

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, May 17, 1985 10:00 am.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

MR. STILES: Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Private Bills has had the following Bill under consideration and recommends it be proceeded with: Bill Pr. 9, Le Diocese de St. Paul Amendment Act, 1985. The committee has further had the following Bill under consideration and recommends it be proceeded with, with certain amendments: Bill Pr. 14, The Youth Emergency Services Foundation Act. With respect to the petition of the Institute of Management Consultants of Alberta, I wish to report that Standing Order 86 has been complied with.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 68
Child Welfare
Amendment Act, 1985 (No. 2)**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce a Bill, being the Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1985 (No. 2).

This Bill replaces Bill 26 standing in my name on the Order Paper and is the same as that Bill, with one exception. Private adoption provisions in the Child Welfare Act passed by this Legislature last fall will not be proceeded with at this time, so that the matter may receive further study. This will mean that while community concerns are being addressed and the approaches reconsidered, private adoption home studies will continue to be provided for the courts by child welfare workers employed by Alberta Social Services and Community Health.

[Leave granted; Bill 68 read a first time]

**Bill 75
Psychology Profession Act**

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill 75, the Psychology Profession Act.

This is right-to-title legislation. It protects the title "chartered psychologist" for those members of the association and, after a period of five years, will introduce the concept of a doctorate degree to become a chartered psychologist.

[Leave granted; Bill 75 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, this morning I'm pleased to file with the Assembly, firstly, a letter from our Premier to the Prime Minister dated May 14 regarding trading relationships with the United States. The Premier will be in the House on Tuesday and will be prepared to answer any questions regarding the text and content of the letter to the Prime Minister; secondly, to table a set of communiqués from the Western Premiers' Conference held this week in Grande Prairie, Alberta; and next, a letter from the four western premiers to the Prime Minister, including a document entitled Western Canadian Trade Objectives for the next Decade, which has been agreed to by the four western provinces. Copies of each of these three items will be made available to all members of the Assembly.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I table with the Assembly replies to Order for a Return 139, 1984, Order for a Return 178, 1984, and Order for a Return 218, 1983.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker. I have two tablings: the reply to Order for a Return 140 of 1984 with regard to travel expenses and, as well, the required statutory report pursuant to section 43(4) of the Legislative Assembly Act, being payments to members of the Assembly for the year ended March 31, 1984.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I have two filings. First, on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Education I wish to file the response for Motion for a Return 182, '84. I wish to file with the Legislative Assembly copies of the Energy Resources Conservation Board report D 85-21, the Sheerness and Genesee report, May 1985.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. SPARROW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 26 grade 6 students from the J.E. LaPointe school located in the town of Beaumont. They are accompanied by their teacher, Pam Yearwood, and parent Mrs. Siedel. They are seated in the members' gallery. I wish they would rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome to the Assembly this morning a former president of my own constituency, a man who has just been named the president of TransAlta Utilities, Mr. Ken McCready.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure this morning of introducing some 73 students from the Bertha Kennedy school, which is located in the city of St. Albert. These students, who are very keen and interested in the building and have been studying government, are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Maria Takacs, Mr. Ron Richard, Mr. Steve Bayus, and parents Mrs. Tammam, Mrs. Holzman, Mrs. Thorpe, Mrs. Smyth, and Mrs. Stang. They are seated in the public gallery. I would ask them all to stand and be recognized by the members.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Social Services for Youth

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Late last fall a group of officials and employees in the Department of Social Services and Community Health

undertook a study of some of the services and facilities available in Edmonton for youth and teens. It is my understanding that that study was completed in the latter half of April. Despite assurances given as late as early April that upon completion the study would be made public, to my knowledge that has not happened.

My question to the minister: given that the report was completed in late April and was discussed at a meeting of agencies and departmental personnel on April 30, can the minister advise the Assembly when he will make this report public?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the department has been working with agencies in the city of Edmonton to review the kinds of services that are in place and what is needed for youth, particularly 16- and 17-year-olds. If my memory serves me correctly, I believe this arose primarily because a year ago one of the agencies in the city required further funding for services for runaway teenagers. At that time we assessed the situation and provided them with extra funding, but one of the concerns that arose from that by other agencies in the city was the co-ordination of services for youth. So together with these organizations we have been reviewing the situation.

I have made no assurances about any study being made public. Any assessment that has been done is in co-operation with these agencies. Our department sat down just recently with representatives from some of these agencies and reviewed the issues and concerns that came about from that. I haven't had a full briefing as to the details of that meeting, but I gather there is good co-operation going on and no concerns expressed to me from these agencies about our not being open.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. Certainly the agencies were led to believe that this would be made public, if not by the minister, by his department. My question simply is: can the minister advise whether or not at this moment it is his determination that this report never be publicly released?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to release this report.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question to the minister. Seeing that this is an important report, which in my opinion should be made public, why is it the department is not going to make this public?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member keeps referring to this as a report. What we actually have done is an assessment of what the situation is in Edmonton, and we have ongoing assessments all the time. These assessments are for internal use and also for sitting down and reviewing the results of these assessments with the agencies that have been involved. That has been done, and it is not our intention to suddenly change government policy, the policy of our department, of many years by releasing every assessment that is done in the department.

MR. MARTIN: I point out to the minister, Mr. Speaker, that people were told this would be made public by his department. My question to the minister is simply this: can the minister advise whether or not one of the principal reasons behind the decision not to release the report is the

fact that it is, in part at least, critical of the policies and practices of his department?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, that is not the reason.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. We're obviously not going to get the reason, but I think the minister well knows that that was in that report. Can the minister advise who issued the order that the meeting to which many agency workers, departmental personnel, and other interested persons had been invited for the purpose of the report's unveiling be cancelled? In fact, those people were told not to bother showing up even though there was going to be a meeting.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, there's no way I can keep track of all the meetings departmental officials are having with agencies and groups in the city, nor do I have at my fingertips or in my head the reasons why certain meetings are cancelled. So I can't answer the hon. member.

MR. MARTIN: Is the minister saying to this Assembly that he was unaware of this public meeting when this report was going to be unveiled? This is the first he heard of it?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I have ongoing briefings in a number of areas. Often I am told there are meetings coming up. I may have been told there was a meeting coming up in this particular case, but I can't remember at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary in this series.

MR. MARTIN: It is rather interesting when the memory slips when it's convenient.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have some difficulty with this. What we're really having is a mini-debate on the production of a document. The reason I have a particular concern about it is that the *Standing Orders* make express provision for that sort of thing when a motion for a return is filed, and then the question of whether or not the return will be provided is fully debatable with notice and in the proper way. This is really irregular debate, and it's preempting something that is already amply provided for in the *Standing Orders*.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We're attempting to find out why it wasn't made public. It has nothing to do with that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm not going to let that go by. If the hon. leader will look at *Hansard*, he will find that it went beyond that. There were critical remarks made about the production of the report, which are perfectly in order at a time when the thing is under debate. But we were actually debating it here.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure we'll make our assessment of that.

My final question to the minister is: can the minister advise which agencies involved in providing services and facilities for youth and teens have been allowed to see the report and why many such agencies have not been allowed to see it?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that departmental officials have had meetings with agencies in the city of Edmonton with regard to the co-ordination of services for young people and sat down with representatives from a number of these agencies to review the results of this assessment. I am not aware of any agency not being allowed to have a discussion with officials about any assessment we have done. If the hon. member is aware of any agency that is concerned that they didn't have the opportunity to sit down with officials and discuss issues and concerns in this particular area, I'd be happy to receive the names of those agencies.

MR. MARTIN: Supplementary — I won't make a supplementary. I guess I had the last one.

I can assure the minister that there are, and we'll probably follow up on that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. MARTIN: Question, question. Excitement.

Genesee and Sheerness Projects

MR. MARTIN: My second question is to the Minister of Utilities and Telecommunications regarding the ERCB report today. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the ERCB has recommended today that while portions of the Sheerness project should go ahead, the commissioning of both Genesee units and the second stage of Sheerness should be deferred for a number of years.

My question to the minister is this: in view of our unacceptable unemployment levels and the fact that we will need this power eventually, can the minister assure this Assembly now that the government will approve the commissioning of Genesee, in particular, despite the ERCB recommendation?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the Energy Resources Conservation Board has had under consideration for the past four months the various elements leading to the question of commissioning both the B.C. Tie as well as Sheerness 1 and 2 and Genesee 1 and 2. That's been a four-month process. The report was released approximately 45 minutes ago. It's not my intention to respond on behalf of government, as to what our response to that report will be, in 45 minutes — a report that's taken four months to put together.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. Can the minister advise the Assembly where at least the compromise position advanced by the city of Edmonton regarding prompt commissioning of the first Genesee unit — will the minister assure this Assembly that this will be looked at seriously by the cabinet, despite the ERCB recommendations?

MR. BOGLE: I'm not sure, by the thrust of the hon. member's question, whether or not the hon. member has had an opportunity to fully apprise himself of both the report and the recommendations contained therein. I phrase my question that way because if the hon. member had an opportunity to be briefed on the report, then he would know that one of the key recommendations of the ERCB is to advance in the scheduling the first of the Genesee units ahead of the second Sheerness unit, which is contrary to

the scheduling that has been in place both as approved by the government some 14 or 15 months ago and the original applications by the companies. That's a very key ingredient relative to one of the positions put forward by the city of Edmonton, a position which would see their project moved ahead of the second Sheerness project.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, that's admittedly true, but stage 1 is what they're talking about and what I was talking about. Their compromise position is to be deferred from June '88 to October '89. To come back: the city of Edmonton has provided a compromise position on just stage 1 of Genesee. My question is simply: will the cabinet take this into consideration despite the ERCB recommendation?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, while the hon. member is correct in indicating that the board has recommended there be an approximate 15-month deferral of the second Genesee unit, from June 1988 to October 1990, the hon. member should also recognize that the board are recommending a deferral of the Sheerness unit 2 from July 1987 to October 1990. That's a 38-month deferral, whereas the deferral recommended for the first Genesee unit, unit 2, is a 15-month deferral.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question. I'm not denying that, but that had nothing to do with the Edmonton compromise position. It had to do with stage 1 in both. They agreed that stage 2 could be pushed aside, but obviously the minister doesn't want to answer the question. So I'll ask if the minister has any projections ...

MR. SZWENDER: Read the report.

MR. MARTIN: Read the report? I don't imagine the little boy from Belmont has read it yet; he's an Edmonton M.L.A. My question is this: does the minister have any projections available on how many jobs will be forfeited by deferring stage 1 of the Genesee project?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the member's questions, I'd first like to go back to his preamble, because again it's obvious the hon. member does not understand either the position taken by the city of Edmonton or what is contained in the report. The first position put forward by the city of Edmonton was that there should be no deferral in any of the plants. They recommended that the B.C. Tie and Sheerness 1 units should both be brought on stream in 1986. They recommended that Sheerness 2 be brought on stream in 1987, followed in 1988 by Genesee 2. Their second position, their backup position, was often referred to as alternative 9, which would see the first Sheerness unit proceed as scheduled in 1986 and then a leapfrogging, if you like, of unit 2 of Genesee — it's actually the first unit — moving ahead of Sheerness 2. That's exactly what the ERCB is recommending. They are not recommending the same time frame, but in terms of the primary objective of the city's second alternative recommendation, the ERCB is following that recommendation.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this. I have a fairly long list this morning.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary question to the minister. I have the second proposal in front of me. Would the minister confirm that they've agreed that stage

2 of these plants be delayed, that they could accept that, but they want to complete the first Genesee and Sheerness units on schedule? That's what they're asking for; they say 95 percent of the jobs would be created. Would the minister confirm that this is now their proposal?

MR. SPEAKER: I regret intervening. I have real difficulty with the question, for this reason. My understanding is that the city of Edmonton's position was set out in a position paper and that that was given wide circulation. Certainly, I saw it. If that is public information, then I have difficulty seeing the purpose of a question asking a minister to confirm what's in the text of a public document.

MR. MARTIN: You're totally correct in that question, but the minister didn't seem to know what was in it. The city of Edmonton has suggested in that report that 95 percent of the short-term job creation potential of the whole project could be realized by going along with their compromise position. Has the minister done any assessment of that, and can he advise if his studies confirm that this is in fact the case?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member has an opportunity to read the report for himself, I believe he will see that there were three elements the ERCB took into account in recommending that Genesee 2 proceed ahead of Sheerness 2. The first factor the board looked at centred on the fact that the cost of the Genesee unit is substantially greater than the cost of the Sheerness 2 unit. If you're looking at the consumers and the stored-up costs that eventually will be passed on to the consumer, commissioning Genesee 2 ahead of Sheerness 2 would certainly have some advantage.

There were two other factors that the board looked at. One centred on the submissions made by communities in the Genesee area and their desire to see the project move ahead, and finally, employment. The board did look at employment and at the submissions made by the city and others and did consider the employment opportunities that would be associated with the Genesee project.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question with regard to the report and the process. Could the minister indicate who within his portfolio will review the report at this time? Secondly, has the minister targeted a date at which time this matter will be brought before cabinet for discussion and approval or change?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, the normal process is of course to ensure that the utilities caucus committee and the Edmonton caucus committee will be fully involved in the review and decision-making processes. As far as the cabinet decision, I have previously committed that I wanted to see that move ahead in due course. I hope it could be achieved within a three-week period of time; that would be our target.

MR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the recommendations, I would like to ask the minister if it would still be possible for Edmonton Power to proceed on their own volition, if they so desire, if indeed these recommendations are accepted by cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER: I have some difficulty with that question. I don't know whether it relates to legal authority, but in view of the fact that it's been asked and I'm not certain

of the direction of it, perhaps the hon. minister might be permitted to answer.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that the cabinet did vary the ERCB order approximately 14 months ago, not in terms of the commissioning of the units — and commissioning really means the bringing on stream of the units; it means the units are completed and they're ready to go into production. But we did allow, primarily due to the strong recommendations made by the city of Edmonton, the owners of the two plants — that is, TransAlta and Alberta Power in the case of the Sheerness plant and the city of Edmonton regarding Genesee — to proceed at their own discretion and at their own risk. We said that, obviously, the consumers in Alberta will not provide an automatic safety net; if you wish to make prudent economic decisions, you have the right to do that. But the commissioning, the actual turning on the switch, if you will, so that the plants could start up production, would still rest with the order as given by the ERCB.

MR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In that this report is extremely important to the citizens of Edmonton, I wonder if the minister has plans to meet immediately with city council members with respect to these recommendations.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I met very briefly with Alderman Lyall Roper this morning, and I'm planning to meet with the president of TransAlta Utilities and the senior vice-president of Alberta Power immediately after question period.

Police Act

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General, and again it's with regard to the minister's pursuit to tramp over the rights of individuals in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Solicitor General is with regard to Bill 59. A few days ago we talked about the accounting profession and the lack of consultation that has gone on. Could the minister indicate what steps will be taken with regard to Bill 59, the Police Act, as to whether that Act will proceed in this session or whether consultation will take place between the Edmonton Police Association, who raised the major concern on that Bill, or the Alberta Federation of Police Associations, who are very concerned about the future of their rights in this province?

DR. REID: I don't know what the concern is about their rights, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps he could elucidate.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will elucidate for the hon. minister. In a letter, which I know a number of members in this House have, the Alberta Federation of Police Associations is very concerned that the Act gives the right to police chiefs to dismiss officers without any type of appeal. The minister has indicated that this protection may come through regulations. They're saying: "Regulations are not good enough. We want protection in the Act as it is now." My question is: because of that concern, is the

minister prepared to hold that Bill until comprehensive, representative discussions take place?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I have had some discussions with the police associations people regarding this concern. I expressed to them the firm intent that their concerns would be addressed in the regulations. In particular, the remark about there being no appeal: there will be an appeal to the Law Enforcement Appeal Board, and it is the intention to amend the Bill to make sure that that appeal will be held in public. It will not be held in private, unless the Law Enforcement Appeal Board intends to do that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate why the protection cannot be built into the Act so that the protection is there under the process of the Legislature and not through the process of order in council, which is through the cabinet?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of the philosophy behind the development of the legislation. The legislation largely develops the philosophy and the intent. A lot of the provisions in regard to many other sections of the Act will be in the regulations. That's the intent with regard to this particular section as well.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister indicate the associations and the members of the police associations or members of local police bodies who made the recommendation to the minister that this particular concern be placed in regulation rather than in the Act as such?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the gentlemen from the police associations that I would involve them in the development of the regulations regarding the particular section about which they're concerned.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. That's not good enough. Why not in the Bill, where people should be involved and representative? Why didn't the minister involve the associations and the interested parties like the police chiefs in the construction of the Bill itself? Why has the minister not done that?

DR. REID: I think I've answered that question already, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. minister be prepared to meet with these associations before the Bill is pressed through this Legislature, so adequate representation takes place from those associations and consultation is a lot freer than it is at the moment?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member didn't hear me. I met with the representatives of the associations already.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Have the associations recommended changes, or has the minister indicated that he is prepared to change the Act as such? Will those amendments be brought forward in this Legislature this session?

DR. REID: If the hon. member wishes to introduce amendments, that's his prerogative at the committee stage.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this topic.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Is it clear at this time that the minister is not going to introduce any amendments to alleviate the concern of these many, many officers and association members across this province? Is that clear at this point in time? Could the minister confirm that no amendments will be made to alleviate their concerns?

DR. REID: In view of my discussions with the representatives of the police associations and the commitments I made at that time, I don't feel that at this time I intend make the amendment that the hon. member is concerned about.

MR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary to the Solicitor General. I have in front of me a letter dated May 14 from the Alberta Federation of Police Associations. Could the minister indicate whether he's met with this organization since May 14?

DR. REID: No, the meeting was held prior to the date of that letter.

Small Business Equity Corporations Program

MR. ALEXANDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Small Business regarding the current status of the funding of the small business equity corporations program. There appears to be some apprehension in the community that the minister's revised Act, which provided for additional amounts of money to go into the program, may be close to being used up. Perhaps the confusion has been added to somewhat by a supplementary estimate which was introduced having to do with a figure of \$18 million. I wonder if the minister could clarify for the community at large what the status of the funding of the small business equity program is and perhaps what the relationship of the \$18 million is to the \$35 million that went into the revised Act.

MR. ADAIR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I can shed some light on that. Number one, the \$18 million in the supplementary estimate is a portion of the \$35 million that was approved after we introduced and then passed the amendment to the Act earlier this session. If you recall, the Act itself had a limit of \$15 million. That had to be amended before any changes could occur. That went through the Assembly, was passed with the unanimous consent of this Assembly, and was assented to. After that, we reached and approved the level of \$35 million. The \$18 million figure is a portion of that \$35 million.

In response to the other part of your question, the staff of the small business equity corporations program have a responsibility to alert me as they get close to the commitment of the \$35 million. I have been alerted that as a result of a number of applications that came in last week — I believe we had something like 46 applications in a day and a half. Once processed, if they are eligible for registration, we will have reached the \$35 million limit on the incentive side. That indicates that around \$167 million worth of

private-sector funds have been, registered for investment in the province of Alberta.

MR. ALEXANDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Given the obvious success of the program, will the minister, upon reaching the level approved so far under the Act and the revised Act, request additional funding from his colleagues to keep up the momentum for this very useful job-creating investment that's taking place, particularly through the small-business sector?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, my first indication is that I would like to reserve responding to that question, in the sense that once having been alerted to the fact that the \$35 million may have been committed, there is a period of time in which we have to determine exactly what has been committed and whether there are some. I assume — and I say this quite honestly — that if that were the fact and the momentum was still there, I would be more than inclined to go back to seek additional funds from my colleagues and hope they would support that.

Canadian Constitution — Quebec

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Is the hon. minister in a position to confirm reports that Quebec has established a position indicating on what basis they might accept the Constitution of the country?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The government of Quebec has now made available to the government of Alberta and, I understand, the government of Canada and other provinces their proposals for Quebec's participation in the Constitution Act of 1982. That document has been under review in the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It is not to be made public until 11:30 mountain daylight saving time. Therefore, I'm not in a position to comment on the content thereof, nor would it be our intention for the government to immediately comment on the proposals, as it will require some very considerable review from both the legal and constitutional perspectives.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's need for time on this. Is he in any position to indicate what schedule intergovernmental discussions might take on that paper? For example, is it on the agenda or is it planned to put it on the agenda for the August First Ministers' Conference?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's a little premature perhaps to indicate a timetable for a review. It would be our understanding that the federal government would initiate constitutional discussions on the Quebec proposal after a reasonable period of time for review by the federal government. However, in view of the fact that a meeting of the premiers is scheduled for St. John's, Newfoundland, in August, it is quite possible that a provincial review of the matter might be undertaken at that meeting. That, of course, has not yet been confirmed.

Farm Income

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. It follows out of the April issue of *Farm Cash Receipts and Expenses* that was released by the minister's statistics branch this week and had some

pretty alarming news for farmers, despite programs already in place. Can the minister outline what programs he intends to implement to deal with the prediction in that publication that realized net income for farmers in this province will decline by 25.6 percent in 1986?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, I haven't as yet had an opportunity to review those statistics; however, I suggest that the 25 percent probably includes a reduction in inventory along with the reduction in income. Everyone recognizes that this past year has been a difficult year, with the drought situation and therefore no carry-over grain stocks that we normally would have, as well as the weather conditions in the northern part of the province, which were certainly negative.

What we may do with regard to additional assistance for our producers this coming year — we have made a number of steps, as all hon. members are aware, examples of which are the farm fertilizer protection plan and a number of other steps in the credit area. We certainly are monitoring it very closely, recognizing the difficulty for farmers, not only here. This isn't an isolated situation for the province of Alberta; it's also across this country and across North America and, in fact, the world. The Assembly can be assured that all steps that can be taken by our government to assist farmers through this difficult time will be taken.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. The projections in the publication do take into account the fertilizer rebate program and still predict this sharp drop in income. Has the minister any intention to proceed with something like a beefing up or a significant improvement in the farm fuel allowance program as another way of dealing with this problem?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: As I stated, Mr. Speaker, a number of steps are being considered. The hon. Provincial Treasurer may wish to respond with respect to the farm fuel distribution allowance, which follows under his responsibility.

MR. HYNDMAN: Maybe you could ask the question again.

MR. MARTIN: Wake up, Lou, wake up.

MR. GURNETT: The question dealt with whether or not, in view of the projected decline in net realized income, there was any consideration being given at this point to beefing up the farm fuel allowance program.

MR. HYNDMAN: No, Mr. Speaker. The budget at the moment contains the largest support of its kind of any state or any province in North America, in the amount of some \$73 million. No other jurisdiction has a 7 cents a litre benefit. That has been our major initiative in terms of reducing farm input costs, and I think it's, at the moment, a major effort by the government to do that, certainly in comparison to other governments in Canada and the United States.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Nonetheless, there is still this predicted net cash income decline of almost 13 percent. My question to the minister, though, deals with another area of the report. In the report it's also predicted that crop receipts will decline substantially for just about every area except, I think, barley and cattle. My question is whether the minister has done any review with

his federal counterpart of the possibility of bringing in some type of parity pricing system that would, at a minimum, guarantee that producers in all areas would realize their cost of production.

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, of course there are discussions under way and will be discussions, particularly at the July agriculture ministers' conference this year, on a wide variety of topics. He can recall that last year the number one issue of concern to all ministers was the farm financial situation, and that will of course be on the agenda again, to make sure what steps can be taken on working on a fast track.

With respect to looking at parity pricing, we all would like to see a higher price for our product. It's nonsense that the prices are lower, and the squeeze is certainly on for our producers, but the parity pricing concept is one we view as being retrogressive and one that certainly wouldn't receive the support of the province.

Looking at the whole area of returns for our producers, as I stated earlier, we know that because of the short crop there has been a reduction in the carry-over stocks of grain. Also, as I stated clearly in this Assembly, it's unacceptable to have the import of beef into this country. That has certainly created a negative impact on our cattle and hog producers. There certainly have been telephone discussions as well as discussions yesterday with federal ministers about the issue of some of the concerns that our agricultural community is facing and that steps must be taken to make sure we are not disadvantaged further. There is some reduction in breeding stock in the province, which is of deep concern to me, and that flows directly out of the method of payment and also the imported beef and pork coming in from the European community, which negatively impacts us.

So a number of initiatives and steps are being looked at, and our government will certainly do all we can to protect and help our agricultural sector through what I believe will be a difficult year.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, specifically following up on the report's prediction of an 8 percent decline in hog receipts. The minister has already told us that he's not prepared to look at a stop-loss program for hog producers. Is there any other program — since this is 1985, and the problem is already there — that the minister is considering to deal with this in an immediate way, in addition to his work for a stabilization program federally?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: The immediate action, Mr. Speaker, that I've made the Assembly aware of, is that we need a national tripartite red meat stabilization program in place now. If the federal government delays that action and doesn't move forward, we would be looking at steps within the province to make sure that all assistance possible is given to our producers. The Alberta Pork Producers' Marketing Board in a clear statement said that they feel that a red meat stabilization program would be adequate to help their industry at the moment, recognizing that that national tripartite red meat stabilization program is retroactive. The payment would be retroactive, so that would give some immediate benefit to our producers. However, if there are further delays and if action isn't taken quickly, I have stated very clearly that we will take any steps necessary to see that our livestock industry is protected.

MR. GURNETT: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary.

MR. GURNETT: As we look at these predictions, another area of concern is the situation of farm bankruptcies, which increased 17 percent during the first quarter of this year in Alberta while other agriculture producing provinces saw declines. Has the minister or his department done any assessment of why Alberta seems to be in this unique position of continuing to see an increase in farm bankruptcies?

MR. FJORDBOTTEN: Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that we had inflation in the province that certainly increased our land prices significantly — more significantly, I believe, than any other province. So the downturn in the economy certainly had an impact on agriculture.

I think we have to be careful in using percentages, because percentages can be deceiving to a certain degree. When we say they've increased — if they were zero before and all of a sudden they went up to one, that's a one hundred percent increase. I think we have to be careful when we're discussing what the increases are in percentage terms.

We recognize the difficulties of our agricultural producers and have taken steps through the Agricultural Development Corporation and the Department of Agriculture to bring in programs that are second to none anywhere. We will continue to review them. As I stated earlier, it is still a very major issue nationally. It's my intention to be very strong at the agriculture ministers' conference in July, to raise concerns and look at taking whatever steps we can to be helpful to our producers.

Accountants Acts

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General and is also along the same line that my colleague pursued: the heavy-handed treatment of special groups in this province. Has the Solicitor General had an opportunity to meet with either the executive or other members of the Certified General Accountants Association of Alberta since Bills 76, 71, and 72 have been introduced in the House?

DR. REID: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have met with representatives and executives of all three.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what assurances he gave to the Certified General Accountants Association that changes would be made in their Act to permit them to do audits the same as chartered accountants?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, obviously the information that has got to the hon. member has been as misleading as that of some of the advertisements that have recently been placed in the newspapers. The difficulty is that the certified general accountants and the people who did the advertisements and communicated with the hon. member obviously have not very carefully read the definitions of audit and review that are included in the statute. I suggest that they be read very carefully. In order to be a designated audit and an exclusive scope of practice, the function has to fulfill all the requirements of that definition. The reviews have to be for the benefit of a third party, or it has to be reasonably anticipated

that they will be, and then one has to remember the provisions for grandfathering that are included in section 94 of Bill 71. That review board will of course be independent. The regulations under which it will operate will not be set by any of the three accounting groups. It will be set by order in council. If the member has any further questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, it's quite amazing how 2,700 people can be so stupid and not be able to understand that. I guess the main problem is that the certified general accountants are worried about what the regulations will contain. In light of that, can the minister give this Assembly assurance that the Bill will be held till the fall, till we can have adequate time to look at the regulations and the association will have adequate time to review those and meet with the minister? Can the minister assure the Assembly that there is the possibility that we can have that Bill held until the fall?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to give that assurance at this time. In particular I'd like to object to the term "stupid" being applied to these people. I didn't apply it, and I don't think they are stupid; otherwise, they wouldn't pass the necessary tests and examinations in order to become certified general accountants.

The point about the timing — perhaps the member missed the introduction of these three statutes. I indicated that involved in the whole process would be a thorough revision of 190 statutes and regulations where the word "audit" is currently inappropriately used. That's part of the package, and none of this will be proclaimed until the whole package is complete. The statutes will be reviewed, the regulations will be reviewed, and the regulations under these three Bills are all required for the whole package to work.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. The ads in the paper that the minister alluded to seemed to indicate that these 2,700 people don't understand, and the minister is telling us that that is not what is going to happen to them. This is what my problem is. Can the Solicitor General indicate if the Chartered Accountants Act is being modelled on the same Chartered Accountants Act that was used in Ontario, or a very similar one? Is this where the model came from?

MR. SPEAKER: Surely the hon. member would be capable of comparing the two himself without asking for — I don't know if it's going to go into clause by clause or paragraph by paragraph, but I think there would be a more practical way of making that comparison than taking up the time of the question period.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I want to know what information the minister received and if that was the model used, other than some other ones, because there are certain regulations that promised the general accountants something, and it didn't happen. That's why I'd like to know if the Ontario model was used.

DR. REID: No, Mr. Speaker. In fact there are significant differences between the model that Ontario used and the Bill that's presented to the Legislature.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister confirm that in discussions with

the certified general accountants he gave a commitment that before entering exclusive scope of practice into Bill 71, thorough discussions would occur between the minister and the association so the association would be satisfied with the final amendment or position that was put into Bill 71?

DR. REID: Mr. Speaker, when I met with the representatives of the certified general accountants on February 20, I believe, I indicated to them that there was possibility of exclusive scope. I gave the same indication to the chartered accountants and the certified management accountants. There was no guarantee given to them that there would be ongoing discussions thereafter with me. There was consultation with department staff and other people regarding the development of the pieces of legislation. Indeed, up to a certain stage, draft legislation of the other groups was transmitted to certified general accountants. Of course, that process came to a conclusion when the decisions were made in caucus.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we could come back to this topic. The hon. members for Calgary Millican and Calgary North West have not yet been able to ask their first questions.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we won't leave this topic. My question is also for the hon. Solicitor General concerning the Chartered Accountants Act, Bill 71. Will any business or accounting firms be forced out of business with the advent of Bill 71?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, that could readily be handled when the Bill is being debated. It is certainly a question of opinion, and even opinion about the future rather than a question of fact.

Private Adoptions

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Could the minister explain why sections of the new Child Welfare Act pertaining to private adoptions will not be proclaimed?

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, over the last number of months I have had representations from a number of people who fear that sections of the new Act may lead to inappropriate home studies being prepared by the nongovernment agencies or individuals who might be doing that and to inappropriate adoption agencies operating in Alberta. I don't know whether or not their concerns are valid, but I do know that the issues are complex — such spin-off issues as surrogate motherhood. What I want to do is delay the implementation of the new Act in that area until further study is carried out.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if we might just conclude very briefly on another supplementary and answer. We've run out of time.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll just ask one more supplementary. Could the minister tell the Assembly what impact this decision will have on the implementation plan?

DR. WEBBER: It's still our goal to have the Act proclaimed on July 1. This really doesn't have any impact at all on our proceeding with the new Child Welfare Act, regulations, and policies. It will be implemented with the regulations in

place, as I mentioned, but we will be developing regulations as time goes on. We already have our Children's Guardian in place, ready to go, and we will have the new appeal system, the child welfare appeal board, in place. Mr. Speaker, there will really be no impact to speak of as a result of delaying this particular area.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Might we revert briefly to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS (reversion)

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, young people from the Onoway elementary school, grade 6, make an annual visit to the Legislature. I'm delighted this morning to have the privilege of introducing 61 of them to my colleagues. Onoway is a very progressive village located some 40 miles northwest of Edmonton. The students are ably led by their teachers Mrs. B. Livesey, Mr. Jim Fegyverneki, and Mrs. Sewchuk. I ask the group in the members' gallery to rise, and I ask my colleagues to afford these very important Albertans the warm welcome of the House. Then we're going to go and get a picture taken.

MR. WEISS: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 17 exuberant and happy students. I say "happy", Mr. Speaker, because they're happy there's no school today. They're from grades 6 through 9 and are located in é Fort McKay school. Ford McKay is in the heart of the Lac La Biche-McMurray constituency. They're accompanied by their teacher Mr. Rod Hyde and parent Mrs. Elsie Fabian. I look forward to meeting with them a little later. I ask that they rise and receive the cordial welcome of the Assembly.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Member for Drumheller, who is unable to be in the House at this time, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, 21 grade 6 students attending St. Anthony school in Drumheller, Alberta. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Gerry Hamilton and parents Mrs. Debbie Grande, Mrs. Marg Ewing, Mrs. Karen Dumancic, and Mr. Robert Sanders. They are seated in the public gallery, and I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, although I can't see them, I have it on good authority that there are 26 grade 6 students who attend St. Clement school, located in the constituency of Edmonton Mill Woods. They are accompanied on their visit to the Legislature by their teacher Mr. Tannus. If they are indeed seated in the public gallery, I ask them to rise and receive the acknowledgment of the Assembly.

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will please come to order for consideration of estimates of the Department of Manpower. When we adjourned the last meeting of the committee, the minister was responding.

MR. MARTIN: Before we go on, I take it there's been a change. On Wednesday night we were told it would be Advanced Education and Education.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think the indication on Wednesday was Advanced Education, followed by Manpower and the estimates of the Legislative Assembly. I think I'm right in that. The only change that's occurred is that the Minister of Advanced Education is not available today. I apologize to hon. members for that.

Department of Manpower

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the minister like to respond?

MR. ISLEY: Very briefly, thank you, Mr. Chairman. My notes indicate that the two speakers were the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. The hon. Leader of the Opposition raised for the second time the question of why the department was growing so fast and the role the planning secretariat plays. I believe a review of *Hansard* will indicate that those questions have already been responded to.

A new question was raised by the hon. leader with respect to career education and what relationship exists between the Alberta Manpower career counselling system and the school system. I point out that in many communities there is a very close working relationship. In addition to that, our hire-a-student program runs job search sessions in many of our secondary schools.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview made representation with respect to community- and worker-based co-operatives, and raised a question in connection with the percentage of people going into retraining who experience some type of counselling. In pure percentage terms, that is a hard figure to come up with. I point out that any Albertan who accesses training or retraining through the Alberta vocational training allowance programs must access that through a career counselling process. For people who are accessing training with their own resources, there's no requirement as to what type of counselling they take prior to making their decisions. I think the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview expressed concern about the quality of counselling that goes on in some of our private vocational schools. I assure the House that many of the private vocational schools I have had the opportunity to visit in the last two years are doing quite a good job of counselling and, in many cases, a good job of job placement and follow-up.

With those remarks, Mr. Chairman, I will await further questions.

Agreed to:

Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services:

1.01 — Minister's Office	\$183,179
1.02 — Minister's Committees	\$24,000

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, it's nice to speed along, but I think we should talk to this minister for a few moments about student employment in the province. I noted on the opening day of the student employment office ...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: With all due respect, can the Chair suggest that the hon. member do it under vote 3?

MR. R. SPEAKER: I might get into some general topics as well.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The member can do it before the vote is reported.

Agreed to:

1.03 — General Administration	\$5,079,719
1.04 — Planning and Research	\$429,348
Total Vote 1 — Departmental Support Services	\$5,716,246
2.1 — Manpower Development	\$24,814,136
2.2 — Training Assistance	\$11,944,127
2.3 — Manpower Training	\$11,823,840
Total Vote 2 — Manpower Development and Training Assistance	\$48,582,103

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Does the Member for Little Bow wish to get in now?

MR. R. SPEAKER: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity of speaking to the students on 109th just off Jasper as they were lined up to apply for jobs for the summer under various programs. In the lineup that morning I think there were about 300 students who were very optimistic and felt they were going to gain employment. They had heard that persons at the front of the line were successful, so there was a lot of optimism. Just last week I believe there was again a significant lineup at the offices, where people were applying for jobs. A number of the jobs were temporary or short-term, a number were making phone calls and, as I understand it, a number of them were on commission, and there are students who are unable to get that employment.

I'd like to know from the minister what has happened at the other student employment agencies. I know this is worked on in co-operation with the federal government, but I wonder if the minister could indicate what has happened across the province. Have most of these placements, these requests for job opportunities, been filled at this time? Are there a number that are on the street yet? Is the minister finding that the job opportunity just isn't there, no matter what we do in terms of programming or expenditure of funds? What is the current picture?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, maybe I should review briefly the major programs that are out there right now for students to take advantage of. There is the summer temporary employment program, which we are currently funding to the tune of \$25 million; it was originally announced at \$20 million. That has two elements to it: the provincial government element and the community support element. The number of student positions created under that program is slightly under 10,000. In addition, as part of Alberta Challenge '85, this summer we have the new summer employment experience development program, which is a federal program directed toward the private sector, where they will pay half the wage up to \$3 an hour, I believe, for the summer months. So there are more student positions created this summer than any summer, to my knowledge. Anticipated take-up under SEED should be 6,500, according to federal sources.

The hire-a-student program is a co-operative effort between the federal government, the provincial government, and the chambers of commerce to provide a bridge between private-

sector jobs and students who haven't found positions under the other programs I've described. The growth of that service has been quite phenomenal. We now serve 78 different communities in the province. Support from the private sector has again been very impressive. I'm not sure whether or not there were 300 students lined up outside that morning; I didn't check the count. But I know there were 600 jobs on that board inside when the office on 109th Street opened, which I think is very positive, and the private sector should be commended for it.

I don't have a recent briefing as to the situation across the province, but from the information that has hit me so far, I would say that it's slightly more positive than last year.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. In terms of the graduates of our university who are looking for professional opportunities, or opportunities where they've been trained in various fields through NAIT or SAIT, has the minister any indication as to the success rate of those people in obtaining job opportunities in their field of training? Has the department done a study on that? Could a study be tabled in the Legislature as to what has really happened in that field? In March, when a number of young people were saying, "I'm going to graduate, but I don't know where I'm going to work," there was major concern. In the last three or four weeks, I haven't heard the same type of message. I'm partly assuming that they have either found a job in their respective fields or taken some other form of employment. I wonder if the minister has done any research in that area. Does the department monitor that kind of statistic?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, it's too early to analyze the current group of graduates. I point out that we have the internship element of the youth employment and training program where, if students who have graduated — we're talking of ones who are trying to go into the work force permanently — are not successful in finding a job related to their field of study over the next two months, they would be eligible to register under that program. Under that program we will pay the employer 50 percent of the salary, up to \$7,800 per year, providing he makes a one-year commitment to that young person. We will also provide up to \$25 per day training allowance if on-the-job training is being delivered to that recent grad. But I would say that it will be two or three months before we'll be able to get a fair assessment of the success of this year's graduates finding jobs in fields related to their areas of training.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the minister, in terms of that type of statistic, how does the department go about that? Is that monitored through the universities or employment agencies? Does the minister have some type of procedure in place for tracking various graduates of our Alberta institutions to determine what happened in terms of their employment opportunity? Is that done in some way in conjunction with the Department of Labour? Is this statistic the minister is talking about a very informal one that may come back here to the Legislature? I'm not aware of the kind of procedure that's used. Maybe the minister could clarify that.

MR. ISLEY: There is no formal tracking mechanism. Some institutions tend to attempt, on their own, periodic follow-ups on their students. The best source of information we

have as far as global figures are concerned is the Stats Canada results, when they start categorizing them into age groups.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the other area I want to raise is related to student programs as well. The figure of 150,000 unemployed was used in the Legislature a year ago and at the present time. There certainly are a number of students and tradespeople in that group. The minister indicated that we were going to impact unemployment numbers by placing these job opportunities before Albertans, and that intent is proper. The second thing we have in this province is a sort of out-migration of people. There isn't in-migration or a population increase occurring at the present time. I wonder if the minister could rationalize that figure of 150,000 with this increased student job opportunity, along with the static or diminishing gross provincial population in the province of Alberta.

MR. ISLEY: Again, based upon Stats Canada figures, I would point out that there have only been two three-month periods when there has been a slight population decrease. All other quarters have shown population growth. Keep in mind that there are three factors that go in to determining population. You've got natural increase, which is births minus deaths, international immigration, and interprovincial migration. In a number of quarters for almost two years our out-migration to other provinces has significantly exceeded our in-migration, but that loss of population has been more than offset, in all except two quarters, by the combination of natural increase and international immigration. So we haven't had a declining population.

The 150,000 you refer to is again a Stats Canada number, whether it's 144 or 146 in a given month. You're right; there is a significant number of young people and construction workers, and we've addressed that at length in the House.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, a question to the minister. The point of my question is: why does the number 150,000 — or say it's in the 140,000 to 150,000 range. That's not a significant number out of the total unemployed. What seems to be happening in our Alberta economy that in a sense stabilizes that number? In manpower planning or job opportunity planning, how does the minister look at that number? If I were sitting in the minister's place with his responsibility, where that number seems to sit static, it would be a little frustrating. At the same time we're putting some \$25 million into STEP and other programs to try to do something with the number, but the number seems to stay right with us. How does the minister rationalize that number in his own planning? I think the ability to deal with that number is beyond the minister's department. It certainly lies with Economic Development and the private sector in this province; that's where the real solution to the matter is. How does the minister observe why that number stays the same and it isn't changing, even though the government is attempting to spend rather an enormous sum of money?

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, our goal is to reduce that number as much as possible. As to why it has stayed pretty well at that level over the past two years, if you analyze the labour force based on the industrial sectors, you'll see that a number of industrial sectors have shown growth in employment opportunities. While construction was taking a

downturn, what it was losing was more than offsetting the gains in other areas. I have some optimism due to the fact that for four months running we've seen the construction employment levels stay constant or move up slightly, and we've seen the size of the construction labour force remain pretty well constant after it took a significant drop earlier. If that is the beginning of a trend, I expect that number to start decreasing, providing we don't get a significant turnaround as far as interprovincial migration is concerned and providing we don't get a significant increase in the participation rate. If those two variables change, you can have growing employment levels, and you may still be dealing with that number of unemployed.

MR. GURNETT: Just to follow a bit further into the whole area of student employment and some questions and concerns I have there, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to begin by asking a little bit about what happens with regard to STEP programs as far as limitations and restrictions that exist for students that might be interested in taking part in them. The background to that is an interesting situation I know of that came up a couple of years ago but that I understand is fairly common. This is the case of a man in Grande Prairie who developed a STEP proposal that was approved. He has a daughter who was at university and was interested in the job. It turned out that she wasn't eligible to be hired even though it was an area that she in fact wanted to work in and was related to her future career plans. Apparently there was a restriction that she couldn't work in that job. The end result was that one of my sisters was hired for this job. It cost her money for accommodation to stay in Grande Prairie. Certainly, it was still a welcome job, and she made money from the job toward her next year of study, but it seems strange that one girl had to find a job somewhere else, which reduced her net profit from the summer's work because of her accommodations elsewhere. Then again in the case of my sister, it cost her money to take a job which people in Grande Prairie could have taken, except for this restriction.

I wonder if that kind of limitation on people that make STEP proposals and have projects approved for funding is still in place and whether there are any other restrictions on what youth can be hired for these kinds of positions so that the benefit of the program can be as widespread as possible. Perhaps the minister could indicate what the overall structure is with those programs and if other student employment programs have similar kinds of limitations built into them.

I wonder whether there's been any analysis by the minister of the effect that has in rural areas where there are a number of people needing a job in some area but in another area there aren't any and, when limitations like that are built in, if it creates unfairness or unnecessary confusion of people moving to other places to get a job when they may have been able to take something in their own area. I suspect that wouldn't be as serious in urban areas probably where there are a lot of jobs close together, but in developing limitations, I wonder if there was any particular attention to that being a condition that shouldn't exist in programs in rural areas.

The Member for Little Bow mentioned the higher statistics for youth unemployment and the fact that there seemed to be more people that aren't employed amongst young people. On occasion I've heard that perhaps for young people the figure is twice as high as it is in the overall population. I wonder whether the minister has statistics about unem-

ployment amongst those in the, say, 18 to 25 age group for Alberta specifically and particularly for rural Alberta. Just how much higher are the figures with young people than with the population at large?

I was also thinking, Mr. Chairman, about a program I was involved with about 15 years or so ago that was funded by the federal government. I believe it was called Opportunities for Youth, if I remember correctly. In that program young people could get together to develop or initiate ideas that created employment for themselves. If the program was approved, it would receive funding, and it put young people to work. The advantage of that was that it became more than just job creation, temporarily putting somebody to work in some job so they had a little money to go back to technical school or university the next year; it became a very valuable learning experience. The dozen or so of us who developed a project and prepared an application and submitted it and tried to operate a program learned a great deal that was valuable — true work experience instead of simply being put to work in some kind of role.

I wonder whether anything exists in Alberta where this government and the minister's department are providing funding to encourage groups of young people to actually initiate new ideas themselves. I'm thinking of two areas. First of all, Mr. Chairman, in connection with creating summer jobs that would have a limited duration, like this Opportunities for Youth program, I also wonder if we're doing anything in a permanent way to encourage groups of young people in this population group that has higher unemployment to create and develop ideas, and then get some kind of significant support so they can try that out. I'm aware that there might be more risks with that than with the shared salary arrangement with an established employer. On the other hand, it does seem to have some opportunities for greater benefits in encouraging personal initiative, going out and really trying things and seeing where they can go with them. I wonder if there's anything within the summer employment programs or the general employment programs that deals with that particular approach to putting unemployed young people to work in this province.

I also wonder whether the student temporary employment programs have any control built into them with regard to whether or not unemployed youth who are not students in the sense that they have an intention to go back to school the following fall are eligible for these positions. That may go back to what I asked earlier about the various limitations that exist on a project before it can receive funding. Is that one of the other areas of limitation, or can any unemployed young person receive employment through these student temporary programs?

Also, I wonder what programs exist or how the whole area of work on farms ties into assistance for students and young people. Can a farmer develop a program, apply, and hire young people, particularly members of his own family or neighbours that need work and would like to stay in the area anyway to be of some assistance with farm work rather than having to go somewhere else in the province to work? Can they be hired through these kinds of programs and as a result provide a benefit to the family and the community where they are as well as to themselves?

Those are just some areas, Mr. Chairman, where the minister could maybe amplify a bit with regard to summer employment.

MR. MARTIN: Just for a point of clarification. We have the House leader in the House. I checked *Hansard*. We'll

continue on with this, but just for his information, Manpower was not mentioned. It was Advanced Education, Education, and the Legislative Assembly. I'm not going to go off the deep end on it, but with the estimates, it is nice to know somewhat ahead.

MR. CRAWFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I must refer the hon. member to page 1,043 of *Hansard*.

MR. MARTIN: I apologize. My information is wrong. We prepared for Advanced Education, and Manpower was there.

Mr. Chairman, I may have to go out immediately to take pictures and be back in, so I'll start with some other estimations with the Minister of Manpower. There are a number of things I want to follow up in terms of unemployment. I suppose the first thing is this minister's reaction. We now have the ERCB report, their recommendations on Genesee, and I'm not talking about site 1, phase 1. I'd like him to comment specifically on their recommendation that site 1 of Genesee go from 1988 to 1989. We've had many discussions in the Legislature about the construction industry, and the minister has talked about it being the most decimated industry. Of course, many tradepeople and the city of Edmonton have been pushing that this would be a real job, that we'll need the power eventually, and it would do a significant amount for unemployment in Edmonton, which has the highest. Recognizing that the decision has not been made by cabinet but fearing the worst, will the minister — I hope the Minister of Manpower will be advancing the cause of the construction industry, to lower unemployment, and will be making representation. I'm asking if the minister, in his role as Minister of Manpower, will assure the Assembly that he will take this up with cabinet, will move ahead and press for Genesee to go further.

Mr. Chairman, a number of other areas, if I may. If we go back, I believe the minister talked about the job creation and training programs of Alberta Manpower. I think he said that his estimate was 44,000 jobs and perhaps 1,000 indirect. I have a list of them here. The minister must have arrived at 44,000 with his people. I wonder if he could give us an idea of where the 44,000 came from by the programs he has announced: youth work, experience, post-secondary. Could he break that down a little more specifically so we can see the type of impact he and his department believe these programs have had?

The other thing is about the trends. We are told by the government, Mr. Chairman, that a recovery seems to have started, yet unemployment seems to go on. We've had this debate. I would like the minister's comments on the overall trends. I suggest that the trends are worsening, even in monthly patterns. Normal seasonal improvements aren't happening. Let me give you just a couple of examples. When we look at Alberta in February 1985 — that's not the most recent, but it's the most recent one we have in months — the seasonally adjusted unemployment was 11.5 percent. In February 1984 it was 10.3 percent. My point is that the trends are continuing. If we look at January '85, it was 10.9 and in February 11.5.

If I may, I would like the minister to answer two questions in that area. One, how would he suggest this works into the recovery stage we're talking about? We were talking about a recession in '84 and unemployment is actually higher now. Secondly, has he any projected trends to, say, a year from now? Will that be about the same? Does he

see it coming down or going up? Why would he come to that assessment?

The other thing I would like to discuss quickly with the minister has to do with a couple of statements — at least accredited to the minister. This has to do with unemployment, and the minister is quoted as saying:

Personally, I'd be comfortable with around six per cent unemployment ...

It's preferable to have competition in the work place if you want the productivity.

Isley says he hopes the province never returns to the virtually zero unemployment levels it had in the late '70s and early '80s.

I think that's what's causing many of the problems we're facing today.

One other quote:

A definition of full employment that says everyone should have a job "is not a healthy thing."

I want the minister to clarify this. Was he misquoted, or is he saying that he actually wants a certain level of unemployment in the province, that that is somehow good for the economy and good for Albertans so they can compete for a limited number of jobs? Because I think that's a rather important statement, I'd like the minister to reinforce it or tell us precisely what he means.

The other area that falls into that has to do with hidden unemployed, and I've talked about that before. When we talk about the figures — the minister may grin, but they're out there. I talk to them; I hope he does. What those figures indicate are the people who are still registered with Manpower. If they haven't looked for work, if they're not getting UIC benefits, they're not in the statistics. There is a whole range of people. Let me quote some figures for the minister. I can't believe he's not aware of this. I just can't believe that reaction. Is the minister saying that the figures quoted are the actual number of unemployed in the province, that the figures we get every month from StatsCan include all the unemployed? I would like to know that. I'd like the minister's assessment; that would be very interesting.

Whether the minister likes it or not, people estimate what they call the hidden unemployed. We don't know how many there are because there's no way to register them. People have guessed 3 or 4 percent or whatever. This is in the United States. I'll quote this:

The US Bureau of Labour Stats has a sub-employment index which adds the official unemployed, the discouraged workers, the involuntary part-timers

and we talked about part-time work

and low wage earners (considered less than fully employed)

because in many cases they're below the poverty level to come up with an estimate of the true extent of unemployment — 30 % or more.

Those aren't my figures; those are the U.S. bureau's. Maybe it's not as high in Canada, but do we have any indication? Are we checking these sorts of things? It's the other aspect of unemployment. By the nature of the minister's reaction, I take it we're not. This is from the U.S. bureau, and I would expect that some of the same things are happening in Alberta and in Canada. I would like the minister's comments on this, Mr. Chairman.

The only concluding comment before I have to go out, as I said, and take some pictures is that I would really like the minister to come back and go through those, because I am fascinated by the 44,000. He must have figures on

their estimation of what each of those programs is adding in terms of the 44,000 jobs.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Would the minister like to respond?

MR. ISLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all, to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, with respect to hiring of immediate family members, I would point out that all of the job-creation programs, including STEP, prohibit the employment of an immediate family member, defined as father, mother, sister, brother, son, or daughter. That runs through all the programs. With respect to the community support element of the summer temporary employment program, the restriction is that the supervisor of that project cannot supervise an immediate family member. The child of the board of directors of the ag society or the rec board, or whatever it is that has created the project, would be eligible as long as the immediate supervision isn't provided by a parent. The only other restriction that generally runs across all our programs is a three-year Alberta residency requirement.

With respect to unemployment levels for youth, Stats Canada gives those figures each month. It's still of serious concern to us that males 15 to 19 years of age have an unemployment rate of 25.4 percent — you can compare that to the overall unemployment rate last month of 11.7 — and the 20- to 24-year-old male, 16.2 percent. Females fare considerably better, with the 15- to 19-year-old's unemployment rate being 19.4 and the 20- to 24-year-old's rate being 11.9. It's as a result of that high level of unemployment in those age groups that we came out with the very significant Alberta youth employment and training program.

I believe the next question had to do with who could access STEP. Remember, STEP is a summer temporary employment program. It is not the student temporary employment program. So while the greatest percentage of individuals working under that program are students, there is no restriction that prevents another unemployed young person, or for that matter another unemployed Albertan, from working on that project. Many of the projects communities develop may require someone with some trade skills, with some supervisory ability. They will generally top that wage off a little higher and hire an older person who has some skills in the work force and finish off their group with young people.

Under the summer temporary employment program, the summer farm employment element is available during the months of July and August, under which a farmer can hire a young person and we will pay half the wage up to \$300 per month. That's restricted to the July/August period to make it available primarily to the high school student who doesn't get a chance to compete for many of the other other STEP positions which run the full five months.

With respect to the questions and confusion raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition — I see he's absent, and I hope he will read *Hansard* carefully on this — I will certainly be involved in the discussion on Genesee, but I again throw out the caution I've pointed out before in this House. We're dealing with a structural problem in the construction sector, and if our only reason for proceeding with the project is to increase jobs artificially at this point in time, that would be a very weak reason for proceeding.

The breakdown of the 44,000 jobs: I will leave that as a global figure for the simple reason that we're running with a fair degree of flexibility between the various job-

creation programs, and I don't want to lose that flexibility. I point out that to date we have almost 10,000 positions under the summer temporary employment program. In the past 12 months we've created at least 20,000 positions in the Alberta wage subsidy program alone. If that continues at the rate it's going, it may do as well this year. The Alberta training program, I believe, has benefitted 8,000 people over the past 12 months, and I anticipate it will continue at a similar level. Then we've got the other programs: the Alberta youth employment and training program, which has benefitted in excess of 2,000 young people since September, and the Alberta environment employment support program; we'll have the priority employment program again next winter. So I have no doubt that we will achieve the goal of benefitting at least 44,000 Albertans, but I will not zero them into the programs and then be restricted from the flexibility of letting one program go faster than another.

The hon. leader questions whether or not the recovery has started. I submit that it started two years ago. I've continually said that the last indicator of an economic recovery is the labour force. With the trends we're beginning to see in the employment statistics, I would say that we're starting to see the labour force respond, but it's responding to decisions that were made, projects that were announced, some time in the past. If we keep the right climate for further economic decisions and investments to be made in, I am optimistic that we'll see more and more impact on the labour force.

I've indicated before why I'm hesitant to make projections based on raw percentages. I'm quite confident in saying that employment levels will be going up, but I hasten to point out that it doesn't necessarily logically follow that unemployment levels will go down.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition should probably quit depending on the newspapers for all his information. He raised some questions about desirable unemployment levels. I've stated many times in and out of this House that the goal of this government with respect to unemployment levels is to have an economy in which all job-ready Albertans are able to find work. But I hasten to add that if you're going to analyze the labour force realistically, there is a group of Albertans who are not job-ready. We've developed many unique programs for that group. I give you programs such as the employment skills program, the Opportunity Corps program, the employment counselling and relocation program, the significant amount of academic upgrading that has taken place through our AVT funding. Those programs are all designed to assist people who have very few job skills to upgrade themselves and get into the labour force. As the hon. leader well knows from the profession he's worked in, that group of Albertans who are not job-ready tends to perpetuate itself. Our school system tends to lose students from age 14 up, say, who aren't ready for the labour force and are probably going to have to look at some skill retraining or upgrading before they can get into it. Those people show up in unemployment stats. So I'm saying that one segment of the labour force isn't job-ready.

Another segment of the labour force is voluntarily unemployed, because they are moving between jobs for one reason or another or decide to take off a short period of time. Some economists will tell you that in an average work force that group will run about 3 percent. So, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, you put the percentage on the other group that you're quite familiar with and you decide at what percentage level we would have every job-ready and willing Albertan into the labour force.

The hon. leader didn't like the way I smiled when he started talking about hidden unemployment. There is such a thing as hidden unemployment in many work forces. I have very little evidence to suggest much hidden unemployment in the Alberta work force. I say that for the simple reason that in Alberta our participation rate is in excess of 70 percent. Seventy of every 100 people over age 15 are either working or looking for work. So we've got the stats on it. That compares to a national average of about 64 percent. Unless you're expecting that everyone over age 15 wishes to be in the work force, there can't be a very significant amount of hidden unemployment out there.

The other item on which I probably upset the leader a bit by shaking my head was a reference that if people are not getting unemployment benefits they are not counted as unemployed. That is not related in any way, shape, or form to Stats Canada figures. The Stats Canada figures, which are released every month, are based on a survey carried on across the province in 7,000 households. That survey is taken about the middle of every month, and an extrapolation occurs. It is not done by counting how many people receive UIC or receive social services and are employable. The actual fact remains that on occasion, you can have more people receiving UIC than you have unemployed. UIC recipients can be apprentices going through technical training. They're not deemed to be unemployed by Stats Canada when they are in an institution, but they show up as UIC recipients. Under section 38, I believe, of the UIC Act, the federal commission can get into such things as supporting job-sharing. So you have people splitting workweeks showing up as employed, but they are still drawing UIC. UIC can be paying out sick benefits. If the individual isn't looking for work, then the individual is not unemployed, under Stats Canada definitions. You don't lose people as they leave unemployment. If they are still picked up in the survey, they are still picked up in the figures we're talking about.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I think I'll await any further questions.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, to come back to a number of areas that the minister has responded to. I apologize that I had to go out. Did he come back on the breakdown of the programs — the 44,000? So each program is on record in *Hansard*? Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, to come back to the whole idea of trends, when I ask about trends, I'm not asking that the minister give us specifics. I recognize that we can't totally predict this. I also recognize that they depend on OPEC and a lot of things. It seems to me, though, that surely the minister's department is doing these things, that one of their mandates would be to look at trends. I pointed out that they have an increase of 34.4 percent. It seems to me it would be fairly important to have some predictions — a year, or even two, three, four, or five. If the trend continues where unemployment goes up, it seems to me that that would have an effect on the types of programs this minister would want and certainly in terms of the things the whole government would want. He says I can do the trends, but I'm not the Minister of Manpower. Is the minister saying they're not doing that or that they have them and he's reluctant to take a look at it? How does that work? Is the minister saying that we do not have these figures, that we do not have a projection of unemployment a year or two down the way? I can appreciate it if the minister says this is scenario one, two, or three, because there are all sorts of intervening

variables. But I'm trying to find out if we're looking at the trends and projections ahead.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I brought it up is that we were told last year there would be a lowering of unemployment and, in fact, it increased. That is the point of the trends. Surely the government wants to know why. I'm not going to go through the evils of unemployment, but it seems to be a pretty important thing for the minister's department to look at.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

To come back to what we call hidden unemployment, I was making a point. I don't know what the figure is. I ask the minister's department: are they taking a look at that in planning and research? He says he doesn't think it's very much. Do we have any scientific basis for making that statement, or is it just that he believes that? Is this the type of thing his department people are looking at? Again, it seems fairly important to me.

I wasn't talking about everybody over the age of 15, as the minister alludes to. Supposedly you couldn't even be in the labour market till you're 16. But many of those people are in high school. Obviously, that's not the concern we have. Many of them are at various institutions. That's not what I'm talking about. I'm talking precisely about the people who want to work, who should be employed. I wonder if the minister's department is doing any studies about the hidden unemployed. The reason I brought that up is that I mentioned that the U.S. Bureau of Labour stats has done that. I remind the minister what they're talking about. They don't call it hidden; they call it subemployment. Maybe I can add to it. We look at this category which adds the official unemployed, the discouraged workers — and that's what we're basically talking about with the hidden unemployed — the involuntary part-timers, and low wage earners. They consider them less than fully employed, and they've come up with an estimate, as I said, of 30 percent or more that fall into those categories. Do we have any evidence from the minister's department about what they call subemployment? Are we looking into this whole area? It seems to be a fairly important area. If they're saying that 30 percent are in that in the States, that's a significant number of the population. I wonder if we have any equivalent research, or if we're looking into that area at all?

I want to follow up in another area. We've had the debate in the Legislature about how much it costs to have high unemployment. When I talk about that, we're talking about the fact that there's lost production. We're paying it out in UIC, welfare, and the social costs of unemployment. Has the minister's department undertaken to find out how much money that might be? In other words, if we had full employment and what we have at a certain level, what would be the cost? Is that the type of research the minister's department is doing? I'd be interested in that, because I think it is very important information that the minister and his department could be giving to the rest of government.

Mr. Chairman, I can't be at the scrums. The minister hasn't invited me to his press conferences to ask questions. To give him a chance, all I asked was if the minister was quoted correctly or not. He didn't come back on it. [interjection] Well, I didn't hear it. He just said something about the press, that I get my information from the press. That's just a simple way to avoid the question. My point is: are those statements from the minister correct? If they are correct, that gives me an idea of what the minister's

department is doing. I specifically ask: did the minister make the one statement that he hopes the province never returns to the virtually zero unemployment levels it had in the late '70s and '80s? Is that a correct statement? If not, please clarify it, because I think it's important that we know precisely what the Minister of Manpower is thinking. His thinking certainly should have an effect on what his department is going to do, especially in terms of job creation and the rest of it.

Mr. Chairman, I await the minister's replies in those areas I raised.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, with respect to trends and projections, I would define a trend as something you see occurring and a projection as your best guess at what will occur. If you analyze the Stats Canada figures, I think you begin to see three trends. I'm depending a bit now on the economists, who say that when you see something occurring for at least three months, it probably is the beginning of a trend. I look at the last four months in other primary, which in Alberta is basically the oil and gas sector and in my judgment the sector that is definitely going to lead our economic recovery. I see employment levels growing for three months and then a decline in the last month, which is purely attributable to the spring breakup. I look at manufacturing, and I see four months of increased or sustained employment levels. I suggest that we're seeing a trend. I look at construction, and I see four months where the work force is virtually unchanged. That's a segment of the work force that has been declining quite rapidly and where employment levels have levelled off for three months and picked up in the last month. I think we're seeing another trend, and that's why I stood in my place and said that I'm confident that the economic recovery which started 18 to 24 months ago is now starting to touch the labour force.

With respect to projections into the future, certainly, we do projections on employment levels. We do best guesses on population growth, but there's a significant difference between doing projections on employment levels and projecting your unemployment rate. If you want to do projections on your employment to population ratio, you may have some success at coming out with a fair degree of accuracy. But as I've indicated a number of times, there are other factors that come into the unemployment rate which make it very tricky to project. Those projections are used in our planning, and I have no intentions of sharing those projections publicly.

Hidden employment, underemployment, and — I would add another one — overemployment: we have done no significant studies on hidden unemployment in this province. I suggest the reason for that is that we have no evidence to suggest there is a problem with hidden unemployment. I go again to Stats Canada figures. When I look at the participation rates across the nation, Alberta led last month with 70.7 percent — over 70 out of every 100 people either working or in the work force. Ontario ran second with 67.5 percent, Saskatchewan was third with 65.5, Manitoba was fourth with 64.5, down to Newfoundland with a low of 51.5. The national average was 64.4.

If there is hidden unemployment, I suggest it has to show up in your participation rate. That participation rate in the 70s — and I'll give you the economists' interpretation — should be telling you two things: number one, it should give you some feel for your level of hidden unemployed and, number two, it should give you some indication of how positive people feel about the chances of getting a job.

If it were to start dropping significantly, sure, our unemployment rate would drop, but I think it would be something we should start getting concerned about. So watching your unemployment rate going up and down is just looking at part of the problem.

Certainly, underemployment is out there. People hold down a job that is below their capabilities, and they aspire for a higher one. It's always there. There is some statistical work on underemployment done by Stats Canada. Unfortunately, there is no work done on overemployment. I'm sure everyone in this House knows people who hold down one, two, and three jobs. If you're going to get into a significant study on underemployment, I think you'd better look on the other hand at overemployment, because it's certainly out there as well.

We have discussed the costs of unemployment before. I think it concerns us all, but I repeat that I don't think you're going to solve it by throwing unlimited sums of money at areas where there are structural problems and hoping to resolve it. You're going to have to allow that work force to make some adjustments. You're going to have to put in programs, as we've put in, to help ease the pain in many areas as much as possible, but you're certainly not going to solve the unemployment problem by throwing public dollars at it.

Did I make the statement that I was not anxious to return to the zero levels of unemployment of the boom years? I made a statement and reviewed with some press members that even during the boom years when we had virtually negative unemployment, Stats Canada was still recording an unemployment rate of 3.5 percent to 4.5 percent in this province. I can recognize that. That's the group that I discussed earlier who are not job-ready. They may be job-willing, but they're not job-ready.

In those boom years — and this is what got us into this very high rate of in-migration — we had more jobs looking for workers than we had workers ready to put into those jobs, even if we could have put in that 4.5 percent unemployed. So we really had periods of negative unemployment if the measuring stick could pick it up. Obviously, with the way Stats Canada does their measuring, they can't pick up negative unemployment. I have no desire to return to periods of negative unemployment. I have no desire to get our economy heated up to the point where we're playing catch-up and can't keep a highly skilled, competitive work force out there.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, let me continue this interesting dialogue with the hon. minister and come back in one new area. The minister says he has no intention of letting us in the Legislature know what's going on in his department in terms of projections. I don't understand why that would be the case. I thought we were elected by our constituents precisely to talk about these sorts of issues. I thought, perhaps very naively when we're dealing with this government, that was one of the things.

Let me put it this way: from the projections the minister has — rather than pinning him down, because I've already recognized the difficulty of that — is his best estimation that employment one year from now will be higher or lower than it is at this specific time? From all that research his department is doing, can he just tell us that? Is it going to be higher or lower? I do not want all his projections. What is his best estimate? Surely it's not asking too much from the Minister of Manpower to give us that sort of information.

I would like to hear from the minister on another area because it has some long-term implications. Has he had any assessment of the numbers in the apprenticeship programs going into the building trades, where unemployment has been high? The minister acknowledges that. Have they checked the numbers in the apprenticeship programs? I raise that, Mr. Chairman, because it may be that young people are being frightened off at the thought of never getting a job and are avoiding going into those apprenticeship programs. If that is the case, it could create difficulty. I say to the minister that I don't know if that's the case. But if that does have an impact and we get on with some projects later on, we may not have the skilled labour force we need and we'll have to import them again from all over North America. I think that's a fairly important area to look at, Mr. Chairman.

The minister talked about overemployment and people with two or three jobs. I suppose there are some like that out there. I guess the answer they would give the minister is that they need two or three jobs to make it, to support their families in this day and age. My question wasn't that so much. My question dealt with the substandard employment in referring to the statistics advanced by the bureau. The planning and research budget, as I mentioned, is up by 34.4 percent. Is that the type of thing the department is studying? Will they be able at some point — we won't get into whether or not it's released publicly — to give us the sorts of statistics I've quoted from the Americans? Is that the type? What he called overemployment meant two or three jobs. I don't know how you could be overemployed, but what he meant was two or three jobs. At the same time then, are they studying the numbers there? Is the minister concerned? I want to know what the department is doing in terms of projections and long-term planning specifically in those areas.

The third area I want to know about — and I'm not going to ask for the results of it at this particular time — is whether the department is looking at the cost of unemployment, what we pay out. Is that the type of study the department is carrying on? That's all I want to know. If they are, I'm encouraged. But I want to know, yes or no. I'm not asking specifically what's in them at this particular time.

It's all right to say the participation rate is high, and that's what the government always comes back to. I remind the minister that that means nothing to the people who are unemployed. That's what the debate is about at this time. Participation rates generally mean that we have a young population and that we have a lot of families with both members working. But that still doesn't deal with the problem. That's the frustration people feel. When we ask, "What are you going to do for the people who are unemployed?" we get back, "Well, the participation rate is this and that." It doesn't mean anything to them; that's what I'm saying. It's all very well and dandy for the government's own statistics, but we're talking about what we're going to do for the people who are suffering right now. I'd hoped we could keep the debate there rather than on the sort of rhetoric that's been worked out by the government to try to counteract the criticism. As I see it, Mr. Chairman, that's not dealing with the problem.

The other area that I would ask the minister to comment on comes back, I suppose, to the projections. Economists, of course, love terms. Some economists now have a term they call "growth recession". They say that if your gross domestic product doesn't increase by over 2 percent, you're

into growth recession. They were talking about that happening in the United States and that you need at least over 3 or perhaps 4 percent to actually have a significant impact on unemployment. I wonder if the minister would comment on that. Would he buy that sort of logic, that with anything less than 3 percent, even a 2 percent increase, our unemployment rates — not our participation rates — will probably go up?

I'd be interested in his comments in those areas, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe the first question related to projections. I was interested to note that the hon. leader used the term "employment" as opposed to "unemployment". I've already indicated that I felt the economic recovery was now starting to impact the labour force and that I anticipate that employment levels will increase. I underline the words "employment levels". If the hon. member were to check the past statistics, there were more people unemployed in Alberta in April 1985 than there were in April 1984. With the projects coming on stream, particularly in the oil and gas sector — I'm referring to the Syncrude expansion; Esso's phases 3, 4, 5, and 6; the Shell project in Peace River; and the activity in Red Earth, Swan Hills, Judy Creek, Elk Point, and Lloydminster — with what we know is out there, I'm very confident employment levels will go up. But on the other hand, I'm not making the projection that unemployment levels will necessarily drop, because one doesn't necessarily happen with the other. If you are asking if my indicators indicate more jobs coming on stream, the answer is emphatically yes.

Apprenticeship numbers are monitored very closely. Remember, as I've stated before in the House, the apprenticeship system is an employment-driven system. We've got preapprenticeship courses which certainly are not employment-driven. But that's before the apprenticeship system. We have the flow, which was mentioned in the House the other day, of students from vocational schools, who can end up in the apprenticeship system at an entry level point above the base level. That is not employment-driven. But other than that, the apprenticeship system is employment-driven. You don't get new apprentices in unless they have a job in that trade. The student coming out of high school doesn't become an apprentice until he gets a job and is indentured to an employer. We have witnessed declining numbers at all levels of apprenticeship because it is employment-driven. I don't think that means we should be changing the system. But there is a debate around that matter on whether we should be looking at a different way of training apprentices as opposed to a work experience and technical school training program.

Do we have a specific study into the cost of unemployment under way at this point in time? No.

Participation rates are very seldom used when I'm talking to the public, because I agree with the hon. member that they don't mean anything to an unemployed person. But I would remind you that it's the hon. leader who keeps coming back to the statistics. Certainly, the people discussing it in this House should have a working knowledge of what those figures mean. With the healthy participation rate we have in this province, there's little evidence to indicate hidden unemployment or a discouraged work force.

What are we doing for the unemployed people, the ones we should be talking about? Maybe I should just recapitulate a few things so they're on record again. For the third year running, we as a government have put forward a \$2.7

billion capital budget, which is certainly a benefit to all sectors out there, but particularly the manufacturing and construction sectors. Hopefully, as more private-sector construction starts to occur, we can phase back on that; the need won't be as great.

In addition to that, we have now committed half a billion dollars in special job creation and training measures for the 30-month period from November 1, 1984, to the end of the 1986-87 fiscal year. That money is directed to the Alberta youth employment and training program, the Alberta wage subsidy program, the summer temporary employment program, the priority employment program, the Alberta training program, the Alberta environment employment program, the employment skills program, the private vocational schools program, the rural home assistance program, special placement work experience, and the Quebec-Alberta student exchange program. All those programs tend to be directed to a certain target group that in our opinion needs assistance during these tough times. If the hon. leader has other groups he feels we should be designing programs for, I'm quite interested in hearing about them.

Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't recall asking for a list of the programs again, but I'm always glad to give the minister an opportunity. I take it he meant "reiterate" rather than "recapitulate", because I thought he was going to give up on it. Let me just come back and make it clear what I'm asking. Unemployment . . .

MR. ISLEY: You didn't ask that.

MR. MARTIN: Maybe I didn't, but I am now. What is the best estimate the minister can give us at this time? In one year, will unemployment be higher, lower, or about the same? I'll stress it a third time: unemployment.

Following along with apprenticeship, I wonder if there shouldn't be some concern expressed. The minister is totally right; it is an employment factor. You have to be employed to be in the apprenticeship program. The fact is that the majority of people in the construction trades I've been talking about are unemployed, so obviously they're not going to be taking apprentices. My concern, besides the obvious one that people are unemployed, is about what will happen over a number of years. This has been going on for some time. Especially if we do not have young people going in, has there been any thought about this or concern expressed that there may not be a qualified labour force left to deal with any projects that may come on stream in the future, especially in the energy industry? You can't inevitably have high unemployment and people not going into apprenticeship programs. You're going to lose those people and you're not going to get young people coming in. I wonder what thought has been given.

The minister mentioned that they're looking at different models. I think he mentioned work experience, working with NAIT or SAIT, although he seemed to indicate — at least, I got the impression from what the minister was talking about — that this probably wasn't a desirable alternative. But he said they're looking at it. Can the minister advise the Assembly when a decision like this might be made? I think it's a serious problem, Mr. Chairman.

In terms of those of us who were involved in high school programs and certainly as counsellors, one of the avenues to get into the trades, of course, was vocational courses being taught at various high schools throughout the

province. For example, if they complete Building Construction 32, at that point they can write the first year off. Does the minister have any knowledge of how many of those people are coming out and getting jobs? In my experience of dealing with students in those areas, I generally found them to be very highly motivated young people, because they had chosen. Are those people getting jobs? Do we have any follow-up generally to find out what is happening to high school graduates in those vocational areas? If we do, I guess I'm asking how they fit into this total puzzle we're talking about. I'd like the minister's comments in terms of that area.

I believe he mentioned that there was no study of the cost of unemployment. I strongly suggest, Mr. Minister, that this is something the department might want to look at, either through another agency or whatever, because I think it's important. But he did not indicate to me if his department was studying, as he put it, over- or underemployment at this particular time, similar to what I advanced from statistics in the United States. He didn't come back to that. My question is simply: is the minister's department in the process of looking at that?

The other thing I asked was what it takes in the economy to get unemployment down. You will remember I talked about growth recession. I don't believe the minister came back in that area.

I'd be interested in those comments, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, going back to this first point that we keep coming to and fro and to again, I will leave my comments stand with respect to employment levels. If the hon. member wants to make certain assumptions with respect to out-migration or interprovincial migration and the participation rates over the next 12 months, I'm sure his research staff can calculate what will happen to the unemployment rate. I repeat that I am confident that economic recovery has now impacted the labour force and I see employment opportunities increasing. That means more jobs, and that's what this is all about. To get into a debate of what other factors are going to change and what the unemployment rate is is irrelevant to me. We're interested in employment, I hope, not unemployment.

The apprenticeship system: I have no specific information as to the success of students who come through the vocational schools in getting jobs. I indicated that reducing numbers were going into that program. I didn't mean to leave the impression that the program had suddenly curled up and died. There were 1,643 new additions in the time period January 1 to April 30, 1985. So while it's moving at a slower rate, there are still people coming into the system. During that same period there were 1,727 graduations. Graduations slightly exceeded additions, but I suppose that's normal when you have a downturn that means less job opportunities at the front end.

Over- and underemployment. Let me put it this way. Stats Canada plays a role in determining the statistics in Canada, attempting to track the population levels and unemployment levels. That is done on a nationwide basis. Historically, any studies related to particular groups have been carried out by Stats Canada. At this time I have no intention to devote the resources in this budget to a study of over- and underemployment. I would far sooner direct those resources toward assisting the people I know are unemployed and may need assistance in terms of training or job creation to maintain contact with the work force or get back into the work force.

I'm not quite clear on what percentage the hon. member was referring to in his growth recession deal. I would say this: with the growth we see occurring in our economy, mainly precipitated by investment decisions, I see — and I repeat — increasing employment levels.

MR. MARTIN: We're not going to find out if we have the projections on unemployment. That's been made clear.

Mr. Chairman, the minister mentioned a figure over 1,000 in terms of the apprenticeship program. Is that specifically the construction trades, or is that the total? Do we have a breakdown just in the construction trades? They're the most decimated. I'd be interested in those figures.

I brought up the high school students because I was curious about whether there is any evidence to indicate that because of their training and the three years they've spent in high school, they are coming out with an advantage. I suppose it could be a disadvantage, because if they pass their first year, they're probably worth more money. I was curious about whether there is any evidence at all of how well they're doing. I take it that we do not know generally how well they're doing at getting jobs with their three years in that area.

I wondered about another part of that. The minister said they were looking at alternatives with the apprenticeship program to just being employed and working full-time. In that discussion, if I could put it that way, is this consideration about the high school students being taken in? It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we are spending a lot of money on these courses, not in the minister's department but in the Minister of Education's department. In my experience, admittedly three years ago, they range from eight or 10 in the vocational classes. They can never take more than 16 or 18, for safety factors and all the rest of it, and they have very expensive equipment there. So I hope that in discussing this and looking at alternatives, a long look has been taken at how best to amalgamate that program and what we can do in it. I would like the minister's comments in that area.

Mr. Chairman, I was trying to figure out precisely what planning and research is and what they do, because they had a significant increase. The minister talks about my department's being able to do this. I would remind him that in the Department of Manpower, his budget just for that is over \$100,000 more than we have for everything. So I'm trying. We're obviously not checking into the cost of unemployment. As I understand it, we're leaving it to Stats Canada about overemployment, substandard employment, and hidden employment. I guess I'm asking specifically, because it had such a major increase in the budget, 34.4 percent: could the minister update us on precisely what they do in that area? I haven't been able to narrow it down to find out what they do. The minister talks about dealing with other people, but all the other departments in his portfolio would have some area there. So I'm asking what they do under 1.0.4.

The only reason I raised recession is that it has to do with the discussion. Mr. Chairman, it's a concept I've read about, mainly from American economists. The question I ask is: would the minister agree with their assessment that if you do not have at least a 3 percent increase in your gross domestic product, unemployment levels will probably get higher? Maybe his planning and research people have looked into that; I don't know. But it seems to me that if that's the case, it has certain implications for our economy, technology, and all the other things. The obvious question

then is: how can any economy keep sustaining that sort of growth? We will have serious problems if that's the case. So I was asking the minister again, perhaps from his planning and research or his general administration, for his assessment of that. I'm not asking him to guess at it, just whether he has some information about it. That's what I meant by those figures, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the construction trades, let me make a general comment and then try to respond to the question. Keep in mind that in the construction trades, there are basically two different types of construction. There's engineering construction and building trades construction. The engineering construction, with the projects I've stated a couple of times, has started to move fairly well. The problem is still in the building construction end of it. I think we all know why there is a problem for the tradesman who builds the house, the apartment, or the commercial building. We have a significant surplus in our two major urban centres, and until that surplus is used up, there is going to be slowness there. There is some possibility of skill transfer from building construction to engineering construction, which unemployed workers could be looking at. That may mean some additional training. It may mean some agreements between local apprenticeship committees and provincial apprenticeship committees to allow more flexible bridging between the trades.

Going back to the specific question, we do have specific numbers on apprentices in all the different trade areas. I think we could determine with very little difficulty the success of the student coming through the vocational programs, because that student appears for an examination and gets picked up in our system if he is attempting to follow it through. I can certainly provide the hon. leader with that information on a future occasion if he wishes it.

I made the comment that there's been a debate as to whether there should be changes to the apprenticeship system. I was not trying to lead the House to think there would be significant changes. But during the recession, probably with the surplus apprenticeship training space that showed up in our institutions, people started toying with the idea that maybe we could do it another way. I would say that the positions of the Apprenticeship and Trade Certification Board, most of our trades organizations, and our provincial advisory committees are for the retention of the existing employment-driven system, and I have to say I tend to agree with them.

What does the planning secretariat do? I thought I'd answered that the last time the estimates were open, but I will go back and take one more run at it. The planning secretariat gets involved in a variety of things. It gets involved in the planning of programs you don't like to hear me list, so I'll just say there's a significant number and not list them again. It gets involved in assessing the needs of target groups, which is necessary information prior to the planning of a program. On occasion it does extensive studies of particular sectors of an industry. I believe we released one not too many months ago on the oil and gas industry: how it is made up, what type of jobs the workers do, what type of skills, et cetera. It works in conjunction with Advanced Ed and many of our colleges in projecting the industrial needs that they should be responding with training for. It does a lot of planning and research in those types of areas.

The question with respect to whether we need at least a 3 percent growth in our gross national product in order

to maintain job levels: I would have to assess that a little more carefully before I give a definitive answer, because I think growth in the economy, as it relates to job levels, depends to a large extent on the type of economy you're dealing with and the impact on that economy of technology, productivity, et cetera. Just off the top of my head, in attacking an unemployment problem, I would like to see a little higher growth.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, coming back to the apprenticeship area, recognizing that in terms of the figures I specifically meant the building construction end of it, do we have any figures in that total of over 1,000 that was mentioned? Does the minister have figures with him about how many apprentices are in that area specifically, or are they available?

MR. ISLEY: I don't have them right now, but they're available.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. I think that's the crux of some of the problems I've talked about, in terms of what happens later on in those areas if we don't have young people going into them.

The other area, Mr. Chairman, had to do with high school students in the vocational courses. I take it that there isn't any evidence of how well they are doing in terms of employment. Perhaps not off the top of the minister's head, but is there no way of knowing that specific thing? I suggest that that's a fairly important area we should look at. I come back, Mr. Chairman. There's a lot of money from Education in that area. From the minister's comments, I take it that we're probably not going to change the system. In view of what has happened in the recession, is there any review about that area? We've got all this expensive equipment. I think these people are generally well trained when they come out, and our experience is that they have done very well. Is there any assessment about how we might deal with that group specifically, so that we have young, skilled people coming into the trades and we don't run into a problem? They already have the equivalent of at least one year of training, and they certainly have the theory. It would be a shame to lose those people.

As I mentioned to the minister, my experience in dealing with these individuals is that you have very highly skilled teachers that are doing a tremendous job with these students and that you also have very highly motivated people that have generally already made a career decision — not always, but a lot of them have and want to continue with the apprenticeship. My guess is that over 50 percent in those classes are actually doing that as a career choice to move toward the apprenticeship program. I wonder what could be done, in consultation with the ministers of Education and Advanced Education, specifically about that group. If we lose them, that could have serious repercussions later.

We talk about unemployment. Of course, my first priority would be the people that are already unemployed, but it seems to me that we have a select group here. I wonder if there is any assessment of how we might tie this program into the apprenticeship program a bit more, whether it be work experience or whatever. I wonder if any thought has gone into that area.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, I thought I had indicated that I could provide a detailed breakdown to the hon. leader of what trades the 1,700 graduates were in, what trades the

new entries are in, and for that matter, the total of apprenticeship people. We have the figures. But I don't have them here so that I can say this, this, and this. I thought I had also indicated that I was quite confident we could have the figures on what type of success the student coming out of high school is having bridging in, because once he reports for that exam, he's picked up on our tracking system. If he gets indentured, of course, he stays in our system. I can provide the hon. member with specific information there.

I share the hon. leader's concern that those are young people we don't want to lose. On the other hand, I have to have some appreciation for the concern of the unemployed tradesmen out there who say, "Don't keep pushing too many people into our system, because we don't have enough work." I think it would be rather unfair to the unemployed third-year apprentice and the journeyman if we developed a special program that ensured that we kept feeding into it the young people that came out of our vocational schools.

I would argue, Mr. Chairman, that even if that young person writes the test, qualifies at the first-year level, and takes a job in another field in either the short term or the long term, I wouldn't view the investment of Alberta Education in that individual as being wasted. I think it goes back to my earlier comments that our young people are going to have to look more and more at retraining from one occupational group to another during their careers. As far as I'm concerned, any type of education or training is a good life insurance policy.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, just to follow up, I would appreciate it if the minister would take it upon himself to get that information for my office. I will take him up on that, because I think it's important information for us to have as well as the department.

In the second area I would agree with the minister: the people that have to have first priority — there's no doubt about that — are the unemployed tradespeople that are already in the field. I said that, so I accept that. But the point I was making is that the people that have gone into these programs have made somewhat more of a commitment right now than other people. They at least have some degree of vested interest in that area — not as high a priority, but a higher priority than other people who are just looking for jobs, because they've already invested some time and effort in those areas. That's my point. They can perhaps go into other areas, but my major point is that eventually, if the unemployment stays high, we're going to lose them, because you forget those skills when you get into other areas. If this goes on for years, a lot of the unemployed people will just get out of the field. Maybe that's what we want, but if all of a sudden we need them, if all of a sudden there's a turnaround in the economy, then we don't have the skilled tradespeople. We could face serious problems down the way, especially if we don't have able young people coming into that area. That's the point of bringing that up, Mr. Chairman.

The other aspect of the whole area is that, sure, I think all of us could benefit by some vocational training. I know I could; I could learn a lot in those areas. You get something out of those classes whether or not you go into the field. Most of them work on attitude as much as anything, and they work on skills that can transfer over, so I'm not suggesting that it's a total waste. But there is that investment.

The other point that I make is that it is a very expensive investment in terms of the high schools and the equipment

in those areas. We as taxpayers are already paying for that to begin with, not through the minister's department, Mr. Chairman, but through the Minister of Education's department. We as legislators have already made a very heavy investment in that area, and I want to maximize the use of that so that we're getting the best bang for the buck, if I can put it that way. That's the whole point of bringing this up.

Mr. Chairman, it looks as if we are drawing relatively close to the end of this session. I expect that there will be other times when the minister and I can trade information back and forth, and I look forward to the information that he's going to give us at some point in the future.

Agreed to:

3.0.1 — Special Employment Programs	\$131,942,000
3.0.2 — Program Support Services	\$3,582,306
Total Vote 3 — Special Employment Programs	\$135,524,306

Department Total	\$189,822,655
------------------	---------------

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the votes be reported.

[Motion carried]

Legislative Assembly

Agreed to:

1.0.1 — Administrative Support	\$4,603,765
1.0.2 — Members' Indemnities and Allowances	\$3,518,322
1.0.3 — Speaker and Deputy Speaker — Office Services	\$217,044
1.0.4 — Government Members' Services	\$918,751
1.0.5 — Opposition Members' Services	\$552,730
1.0.6 — Legislature Committees	\$284,763
1.0.7 — Legislative Interns	\$169,327
1.0.8 — Hansard	\$733,156
1.0.9 — Legislature Library	\$1,082,958
Total Vote 1 — Support to the	

Legislative Assembly	\$12,080,816
----------------------	--------------

Total Vote 2 — Office of the Auditor

General	\$9,675,010
3.0.1 — Edmonton Office	\$710,403
3.0.2 — Calgary Office	\$174,982
Total Vote 3 — Office of the Ombudsman	\$885,385

4.0.1 — Administrative Support	\$371,128
4.0.2 — Elections	\$100,000
4.0.3 — Enumerations	\$3,838,995
4.0.4 — Electoral Boundaries Commission	—
Total Vote 4 — Office of the Chief Electoral Officer	\$4,310,123

Department Total	\$26,951,334
------------------	--------------

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I move that the votes be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration the following resolutions, reports as follows, and asks leave to sit again.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1986, sums not exceeding the following for:

The Department of Manpower: \$5,716,246 for departmental support services, \$48,582,103 for manpower development and training assistance, [\$135,524,306] for special employment programs.

The Legislative Assembly: \$12,080,816 for support to the Legislative Assembly, \$9,675,010 for the Office of the

Auditor General, \$885,385 for the Office of the Ombudsman, \$4,310,123 for the Office of the Chief Electoral Officer.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it's not proposed that the Assembly sit on Monday, which is a national holiday. On Tuesday the House will sit in the evening. One hour has been designated for Tuesday afternoon. Both the afternoon and evening will be for second reading of Bills on the Order Paper. It's proposed to call the Committee of Supply again on Wednesday.

[At 12:55 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

