

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, April 6, 1987 8:00 p.m.**

Date: 87/04/06

[The Committee of Supply met at 8 p.m.]

head: **COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY**

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Supply will come to order, please.

Hon. minister, would you like to make some opening remarks?

**Department of
Career Development and Employment**

MR. ORMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased today to present the estimates for the Department of Career Development and Employment for the fiscal year 1987-1988.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to firstly begin by indicating that the face of the Department of Career Development and Employment not only changed by way of a name change, but it changed substantially in terms of the challenges that were presented to it in the last year. I would like to address some of those challenges, some of the things that we as a department faced. I'd like to talk about what we anticipate for the coming year and some of the programs that we have, touching briefly on the new labour market strategy, moving into some of the new programs, and then ultimately discussion with regard to the budget for the department.

I would like to first acknowledge the staff of the Department of Career Development and Employment. There is no question that the challenges that we faced as a department and in the ministry were substantial, and I believe that many of the individuals that contributed, particularly the senior staff in the department, play a major role in accomplishing those goals. Particularly in a time when we are in fiscal restraint and are downsizing or holding the status quo in terms of the size of our manpower in our department, it makes it a doubly challenging task, Mr. Chairman. I would like to inform all members today that we as a department are up to that challenge and I've been very pleased with the performance of the people in the department. I did refer to their support and the initiative of the individuals in the department, and I would like to underline that again, one year later. It has been a great deal of pleasure for me to work with the department and the individuals who are of a great benefit to me and assistance in dispatching my task as minister of the Crown.

This evening I want to be sure that I put many of the things in perspective that I think are important when we talk about the labour force, the size of the labour force, and the demand created by the economy and the commensurate number of jobs therein created.

I want to begin, Mr. Chairman, by talking about the difference between what we do as a department for job creation and what is done by the private sector and other government departments for job creation. For it is not the role of the Department of Career Development and Employment to per se create jobs.

It is the role of the Department of Career Development and Employment to create training opportunities and to create opportunities for people to enter into the labour force who have been away from the labour force, particularly moving in from universities or postsecondary institutions or, in fact, individuals who have not finished their schooling.

So if I can first put that into perspective, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to talking about job creation by government, there are really three components, in my view. The first component, of course, is the civil service, and there are, as you know, 35,000 full-time employees of the government of Alberta. The second component is the jobs created by the spending through our capital budget. I have referred on different occasions in this Legislature about the full-time jobs or the person-years of employment created by the expenditures in the capital budget; for instance, expenditures in the area of roads, schools, and hospitals. Good examples are the hospital in the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods' riding and the Peter Lougheed hospital that services particularly the ridings of the Member for Calgary McCall and the Member for Three Hills and my own riding of Calgary Montrose. That is job creation. Last year, in our estimation, as a result of the expenditures of the capital budget there were some 60,000 full-time jobs created as a result of that initiative. I might add that it is the largest capital expenditure per capita in Canada, even though it is smaller than it was in the fiscal year 1986-87.

The third area of job creation relative to what governments do in this particular area has to do with training and job-creation initiatives. In the Department of Career Development and Employment it is our task to respond to what is going on in the labour market at any particular time. During times of high employment when we have a very strong economy in the province, it is important that we are offering a wide range of training opportunities for individuals because a heated-up economy demands a well-trained labour force.

When we have a downturn in the economy, Mr. Chairman, there is a shift in the nature of the demand from the economy. In that we have a stagnant economy and we have limited growth in the province today and a situation of high unemployment, it is important that we shift our focus from training into the area of job creation, because it is a direct response to the rate of unemployment in the province. We find that the greatest barriers to employment are a lack of skills that are marketable in the labour force and a lack of recent work experience. When there is a situation in the economy, as there is today, when people have been out of work for a protracted period of time, they do not become attractive to the employers in the economy, and it is important that we offer job-creation programs so that they have that work experience.

There is a downturn, in fact, in the demand for training programs, so that also gives us a signal that we must move from the area of training. We must move the dollars expended and the focus of the department into the job-creation side. Now that doesn't mean to say, Mr. Chairman, that we abandon training to move into the job-creation area. The two are not mutually exclusive. We continue to offer a wide range of training opportunities as are outlined in my estimates, and we also offer a wide range of job-creation programs. In this fiscal year our focus will be in the area of job creation, and in fact you will see from our estimates that we have moved dollars from the training side into the job-creation side, for the reasons that I've just outlined to you.

It is well understood by members of the Assembly, Mr.

Chairman, that the Alberta economy experienced a downturn in 1986, and there were two fundamental reasons why. Reason number one was a collapse in the price for crude oil in the world. I don't say a collapse in the market, because certainly as anybody that follows the oil business knows, the price is not related to the demand. And I see that in the area of agriculture the situation seems to be somewhat the same. There is artificial demand; therefore, artificial prices. Certainly we in this province experienced the double whammy of prices dropping for crude oil from the area of \$30 U.S. per barrel to the area of \$12 a barrel, and fortunately we have seen a recovery to the area of \$19 U.S. a barrel. That has had a significant impact on the labour market of this province. We have seen investment in this sector drop by 37 percent in 1986, well completions decline by 33.7 percent, and drilling metres were down 23.4 percent.

Late last year, Mr. Chairman, we wanted to examine and be sensitive to the impact of lower world oil prices to the labour market and determined that there is substantial impact. There was a potential for a job loss of 50,000, with oil prices remaining between \$12 and \$15 U.S. per barrel. Sixty percent of that job loss was in the service and supply sector. Service and supply sector is substantially outside the bounds of the city of Calgary, so the impact was not only felt in Calgary but it was felt throughout the province.

With regard to agriculture, this sector was hurt by low grain prices and diminishing export markets. However, due to federal and provincial government aid, total farm cash receipts showed only a slight decline: less than 1 percent in 1986.

With regard to the manufacturing industry we determined that there was suffering in terms of unemployment in that particular area within the province, and manufacturing shipments decreased by about 4 percent; that is, in the area of refined petroleum products. We also determined that manufacturing throughout this country was substantially hurt. I have coming to me the phase 2 of the series study on the impact of lower oil prices outside of the province of Alberta, and I can tell you today, Mr. Chairman, that the impact is far more substantial than we anticipated when we reviewed the first series study. That study has indicated to us that outside of the province of Alberta there are in excess of 15,000 jobs at stake based on prices in the range of \$15 a barrel down to \$12 a barrel.

One of the challenges along with lower oil prices, Mr. Chairman, was the rate of growth in the labour force for the past five years. Let me say that in 1982 the size of the labour force was 1,227,000 people. In 1985 the labour force was 1,249,000 people, and in 1986, 1,271,000 people, which is a 1.8 percent increase in the size of the labour force in the province of Alberta. That's an increase of 22,000 people moving into the labour force, competing for the jobs created by the Alberta economy.

Commensurate with the increase in the size of the labour force, Mr. Chairman, was an increase in the employment growth in the province of Alberta. In 1982 there were 1,132,000 people working in the Alberta labour force; in 1985, 1,124,000; and in 1986, 1,146,000 people, which is an increase of 2 percent or 22,000 people. There were 22,000 more people working in 1986 than there were in the previous year, 1985. Now, I point that out in conjunction with my discussion about energy prices and agricultural prices because there are other things that are happening in the economy that have an impact on the rate of employment in the province.

I would like to also touch on a new phenomenon, Mr. Chairman, that is happening not only in the province of Alberta and

not only in Canada but in North America as a whole, and that is the relationship of the goods-producing side of the economy as it compares to the service-producing side of the economy and the relative job creation therein. Between 1981 and 1986 employment in the goods-producing sector declined to 313,000 from 391,000, a decrease of 78,000 jobs. Between the period 1981 to 1986 employment in the service-producing sector increased to 833,000 from 760,000 jobs, an increase of 73,000.

You can see that it's obvious that the potential for growth to address the demands of the expanding labour force comes from the service-producing side of the economy. That's where the jobs are being created today, Mr. Chairman, and I bring that to the members' attention. The reason I bring it to the members' attention is because it's something that we also have to address in the overall context of programming. I should say that the goods-producing side of the economy is the side of the economy that presents something tangible, something that is a good. In the service-producing side of the economy, that is a service that is provided. It includes amusement and recreation, personal services, accommodation, food services, lawyers, accountants -- all of the things that provide a service to people. The medical profession, the education field are all areas that are determined to be the service-producing side of the economy.

Now, I have said in this Legislature also that there is a school of thought that would say that if you do not have a strong goods-producing side of the economy, you will not have a spin-off service-producing side of the economy. And I would say that in years gone by that was in fact the case. It was something that we saw happen in Great Britain. When the goods-producing side of the economy saw a downturn, the service-producing saw a commensurate downturn, and the reason was because they could not compete on a global scale.

Today, with a reduction in the jobs being created in the goods-producing side of the economy, we can compete on a world scale. We can continue to have growth in the service-producing side of the economy, irrespective of what is happening in the goods-producing side. And it is something that is a phenomenon, I believe, happening throughout the world. That is why it is so important that we as a province continue to focus on expanding beyond the border of the province of Alberta, beyond the borders of Canada. That's why the Pacific Rim is so important to us as a province, to be able to market the services that we are producing, to meet the demand that is in the Pacific Rim. It also reflects the need for a freer trade agreement with the United States, for within the context of freer trade with the United States it also gives us an opportunity to expand beyond our borders, make the services that we produce in this province competitive throughout the world.

It is encouraging to me, Mr. Chairman, to see that the Minister of Economic Development and Trade is sensitive to this issue, and it's something that we work together on and discuss on a regular basis. I should also say that my hon. colleague the Minister of Tourism will tell you that tourism in the province of Alberta has a potential to be the third pillar of this economy. It has a potential to be as strong as agriculture and energy have been in the past, and that is the service-producing side of the economy. So it is very important to put that context, when we talk about the types of programs that we offer as a department.

Before I talk about some of the department programs and the business community I also wanted to point out another feature that has a significant impact on the size of the labour force, and that is interprovincial migration. Now, I could talk about all of the categories that affect population growth that we track when

we talk about net migration, but I want to focus in on one that I think is very significant and one that would be of interest to the Members of the Legislative Assembly, and that is interprovincial migration.

Between 1976 and 1981, Mr. Chairman, we had 253,800 people come to Alberta from other provinces exclusively. That does not include natural growth or international in-migration. Between 1982 and 1986 we have seen a net interprovincial out-migration of 90,000 people, which leaves us today with a net interprovincial in-migration of 163,800 people. I find that very significant because we all knew of the people that came to a strong economy during the late '70s and early '80s, when we had rapid overgrowth in the province of Alberta, we had pockets of underemployment, and this economy was very much overheated. It is a surprise to me to see that even though our economy has been somewhat flush over the last four or five years, we still have a significant net interprovincial migratory trend in Alberta. The people who have come to Alberta during that period for the most part remain here.

Now, I want to put it in the context of another western province, Mr. Chairman, and that's the province of Manitoba. Between 1976 and 1981 the interprovincial migration in that province was minus 45,778 people, 1982 to 1986 was minus 393 people, for a total net interprovincial migration trend in the province of Manitoba between 1976 and 1986 of minus 46,163 people. So you can see that along with the other challenges that we are presented here in the economy in the province of Alberta with respect to job creation, it is also significant to note the other areas that impact the size of the labour force and the demands that are put on this province in the area of job creation.

I indicated in my earlier remarks, Mr. Chairman, that it is not government that creates good, solid, long-term jobs outside of the civil service -- and as we found, some of those may not be considered to be long-term jobs. But in any case, it is up to the private sector; that must drive job creation in this province. What we have seen is a significant role played by particularly small business in that scenario. Ninety-seven percent of all businesses in Alberta have fewer than 100 employees; 89 percent have fewer than 20 employees, and these firms account for almost 50 percent of all employment in Alberta. We should note that 70 percent of all new jobs created are created by small business. There are currently 120,000 active small businesses in Alberta, with an average of 1,200 new businesses incorporated monthly. Since April 1, 1984, 89 percent of the employers using the Alberta wage subsidy program were small businesses, accounting for some 52,000 funded positions.

When you look at the good news and the bad news of the economy, Mr. Chairman, there are some areas that are indicative of where this economy is going. As I indicated earlier, there were 22,000 jobs created between 1985 and 1986. That is indicative, in my view, that there is an underlying strength in the Alberta economy. Certainly if I had to make a prediction of the unemployment rate today -- if I had had to make that prediction last year or two years ago, under a scenario of \$12 oil, I would predict a much higher rate of unemployment than we are currently encountering today. And I think that has to do with the underlying strength of the Alberta economy. It has to do with small business. It has to do with the expansion of the service-producing side of the economy. When we stop creating jobs in the economy, in my view that is time for substantial concern because you are not experiencing growth, and it is so important that that job creation component continue to be there. It comes from small business, and that's why many of the initiatives that

we have as a government are related to small business specifically.

I should also say that Alberta has the second-highest level of job creation in Canada. February Statistics Canada figures indicated that Alberta created 464 jobs for every 1,000 people of population, a close second to Ontario at 494 per 1,000 people. So in fact there are jobs being created in the economy, but for the reasons that I've outlined, it is not happening today that the job creation is keeping up to the pace of interprovincial migration, trends to the international migration, and the natural increase in the size of the labour force.

Mr. Chairman, I think I will conclude my remarks by talking about one other issue. I had at one time the inclination to discuss many of the programs, but I think I will not do that in that we did announce the department's labour market strategy last week. But I would like to point out one significant factor that also comes up from time to time in the Legislature, and that is the average hourly rate paid by the programs in the Department of Career Development and Employment. As members of this Assembly know, it is the structure of these programs that the private sector cost shares in the rate of pay to individuals under our job-creation programs and in our training programs. I just would like the members to know that in, for instance, the Alberta wage subsidy program, which we pay \$2.50 an hour for, we have determined that the average hourly wage paid is \$6.27 an hour. Under the community employment element of PEP, where we pay \$3.80 an hour, the average rate of pay is \$5.31; and under the community element of STEP, where we pay \$3.80 an hour, the average rate of pay is \$5.17. So in fact you can see that the amount paid is cost shared, topped up by the private sector, and is, I believe, higher than many anticipate.

With those comments, Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to move into the discussion of estimates of the Department of Career Development and Employment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you. Well, after listening to the Minister of Career Development and Employment, I don't know what's wrong with the economy. I suppose those 145,000 unemployed Albertans out there should just be ever so happy to be part of this buoyant economy that the minister talked about and that they should be happy that there's an underlying strength that we should look forward to, knowing full well that tomorrow, according to the Treasurer, we'll probably still have 11 percent unemployment.

It's a tough job being the Minister of Career Development and Employment these days, but I suppose somebody's got to do it. There was a time not very long ago when the Minister of Finance or the Treasury Department was the job that was seemingly the kiss of death in government. Nobody really wanted to undertake that job because you always had to say no and cut back in certain programs or approve certain programs over others. But now it would appear that it's Career Development and Employment that has to say no or make some of the more tough decisions.

I want to start off by making a number of notes that I hope the minister will be able to respond to. Just going through the actual departmental budget, I noticed that the manpower authorization has just taken a very, very slight decrease. In fact, I think that perhaps if we take the manpower authorization and add in the administrative support from vote 4.1.1, which was not

in last year's budget, we may find that in fact nothing was lost at all. So I would appreciate comments on either the reduction or the administrative support in that particular vote 4.1.1, which is the program support for exhibitions and fairs.

Again, the minister's office has a small drop of 4.9 percent, yet the minister's committees' costs went up some 150 percent. Perhaps the minister could advise us just who's on the committees, how often do they meet, and what are they responsible for. Are they part of the group that tell you what programs are necessary to create some of the jobs? Just a little more explanation for that expenditure would be appreciated.

Again, I see that the purchase of fixed assets is somewhat up; not an awful lot of money, but surely at a time when we're trying to create employment or create job training, I wonder why we have to have an increase in fixed assets in that particular department.

Moving along, the apprenticeship and trade certification, vote 2.2.1. Administrative support is up some 41.4 percent, while the overall amount is up only 1.6 percent. I think there's something not quite right there. We have a major increase in the administration of the apprenticeship and certification programs, yet we have a minor increase in the overall amounts.

Also, there's something new there that wasn't there last year, and that's vote 2.2.6, which is the employer-delivered apprenticeship training program. Some \$0.5 million wasn't there before, yet it's here this year. I wouldn't mind hearing a few comments on that one.

The Opportunity Corps is down substantially; it's an overall drop of 14.3 percent. Yet in employment counseling and relocation services we have a drop of 30.3 percent. Now, one might suggest that there's either nobody to relocate or no jobs to relocate to, but I'll invite the minister to make a few comments on the drop in the Opportunity Corps, which is a most unfortunate drop, I fear.

Vote 2.7 is seemingly a bright spot. We have a 17.5 percent increase in the career assistance programs, and that's something that's certainly needed at this point in time. I'll skip over vote 3 for a moment, because I do want to spend a fair bit of time on vote 3, so I'll jump over that for a moment and go to vote 4 to end my questions on the specifics.

Vote 4.1, the new amount of \$155,000. Now, if we have that new administrative support in place, I'm wondering: who did the administration before? Surely at some point in the department some of that administration must have been done. Why do we now need an extra \$155,000 for administrative support in vote 4.1?

Finally, vote 4.2.3. We have a 42.7 percent drop in capital grants, and I wonder: what is that due to? Is that a real drop, or is that a drop that's there because some of the Olympic development may have gone to a different department?

Now I'd like to turn to vote 3, the area of employment and agency support, probably the largest part of the budget, almost \$100 million here. Employment and agency support -- I wonder how much of the employment and agency support is going to community agencies and how much is going to profit agencies. Are we providing profit for people that are finding employment for people, or do we have a number of community-based employment agencies that are out there? What's the difference in funding there?

Once again, we've got the government creating employment or, as the minister says, "Career-related experience, work skills that will be a long-term benefit to them." Who is "them"? "Them" is the unemployed, Mr. Chairman; "them" is the

unemployed.

The problem with a lot of the programs in the department, quite frankly, is the wages. For many who seek employment the problem is the income that they're going to have at the end of the job. For many who work through the STEP program during the summer at a princely wage of \$5.50 an hour it's not an awful lot of money. You multiply that by the 40 hours in a work week, by the number of months the program is available for, and you have people that are working for a period of four months for less than \$4,000 for the entire summer. And that's if they're lucky. If you base that 40 hours on the minimum wage, which is what some folk happen to receive these days, of \$3.80 an hour, you have a total income for that period of time of \$2,616, and that's before taxes.

If you're a student attending university or college or a vocational institute, you're going to have either \$2,600 or \$4,000 to try and get through the next eight months. It's not much to return to university on. Take your costs of tuition, books, transportation, room and board -- all of those costs combined would easily amount to \$5,000 or \$6,000 for the eight-month period. But here we have employment programs or career development programs that provide minimal wages for people that are seeking work on a short-term basis to try and get back into higher education, and yet what we're doing is we're not providing them with the means to get back there.

What about the quality of the job? I wonder, quite frankly, how much monitoring is being done for these jobs. I notice that on the STEP and PEP application forms, it's one simple page, name and address of the employer and a few lines that describe the kind of job. What may sound very good on paper may in fact end up being a nightmare in reality. I'm wondering why we in the department don't provide certain training programs that -- people that are in advanced education programs or in low-skill jobs, why they can't go out and enroll in programs that are sponsored by the government and then become available to private employers? Why don't we have programs that are set up where we train the work force and let the employer have access to the people that are involved in those programs, rather than have the employer, hopefully, train the employee? It's something that I think the minister ought to be looking at and making sure that what we're doing is training people rather than just supplying people for the employer.

I do want to comment on the announcement that the minister made not very long ago, and that's the labour market strategy. There were few, almost no, specifics attached to the announcement. The number of programs -- again, just like the application for a STEP or PEP position, on paper the programs look not too bad. The problem is that we don't have too many specifics to go along with all of the buzzwords that are contained on that paper.

I look at the Alberta business and community development program. Now, according to the announcement, that is a program that

provides wage subsidies to private sector employers, non-profit organizations, municipalities and other publicly funded agencies.

So far it sounds not too bad.

Projects which support the environment, community or regional development, economic diversification or productivity improvement will receive priority funding. Well, those are certainly laudable goals to have, certainly something that we should all be working for. But the problem is, it's a step in the right direction. Environmental cleanup: who can

be opposed to that? And regional development: who can be opposed to that? Economic diversification: nobody can be opposed to that either. But how much money is going to it? We don't know. All the buzzwords are here, but there are no specifics. All the buzzwords, but how much money? All the buzzwords, and maybe nothing more.

The PEP program, the community element of the priority employment program. Again, on paper it looks like a good program; it looks like it's not too bad. The minister says that the program is going to go from six months to the full year. Who is it going to affect? Well, employee benefit costs to municipalities, nonprofit organizations. Clearly, that's a good goal to have, because the truth of the matter is that this government has cut back. They've cut back to the municipalities and they've cut back to some of those nonprofit organizations, so those municipalities have had to lay off people; those nonprofit organizations have had to lay off people. But what's happening now? There's the generosity of this government, providing certain programs, making them available at low wages to those people that they've cut back whom they've had to lay off. So what we're doing, we're replacing people. We're undercutting the working poor with the unemployed, putting the unemployed back to work, and the working poor -- let them go on UI for a little while.

There's another good one on page 2, the fourth paragraph:
The Women's Career Resource Centre

And this one's worth reading.

will provide valuable career information services to assist practitioners and professionals who are involved in assisting women make decisions about education, training and employment.

MR. STEVENS: You don't want to help women in Alberta?

MR. SIGURDSON: Oh now, hon. member. Now, now, you'll have the opportunity to stand up.

Because this isn't going to help women find employment in Alberta. You know what this will do? This will provide consulting services. This will provide and conduct workshops. It's going to help produce new publications and serve as a clearinghouse for information. Boy, that's going to help a lot of women find an awful lot of work. That's not going to find a single job for any of the women out there. If you want to get serious about helping women in the working field, you'll start looking at equity payments for them. You'll make sure that you've got legislation that means equal pay for work of equal value...

ANHON. MEMBER: [Inaudible] more brochures.

MR. SIGURDSON: Yeah, more brochures; that's what we need. Let's tell them that they've got opportunities. Boy, if you tell them often enough, maybe they'll start to believe it. They'll be able to take them home and read them. They haven't got anything else to do, but let's take home the brochures that are available through the centres and let them read them at home and cook them for supper. The centres, you know, they've got qualified counselors that are there who are overbooked, overworked. What this government is doing is creating a brand-new bureaucracy putting this career resource centre into place. Instead of doing that, instead of having an information clearinghouse, perhaps what we should have done is increase the number of counselors. Because right now if you want counseling for

a job, you don't have to wait one week, you don't have to wait two weeks -- not even three. You've got to wait a full month in order to get an appointment with a career counselor.

Oh yes, the favourite one of all, everybody's favourite program, the program that's going to take us into the 1990s and, with the way this government has handled the economy, probably the program that will take us into the next century. What program is that? The employment alternatives program. All the Tories like this program. This is the one that's going to give everybody the opportunity to go out and find work. This is the program that's voluntary; you have an alternative. That's what the word "alternatives" means in this program. Alternatives to what? Alternatives to starvation. If you're single and on welfare, you starve or you undercut some poor SOB who happens to be working for a minimum wage. It seems odd that the specific details of this program will be announced at the approximate date that the Minister of Social Services drops the amount of money available for rent and for food. [interjections] If you want to object, stand up on *Beauchesne*. But you know, I'm sure that that's only coincidence.

ANHON. MEMBER: [Inaudible] stand up on *Beauchesne*.

MR. SIGURDSON: He needs all the height that he can get.

This government wouldn't blame any of the poor for the economic problems, not this government. But what about the problems that this program creates? You know, some single employables happen to be trained journeymen, tradesmen who happen to have an awful lot of equipment. I've got a constituent who is in his fifties. He's a single employable. He used to work at Syncrude, and he made an awful lot of money when he was working there at Syncrude, but he's lost his job. He's tried to work. In fact, Mr. Chairman, he worked for a while at West Edmonton Chrysler. At West Edmonton Chrysler they paid him the rate of \$13.40 an hour, and that was for every hour that he was working. The problem was that if he only worked a half hour in a day, he was paid for the entire day \$6.70. That works out to about 85 cents an hour.

ANHON. MEMBER: That's more than I get.

MR. SIGURDSON: It's more than you deserve, maybe.

But you know, this is a single employable, a skilled tradesperson with all of the tools, thousands of pounds worth of tools. He has to store those tools in a basement. What are we going to do with him? Those tools are his livelihood, but now he has to share his accommodation. Currently he shares his accommodation with his tools. He would like to keep his tools so that if this economy improves, he would have the opportunity to go back to work. But you know what we're going to do as a government? We are going to tell this gentleman that he has to share his accommodation with somebody else, get rid of the...

MR. DAY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the latitude which the Chair allows as we discuss the estimates of the varied departments, but this, I believe, is really stretching it to the extreme. The member opposite is totally confused again and believes we're discussing Social Services. I wonder if he could be reminded of the department that's being discussed tonight and stay within those parameters.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member is aware of what we're discussing. Would you please proceed, Member

for Edmonton Belmont.

MR. SIGURDSON: If Sir Erskine May over there wants to rise on a point of order, let him rise on a point of order that relates to what we're talking about. This is clearly in the area of career development. This is what we're talking about. It's right here in the minister's announcement. You didn't read it? I don't blame you; it's not very damn good. You wouldn't want to be going back there either to your constituents . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, you have got the floor, but please refrain from using profanity. Thank you.

MR. SIGURDSON: Every once in a while we get a little emotional. Every once in a while we say things that we really mean. Because you know, every once in a while we happen to find people out there that have some real problems that aren't being addressed, and I'm just talking about one right at the moment. Because this person is going to be asked to participate; in a kind of covert sort of way, he's going to be asked to participate in this voluntary employment alternatives program. But you see the problem is that he's going to have to sell all the tools. He's going to have to sell the special clothing, the insulated clothing that allowed him to work up north on certain projects. And he will probably find a place to share with somebody after he's sold his tools and he's sold his clothing. And I guess for the government, the government is fortunate, because this individual, this single employable, happens to be in his fifties. This government is only going to have to support him for 10 or 15 years until he's eligible for pension. Because once he sells his tools and his clothing, should the economy improve and turn around as we all hope it will, this person isn't going to be able to get back to work. But that's one of the problems that we've got with some of the programs.

You know, we've got to take a look at the programs that are currently existing and clean up, just begin to clean up what we've got. We want to provide jobs to teach people skills. We have programs right now that employ Albertans and, by the minister's own admission, don't provide skills. Where's the payback on that? I thought that the Tories were supposed to be prudent business people.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are.

MR. SIGURDSON: You are? I'm glad. You make an investment and you expect a return. But not with some of the programs. The minister says that in a letter, that while it's desirable that employees gain skills while they're on a program, PEP is not a training program. If we want to train people to work, if we want to make sure that people are working in the not too distant future, let's make sure that they've got the needs and the ability to work after they're finished some of these programs here.

I want to talk a few minutes about the benefits of the reduced work time, or the compressed workweek. We now have a tremendous cost to the public purse attempting to maintain all of the social responsibilities that we have to to many of the unemployed Albertans -- social assistance programs, welfare, unemployment insurance benefits -- not to mention what happens to the economy when we take disposable income away from workers who have no spending power, which leads to further unemployment in the service sector.

Two things are happening in the work force at the present

time: the number of part-time jobs is getting a greater share of the work force than before, and the number of people working overtime, more than 50 hours a week in total, is greater than before. So we have many, many people doing much more than what perhaps they ought to. And we have many people in the work force who aren't being allowed to contribute the amount that they want to contribute.

The Treasurer, in his budget, suggests that unemployment is going to remain at 11 percent for a period of time, at 11 percent for too long a time. At 10 percent, according to the Forget commission, one in four individuals will experience unemployment; 25 percent of all Albertans next year can look forward to unemployment -- more than 25 percent, in fact. That's what we're being told. That's something to look forward to. Surely, with the amount of people that are working overtime and the number of people that are only working part-time, it makes sense to reduce the workweek. We've increased the taxes of working Albertans to support the unemployed. At the same time we give concessions to corporations in the hope that they'll create jobs. Clearly, now isn't the time to be giving so many concessions, or grants, or low wages. Part of the answer is disposable income and a reduction in the workweek. We've got to be able to allow people to go out and spend the money that they make. So if all we were to do is to ban overtime, it is estimated that in Canada -- and this is Canada; unfortunately I don't have figures for Alberta -- 40,000 manufacturing jobs would be created, banning overtime. No government spending there: banning overtime. No PEP, no STEP, no tax increase; just an end to overtime.

Other countries, Mr. Chairman, are reducing their workweek. France has 39 hours, and after one year of employment they guarantee five weeks vacation. Belgium: proposals for a 32-hour workweek, with a proportional cut in pay. Austria: the government is recommending a 35-hour workweek with no loss in pay, and after one year of employment a minimum four weeks vacation. Norway, the United Kingdom, Sweden, the Netherlands, West Germany: all are proposing less hours of work. And if we can't convince our federal counterparts and other provinces to catch up, then maybe we have an opportunity or should take the opportunity to lead the way in Canada.

University of Alberta studies show that if work was reduced to four days and 36 hours a week, companies would do the following in order to accommodate that change. One hundred eighty-four would expand the work force. That's what we need: an expansion in the work force. One hundred and four would increase the amount of overtime. That's not what we're trying to do, and that's why we have a penalty for overtime; it's called a premium. Fifty-nine companies would absorb the change in some fashion or another, and 54 companies that were surveyed said that they would take other measures to offset the effect of a reduced workweek. We in Alberta ought to be looking at the same kind of programs, the same kind of policies that may be working in other countries, and those programs are the reduction in the time that workers are spending at the worksite. It's getting to a point where we're going to have to realize that we have the opportunity for more leisure time and, therefore, the opportunity to spend what we make and to make sure that more people are going to be working and earning money and spending money.

Mr. Chairman, I note that my time is almost up, and rather than . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't let that stop you.

MR. SIGURDSON: It shouldn't. If you're standing, I know that my stuff would be more valuable.

But rather than get into a point of starting to speak about youth unemployment, I will take my place and allow other members to participate in the debate.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was jumping around in labour matters -- department of labour, Social Services -- and presented some confusion. There was one point of clarification I'd like him to give me. He talked about, if I could quote him, "education for profit," and if he can point me to the vote that he was talking about, I'd be pleased to discuss it with him.

MR. SIGURDSON: Mr. Chairman, if I said "education for profit," I didn't mean education for profit. I was talking about vote 3.2, which is the employment and agency support group. I was wondering, in that money -- that nearly \$100 million expenditure by the department -- how much is going to community agencies and how much is going to profit agencies.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister?

MR. ORMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Another thing the member did was jump from vote to vote. I've tried to organize it so that we can all follow through, beginning with vote 1 through vote 4, for everybody's convenience.

Let me begin with vote 1.0.2. The hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont inquired as to the 150 percent increase in the minister's committees, which is an amount of \$36,000. Mr. Chairman, that is a provision for a new committee, the immigration and settlement services advisory committee. Immigration and settlement services is a very significant part of my department that deals with, just as it indicates, settlement for refugees and immigrants to Alberta, in that the settlement agencies are funded by government but are delivered by outside agencies. I thought it was important to be sure that I had a committee that was made up of people that came through that program, new Canadians, immigrants from the past, to be sure that the delivery of those programs is meeting the needs of new immigrants and refugees to the province, and that's where the increase comes as outlined in vote 1.0.2.

With regard to vote 2.2.1, administrative support, the 41.4 percent increase, or \$227,349, is a provision for the proposed apprenticeship review committee. The review of the apprenticeship and trade certification area was something that was promised by my predecessor, the hon. Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services, when he was minister of this department. I will be very shortly announcing the details of the committee and the mandate of that committee. The review committee will consist of various interest groups from industry, labour, and the general public to conduct an in-depth review of apprenticeship, training, and certification in Alberta.

With regard to vote 2, specifically 2.6.1, the Opportunity Corps, we have a reduction of 12.4 percent in that particular area, Mr. Chairman. It reflects, firstly, a reduction of excess trainee wages, reflects the demand in the downturn for a program that is training based. There is some reduction of salaries, allowances, and benefits in order to accomplish Treasury Board guidelines, a reduction in travel and hosting, and a reduction in materials and supplies to accommodate increases in other areas. That is basically a result of a downturn in demand in that particular program.

With regard to employment and agency support, we have an increase of 36.3 percent, Mr. Chairman. That is in accordance with the new labour market strategy. Increased emphasis is being given to job-creation and job-retention programs. In order to accommodate these initiatives, proposed expenditures in AVT and industry-based training were reduced so that we could move funds over to the employment initiatives, which will in fact, I guess, give us an additional \$25.572 million in employment initiatives. Substantially all of those funds came from the training side of the department.

The Member for Edmonton Belmont referred to vote 4.1.1, program support under lotteries and financial assistance to major exhibitions and fairs. As the hon. member knows, the responsibility for lotteries and financial assistance to these fairs and exhibitions was transferred to me on June 19, 1986. This new element was created in order to accommodate the administrative costs associated with these responsibilities. The budget consists of 2.5 man-years, including one permanent position transferred from the Department of Career Development and Employment, and \$155,000 in operating costs transferred from excess program funds. The administration for that particular program, when it was with Consumer and Corporate Affairs, was handled by an assistant deputy minister who is still in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It was important, in my view, that we had an individual in the Department of Career Development and Employment that dealt with that particular initiative and in fact deals not only with the financial assistance to fairs and exhibitions but all matters relating to lotteries.

With regard to the hon. gentleman's reference to vote 4.2, capital grants, there has been a reduction of 42.7 percent in that particular area, Mr. Chairman, the reason being that it is a winding down or the phasing out of an existing program. It was a per capita grant to fairs and exhibitions across this province. In that the program was based on a per capita growth, the program is winding down, and that's why there was a reduction in that particular area.

The member referred to something else that I wanted to discuss, Mr. Chairman, and that has specifically to do with wages. I tried to explain to the members of the Assembly that the nature of the programs in Career Development and Employment are not to create long-term jobs. We in this department will not create long-term jobs. It just doesn't make sense. The jobs have to be created in the private sector. What we endeavour to do is subsidize individuals' salary while they are getting some work experience on the job. We have had substantial success in these programs, particularly in the wage subsidy program, where we help create the new position in the private sector. We subsidize a portion of that individual's income. One out of two individuals at a minimum stays on after that program expires, and I believe that that is a significant result under the wage subsidy program.

I just want the hon. member to be clear that the wages that we pay and cost share with the private sector and with the public sector and communities is a job-entry wage. It is not indicative of anything other than a wage for that individual to be able to go in and get work experience or on-the-job training. The increase over and above that entry wage, Mr. Chairman, comes with that individual's ability to convince his employer that he is doing a good job and that he is indispensable in terms of the job that he is conducting under the program.

I wanted to bring those points out, and hopefully they clear up any questions the hon. member brought forward.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Red Deer North.

MR. DAY: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to make some observations on the estimates tonight and to congratulate the minister and his department for the task that they face in our challenging economic times and the firmness with which they are committing themselves to policies that are proven and that they know are working and are going to continue to work.

I'm looking specifically at vote 2, training and career services, and I'd like to make comments, observations and ask some questions in light of how that applies to youth programs. The hon. member of the opposition who began his remarks after the minister tonight said that he was just about to get to that area and didn't have the opportunity to, so realizing the importance of his concern and wanting to address that also, I think it will work well for both of us that I can advise you on some of these areas, and certainly you can feel free to ask me for more information at any time.

The Alberta Career Development and Employment programs targeted primarily at youth, as I observe here in the votes and the estimates, include the summer temporary employment program, the Alberta wage subsidy program, the Alberta student employment exchange program, the Alberta youth employment and training program, hire a student, and the Alberta vocational training program: quite a broad base of programming that's being made available there. Some of the things that are interesting to note in the member opposite's comments -- oh, I thought he was concerned about this. Okay, I'll try and hang tough.

MR. SIGURDSON: I'm sorry; I promise to read Hansard.

MR. DAY: I think it's interesting to note that criticisms were based basically on one thing. As he went through the votes, if spending went down, the minister was roundly criticized; if spending went up, then it was accepted that everything was all right. It seems to be a corollary which more than one socialist government has run their state ship aground on, and that is the simple corollary that as long as we're spending more money, everything's going to be okay. I'm glad that this government, as represented by this particular department tonight and others, recognized that that is not a direct corollary and has taken steps to adjust that.

I noticed and I'm pleased to see that the minister has made sure that the fabric of our youth programming is clearly interwoven with strong threads of reference to individual initiative, self-esteem, and an understanding of the entrepreneurial system, and I would ask the minister to continue on that track. I believe that's effective for two reasons, number one being that it will equip a young person who needs the skills to move into the entrepreneurial areas. They will be equipped because they've been informed and presented with information and counseling in this area. And even for those who don't eventually wind up as owners of small businesses themselves, they'll have an increased appreciation for what the small business owner goes through, some of the challenges that they're faced with. I believe that would work towards promoting more harmony in the workplace and not a confrontational and adversarial type of approach.

In the '86-87 fiscal year, Alberta Career Development and Employment provided training and career services to approximately 258,000 young Albertans. Members would be ad-

vised just to keep that fact at their fingertips and also members opposite who seem to echo a sentiment not based on reality that this department is doing nothing for youth. So before you say, "They're not doing anything," say, "Well, they did provide services to approximately 258,000 young people, but other than that they did nothing." So as long as you include that quarter of a million figure, then I think you're being a little more honest on it.

In the 1986-87 fiscal year we see that a total of 43,200 positions were funded for youth as a direct result of Career Development and Employment job creation programs. I am really at a loss to see how people can reflect and say that nothing has been done for youth when you're looking at these kind of figures. In spite of the fact that in the '86-87 fiscal year 43,200 positions were funded for youth, I believe we must keep in mind and recognize the effect of this whole philosophy of the government creating jobs and what that philosophy can do on a young mind. I think it's instructive to note how we've evolved in our western culture over several hundred years, and we've got to look at this evolution of thought which demands that "the government create a job for me." I appreciate the minister's comments when he reflects on the fact that small business is the true driver of the economy and the true creator of jobs.

This evolution in our thinking -- we can look back several hundred years ago to a feudal system where we were forced to work, our people were forced to work. Now, that's not an enviable situation, but we evolved from that and we hit a stage where people were allowed to work. And we've moved on from there to a right to work; we have a right to work. I endorse that. I concur with that. We do have a right to work. And then as a society we've moved from there to: we have a right to a job. Well, yes, that's a logical sequence. I won't dispute that. We have a right to a job. But by my saying that I have a right to a job, does that mean that I have a right to demand that the government must create a job for me?

This is a new statist, socialistic -- well, it's not new. It's been there for a lot of years, but we're having this constantly brought out. I believe that when we force this idea and infect the thinking of our young people that the government must -- it is their responsibility to -- create a job for you, I believe we destroy our young people. I believe we sap their initiative. I believe we cut away the very roots of what can be the driving force in their own life, and that is the responsibility to recognize what they have in terms of a job, or a career, or a profession. But this thought that "the government must create a job for me" is destructive. I believe and would suggest to the minister that as we continue programs which do fund -- and as we looked at here -- 43,000 jobs to young people, let's be careful that we balance out this area so that they recognize personal responsibility and don't fall prey to just another subtle system of redistribution of the resources in an inequitable way.

It's been suggested and mentioned that -- and again we hear this all the time, and I am going to send some studies, Mr. Chairman, to the member opposite who made the comments on the minimum wage to try and just maybe help in some very elementary areas of economic understanding. But, you know, just blindly raising the minimum wage is suggested as: that's it; that's the panacea; that's going to solve it all. Well, I'll tell you what; if just raising the minimum wage to \$5 is going to help a bit, why don't we just pass legislation here tonight making the minimum wage \$100 an hour? I mean, that would be it. Hey, everybody would be rich overnight. We wouldn't have any problems, would we? Not a problem in the world. Why don't

we just do that? Why mess around with five or six bucks an hour? Let's go for a hundred. If the thinking is there that raising the minimum wage is somehow going to mean prosperity for everybody and an automatic higher standard of living, why mess around with five bucks an hour? Let's go for 100 bucks an hour and drive every single businessman in this province out and totally ruin our economy.

There are many businesses that operate and are operating now very marginally. They cannot afford an arbitrary raise in the minimum wage that would result in businesses closing down, and any economical study worth its weight on the paper that it's written on in the area of minimum wage shows that arbitrary raises in the minimum wage do more to increase unemployment than to help it because of the businesses that it drives out and the people that it no longer makes available for these businesses to hire.

As native Albertans we have somewhat to be ashamed when we see the rate at which the immigrant groups who move to this province will willingly take on minimum wages. Willingly and quickly they will accept the minimum wages, but for many Albertans that's beneath our thinking. Now, the reason many of these immigrant groups will gladly take a job at minimum wage is that they know and recognize the fact that seems to slip the minds of our socialist colleagues here, and that's the fact that they are not going to be working at that minimum wage forever. It's a temporary place as they work their way into the system. It was never intended to be a final resting place in terms of economic well-being. They take these jobs on recognizing that. They work hard at them; they accumulate their funds. And what do we see happening over a generation? We see them accumulating their funds, we see them coming up with their own businesses, we see them becoming more involved in higher education, and we see them making a meaningful life for themselves and not demanding that the government do it for them.

Statistics show that the average immigrant family that moves to Alberta -- and this is virtually with no education as we declare education to be, virtually unskilled as we would call skills -- within five years is purchasing their own home. Now, I would suggest that they have learned something about initiative that we are robbing our own young people of by giving them this philosophy that the government must create a job for you. I believe we've got to address that and not be afraid to address it. These groups are passing a heritage on to their children, and their children are going to move up in the same way that we are.

The hire-a-student program provides job search information and services and job placement services to some 80,000 young Albertans. What are we doing for young Albertans? There's the hire-a-student program, and I would encourage the minister to -- one of the strengths of this program, I believe, is that it doesn't operate in isolation as a departmental entity, but it's a joint venture sponsored by the federal and provincial governments, local chambers of commerce, and community groups. I appreciate that and would encourage the minister to continue these programs along these lines with an integration of services right from the federal down to the municipal and community groups.

I see that with the two new centres open for youth in Alberta, we have some exciting things happening: the Youth Employment Centre in Calgary and the Youth Enterprise Centre in Edmonton. And, again, the Youth Employment Centre is funded by a federal department, Alberta career development, and the city of Calgary: a three-pronged system working together, providing sort of one-stop shopping to the various employment pro-

grams and counseling services that are offered by all the three levels of government. A young person can go directly to that Calgary Youth Employment Centre and be channeled into and find out the scope of resources and training that are available to him.

I appreciate that the Youth Employment Centre, Mr. Chairman, also features a job-finding club which encourages self-marketing, something that we may not be aware of. It's estimated that 80 percent of all job vacancies are actually not advertised through conventional methods. Therefore, a young person wanting to break into the job market is going to have to be equipped with certain skills to be able to find the 80 percent of jobs that aren't advertised through conventional methods, and these job-finding clubs provide that environment where people seeking employment can share ideas, support each other, and gain the necessary skills. Again, in these clubs what is being taught is that area of personal responsibility.

The job club in Red Deer that operates out of the provincial building in Red Deer North under the minister's department, recognizes the importance of personal responsibility. And talking with one worker there -- that particular club goes on for three weeks -- you must come in at either 8:30 or 9 o'clock, and that's actually part of the training. Some of the difficulty we have in having a stable work force is just to get people who've never been in the work force and learn personal responsibility. Just to get them to show up to work four or five days in a row sometimes is somewhat of a challenge, and by working them into this through the job club, the minister and his department have recognized that. More than just the academic that they're learning in those particular clubs, they're learning areas of personal responsibility. There's a need for that to be taught.

In our last session I made some comments to the minister about a businessman in Red Deer North who owns a restaurant. At that time he was complaining to me that young people just weren't learning responsibility like they should. Now, I take somewhat of an issue to that because I think our young people have the potential to be every bit as responsible as anybody else, but his concern at that time was -- now, this may seem strange to those who think that they should only lower themselves to so-called meaningful employment -- but he couldn't get anybody to deliver his pizzas for him at night. He would guarantee them between \$50 and \$70 a night to deliver pizza. It's not as much maybe as -- well, it would be pretty close to what we're making here, I guess. But I asked him to keep me informed of the progress. He couldn't get anybody to do that and most nights wound up delivering those himself. That was a year ago. I was in there enjoying one of his pizzas a few nights ago, and he said he's still got that problem. He can't get a young person in there to deliver his pizzas, yet we're told there are thousands of young people unemployed in Red Deer, or hundreds anyway. That's why I appreciate the initiatives of these job-finding clubs in teaching the area of personal responsibility and initiative. I think it's a tragedy that some people would believe these jobs to be somehow below their state in life.

Now, I do have a copy of the *Edmonton Journal* here, not that I use the media for research as much as the members opposite do, but I did glance at it tonight. I'll provide a copy to anybody here. There are five or six pages of help-wanted columns there, and this is for basically unskilled and not asking for people with degrees. And I don't think that's a rare event that it just happened this night that all of a sudden it jumped to five or six pages. There are hundreds of jobs, hundreds and hundreds of jobs being advertised, everything from labourer to maintenance

person to janitorial work to office and clerical. Again, I just say that to encourage the minister to keep on this course in the job-finding clubs and in the training of young people, to encourage that area of building their self-esteem and helping them to recognize that they do have the ability to go out there, get those jobs, take care of themselves, and in the future take care of their families.

Now, the Youth Enterprise Centre in Edmonton again is a reflection of this direction, and it addresses the problem of youth unemployment in kind of a unique way. It's through the encouragement of entrepreneurship as a viable occupational choice. Mr. Minister, that's a commendable program, and please continue on that course. The centre is designed to provide the young entrepreneur with training and technical advice and facilities and financial assistance and office support services. These young people are able to avail themselves of information about skills in the entrepreneurial area that took business people a lifetime to learn. And now these are being made available to young people in the Youth Enterprise Centre here in Edmonton. It's funded over a three-year period and, again, a three-pronged attack here by Employment and Immigration, Alberta Career Development and Employment, the city of Edmonton, and various donations from Edmonton businesses.

An essential part of the centre is the participation of the business community. Here we have business people providing advice and ideas in addition to donations to help these new ventures get off the ground: an exciting area where we see businesspeople involved in helping other businesses get going and get started. The socialist element in our society always tries to paint the businessperson as being totally self-seeking and just out for themselves, and it's just not an understanding of the whole economic process in which a statesman a couple of hundred years ago commented on, saying that he prayed for the wealth and the well-being of every other country besides his own, because he recognized that as other businesses flourished, so would his own.

Here is a reflection of a very basic economic premise, that in a free-enterprise and capitalistic type of environment, my well-being depends on your well-being, and the freer you are able to move economically, the freer I'm going to be able to move economically. The free-enterprise system actually finally makes the golden rule a proper and acceptable economic guideline. Because as well as I'm doing, you need to be doing as well, so I can keep doing well, so that you can keep doing well. That's why I appreciate these businesspeople being involved in the enterprise system and not bringing out a line of socialist thinking that forces mediocrity and a false sense of egalitarianism upon us that saps initiative and destroys growth.

In addition to the ideas and initiatives of the young people who will be learning business skills at this centre, the financing for the centre's equity pool and for renovations to the building, Alberta Career Development and Employment is funding 12-week courses at the NAIT centre for entrepreneurship, and on that particular expense item I would commend the minister and hope that he would be able, in his department, to maintain that program, that 12-week course at NAIT.

In the area of apprenticeship and trade certification, which applies very strongly to young people, in vote 2, specifically 2.2, we see \$8.298 million. I'm glad to see that Alberta Career Development and Employment is undertaking a review of provincial apprenticeship and trade certification, and that's in recognition that the economies are constantly in a state of flux and we need to be on the cutting edge of what is happening.

This continuing review is going to advance and keep us at the cutting edge, even in the area of trades and apprenticeship in terms of competition and other things that people in the youth force are facing. I also appreciate the fact that the age has been lowered to 16 years as far as availability to these programs.

I would close my remarks by saying the member opposite who said he was so concerned about what programs we have for youth -- and I've just expounded for about 20 minutes on what I feel are some of the good ones -- I'll have to make sure he gets a copy of *Hansard*. I thought he said he was concerned, but on the points that I've addressed, Mr. Minister, I would encourage you to maintain those particular ones which I've mentioned.

Thank you for your foresight as you deal with the difficulties facing us today.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the Member for Red Deer North brought up the point about youth in our initiatives as a department. I was quite taken aback by the Member for Edmonton Belmont's comments or lack of comments when he indicated that he didn't seem to have time to talk about youth employment as a priority. Well, I want to assure the member that in the Department of Career Development and Employment, youth and youth initiatives are a priority, and they are a priority with this government.

I just wanted to supplement two points that the Member for Red Deer North made and answer one question and supplement the other, Mr. Chairman. The answer to the question is the extent to which we as a department support youth initiative, and with regard to \$143.5 million announced in our labour market strategy, fully \$76 million of that labour market strategy is accessed by youth in this province. I think that is obviously an indication of the priority that we give to dealing with the young people in Alberta today.

One other brief point I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman, was with respect to the Member for Red Deer North's comments about youth initiative and youth enterprise. We know in Alberta -- at least we on the side that forms the government of Alberta are very aware that there is a very strong individual initiative in the province of Alberta. We have the highest participation rate by men in the country and the highest participation rate by women in the country. And that to me is indicative that individuals want to work. They're either working or they are looking for work.

Now, what we want to do with regard to youth is to be sure that we offer programs and the opportunity to become valuable contributors to the economy of the province. We believe one of those areas is in the vicinity of exploiting entrepreneurial spirit. The Calgary Youth Employment Centre, which is funded by the Department of Career Development and Employment and the Minister of State for Youth, is I think going to be a very successful program. I had the opportunity to participate with the Hon. Jean Charest in the opening of that initiative in Calgary a couple of weeks ago, and I'm just very pleased with the opportunities that are being presented to young people to give them the opportunity to become entrepreneurs and start their own businesses and also look at the interface with the counseling services that are available and be sure that they are aware of the jobs that are available in the labour market and be sure that they are getting proper counseling for it. Proper counseling is a very significant component of being competitive in the labour force.

The other initiative I wanted to refer to was the Youth Enterprise Centre in Edmonton, which is being run by the YMCA. That is a three-year program, also with three levels of govern-

ment funding. I had the opportunity of participating in the opening of that particular venture. That is much in line with the concept of the incubators that my hon. colleague the Minister of Economic Development and Trade referred to just recently, and I want to let hon. members know that they should visit that centre and see what they are providing for young people. They are giving them counseling and giving them the opportunity to avoid the pitfalls in starting your own business, because, as we all know that have been out there starting our own business, it is very important to avoid the kind of mistakes that cost money. Most of the businesses that fail, fail in their first year, towards the end of the first year. The incubator system will provide counseling by skilled entrepreneurs, by people who have been successful in the economy so that young people can benefit from that knowledge.

So those are some of the comments that I wanted to supplement and the answer I wanted to provide to the Member for Red Deer North.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Calgary Buffalo.

MR. CHUMIR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure to be able to speak on the matter of this department's estimates once again.

AN HON. MEMBER: Five bucks if you never use the word "entrepreneur" once.

MR. CHUMIR: You're on. Pay me now or later.

In fact, this is a bit like déjà vu insofar as last year's estimates were concerned. We have a repetition of the pungent and hard-hitting critique of the minister's estimates by the Member for Red Deer North. I'm delighted to see that he has overcome his disappointment that the minister's department is still in existence, spoiling people with \$5 and \$6 an hour wages. There's no doubt that the unemployed will soon be clamouring for the hon. Member for Red Deer North to be put in charge of the department, although a few malcontents may be underwhelmed at the thought.

I'm proposing, Mr. Chairman, to range over a broad number of topics relating to the minister's department, including a number of the particular programs he has spoken about. I also propose to get into some of the issues of illiteracy, immigration, and particularly lotteries, which are of current interest and most interestingly appear to have escaped comment by the minister, which is a matter of no small astonishment.

In opening perhaps I just might make a general request of the minister that perhaps in future we might ask for slightly more consistency in the announcements with respect to the programs and the details of programs. This year we've had a labour market strategy presented as well as the estimates per se, and might note that some of the minister's comments with respect to attempting to reconcile the numbers in these documents have been a subject of satire in one of the local newspapers. And indeed it would appear that trying to reconcile those numbers generally would baffle a National Defence department cryptology expert. It's more in the nature of a pizza than a four- or five-course meal, and I think the minister perhaps might be able to do better in future.

In that regard, I would like to ask, for example, why the minister restricts his designation of the title "strategy" to the \$143.5 million of expenditures referred to in his press release. It's ob-

vious that the department is spending more than the \$143.5 million. Are these other expenditures not part of his department's strategy? Why is it that one portion of the expenditures is part of a strategy and the other part is not?

I might also note that the release of the labour market strategy appears, Mr. Chairman, to be more in the nature of a maximum of public relations hype and a minimum of needed response to the problem. There is a very strong implication in the trumpeting announcement of new spending when, in fact, spending is cut, albeit only slightly, but cut nevertheless; \$143.5 million is really just a reshuffling of money, primarily from training programs to subsidy programs, and I emphasize low wage subsidy programs.

[Mrs. Koper in the Chair]

Now, the thrust of the minister's policy is obviously that of reducing spending on training and career services by slightly over 20 percent, over \$26 million, and increasing spending on employment programs by 33 percent: up \$27 million. Most of the employment program is, as the minister has noted, directed to providing wage subsidies for job programs. However, the essence of these programs is that the subsidies are low, the wages paid are low, and they're limited in time. The effect is that then we will have low-paying jobs only for a short period of time. On the other hand, the essence of the training programs which have been cut is that they're directed to providing skills which will be of lasting value to workers, and as the epigram states: Give a man a fish, you feed him for a day; teach him to fish, and you feed him for a lifetime.

Now, the minister explains this shift in emphasis from long-term to short-term thinking on the basis of the current economic situation and the alleged fact that employers want recent work experience which will be provided by these programs. Might I ask: where is the study or data which backs up the minister's statement that recent work experience is the primary obstacle to obtaining employment? I understand that this information was part of advice received by the hon. minister from the Minister of Social Services, and I would be very interested, Madam Chairman, if the hon. minister would be able to provide us with some concrete information and studies and backup data as to that being the case in this situation.

Similarly, with respect to the other assumptions underlying the policy of the minister, I would like to ask the minister what evidence he has that the creation of these particular low-paying jobs that are part of the department's labour market strategy provide the kind of experience and training that provides lasting benefits. Now, the heart of the problem with respect to assessing these programs generally is that we have in fact no meaningful information about the validity of the minister's approach to policy. Where are the studies which reflect the success that the wage program has had to date? We've had wage programs in place for a number of years. We hear the minister giving us glowing reports of so many jobs being created permanently, but where are the studies? Where are the jobs? With 11 percent unemployment, how many jobs of an enduring nature have been created? What has happened to workers after the program is terminated? How many new jobs have been created, as opposed to offering business or government subsidies for jobs which would have been created in any event? Are jobs going begging because of an absence of recent work experience? Are these jobs unfilled, or in fact do most of the jobs get filled in any event? Pardon us, Madam Chairman, if we would like some-

thing more than the minister's statement of numerical success.

So in summary, Madam Chairman, we would ask whether the minister does have some studies backing up the policy direction that he's going, and if so, will he table these studies? And if he doesn't have such studies, why doesn't he? In the same vein, I would ask the minister if he might advise who he is consulting on these important issues. We assume he has access to some of the birdies who are advising the government from time to time, but is he consulting with the municipalities? Apparently not. Is he consulting with labour? Apparently not. Is there an advisory group of affected and involved individuals? If not, why not?

There is also a question, Madam Chairman, of the policing of these programs to ensure that existing employees are not fired in order to make place for government-subsidized employees. What form of undertaking do employers give to the minister and to the department to satisfy that the integrity of the program will be maintained? What policing is done? What happens if an employer does abuse the program? The minister has talked during question period about legal action. What kind of action does he mean? How many cases of abuse have there been detected to date, and how many legal actions have there been, with what results? It would be very useful if we could have a report on the essential ingredients of the policing of this program.

I would like to move on to comment on the issue of the work-for-welfare program that has been announced as part of the labour market strategy. We now have such a program in the making, at a time when there is totally inadequate emphasis on helping social assistance recipients get proper job training and upgrading in the first place. I was wondering whether the minister could advise of where that work-for-welfare program is in the elements. I certainly see no mention of it. If it is in a wage subsidy form, how much will the wage subsidies be? What are the administrative cost components of it? Presumably such a program will be very administratively cumbersome and expensive to administer. In general, what are the details of this program?

Also, can the minister tell this House clearly and unequivocally that the recent cuts in funding for single employables are not part of an overall program to push social allowance recipients into accepting low-paying jobs in economic desperation? Are we going to see the type of program which allows these recipients to top up their social allowance benefits to their recent past levels without penalty, in effect saying that they need not take a cut in income provided they take some of the new jobs being offered to them, obviously at wages which would offend the Member for Red Deer North?

Another apparent goal of the strategy, Madam Chairman, appears to be that of pushing social recipients into getting jobs for a period, which will qualify them for unemployment insurance. The effect of this, of course, would be the somewhat salutary one, from a provincial point of view, of shifting the ultimate economic burden onto the federal government, which pays for 100 percent of the unemployment insurance program, and away from social assistance, of which we pay half. From a strictly economic point of view, there may appear to be some merits for that type of approach, but when we get beyond the hard economics and we look at the lives of the people involved, what this really involves is putting them on a merry-go-round, bouncing from one program to another in short periods of time rather than addressing the long-term job needs that they have. So can the minister tell the House that these goals are not in fact a part of his department's strategy?

I would also like to get some comments from the minister with respect to the community schools program. This is a very wonderful program which has developed in our province in recent years. It integrates schools and communities in a very successful and meaningful way. Many of these community schools perform career counseling and related services. The career counseling is done for lower income and ethnic communities which in many cases would not otherwise be reached. The role of the department of manpower has been acknowledged by its presence on an interdepartmental committee. However, instead of a sensible, integrated funding approach the community schools program is funded only through the Department of Education, and it's no surprise that with this fragmented, balkanized approach to funding the Department of Education would review only the educational benefits in isolation and would overlook the global benefits, including those pertaining to the manpower issue.

So I would ask the minister whether he has in fact reviewed the benefits of this community school program insofar as career and manpower counseling are concerned. Could he give us his view of this program? And has he consulted with the Minister of Education -- other than in the last 60 seconds. A cram course is in the process, I might note. Has he consulted with the Minister of Education to determine the best way of co-ordinating and keeping these programs? I emphasize co-ordinating these programs. Has he done anything specifically to advise community schools of how they can access and tap into his department's programs, as he suggested was feasible in response to one of the questions in question period, and if not, will he do so? Because people who are involved in these programs in the schools are busy trying to deliver the programs and are not in a position to go around chasing funding.

On the subject of illiteracy, Madam Chairman, I spoke last session on this subject at length. It is a major problem of our society. I have indeed spoken to the minister separately on the subject a few times. In summary, it is estimated that there are one million Canadians who can't read or write, and another three million Canadians who don't possess adequate skills to function properly in our community. In Alberta it's estimated that anywhere from 200,000 to 400,000 Albertans are illiterate, and indeed the 1981 census says that 239,000 Albertans have not completed grade 9. We do have some programs, but they are fragmented, when an all-out attack on the program is called for. The attack is called for not just for the good of the individuals who are involved, but for the good of our whole society in reducing unemployment, crime, accidents, and massive economic loss.

[Mr. Musgreave in the Chair]

I referred during the last set of estimates to the possibility of combining some job-creation programs with a program to tackle illiteracy by training unemployed people to deal with this problem. Is anything being done with this brilliant and incisive idea and on the overall illiteracy problem? The job can't be done overnight, but we need a meaningful and an overt commitment from the government to deal with that problem.

I'd also like to deal with another issue that I spoke of during the last estimates, that of English language training for immigrants, and I refer it to the minister in his capacity as the minister responsible for immigration resettlement services, which have suffered a very, very slight setback in funding. It's quite clear that language is the most important single skill that im-

migrants need for success in this country. I alluded in my comments last July 23 to the shortage of programs in this area, a desperate shortage of programs. The minister stated in response that he was concerned about the problem, that the federal government was cutting back, and that he would make representations to the federal minister. I'd appreciate very much if the minister might give his report as to his dealings with the federal minister on that matter. What is the status in general of English as a Second Language programs in this province? Are services in fact increasing? What is the minister's general assessment as to the way the need is being filled? Are we doing enough? If not, by what measure do we fall short? In summary, what is his department doing to tackle this problem on a global basis?

Insofar as immigration is concerned, I would also like to raise some comments arising out of the issue relating to the problems of Mr. Gul Qaderi which came up in question period not so long ago. As we're aware, the federal government, with the enthusiastic approval of the provincial government, has implemented a program for bringing in immigrants who are prepared and able to provide some investment capital. To some extent this program has been criticized as making access to this country subject to the ability to be able to finance it; in other words, selling access for money.

The problem of Mr. Qaderi raises a problem of a totally different pole from that of finances, and this is the question of family reunification. Mr. Qaderi is a Canadian citizen who was here for six years and couldn't get his 12-year-old daughter admitted to the country as a result of medical problems. This was indeed a very, very distressing and disturbing case, not only on its particular facts but for what it says about our immigration policies generally, not only at the federal level but in terms of the types of programs that the provincial government is prepared to provide. I am pleased that the minister got himself involved and that the issue is apparently resolved, and I would appreciate confirmation from the minister, if he's able to give it, that in fact the matter has been put to bed and is finally resolved and that the daughter will be admitted.

But what I am concerned about is using this as an object lesson of what is wrong with some of our immigration policies. If Mr. Qaderi's daughter should come in and is entitled to come in -- and I assume the minister in making representations is conceding that -- then everybody else's daughter who is in a similar situation should be able to come in without having to go through the difficulties, the hardship, the heartbreak, and the press publicity that was necessary in this particular instance. So I would be very appreciative if the minister could undertake to ensure that he's involved in stimulating a change to the overall policies of this country with respect to the reunification of families and that he will work to ensure that our social programs and rules accommodate the needs of immigrants. Allowing situations such as this to prevail, of having parts of families come to this country and other parts of immediate families not be admissible, smacks far too much of the old approach of allowing Chinese male labourers to come to work here but not to allow Chinese women to arrive.

Moving on to lotteries, Mr. Chairman, I note enthusiasm and delight on behalf of the minister. Last year, if I understand the figures correctly, \$39 million was distributed to various organizations from the province's share of Western Canada Lottery funds for the year ended March 31, 1986. There were indeed many worthy recipients of these funds -- cultural, community, athletic, volunteer, and other organizations -- although I

might except from the description of "voluntary" the provision of \$3.6 million to send Alberta students to Expo in Vancouver and export tourist jobs while we have unemployment and people are lined up at food banks in this province, as I never tire of telling, as the Minister of Education has just noted visually.

However, the concerns that I would like to express and ask the minister about are as follows. Firstly, we have \$110 million of accumulated funds in the Western Canada Lottery Corporation to the account of the province of Alberta. This grew at a rate of over \$50 million last year. Presumably, as Charles Dickens would say, we have great expectations of the amount growing at that same level next year. Last time I looked, gambling was a relatively recession-proof business. I was wondering if the minister might give us some idea as to what plans the government has with respect to these funds. Does the government in fact have a plan, and if not, why not? I might also ask: why is it that after three years of admonition by the Auditor General that the government is acting illegally -- and I say illegally because that's clearly what the Auditor General's report has been saying. He said that the government has been acting illegally by not paying those funds into the General Revenue Fund to be disposed of subject to appropriation as in the rest of the provinces' expenditures. How is it that the government has not seen fit to comply with that admonition of the Auditor General? Now, I'm aware that the Auditor General said that if you don't do that, you have to change the law. You have an option of changing the law, but you haven't done either: you haven't changed the law; you haven't followed the advice of the Auditor General that you have to pay the money over or you're acting illegally. You haven't done either; you've just continued to act illegally. I find this totally unacceptable, and I would be very interested as to the minister's explanation.

I'm also concerned, secondly, Mr. Chairman, with the absence of opportunity for this Legislature to be able to deal with the manner in which the lottery funds are spent. Might I ask the minister: who decides where the lottery allocation goes? To my knowledge, unless I've totally been oblivious to what's been going on in this House during the last few sessions -- some nods of yes -- I have not seen these expenditures brought before this House for approval. And I would appreciate the confirmation of the minister that in fact these are not being brought before the House. I'd like to ask why they aren't brought before the House. Why should they be dealt with by the government alone as opposed to the normal process of spending being approved by the people's representatives? As I recall, historically we have examples of revolution for matters short of what we have seen here.

Finally, a detailed issue with respect to the lotteries, and that is with respect to the exhibitions. I noted that each of the Calgary and Edmonton exhibitions is the recipient of \$2.75 million from the lottery funds. Is this on top of the amount in vote 4? Perhaps the minister could explain just the significance and the source of the amounts in vote 4 and the relationship between the funding.

I'm delighted to see the minister is moving on to set up a committee with respect to apprenticeship. I've had representations from members in the labour movement who are very concerned about the focus of the apprenticeship program and the delay of the government in getting to it. Better late than never; it certainly is late.

And finally, with respect to the women's career centre. If I might say, Mr. Chairman, that seems to me to be nothing short of a public relations exercise, and I'm sure that any women who

were seriously interested in seeing the cause of women advancing their job opportunities are probably laughing at the initiative. It would be more meaningful, I would suggest, if the government resolved to put its own house in order. They have a great deal of room for improving their performance by equalizing wages being paid to women in the public service, which are seriously and unacceptably out of proportion insofar as the payments for women vis-à-vis men is concerned, and they might also pay attention to advancing the number of women in management. As it is, the closest we come to a female deputy minister . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Wainwright.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The last speaker mentioned to me that about 10 minutes ago he said, "In summary." about five minutes ago he said, "Finally," and then pretty soon he said that he was almost ready. I was getting afraid that I wasn't going to be able to get up and give my speech tonight.

Anyway, I'm not going to start out "in summary." I would like to congratulate the minister on his appointment to Career Development and Employment. I'd like to commend him and his deputy minister, Al Craig, and the department officials who are up there in the gallery helping absorb some of this great knowledge that's flying around here tonight. I would like to commend those people on the good work that they're doing in handling the funding of this department. Certainly in these economic conditions your work is a great challenge, and I do have to say that in my area you are certainly doing a very good job. I checked in with our manpower office a number of times during the winter, and our people in there tell me most of the winter that we were the lowest unemployed area in Canada. It was in the area of between 4 and 5 percent. It would sometimes get up a little higher, but it was very, very low. Somebody has to be doing a pretty good job in order for that to happen.

Also, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Red Deer North mentioned about destroying the initiative of our young people with the encouragement of too much government finding jobs and pushing them towards jobs that don't mean anything. I checked in my manpower office and asked: how many returnees do we keep getting back? How often do the same people keep coming back to our office? And it seemed like when you check the unemployment insurance and how soon it would run out, the same people were back time and time again. Our employee there said that anywhere from 20 to 30 percent are people that keep coming back again. I would like to have our department take a look at that and see if there isn't some kind of incentive that we can get in there that would encourage people to stay off unemployment insurance and stay with their job.

I guess that when we have the lowest unemployment level in Canada, I have to go and ask why, and one thing I guess we've got to say is that we've got a pretty nice constituency down in the Wainwright area. We have the army camp that employs a number of people, and certainly that's a bit seasonal as well. But it does create a bit of a problem, and it gets back to the low wage business that we heard talked about earlier on. Employers in small business in downtown come complaining to me quite a little bit about the fact that the federal government pays \$11 to \$12 an hour for unskilled people in the army camp there, and it's very difficult to hire someone in a small business that can't afford to pay that price. It does create a bit of a problem.

We also have a very strong oil development and service sec-

tor in our area. The oil prices' change now are going to give us quite a boost. We're hoping to see that Lloydminster upgrader go ahead and all of the further oil development that takes in a lot of our Chauvin, Edgerton, Wainwright, Provost areas. We are quite strong in the energy there. The tough times the past winter have certainly been hard on the employment, but we still remain quite strong.

Our Lakeland College has been doing a great job. We are one spoke of the Lakeland College there in Wainwright. We don't have a big college, but we have been retraining many of the local people. They have been flexible and been adjustable so that they can move into a different job. We have a lot of people with a little initiative; they know that if they can't find employment in what they're in now, they're going to retrain and get into something. I went to the graduation that they had last spring there, and it was most satisfying to see the people that were graduating. Most of them had jobs when they were getting out. They were very excited about it, and they were happy to make that change. I think that our programs that go to helping retrain are very, very beneficial to us.

The wage subsidy program and the on-job-training program is particularly helpful to our small businesses and farmers there. Many of those jobs, especially the job-training program, help develop those jobs into permanent positions. It does make it very beneficial to an employer that can have someone that is trained and can make his own way and make his wages.

I would like to just relate to a few of the buzzwords that our Member for Edmonton Belmont mentioned on the low wages. I just wondered if he ever has had the opportunity to go out and hire someone and pay him some wages out of his own pocket? I do know that when you sit down as a small businessman and hire employees, you have to sit down with your employee and discuss whether or not he's going to make his wages. If he can't make his wages, you can't stay in business. And certainly we have to sit down and talk about money and if he's going to get his \$15,000 or whatever he gets, plus his room and board or whatever. He's got to be able to make that. I guess I can relate it to the farm quite often. It's awful nice to have someone that has got some training in agriculture, and if they're doing well, certainly you like to develop some jobs during the wintertime so that he can stay year-round. Quite often you sit down and try to figure out how you can feed a bunch of cattle that will pay for your man's wages to get him over winter, and then he can help you again in the summertime. Quite often it means that you have to cut his wages a little bit, but I think that it's important that you sit down with him and show him the dollars and cents. It is an incentive for him to see that he can make his wages.

I'd like to ask the minister one question on vote 3.3.3, immigration and settlement services. I understand that this is kind of a joint participation program with the federal government, and I just would like you to explain it a little bit. How much participation does the provincial government get in the decision-making, and does the federal government participate in the dollars? I see that we spend \$2.5 million or thereabouts with that program, and I'd like you to just explain it a little bit further.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. ORMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My hon. friend and colleague the Member for Calgary Buffalo would never forgive me if I did not get up and respond to his comments, so I intend

to do that. I also will respond to my friend and colleague the Member for Wainwright's inquiry as to immigration settlement services.

Firstly, I'd like to respond to the question about the labour market strategy and how it relates to the rest of the department. If the hon. member would go back to October of 1984, he would see that the departmental budget was in the area of about \$80 million, as I recall. The labour market strategy was a means to give impetus to job-creation and training programs over and above the departmental budget. I like the way the labour market strategy works, because it gives us the flexibility to be sensitive to the economy and it avoids entrenching programs within the department. With the manner in which we present the labour market strategy, we are able to retool and redesign the programs therein based on the demands of the economy and the demands of the labour force. So it's a very important way in which we deal with the strategy, and I hope that we will continue to do that and can assure that I will play my part in hoping to continue handling the labour market strategy in that particular manner.

I also wanted to point out to the hon. member, with regard to his question about training and job creation, that our shift in emphasis from training to job creation, as I indicated, is not a shift totally. It is just a shift in emphasis. We continue to provide substantial amounts of funding in the area of training, but it is not in the absence of a reduction in the demand of training programs. That is what gives us the latitude and the ability to shift funds from that particular area over to the job-creation side. It is all a matter of being sensitive to what is happening in the labour force.

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo also asked about the basis from which we make our judgments on moving from training to job creation. Well, one of the judgments I make, Mr. Chairman, is my 15 years as a small businessman in this province and knowing that if an individual has been out of work for a protracted period of time, that individual is less attractive than another individual who has been working, because the first thing it tells you is that that individual has an inclination to work, that he is willing to take a job, willing to participate in the labour force. Our job-creation programs allow for that opportunity. If individuals are willing to take the job-creation programs that we offer, it is an entrée into the labour force, it gives recent work experience, and it creates an attractiveness for that individual that he would not have if he has been unemployed for a year. So it only makes sense.

I don't need volumes of studies to tell me that that is a practical approach. All I need is the background that I have experienced as a small businessman. As a matter of fact, that sentiment prevailed before I came to the portfolio, so I'm not the only one that thinks that way. It's been part and parcel of the thinking of this government for a number of years. Based on the numbers and the successes that I've delineated here this evening, I believe it is the right direction and the right approach.

We do on a regular basis, Mr. Chairman, monitor the programs that we deliver through Career Development and Employment. We monitor to be sure that employers that are approaching us to bring people in under training programs or wage subsidy programs are not laying people off to make room for our programs, and we do our best to make sure that the individual is working while they are receiving the training subsidy or the wage subsidy. In that we fund in excess of 70,000 positions, Mr. Chairman, I can't stand here and tell the hon. member nor can I tell the Assembly that 100 percent of our programs are without abuse. We find that we are able to detect in the area of

3 to 5 percent of the abuses that happen under our programs, and that comes through the monitoring. Unless I have a staff of a sufficient size to monitor all 70,000 positions, I cannot be sure that there is not abuse. But it's much like income tax, Mr. Chairman. There are abuses that occur. We do our best to minimize them, but we are not going to abandon any of the programming we deliver just because there is a modicum of abuse. We will, however, do whatever we can to make sure that the abuses do not continue, and we are sufficiently harsh on the individuals that are abusing our programs to the extent, I think, that is discouraging further abuse.

The member referred to the employment alternatives program. I anticipate being able to announce in this Assembly that program sometime over the next month or two. The details have not been worked out, and I think the program is of sufficient importance that I did not want to rush ahead with just a program. I want to be sure that the program we bring forward is one that's acceptable to the employees and to the employers, for if it's not acceptable to either one of those parties, Mr. Chairman, it's not going to be successful. You can't force employers to hire people, and you can't force people to go to work. It doesn't work that way in the 20th century. I want to deal with the people that have an inclination to work and so do the employers, and that's going to be the design of that particular program.

With respect to community schools, Mr. Chairman, I have three community schools in my constituency, and I recognize that they do play an important role in the community. I do also recognize that the 66 community schools that were funded were funded preferentially to the some 1,500 schools we have in the province, and it was a decision that that preference could no longer continue to the extent that it had based on our overall policy with regard to restraint. I have met with representatives of community schools not only from my constituency but from around the Calgary area, and I have advised them to advise their colleagues throughout the province that they can access the priority employment program, they can access the summer temporary employment program, and they can access training programs if in fact there is a component of on-the-job training being delivered by the community schools.

My intent is more to disseminate information about our department's programs rather than to soften the blow of any particular cuts, because I do support the position that we have taken with community schools. They still receive \$37,000 more than the rest of the schools in the province, and I believe that is acceptable in terms of overall fiscal restraint.

The hon. member referred to English as a Second Language, and I would like him to know that our department, in keeping with its settlement and training responsibilities, assumes a lead role in the establishment of an ESL secretariat. The unit is responsible for co-ordinating the activities of those provincial departments involved in funding and delivery of English as a Second Language training in Alberta. An adult English as a Second Language committee, chaired by the manager of the ESL secretariat and comprised of senior-level representation from five provincial departments, meets monthly on an ESL agenda. The department also funds ESL assessment and referral centres, whose role is to assist immigrant newcomers to access appropriate training programs. Reporting to the ESL secretariat, these centres also collect data on ESL client needs which can be used in planning and delivering appropriate training. The department is also involved in funding ESL training for immigrants not eligible for federally sponsored programs.

Mr. Chairman, I'd also like to report to the hon. member that when I met recently with my colleague ministers responsible for the labour market in Ottawa, we as a government, and my department particularly, presented an initiative with regard to ESL training. That initiative, in a nutshell, was a recommendation that ESL funding by the federal government be attached to immigration policy rather than to the Canadian job strategy. It's a very important issue from my point of view on a personal basis. I'm very pleased to report that there was unanimous agreement by my colleague provincial ministers. We moved that recommendation forward to the recommendation of the federal Minister of Employment and Immigration, and he has undertaken to review our recommendations, as adopted by my colleague ministers, and report back to us at a subsequent meeting.

I would like to confirm the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo's query with regard to the Qaderi immigration matter. The matters come to a provincial government when there is a component of social assistance or health care needed on the part of an individual of that family. The federal government consults with us. We have a joint committee with that federal government, and I recommended that this matter be dealt with swiftly. And while I was in Ottawa last week, Mr. Chairman, I had a discussion with my colleague the Minister of State for Immigration, and he indicated to me that they were reviewing it with a view to expeditiously issuing a ministerial permit for Mr. Qaderi's daughter. I too am pleased, as the Member for Calgary Buffalo is, that we were able to move this matter to an early resolution.

The hon. member also asked questions about family reunification and our record of immigration here in the province. The federal government does, on a regular basis, seek our advice on immigration levels and refugee levels, and we provide on a regular basis our views on levels of immigration. I should let the member know that we as Albertans have, I would say, a remarkable record in this province of accepting immigrants to Alberta. We have accepted in the past, Mr. Chairman, with 10 percent of the Canadian population, in the area of 15 percent of all refugees that come to Canada. I think that is a recognition of not only the role this government has played but also the role that people of Alberta take, reflected by that initiative, in accepting the disadvantaged from other countries. I have communicated to my colleague the Minister of State for Immigration, the hon. Gerry Weiner, that family reunification is a number one priority with this government. We want to be sure that individuals who have moved through the system are able to be reunified with their family members in other parts of the world. I'm sure that the hon. member is pleased to hear that and also supports this government's position thereon.

The hon. member also made some inquiries with respect to vote 4, lotteries, and I would like to indicate that in fact there is a surplus in proceeds from our original allocation of lotteries funds. I do not view the fact that we have excesses, Mr. Chairman, as a necessity: go out and spend that money. I can assure the hon. members and assure the Assembly that that money will go to the areas of greatest need. And with regard to further initiatives in that area, I will be discussing allocations of those funds with my caucus and with my cabinet to be sure that we are channeling the moneys into the areas of the greatest need. We have a commitment of lotteries proceeds to amateur sport, recreation, and culture, and my hon. colleague the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has told me that he perceives our commitment in that particular area of recreation and sport as preventative health. So in fact there are moneys moving into the

health area. It's in the area of preventative health.

I am familiar, too, with the Auditor General's comments with regard to lotteries proceeds. As the hon. member indicated, the lottery surplus is outside the General Revenue Fund, and I have assured the Auditor General that at the earliest possible convenience I will be bringing forward lotteries legislation to address his particular concerns. I have communicated that to the Auditor General, Mr. Chairman, I believe to his satisfaction.

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo also made some comments with regard to apprenticeship review. He has had private discussions and correspondence with me, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate his interest in this particular area because it is a very, very important initiative. As my colleague the Member for Red Deer North indicated, we must continue to deliver programs that are on the leading edge of programming, and it is my view that with a review of the apprenticeship and trade certification area we can offer more up-to-date programs and a wider range of programs under that particular area of government.

The Member for Calgary Buffalo also made some, I think, derogatory comments about the Women's Career Resource Centre. I would hope that he has had an opportunity to visit that centre prior to making any comments like he did a moment ago. That Women's Career Resource Centre is also in response to the demand created by the labour market; that is, to counsel women who have been out of the labour force or who are considering career alternatives in the most appropriate way and give them the most up-to-date information so they can make appropriate decisions about their future. We have examples of women who have left the labour force to raise a family, are now back in the labour force, Mr. Chairman, and need advice as to the marketability of their existing skills. Can those skills be upgraded, and are they in demand? The Women's Career Resource Centre will address that particular issue.

The Member for Wainwright asked about our relationship with the federal government with regard to immigration settlement services. I believe I have clarified that question with my other comments in response to the Member for Calgary Buffalo, but let me say that we are in constant contact with the federal government. They, too, provide substantial funding to the immigration and settlement area. We are continuing to meet with the federal government to be sure the funding they do provide is ongoing and is representative of their policies with regard to immigration.

I would like to close my comments on that note, Mr. Chairman.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee adjourn and rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions, reports progress thereon, and requests leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps one hon. member could find a tie and another one a jacket.

Do you all agree with the report and the request for leave to sit again?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? So ordered.

[At 10:38 p.m. the House adjourned to Tuesday at 2:30 p.m.]

