR. KOSKIE: — You will send that over, eh?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes.

MR. KOSKIE: — Yes.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Do you want that right now? Approximately \$25,000. Oh, just a minute. The exact amount has not been determined but approximately.

MR. KOSKIE: — Mr. Minister, if I could, deal quickly with a couple of items in the estimates itself, rather than going point by point. Your policy and planning, that's actually item 4, subvote 6. When we note there that the number of person-years estimated is the same as estimated in March, and the same as 1981-82, but the estimated expenditure according to our figures is down 19 per cent from the March estimates, and down 8 per cent from the '81-82 figures and the largest reduction is under other expenses, which was reduced \$115,000 or 29 per cent from the March estimates or 25 per cent from the 1981-82. I would like an explanation of that decrease.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that is a reduction in the amount of studies that we would have contracted. We will be doing more of those studies in House rather than contracting for them.

MR. KOSKIE: — A more detailed breakdown of the reason for the reduction there and we can go on.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes, I am sure that we can supply you with that and I'll send it.

MR. KOSKIE: — In respect to item 11, just for your assistance, subvote 15, Mainstreet program. Here again your estimated payments under this program are down 42 per cent from the '81-82 estimates and down 42 per cent from the March estimates. Are we to believe the reason for this is the phase-out of this program? What is the reason for the decrease?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Number 11, you said. Yes, I am advised that that is as a result of timing. We accelerated the payments in last year's budget rather than bringing them into next year's budget so that's why we were able to reduce it.

MR. KOSKIE: — In respect to the small business interest abatement program, item 12, subvote 16, again your estimated payments under this program have been reduced, 42 per cent from '81-82 and 48 per cent from the March budget. Is there an explanation for the major decrease in that?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I want to correct a statement I made in a previous question. I said next year; I was in the wrong year. Okay?

To answer your question on the other one, it's that the prior years were overbudgeted. They were adjusted to reflect a more accurate figure which is really what happened this year. The previous ones were overbudgeted. That was brought in for that reason: to reflect the actual and accurate.

MR. KOSKIE: — Also in the March budget, we proposed an advanced technology assistance program, and some \$200,000 was allocated in grant assistance to the development of high technology. I note that this has been, in fact, deleted from your budget. We had \$200,000 for advanced technology assistance programs. This has been dropped.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — That, as you know was a new program. It had never been implemented. It was held pending a review of all our programs. It is being reviewed, has been reviewed. We will be implementing some elements of it and co-ordinating as well with the other areas such as the Saskatchewan Research Council and so on. I just went as far as I'm prepared to announce on any plans on that.

MR. KOSKIE: — One other item, Mr. Minister, the economic development foundation. It appears that the entire concept of the economic development foundation has been deleted completely from the department. My question to you is: does your department have any plans to assist in the economic development of northern Saskatchewan in the way the economic development foundation would have, or have you any other substitute to it, because certainly the whole concept has been deleted from your department?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I guess the short answer to the question, Mr. Chairman, is that the whole area of economic development re the native programs or northern Saskatchewan is, at the present time, under review.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Minister, I just want to reflect back to a memo that was written on July 16 to all civil servants within the Department of Northern Saskatchewan which was endorsed and signed by the hon. member for Meadow Lake. It stated that the policy would be to try to establish sound local government with an outlook toward establishing a sound economic self-sufficiency type of structure. I wonder what plans, if any, your department has to this effect. Could you kind of verify this one way or the other?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, I think I would advise the member that the whole area of economic development in northern Saskatchewan is still under the Department of Northern Saskatchewan. So really the question is irrelevant in my department. It's do with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

MR. KOSKIE: — The economic development foundation was in fact in your department at the time that you assumed office. Are you saying that you have now totally eliminated the economic development foundation from the Department of Industry and Commerce, and has it been in fact transferred to another department because certainly it was in industry and commerce?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — First of all, the economic development foundation was a two-part act — one for the North and one for the South. Let me advise you that the whole program is on hold pending the review that I referred to earlier. When that review is completed, we'll have the information available to you at that time.

MR. YEW: — Mr. Minister, you mentioned that you have this program on hold, under review, under consideration. Could you advise the Assembly just how long this process will take until the Assembly and northern Saskatchewan can get specific information and direction on this total package?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — No, Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I can't answer the member because it's not being reviewed by my department. It's being reviewed by intergovernmental affairs, the whole area of economic development in the North and in the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, I'm sorry, it's being reviewed by the

Department of Northern Saskatchewan, and the economic development of the North is still in the Department of Northern Saskatchewan, so I have no answers to give you on those questions.

MR. KOSKIE: — I just want the names, positions, salaries, of all members of the minister's personal staff. Can you provide that?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Will you accept them if I send them to you?

MR. KOSKIE: — Yes, and with respect to the minister's staff, are any of these persons paid any payment other than salaries, such as contractual or consultant fees?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I'll provide you with the information. At this point I don't have it, but I'll provide you with the information, if that's acceptable.

MR. KOSKIE: — We would like also the total amount of what I term as "entertainment expenses" incurred since May 8, 1982, by the minister, the deputy minister, each special assistant, and each executive assistant. What I mean by "entertainment expenses" are conferences, or dinners, or lunches, or . . .

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Well, I'd be happy to provide whatever information, but I'm not too sure how far you want me to go. In other words, do you want me to include the European trip, to include any delegation from foreign countries, other countries, that I entertained here? Is that what you are asking for, or are you asking for what we individually . . . You know, I can provide you whatever you want. It's available.

MR. KOSKIE: — Total expense would be the simplest.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I believe the question I have is . . . I shouldn't be asking you. The other question you asked me before: would you reiterate the request you made on my personal staff, so that they will understand exactly what you mean?

MR. KOSKIE: — Have we clarified the one that we're on, that you are going to provide that information? What I wanted was the names, the positions, salaries, titles, of all members of the minister's staff.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Are you talking about the 90 or so that are industry and commerce, or upstairs in my office — personal staff?

MR. KOSKIE: — . . . (inaudible) . . . and as we have been doing estimates, that refers to your deputy and the executive assistants, and so on . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . We were prepared. I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, we were . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . No, I want to finish the estimates, and I'm trying my best to facilitate that because there are more questions I could ask. You know, we were prepared to come back in early January to go through these and have a lot more time . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . I have a couple of other questions. Do any of the minister's staff have an assigned CVA vehicle, and if so, what are their names and positions? Minister's staff being what we defined before, not in the department.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Referring to my personal staff again? No.

MR. KOSKIE: — Does the minister have a press agent?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Yes.

MR. KOSKIE: — Can you give me the name?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I want to correct that. You called it a press agent. I have a communications executive assistant, if that's what you are referring to. Her name is Dorothy Sollosy. Is that all you want?

MR. KOSKIE: — The salary as well. I want a list of all persons fired from the department since May 8, '82, if indeed there were any.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — I think that ones that were fired were fired by your leader. I don't believe . . . just the ones your leader fired.

MR. KOSKIE: — I didn't get the answer. What is the answer?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — The only people that were fired in my department were the people that the Leader of the Opposition fired when he left.

MR. KOSKIE: — All I asked you is to answer for your department, Mr. Minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, and they answered that you hadn't fired anyone. That's all I'm asking for.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — That wasn't as I understood the question. The question you asked was to name those who had been fired since May 8. Do you include May 8 in that? Because I believe it was that day that the Leader of the Opposition fired some people out of my office. I haven't fired anyone out of my personal staff.

MR. KOSKIE: — And you have knowledge of the Leader of the Opposition having fired some people on May 8. Can you give us the information in respect to what you're alleging?

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Okay, I was wrong. It was May 7 he fired them.

MR. KOSKIE: — . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You want to finish, that's fine. Then keep quiet.

I want also a list of all the persons whose services were terminated from any boards, commissions, agencies, under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, if indeed they're . . . He undoubtedly has some . . . since May 8, '82.

HON. MR. ROUSSEAU: — Mr. Chairman, the Department of Industry and Commerce, I am advised, doesn't have any boards, agencies or commissions.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 14 inclusive agreed to.

Vote 19 agreed to.

SASKATCHEWAN HERITAGE FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

Provincial Development Expenditure — Vote 19

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 19 agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (NO. 3)

CONSOLIDATED FUND BUDGETARY EXPENDITURE

INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

Ordinary Expenditure — Vote 19

Item 1 agreed to.

Vote 19 agreed to.

The committee reported progress.

The Assembly adjourned at 1:40 p.m.