

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, April 6, 1988 2:30 p.m.**

Date: 88/04/06

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: Before we pray, may I say that the hums of Happy Birthday are greatly appreciated.

PRAYERS

MR. SPEAKER: O Lord, grant us a daily awareness of the precious gift of life which You have given us.

As Members of this Legislative Assembly we dedicate our lives anew to the service of our province and our country.

Amen

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Speaker, in response to questions dated March 30, 1988, from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glengarry, I am today filing two copies of all the plans and specifications and all construction contracts awarded to date for the Oldman River dam and related work components of the project. To assist hon. members in reading the documents, I'm also filing lists of the 21 separate contract plans.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission and to assist the pages, it might be appropriate if the Member for Edmonton-Glengarry would personally come over and pick up his set.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm not certain whether pages are covered by WCB if they're injured lifting all this.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. ELZINGA: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, sir, and Members of the Legislative Assembly, six members of the 13th Girl Guide company. They're accompanied by Ruth Worobetz. They're in the members' gallery, and I'd ask that they rise to receive the warm welcome of the Legislative Assembly.

MS LAING: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, 31 grade 6 students from Donnan elementary school in the constituency of beautiful Edmonton-Avonmore. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Fearon; Mr. Asquith, the principal; and parents Mrs. Ann Hartwig and Mrs. Erika Juchem. I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Speaker, I'm privileged today to introduce to you and through you to members of this House, two school groups from Edmonton-Gold Bar. The first group are 18 in number, a grade 6 class from Fulton Place elementary school, and they're accompanied by their teacher Mr. John Ray. I would ask that they stand and be acknowledged and welcomed by this House. They're in the members' gallery.

The second group is another grade 6 class from Waverley school. There are 36 members in number, and they're accompa-

nied by their teacher Evelyn Pasmore and parents Mrs. Klingbeil, Mrs. Jaritsma, Mrs. Meeuse, and Mimi Bedard, an aide. They, too, are in the members' gallery; if they would rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Speaker.

[remarks in Spanish]

I am pleased to introduce to you and the other members of the House, one of Chile's best known popular singers and artists, Olivia Onate. Ms Onate has been giving performances in several Canadian cities in the past few months, using the mediums of song and art to explain the struggle of the Chilean people for freedom and democracy. [as submitted]

Mr. Speaker, I'd ask Ms Onate to rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. PIQUETTE: Mr. Speaker, I'm privileged to introduce to you, members of the Metis Coalition Society of Alberta: Mr. Felix Desjorlais, the president and director of operations -- he is also settlements counselor of Buffalo Lake in my constituency -- his wife, Ester Desjorlais; from Kikino, Fred Pruden, secretary treasurer; Harvey Whitford, liaison officer; Penny Walton; Marshall Howse, public relations; and Stein Ridgedale, who is also an active member in that society. I would ask the House to please give these people a warm welcome today.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Calder.

MS MJOLSNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my pleasure today to introduce 29 terrific grade 6 students from the school of Caernarvon in the constituency of Edmonton-Calder. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Bauerfind, Mr. Wyatt, and a parent Mrs. Faulkner. I would ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Principal Group

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. I have in front of me here an urgent memo from the assistant deputy minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, dated April 24, 1984, in which Mr. Darwish acknowledges that two investment companies, First Investors and Associated Investors, had overvalued assets and, particularly, no capital to speak of. Now, he indicated, and I quote:

Serious consideration should also be given to an immediate curtailment of F. I. C.'s and A. I. C.'s licences.

Very clear. That's back in 1984.

Now, obviously, Mr. Speaker, despite these dire warnings the companies continued to sell contracts to an unsuspecting public. My question to the Premier: has the Premier made any inquiries at all into why these warnings were ignored, and if so, why were they ignored?

MR. GETTY: Inquiries, Mr. Speaker? The very matter is before an inquiry. Those are public documents that have been put before the Code inquiry, and we're waiting to hear the results of that inquiry.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, what we're talking about is accountability here in the Legislature. This was a government document. The Premier's got to do a little better than that, Mr.

Speaker.

He asked for a meeting with the minister at that time, in 1984, to talk about the apparent demise of these two companies. My question is to the Premier. We want to know now why no action was taken. Would the Premier indicate if he at least attempted to find that out, and will he finally tell the people of Alberta what was going on?

MR. GETTY: Of course, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't here in those days. Regardless, this matter is before a public inquiry ordered by the courts, and it's silly for me to start trying to deal with one little part of it when we are getting a full investigation, and that investigation with a report to the public of Alberta.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, he'll find out how silly it is after the next election, because people are upset about this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, yesterday Mr. Cormie said, and I quote, said by a senior government official: "You seem to be highly regarded at the cabinet level, but you're terribly regarded at the regulatory level." My question to the Premier: has he been able to find out why he was so good friends with the cabinet and not with the regulators? Has he looked into that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I thought the member could do better than that. Those comments came when Premier Strom was in place. I mean, that is one of the most foolish questions in the time I've ever been in the Legislature to hear come from that individual.

MR. MARTIN: Again, Mr. Speaker, whenever he doesn't want to answer the question, he resorts to name-calling. Some performance by this Premier.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the Connies were contributors to the Conservative Party, quite generous ones -- also \$20,000 to his leadership campaign. Now, my question is: is this why the Connies were able to continue in business four years after and take down a lot of innocent Albertans in the process? Is this why?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, he's been found so badly off base, talking about a time when there was another government, another administration in 1969, and asking us to account for them in some way. Now he starts to yell because he realizes he's been so badly embarrassed.

And if we want to talk about elections, Mr. Speaker, we had one recently in Chinook. They ran fourth and lost their deposit, for God's sake. Don't tell me about elections.

MR. SPEAKER: Second main question, Leader of the Opposition. [interjection] Sorry; I didn't see you, hon. Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: How could you miss, Mr. Speaker?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a supplementary to the Premier. In view of the fact that's clearly come out through the months over the TV set and in the papers and what's accepted, would he now not put an end to this charade and quit holding back repaying the investors? It's obvious the government is at fault. It comes up every day. What is the reason for holding back now? It's just costing the taxpayers money.

MR. GETTY: It's an incredible comment from the hon. member. We have an inquiry appointed by the courts which is deal-

ing with this matter in public right now, and for him to say, "Well, let's brush it all aside and make some kind of a judgment instead," is just absolute foolishness but typical of the hon. member.

MR. MARTIN: Maybe we'll try to get some answers, Mr. Speaker, from the timid Premier. My question I'd like to designate to the Member for Vegreville.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Vegreville.

Education Funding

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Education. In addition to having to cope with this government's reduced commitment to funding education in rural areas from 85 percent of the total cost to 63 percent of the total cost, some counties like Two Hills are faced with dramatic declines in enrollments. Now, even though we're all glad to see that students are going back to school in northeastern Alberta, the long-term problem remains. I'd like to know what commitment this minister is prepared to make to students, teachers, parents, and trustees in rural Alberta to examine the impact of these funding cuts and move towards the 85 percent funding level again.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is perhaps a little incorrect in his assumption that all funding for rural boards in this province is at about the average of 65 percent. In fact, some boards are funded up to about 90 percent of their needs beyond that which the province provides for them, in recognition of the very fact the hon. member rightfully points out, and that is the difference in the ability of school boards to supplement what the province gives them. So I think it's very important to note that we are examining the manner in which we fund school boards in this province and have taken a leadership role in putting out a paper on exactly that issue. I would welcome his comments on those options.

MR. FOX: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The fact remains that rural Albertans are being asked to absorb an ever-increasing share of the cost of education. I'm wondering: how does this minister justify asking rural Albertans to dig deeper into pockets that are already empty to make up for this government's declining commitment to funding education in rural areas?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the government's support for basic education in this province has grown in excess of both the consumer price index and the educational cost index. To move to 85 percent funding would have the effect of in fact dropping support for some school boards which are receiving in excess of 85 percent funding from this province and would, as well, require about \$400 million. Perhaps the hon. member would like to suggest whether we propose a 267 percent increase in the corporate levy or an increase of 8 percent in personal taxes or any other kinds of options he would suggest to raise it to \$400 million.

MR. FOX: Well, supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Many boards, like the county of Minburn, are faced with some difficult decisions about the futures of schools like the Innisfree high school or the Lavoy community school.

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. FOX: Is the minister prepared to recognize now that the 3 percent cut in funding for education last year, along with a mere 2 percent increase in funding for education this year, is forcing boards to consider things like closing schools, larger classes, increased busing, and reducing opportunities for . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much, hon. member.
Minister?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that there were adjustments that needed to be made both provincially and locally when the province was faced with the difficulty of a \$3.5 billion deficit. But to suggest that school closures only occurred in the last year is completely erroneous because, as we know, school openings and school closures occur at all times during our province's cycles.

MR. FOX: Well, supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Like many rural schoolchildren my kids get on the school bus before 7:30 every morning, and I'm wondering: how much extra time do rural kids have to waste on school buses traveling to schools and how many schools have to close before the minister is prepared to say enough is enough and that this government is going to renew its commitment to funding education in rural Alberta?

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the funding of this province for education is something that I am very pleased to note has increased at a greater increase this year than to any other area of education. Yes, there are some difficulties -- not restricted to the rural area, in fact, because kids in cities ride school buses as well. But I'm pleased to note that to date this year there have only been requests for three school closures. I hope that number will not grow at all, in order that we can continue to provide the access to education in this province that all our students deserve, rural or urban.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's to the Minister of Education with regard to funding and with regard to northeast Alberta where the hon. Member for Vegreville is from. The minister said last week that she is holding back \$40,000 a day for the strike. Now that the strike is settled, that comes out to a little over \$900,000. She rightfully said it shouldn't go to the teachers -- they weren't working -- rightfully said it shouldn't go to the board; the board wasn't operating the school. But should it stay in the hands of the government? Would not this government then return that \$900,000 to the taxpayers of that area so that the board then could have a better chance of financing the problems that the hon. Member for Vegreville just pointed out, instead of sitting on the \$900,000 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. Ministerial Statements have past.
Minister, please.

MRS. BETKOWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I continue to believe it would be exceedingly wrong to support a school board, when a strike is occurring, by provincial funds. Given that a school board does not pay 80 percent of its budget, which is teachers' salaries, to a school board, the provision has been in our School Act for many, many years that where a strike is occurring, the province will withhold funds.

I think the point should also be made that it would be very unfair to those boards that are currently negotiating and have negotiated a settlement with current funding and with current laws in place -- to then turn around and amend those laws in mid-process would be exceedingly unfair to a labour process which is based on two equal parties coming to a negotiated solution.

MR. SPEAKER: Main question, Westlock-Sturgeon, followed by Little Bow.

Loan Guarantees

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is to the Premier, and if he's feeling fragile, he may want someone to help him.

Mr. Speaker, the government now has over \$100 million out in loan guarantees throughout the province with no particular patterns except possibly that they are Tories or contributed to the Tory party. The second sentence now: these loan guarantees are of great concern to the taxpayers because it could ultimately be a debt. But maybe most of all, they're as good as a gift; they're the same thing as a gift. Now, first of all, could the Premier let the House know whether or not the guarantees -- for instance, to Mr. Pocklington and the Zaozirny/Whitecourt group -- have been backed by personal guarantees?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, guarantees are not made to individuals. Also, I might point out to the hon. leader of the Liberal Party that as has been expressed in the past in the Legislature, a price is paid for a guarantee by the firms who obtain such support from the provincial government.

And yes, Mr. Speaker, in any form of guarantee there is some risk. But let me tell the hon. member this: we're prepared to accept that risk. We have confidence in Alberta; we're turning this economy around; we're diversifying this economy whether you like it or not.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Premier has a lot more faith in Mr. Pocklington than many others do, and some of the others he's put the guarantee out.

But could he then go this far. In most cases there's a loan guarantee and also there's a loan. Which expires first, the loan guarantee or the loan, or do they expire at the same time, or is the guarantee the one that expires last? Which expires first? In other words, how big a hook are we on here?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, it was kind of a gibberish question. If he's trying to make any sense out of that, put it on the Order Paper.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, he runs for cover very quickly, very quickly.

Let's go a little bit further then. He mentioned that the guarantees were with the corporations. Is he aware whether or not the guarantee is still in effect even if the ownership of the corporation that has been guaranteed is changed? Is the guarantee always in effect, no matter who owns the corporation?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, various guarantees have different conditions in them. If the hon. member wants to identify a particular guarantee somewhere in this province and put it on the Order Paper, an effort will be made to see if it can be answered.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I have asked that repeatedly for guarantees. They say it's a secret code; they say they can't give it away. Now, the Premier can't have his cake and eat it too. Either he refuses to answer it, or it isn't a secret. Now, why he can't release it, I don't know.

Let's go a step further. Then is he aware in the case of the guarantee -- let's, for instance, say the Pocklington and the Zaozirny people. Is it possible that they can turn around and sell the whole deal, make a tremendous capital gain, and we're stuck with guaranteeing a loan to an entirely new set of people?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member is referring to guarantees generally, not a specific one, and frankly if he has any interest in getting more details on a specific matter, he should put it on the Order Paper.

But let me tell him again: success that is going on in this province right now -- we know the hon. member and that party in the opposition don't like what's happening in Alberta because things are so good. They loved it when unemployment was high. They loved it when the price of oil was down. They can't stand success because they are so negative. Too bad. [interjections]

MR. TAYLOR: Can we keep at it, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: You can if you want; you're wasting question period time.

The Chair recognizes Edmonton-Kingsway.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Premier. Is the reason the government is scrambling around very quickly and passing out money with no particular game plan, or at least none that's made public, and with no debate in the House -- is it because they're afraid that when January rolls around next year, the Americans would consider those kinds of things as unfair subsidies under the free trade agreement?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it's remarkable the amount of money we give the opposition for research, and to have the gibberish from the leader and then from this guy with a question so lacking in research and information in it. The government -- and they don't like it -- is making sure that this economy is turning around. We promised it to Albertans; we're doing it. We're making sure we're providing jobs; we're doing it. We promised we'd diversify the economy, and we're doing it. That's why we're making loan guarantees and other things, because we're doing it for the people of Alberta. Too bad.

MR. SPEAKER: Member for Little Bow, followed by Edmonton-Centre, then Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Beginning Farmer Program

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Associate Minister of Agriculture, who attended a meeting in Bow Island last night of some 250 farmers who were rather unanimous in their opinion that changes should be brought about in the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation policy with regards to beginner farmers. My question to the minister is, and this was asked last evening as well: is the minister prepared to give those young farmers who are now facing a quitclaim, some as of today and as of this week, the option of a five-year lease-back of their lands so that we can keep young people in rural Alberta?

MRS. CRIPPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the question. You notice that I took my beads off because I expected it.

I did, Mr. Speaker, attend a meeting in Bow Island last night with a number of people who were interested in the financial difficulties in agriculture. They did not specifically ask for changes in the beginning farmer program, although I said we were looking at changes in the beginning farmer program. Some of them did, however, suggest that they are having difficulty meeting their loan obligations and are looking at quitclaims, and some of them, in fact, were looking at a five-year lease-back on a quitclaim.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have great empathy for the problems these young people are suffering, I have great empathy for their desire to farm, and I will look at all alternatives in order to assist and be responsive to the problems they have and responsible to the taxpayers of this province.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier, and it's on the word "responsiveness." The minister last evening indicated that before a policy change could take place, it had to go through the Conservative caucus agricultural committee, through the caucus in general, through a priorities committee, then through cabinet, and possibly then we'd have a new policy. Our problem, Mr. Premier, is that farmers are in the field today. Within ten days we will be seeding, and there is no policy change on the horizon. My question to the Premier: would the Premier intercede in this matter and see that this policy I've just enunciated in question number one would be dealt with as immediately as possible?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does explain the process under which policy changes are made. The fact that it has to go through a series of approvals is the way a government operates, and certainly it's the way our caucus operates. The hon. member is working already within caucus and cabinet to have certain changes. I don't want to be specific in terms of that matter; it may be that we're able to move fairly quickly. However, it's just one of the options the hon. member is raising that we're considering.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the associate minister. Could the minister indicate what other options are available to these young farmers who are facing a quitclaim and are going to be leaving the farm this spring? What other options are going to be made available to them immediately? A decision is required now.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, we have made a number of changes which I've enunciated for the Member for Little Bow before, and as the Premier indicated, we are looking at other options.

ANHON. MEMBER: What are they?

MRS. CRIPPS: I'm not about to outline options that are being assessed in caucus before we have made the decisions on them.

In terms of leasing the land, ADC has been given the directive to act in a responsible manner to ensure that the ADC land is managed properly, is farmed and looked after on a regular basis, and at the same time does not become a land bank. There are cases where ADC is leasing. I know that in many cases where there are quitclaims, they will lease, or proportional quitclaims, they will lease for a year and then look at the two-

and three- and up to five-year leasing option. But the number one criterion has to be, in that case, the ability to make it on the farm. That has to be shown in order to lease the land and certainly in order...

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

A final supplementary.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister clarify the statement just made as to whether there is a policy in place as of today that a young farmer facing a quitclaim can lease the land back for a two- or three- or, I believe the minister said, a five-year period of time? I didn't hear about that last night, nor have I heard about it before.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, on a proportional quitclaim -- and I've enunciated it before -- one of the agreements that we've reached and that ADC has reached is that there would be the option of a one-year lease. That's to give a beginning farmer an opportunity to look at his situation, to assess it, and then to look at a possible three-year, and we've said that in extenuating circumstances there might be a five-year. We haven't ruled it out, but it's not a policy that we have five-year leases. But we do want ADC to have the flexibility to look at it. On a quitclaim in most cases the leases are done on...

AN HON. MEMBER: I forgot

MRS. CRIPPS: I have too.

In most cases the leases are done by tender.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, this is back to the Premier. Due to the fact that the process is as slow as he says it is to go through the caucus and the government, would he not at least have ADC suspend any quitclaims for the next year until the policy is decided one way or another? After all, neither the farmer nor the farm is going to...

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member. The supplementary question has been asked.

MR. TAYLOR: They will not disappear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, hon. member.
Minister.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to that, because suspending all quitclaims would be detrimental to some people who in fact want to quitclaim, and they want an answer. They certainly don't want your suggestion of waiting for another year, in agony and suspense until they know the decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Centre.

Reproductive Health Care

REV. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given mounting evidence, political pressure, and preventative common sense, it seems that almost everyone but the obstinate Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care agrees that sterilization procedures for women and men are an integral part of a comprehensive health care system and must be covered under the Alberta health care

insurance plan. Given also the 7.4 percent increase to the fund this year, when will the minister announce the reinsurance of contraceptive counseling, surgical sterilization, IUD insertions, and vasectomies under the Alberta health care insurance plan?

MR. M. MOORE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the Legislature last week, we never did deinsure contraceptive counseling. Doctors are asked to and indeed do provide contraceptive counseling and birth control advice and information in a variety of fee schedules that are now paid by the health care insurance plan. Perhaps the hon. member could refer to *Hansard* of last week when one of his colleagues asked a similar question.

With respect to the other matters of the insurance of tubal ligations and vasectomies and IUD insertions, I've indicated as well in the Legislature that we're reviewing the comments that come from our citizens with respect to those matters, particularly with reference to whether or not there's a burden on individuals for the costs that may be being charged by the medical profession at this time for those services. When that review is complete and when we have additional information, Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to share it with the hon. member.

REV. ROBERTS: Well, it's nice that you're reviewing it.

Will you then tell me what would be the status of a 38-year-old mother of three who's due for a cesarean section later this month and who has to pay out of pocket \$400 for a tubal ligation? Does she have to wait for your review, pay for it now, or wait until it's reinsured and have the procedure later under Alberta health care insurance?

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, it is malpractice for a medical doctor to refuse to provide service of any kind to an individual because of that individual's inability to pay. I would ask the hon. member if he would give me one single case in this province where an individual has been refused medical services because of the inability to pay -- just one single case.

REV. ROBERTS: I wonder if the minister is going to deinsure heart transplants for people's inability to pay for them.

After his statements over the weekend, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Community and Occupational Health, here in the House and before the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, expand on the meaning of his statement, and I quote, that "for the health care insurance plan to be tinkering with [reproductive health] makes me more than [a little] uncomfortable"?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to respond. It was a matter I have spoken about and the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care has spoken about on numerous occasions. I simply reconfirmed on Thursday and reconfirm now what the minister said: these matters of deinsurance will be reviewed by the provincial government, by our caucus in the days ahead. That is something the minister has said repeatedly.

REV. ROBERTS: Maybe we can get to the big boss who's making all the health care decisions over there: the Premier, who has announced his own health commission, announced the \$70 million for the Cross Cancer, and other announcements we would expect the minister to make. Will the Premier here today take some leadership and show to the people of Alberta that he will announce the reinsurance of contraceptive care for the women of this province?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the matter has been dealt with by the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care already in the House and last week. But it was interesting to note that when he challenged the hon. member, he quickly changed the subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary is to the Minister of Community and Occupational Health. All this blather about reproductive health care and poor old FCSS going down the drain -- when on earth will the minister require and provide the resources so that all of the public health units can provide this kind of counseling, family planning counseling, contraceptive counseling, in every part of Alberta?

MR. DINNING: Mr. Speaker, I have to address the preamble to the member's question. She talks about family and community support services, which has enjoyed an increase over the last three fiscal years of some 30 percent in its funding.

As for reproductive health and sexuality education and clinics throughout the province, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a matter I would want to address in the days ahead when we announce some elements of our comprehensive reproductive health strategy.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

Additional supplementaries? Failing that, the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark, followed by Edmonton-Beverly.

Economic Diversification

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Premier. The Premier has this famous blueprint for diversification which is clearly focused on large business. Diversification through small business has been left out of the equation. Could the Premier please tell us how he can claim a balanced blueprint for diversification when fully \$400 million has been put into 15 large corporations and support for small business through AOC and Economic Development and Trade has actually been cut?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member obviously doesn't know anything about how businesses work. When we provide \$1.4 billion for forestry projects in northern Alberta, that not only helps businesses, small and big, in Edmonton; it helps them all over northern Alberta. It helps small businessmen in Whitecourt, Peace River, Hinton; it helps them throughout northern Alberta. All he has to do is travel in the areas and see the bustle and the hum of small businesses expanding.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we also know there was \$1.1 billion provided to small businesses, long-term funding to small business at fixed interest rates. It's not available anywhere else in Canada. It is here in Alberta.

MR. MITCHELL: The Premier is referring to an interesting trickle-down theory of economic development. Does the Premier have facts to demonstrate how it is that putting money in the hands of 15 corporate presidents, large corporations, actually trickles down to specific small business sectors which we need to develop in this province; manufacturing, for example?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I guess all you have to do is get out of the ivory tower or wherever the hon. member spends his time

and see what's really happening in Alberta.

MR. MITCHELL: Could the Premier please indicate to us how it is that putting all his economic development eggs, or a large part of them, in 15 specific corporations in any way compares to the kind of economic diversification potential that can be achieved by supporting a broad base of small business entrepreneurs in this province?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, there are certain large projects that are so important to this province, and the government is prepared to support them because we have confidence in this province. What we've been able to do is no longer have Alberta's economy based on agriculture and energy. We've been able, through assistance and the financial strength of this government, to provide growth in tourism, forestry, technology, and research, and the people of Alberta have responded. Small businesses are growing, incorporating all over this province. You see the economy turning around.

I know the opposition doesn't like it, but the government is going to live up to our promise to have this economy turn around, to diversify this economy. The hon. members hate to see it happen, and they want to somehow knock a hole in it. They can't do it, because it's going on right now.

MR. MITCHELL: How many small businesses are actually failing?

Could the Premier please indicate to us how anybody in this Legislature or in this province can possibly believe that there isn't a concerted shift of emphasis by his government from small business support to large business?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. Minister of Economic Development and Trade, who works with this every day, may want to also add to my comments.

Here is a release from the Alberta Opportunity Company of March 4, 1988. The Alberta Opportunity Company authorized 40 small business loans totaling in excess of \$2.5 million. A total of 100 positions were created by these businesses, bringing total employment to 213. These were in northern Alberta and in central Alberta. These were grocery stores, convenience stores, fast-food distributors, ambulance service, general stores, insurance agencies, video arcades, and photograph processing.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. Premier.

Has it been decided by the New Democrats which is the supplementary? St. Albert.

MR. STRONG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, not like some of my brothers to the left here, support some of the Conservative government's moves in getting some of these bigger projects going.

My supplementary to the Premier is this: seeing as how this government has got all of this money for those large businesses out there that are going to build all these jobs, could he guarantee Albertans that those tradesmen working on those jobs are going to get paid adequate wages on those jobs?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, obviously, the agreements between management and labour are worked out between the two. Certainly the history in Alberta has been that workers have received adequate wages. As a matter of fact, Alberta's average wage is second to only one other province in Canada.

Now, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I have been talking about a matter that the Minister of Economic Development and Trade is dying to get in on. We'll see if he has some additional information to provide.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, there's always a risk when an hon. member such as the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark uses linear thinking and looks at a line on a budget and doesn't take into account factors that he may not be looking at, such as the small business equity corporations, where the government invested \$55 million. That program is working now in that it has provided investments in over 400 small businesses, created 3,600 new jobs, and is still working. So because it doesn't show up in the current estimate, the hon. member isn't aware that it is working. The fact that there are 50 percent more small businesses in Alberta now than there were in 1977 tells you that small businesses are flourishing.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister.

Calgary-McCall, followed by Edmonton-Beverly, then Edmonton-Strathcona. Briefly.

MR. NELSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Economic Development and Trade on a similar question. Could the minister indicate, when you consider small business and the emphasis that we do place on small business, how many small businesses were actually commenced in 1987 in the province of Alberta?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, it's important that we have questions that are constructive in the Assembly. Yes, the environment for small business, including manufacturers in a whole variety of fields that really have their incentive as a result of major projects going ahead that cause the indirect spin-off in the small business community, that more than . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure all hon. members wouldn't mind sitting for a few minutes and meditating.

The Minister of Economic Development and Trade, try again, please, to answer.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, the fact that the failure rate of small businesses last year dropped dramatically from previous years is a reflection of the results of the small business term assistance program providing assistance to small business. In addition to that, there were 17,000 incorporations in 1987, and that does not include the individual proprietorships or partnerships that were formed. So it was a very successful year in terms of formation of small businesses.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Edmonton-Beverly, followed by Edmonton-Strathcona.

Postal Services

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. The federal Tories are saying to our rural Albertans that they have to cut their mail services because of the high cost of providing door-to-door services in urban centres. At the same time, they're saying to residents in urban centres that their costs are excessive and that they have to cut mail services to them as well. Will the minister demand that his federal counterparts discontinue this

conquer and divide tactic and rather apply their energies to developing a more effective rural post office system?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't have a federal counterpart in that particular field. There is no post office service department in the government of Alberta. I can't understand why the hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly, as did the hon. Member for Vegreville last week, asks me questions relating to a matter which is solely within the constitutional responsibility of the government of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair gives the direction of *Beauchesne* 359(6), relating to "administrative competence of the Government." This is the problem of the question with regard to the other day and also the Order Paper.

Please continue, Edmonton-Beverly.

MR. EWASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think what we're really seeking here is representation from this government to the federal level. They have a responsibility to Albertans.

While door-to-door mail services are not necessarily essential services, I do think they are a basic service. There are people in our society who require it, such as the disabled, seniors, and those who are homebound. Does the minister not feel that it is unfair and discriminatory that these people not receive mail services?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, once again I do not have a counterpart at the federal level, because there is no responsibility on the part of the . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister. I think we'll continue, if it quiets down.

A supplementary question, but we are examining the Constitution of Canada at the moment up here in the Chair as to what the rights of the post office are.

MR. EWASIUK: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the government has a responsibility to represent the people of Alberta at Ottawa, and that's the minister's job.

Will the minister attempt to convince his federal colleagues that the policy of making the post office a profitable organization is resulting in inadequate services and in some cases hardship to Albertans? Will he do that? Will he represent Alberta's cause in Ottawa?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to repeat the same answer, but I would suggest that the hon. member, if he is so concerned about this matter, should write a letter to his Member of Parliament.

MR. EWASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I think we've attempted to talk to our MPs. We get the same sort of results we're getting from this minister.

With regard to door-to-door deliveries, will the minister not protest this silly practice of those people who build a house in a new subdivision and don't qualify for mail delivery consequently getting a super mailbox? Is that not discrimination against people because they build their house at a certain time?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I repeat the answer. I don't take it lightly; the matter is of concern to Albertans, obviously. The delivery of mail is the constitutional responsibility of the

government of Canada; section 91 of the Constitution Act says so. That being the case, it is up to members of this Legislature and the citizens of this province to make their views known to the proper authorities. It is not the responsibility of this government to deliver the mail, thank goodness.

MR. SPEAKER: Vermilion-Viking, followed by Edmonton-Meadowlark.

DR. WEST: Thank you. A supplemental to the Minister of Economic Development and Trade. Is postal service a business that Alberta Opportunity or perhaps Vencap might look at in certain areas as the federal government may look at privatization of these sectors in the future?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I understand that it is a constitutional responsibility of the federal government to deal with matters related to first-class postage, but there are a number of couriers that are in the business, and that of course is a private-sector operation. I'm not aware of any of them having been financed through the Alberta Opportunity Company.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for question period has expired. Might we have unanimous consent to complete this series of questions?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Opposed? Carried.

MR. MITCHELL: To the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I'd just like to clarify this one point. Is the minister saying to the people of Alberta that he will not use the power and influence and authority represented in his office as Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to represent the interests of many urban Albertans who are suffering the effects of super mailbox mail delivery, which reduces their property values and which represents discrimination against their...

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. member.
Minister, please.

MR. HORSMAN: I've already answered the question earlier. It is not a matter to be taken lightly by anyone, and I'm not suggesting that. For the benefit of the hon. member, if he is not familiar with the Constitution Act of Canada, it provides for a division of responsibilities. The responsibility for delivering the mail and postal services is found in section 91 of the Constitution Act, which outlines the responsibilities of the federal government of Canada, not the provinces. It is not the intention of this provincial government to take on the responsibility of the federal government. He, like every other Albertan, if he is concerned about this issue, should take his concern to the proper authorities, not try to bring it into this Assembly, where it is not within the constitutional responsibility or authority of this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you, hon. minister.

Once again the Chair would direct for the consideration of members that they would turn to *Beauchesne* 359(6), and also bear in mind that under the Constitution Act of Canada, section 91(5) deals with this whole matter. Therefore, future questions

on the issue will be dealt with more severely by the Chair.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee of Supply please come to order to consider estimates called by the government. Members wishing to raise questions, amendments, or suggestions, please indicate to the Chair.

Department of Career Development and Employment

MR. CHAIRMAN: The department under consideration is on page 65 of the estimates book. The minister's responsibilities are contained on that page. All questions and comments relative to that will be considered by the Chair. The authority for the programs is on page 68 of the estimates book. Further reference is on page 23 of the elements book. Hon. minister, Mr. Orman, do you wish to make some opening comments to the committee?

MR. ORMAN: I do, Mr. Chairman. I'm very pleased to come before committee today and discuss the estimates for the Department of Career Development and Employment, and as it goes, it is exactly one year ago today, April 6, that I gave the estimates for last year's budget. I'd like to point out that in that intervening time we have seen some significant increases and significant improvement in terms of level of employment and reduction in levels of unemployment, and certainly we're happy that we have seen substantial declines in unemployment levels along with a decline in the province's deficit.

I'd like to begin today, Mr. Chairman, by providing members of the Assembly with some statistical information that outlines the degree of improvement that we have experienced in the province in the labour market and, we believe, directly related to the resurgence in the private sector and also directly related to this government's vigorous efforts in support of economic diversification, export trade, and job creation.

Now, to begin with, I'd like to say that in 1987 Alberta experienced net employment gain of 6,000 new jobs. The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate fell from 10.6 percent in January of '87 to 8.7 percent in December of 1987. The average annual unemployment rate in 1987 was 9.6 percent, and this was the lowest level since 1984 when it peaked at 11.2 percent. Let me say that more than 1.1 million Albertans were employed in 1987, and this reaches the highest level in this province's history. There are more women in the labour force this year. As a matter of fact, we reached an all-time record of 500,000 women participating in the labour force, and this is roughly 43.4 percent of the total employed labour force in the province of Alberta. Last year's Alberta labour force participation rate continued to be the highest in Canada at 71.5 percent. I believe, Mr. Chairman, these statistics demonstrate the reality that there is a strengthening economy and that Albertans are determined to work. There is a strong work ethic amongst Albertans. Naturally the government is very pleased. However, we are not complacent, nor can we be. Further improvements can be made and will be made, and we will certainly work with all levels of government, for we believe that all levels of government must work together and co-operate. The local city governments, the

town governments, the provincial government, and the federal government must all work co-operatively to eradicate any level of unemployment in the province of Alberta. Mr. Chairman, it's also important to note that this is not just a phenomenon we in Alberta preach, that there is a role by all three levels of government to work co-operatively together for employment. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development issued a document entitled *New Roles for Cities and Towns*. This document concluded that while national and regional governments are accountable for employment policies, local governments also have a fundamental role to play in economic development.

Mr. Chairman, the provincial government acknowledges and accepts its responsibilities for employment creation, in particular in the areas where unemployment is the highest. It is clear that the levels of employment vary from one part of the province to the other. This, I believe, is a phenomenon of recent economic recovery, and as we move through 1988-89, we'll see those pockets of unemployment start to come down and match the lowering level of unemployment in the rest of the province.

I want to speak about a few of the initiatives that are contributing significantly to economic renewal in the province of Alberta and lowering the rate of unemployment. Members will know from the provincial government's budget, announced recently, that the total capital spending by the government of Alberta in 1988-89 is expected to be in the area of about \$2.5 billion. Mr. Chairman, this is a significant job creator in this province. We expect that the capital budget will create 27,600 direct jobs and some 38,400 indirect jobs. The capital budget goes to spending in the area of road repair, road construction, schools, hospitals, and provincial buildings from one end of the province to the other. It should be pointed out that the job creation as a result of the capital budget is both in the private and in the public sector.

There are also a number of energy and construction projects that have been initiated and have been well delineated in this Assembly in recent months. Those, too, should generate thousands of jobs, particularly in the northern Alberta area. Diversification efforts in high technology, tourism, and forestry will create jobs throughout Alberta, including, of course, the Edmonton area. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I just want to refer to a couple of those initiatives. Pelican Spruce Mills is expected to create 350 jobs in the Drayton Valley area. Millar Western will create some 365 jobs in the Whitecourt area. Procter & Gamble in Grande Prairie will create jobs as a result of their mill; Champion Forest Products, 370 jobs in the Hinton area; Daishowa, 2,000 jobs in the Peace River area; and Alberta Newsprint Company, 1,000 jobs in the Whitecourt area. So as you can see, Mr. Chairman, the economic initiatives of the private sector, supported by this government, together with the public sector spending in the area of capital construction are going to go a long way to assisting in economic renewal in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Chairman, there are some other encouraging economic forecasts, and far be it for me to rely on our own department, our own intergovernment translations of economic trends in the province of Alberta. Let me go a little bit further afield. Let me quote the Conference Board of Canada, whose forecasts say that Alberta's economic growth will outpace that of all other provinces over the next two years and Alberta's real output will increase 4.9 percent in 1988 and by a further 3.3 percent in 1989. We expect \$6.6 billion of investment in major resource projects over the next four years. This will generate thousands of con-

struction and operating jobs for Albertans. A net employment gain of 85,000 new jobs between now and 1991 is anticipated. We expect 16,000 of those jobs will be created in 1988, which is nearly three times the number of net new jobs created in 1987. Mr. Chairman, three times the jobs created in 1987, and 1987 was a record year in this province for employed Albertans.

I don't want to spend a great deal of time on the free trade agreement, but I would be remiss if I didn't refer to some of the initiatives around free trade, because they, too, are going to play a significant role in eradicating unemployment in the province of Alberta. As members of the Assembly know, the two-way trade between Canada and the United States is about \$170 billion. Of that, \$93 billion is Canadian trade. Alberta's share is about \$8 billion, and that represents about 75 percent of all our exports. So you can see that the free trade agreement is so very important, so very fundamental to economic development, economic renewal in the province of Alberta, and we expect to see an additional 40,000 jobs created between now and 1999, incremental jobs over and above the jobs created by the present economy.

Mr. Chairman, before I get into my estimates, I want to provide you and members of the Assembly with a few of the key features of my department's estimates and talk about some of the successes of our programs in the past year. Firstly, some of the notable achievements of the Department of Career Development and Employment in the 1987-88 budget year. More than 70,000 Albertans were helped by our department's job creation and training programs. In all, our department's 27 career development centres, seven career centres, and the information hot line provided counseling and assistance to more than 5,000 Albertan visitors to those facilities. The Alberta Career Development and Employment department also made significant strides in nurturing entrepreneurship, in improving employment and training opportunities not only for youth but also for women.

With regard to entrepreneurship, Mr. Chairman, it is an area that I have spent a great deal of time with and that is dear to my heart in the Department of Career Development and Employment. Coming from the small business sector, being an entrepreneur myself, I recognize the importance of nurturing entrepreneurship in the province. It plays a vital role in job creation, as we all know. Small business now employs nearly half of all working Albertans, and as many members know, small business has accounted for 73 percent of the 95,000 net new jobs created in Alberta from 1978 to 1984. A recent survey by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business surveyed in excess of 42,000 individuals who were operating or working in small business. Sixty-six percent of the small business interviewees indicated that the free trade agreement would be a benefit to their business. That's across Canada, Mr. Chairman. We can see very clearly that small businesses that are creating the jobs, creating in excess of 90 percent of all jobs in the country, support free trade because they see the very important aspects of a free trade agreement in the area of the success of their business. They're the ones that are creating the jobs.

Mr. Chairman, my department, as I indicated, is committed to nurturing the entrepreneurial spirit. Career Development and Employment last year committed \$1 million to entrepreneurial training programs throughout the province. We support, through many of the public institutions, entrepreneurship training, particularly at the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology, the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology, Lethbridge Community College, Keyano College, the University of Calgary, the Alberta Vocational Centre in Grouard, and the YMCA here in

Edmonton. The department has also launched a pilot project for entrepreneurial training for re-entry women. That program is designed for women wanting to start their own businesses after a prolonged absence from the labour force. The program is offered through Edmonton's Concordia College, and we're very much looking forward to having a successful program.

With regard to youth employment, Mr. Chairman, I believe in my estimates last year I expressed a concern about the level of employment for youth. It is a problem throughout this country and deserves particular attention by all levels of government. Although it is down slightly from our 1986 levels, it is obviously still too high.

To combat youth unemployment, Mr. Chairman, last year our department provided a total of \$448,100 to help establish youth employment centres in both Calgary and Edmonton. I was very pleased to participate in the opening and initiation of those projects, and they are moving along very well. We're very pleased with the initial success. Both those centres offer life skills, job search workshops and counseling, job placement services, and follow-up support.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I want to talk a little bit about women in the labour force and some of our job creation and training initiatives. But before I do that, I want to talk briefly about the Member for Edmonton-Belmont's criticism last year on this day with regard to the Women's Career Resource Centre. The Member for Edmonton-Belmont, in response to the announcement of that initiative, indicated that

this isn't going to help women find employment in Alberta.
 . . . [It's] not going to find a single job for any of the women out there.

Well, let me just point out to that hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that in fact that wasn't the case and his pessimism is unfounded. The Women's Career Resource Centre was a service that provided in-service training workshops for 170 department employees, a workshop for rural women interested in starting their own businesses, career counseling to private career agencies. It's developed a significant library for access by career counselors of 1,200 books, 55 periodicals, and 71 audiovisual productions.

Mr. Chairman, we will be preparing a book called *Directions*. It's an informational handbook, and it will assist women returning to the paid labour force. This book is slated for publication later in May. So I guess it's just an example of the pessimism we get from across the way from time to time, but I thought it was important to bring to the attention of this Assembly that in fact that pessimism was unfounded. It's a very successful program and has helped hundreds of women find jobs through appropriate career counseling.

With regard to apprenticeship, Mr. Chairman, another very important responsibility in the Department of Career Development and Employment, there were 18,703 registered apprentices in Alberta as of December 31, 1987, and I'm pleased to note that this is the first increase in the number of registrants since 1981 -- also a sign that economic renewal is upon us and young people are looking to the apprentice trades for job opportunities and training. About 1,643 or 9.02 percent of Alberta's apprentices in 1987 were women. Mr. Chairman, this is an increase from 1980, when women comprised only 1.5 percent of the total number of apprentices. I don't believe it's high enough yet. I believe there still is a role in the apprenticeship area for women to play in terms of getting meaningful training to make them productive in the labour force and the economy.

In 1987, Mr. Chairman, 6,000 Albertans received jour-

neymen's certificates and 6,405 Albertans entered the apprenticeship system for the first time; 3,849 journeymen attended 177 journeymen updating courses. In 1983 Alberta was the first province to institute upgrading of journeyman courses, an upgrading program. Alberta now is modeling their program after Alberta's, and they began that just recently because of the successes we've had in this area.

Members will know that we formed a committee to review apprenticeship and industry training, and that report was completed in February of 1988. The committee, as a matter of record, was established in April '87 to examine the current apprenticeship system and to see if there were areas of improvement and new directions for the future. We received 243 written submissions and 121 oral presentations during 12 days of public hearings in nine different communities. We currently have an advisory panel that is chaired by Dr. Cassin of Calgary-North West. That panel will review and advise me on the initial report and will be making recommendations to me shortly.

Just briefly with regard to immigration, last year Alberta welcomed in excess of 11,000 immigrants to the province. In excess of 10 percent of all refugees and family reunification immigrants who came to Canada last year were accepted in this province. The business immigration program received about 5 percent of all business immigrants, and because of the success of our business immigration program, we will be renegotiating a new immigration agreement with the government of Alberta. This agreement will be broadened under the terms of the Meech Lake accord. Hopefully this will give Alberta a broader role over the selection and processing of business immigrants to Alberta. Mr. Chairman, by investing and starting new businesses in Alberta, business immigrants make a significant economic contribution to the province. We have seen investments in the entrepreneur category of the business immigration program to the tune of \$41 million, resulting in 544 new jobs and the retention of 127 existing jobs. In the investor category we have seen a potential investment of \$22.5 million in the province, dollars that are ready to be invested. This, too, will create new employment opportunities. Mr. Chairman, the business immigration program has been successful. The number one criterion for the program is that it must create jobs or maintain existing jobs.

To basically move to a conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I believe the labour market strategy should be reviewed at this time. It was announced on March 30, 1987, and as members know, it is the acknowledged purpose of the labour market strategy to provide a well-prepared work force, and it reaffirms that no level of unemployment is acceptable in the province and stresses the importance of co-operative action among the three levels of government, employers and individuals, and the important role the private sector plays in generating new employment. The strategy, as you will recall, consists of job-creation and training programs, and it's designed to significantly reach the ultimate goal of zero unemployment in the province. As we move from a period of high unemployment to a period of lower unemployment, we want to move job-creation dollars into training. Members will recall from my last estimates at this time last year that we moved training dollars into job-creation programs, and that is to be sensitive and be able to respond to the nature of the economy. As the economy improves, job creation is not as significant as training and delivering a well-prepared labour force to the demands of the economy.

This year we will invest substantial dollars into the training area, as my estimates have outlined. Vote 2 totals \$110.6 mil-

lion. This is an 8.4 percent increase over the \$102 million increase in the 1987-88 fiscal year. The additional dollars, Mr. Chairman -- \$2.7 million for the Alberta vocational training program will accommodate increases in tuition fees and living allowances for 13,000 students. The \$2.2 million for the youth employment and training program gives 2,000 young Albertans the benefit of job-creation and training opportunities. And we have announced a new program, the tailor-made training program, which will total \$3.5 million. This program will support the Alberta government's economic diversification initiatives. Mr. Chairman, the tailor-made program will cover up to 75 percent of an eligible employer's training costs and provide counseling on how to develop and implement a training plan for employees.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, this year, 1987, was a very positive year. As I indicated, we had higher levels of employment than we've previously experienced. I should also point out that the opposition, in their response to my estimates, indicated that there's no way we

should be happy that there's an underlying strength that we should look forward to, knowing full well that tomorrow . . .

we'll probably still have 11 percent unemployment

Well, I'm here today to report to the Member for Edmonton-Belmont, Mr. Chairman, that tomorrow has arrived. Unemployment is not 11 percent; it is well under the 9 percent level and moving. It is adjusted today in the area of about 8.3 percent, and the level of unemployment has dropped from 145,000 last year at this time to 123,000. I don't mean to stand here and say that the job is done, but the economy is proving our programs and our department are being tailored and moved around to be sensitive to the nature of the strengthening economy. I believe that in fact, as I've indicated in my opening comments, 1988-89 will prove to be an even better year than 1987.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Member for Edmonton-Belmont, followed by Calgary-North West

MR. SIGURDSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I didn't realize that the Minister of Career Development and Employment was editing a collected works of Tom Sigurdson. I'm pleased that he's doing so. I didn't realize it was the anniversary date of a statement I had made. Goodness knows it was perhaps an incorrect statement. I've been wrong before, and no doubt, with all the exuberance I have for so many projects and the criticism I have for so many departments, there may come a time in the future -- I hope it doesn't happen very often -- when I may be wrong again.

Mr. Chairman, I have watched, along with the Minister of Career Development and Employment, the falling level of unemployment. I've watched department figures that come out on the first Friday of every full week of a month and looked at that decline in the unemployment rate, and I, too, have been pleased with that falling rate. We have questions about the level of part-time work that may be increasing or the level of work that has no benefits to employees, but the minister is quite right when he recognizes that Albertans want to work. I don't have any doubt about it. I know that in my area of the city of Edmonton we have perhaps a higher rate of unemployment than other parts of the city of Edmonton. I deal with a number of constituents who come into the office on a regular basis looking for programs that might assist them in acquiring some meaningful employment. I know full well, as does the minister, that Al-

bertans want to work. The problem, as we're all well aware, is that the economy still has not yet been able to pick up to the point where all those who want to work in meaningful jobs are going to be able to access those meaningful jobs.

I've no doubt that this is a tough department to try and handle, to try and manage, to try and administer. This is a department that deals with the training programs or establishes programs and supports programs, that tries to pull from many directions: the directions inside the Legislature from this side of the House and no doubt from the minister's own caucus, from outside the House, from the variety of groups you must deal with, whether in management, business, corporations large and small, or the general public at hand. Everybody is making some very specific demands. It's a tough department, Mr. Chairman, to try and administer. But the goal . . .

MR. ORMAN: Where's the other shoe?

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't worry. It'll fall. The other shoe will fall.

MR. SIGURDSON: But the goal of the department, Mr. Chairman, is a laudable one. The goal is to provide individuals, Albertans, with skills that will allow them to become productive members of our society, to become contributing members to society.

As I said before, in my constituency I deal with very many of the unemployed. When I ask people what they do for a living, they respond by what their profession is. They don't respond by saying, "I'm remunerated for the work I do as a carpenter or as a plumber," but they say, "I am a carpenter." When we take our identity from the industry we work in, we can only imagine the kind of devastation we feel psychologically when we are without work in our profession. And that's what we've tried to address: to get people to work in professions they've chosen. Not part-time. They've made a commitment to study, as the apprenticeship programs go, for four years -- they've made a commitment to study for a period of time something they feel or hope will provide them with an identity and an income for a long period of time throughout their lives.

When I went through the estimates, and especially in vote 3 which is Employment Services, I was dismayed to see that there was relatively little, if anything, available that was specifically designed to meet the needs of the unemployed in Edmonton. Now, the minister noted in his introductory remarks that the level of unemployment in the province has dropped from over 11 percent to less than 9 percent today. In the city of Edmonton we've had an extraordinarily high unemployment rate, but still today we suffer with 11.6 percent unemployment: 47,000 Edmontonians, Mr. Chairman, without work. That constitutes 42 percent of the total number of Albertans without work happening to reside in the city of Edmonton. The minister and indeed we all may take comfort in the fact that unemployment is down by 5,000 in the city of Edmonton from the same time last year. Last year we had 52,000 unemployed in the city; this year we have 47,000. But the fact is that last year even with an increased number of unemployed, Edmonton had 36 percent of Alberta's unemployed. So what has happened is that while the actual number of unemployed Edmontonians has dropped, Edmonton's share of the unemployed has risen by 6 percent, from 36 percent to 42 percent. We're having a much higher level of unemployment in this city than we ought to. Our share is much higher than it ought to be. Other areas of the province are en-

joying this measure of recovery, but in the city here we still have some very specific problems that need some very specific answers to try and get us out of a very sorry situation.

In the same statistics from Statistics Canada, Calgary has 28,000 unemployed. Now, perhaps that's attributed to the Olympics. I hope it's more than just the Olympics, but perhaps it's attributed to the Olympics. But there is a city of relatively the same size as Edmonton with 28,000 unemployed. Here we have 47,000 unemployed in our city. The reason, perhaps -- a contributing reason at least -- is that we have a very different economic base. The economic base in the city of Calgary is more in line with the private sector. In the capital city, as in many capital cities in our country and in North America, the economy is a publicly-based economy, because people that reside in the capital city rely very heavily on servicing the government of the day. Now we have cut back, and we have some terrible, terrible problems that we have to deal with in light of those cuts.

Perhaps what it's going to take in order to stimulate the kind of economic activity that's going to provide a catapult is an injection of public dollars not into make-work projects for the sake of make-work projects but into meaningful projects such as municipal infrastructure. Maybe those are some of the areas we ought to be looking at. Perhaps some of the employment programs that are targeted throughout Alberta ought to have some specific direction to the capital city region so that we can try and reduce that very high number of unemployment here in this city. Surely the difference of 19,000 between the cities of Calgary and Edmonton -- surely to goodness that discrepancy should indicate that there is something different with our economy in Edmonton, that perhaps there's something wrong with our economy in Edmonton, and that perhaps what we ought to be doing is looking at some specific direction from the province to the city in order to put a good number of Edmontonians back to work.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to deal with the specifics of the minister's department. He has a number of areas that I have some questions about, and no doubt he'll have the opportunity to respond a little later on this afternoon. In vote 1 I noted straightaway a bit of a discrepancy, and I noted it for all ministers, not just the Minister of Career Development and Employment. But the discrepancy that I noted was straight off the bat: ministers get an increase of 3.5 percent in salary and benefits. On the very next line, for Salaries, Wages, and Employee Benefits for the department workers, we have a loss of 9.7 percent. So while the minister's increase is but a mere \$1,500 and the decrease for the employees is approaching \$5 million, I wondered why that would be. Because if you look at the equivalent number of permanent full-time positions, comparing this year with last year, there's no change. If you look at the full-time equivalent employment, there is a change in numbers, and I'm wondering if that's specifically where that -- surely to goodness the \$5 million wouldn't account for that subtle change. But perhaps the minister could respond to that. Are we contracting out services in the department? Is that going to allow for that substantial change for Salaries, Wages, and Employee Benefits?

Vote 1.0.1. There's what I think is a substantial increase, in terms of percentage anyway, of 9.9 percent for the Minister's Office. That's more than just inflationary, and if the minister could explain what he needs that extra \$18,000 for, I'd certainly appreciate it. I know that we now have a department of -- it's not propaganda; what is it? -- Public Affairs, and I'm sure they would be able to provide the government, and indeed this par-

ticular department, with any extra excess of funds to try and get that message out to Albertans. So why does the minister and the minister's department require that extra \$18,000 in his office?

The committees. There's no increase at all for committee work, but I was wondering -- and the minister alluded to it briefly in his introductory remarks -- how many people get that \$60,000. Who are they, and what do we as taxpayers get in return? Is that in-house? Is that for members of the Assembly who travel on particular committees, or is that people that are outside? I'm just curious about that \$60,000. There's no change, but I am curious to know who gets it, what they get, and what they're providing back to us.

The deputy minister had a drop of 18 percent, and I'm wondering what's lost there. Normally there are administrative services that come out of the deputy minister's offices that are rather important, but with a drop of \$56,000 that's almost one position. I'm curious to know if that is indeed a position in the Deputy Minister's Office.

Vote 1.0.4, the administrative services. There's a substantial drop there of \$128,000, and I found it rather ironic that we'd be having a drop of that nature, given that the Auditor General criticized the administration of the department. I look at the report of the Auditor General for this year, '86-87, and on page 29 the Auditor General states:

The Department needs to further improve the accuracy of its accounting for year-end accounts payable, particularly as they relate to expenditures on training and employment grant contracts.

Now, I know there's another vote later on in the department that deals with that, but I'm curious to know why we'd be cutting back in the area of Finance and Administrative Services, not only here but throughout the department, when the Auditor General has been really quite critical of the administration of the department.

Votes 1.0.5, Planning and Research, and 1.0.6, Policy and Program Development Support, are both receiving equivalent cuts of \$100,000. But I wonder, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, if there's not a duplication of services in those two areas. Would there be benefit in combining some of the services? It seems to me at least that there may be some duplication there, and I would certainly like some clarification on that.

In vote 2 we have the real guts, I suppose, of the department, the very reason for existence, I think, for the Department of Career Development and Employment. Those are the Employment Services and the Apprenticeship and Trade Certification services. A lot of changes seem to have taken place over the course of a year. We see in Program Support, in vote 2.1.1, the 27 percent increase in Administrative Support, and although I just mentioned the cut in the department administration, I wonder if this particular increase of 27 percent is an attempt to tighten up some of the accountability of the specifics that were criticized by the Auditor General. If it is, it seems to me to be rather odd that in vote 2.2.1 -- again which is Administrative Support under Apprenticeship and Trade Certification -- we have a 33.6 percent drop in the administrative costs for the area of Apprenticeship and Trade Certification. The minister said that there was an increase in numbers, but surely to goodness, with a drop in the Administrative Support programs, one would almost hazard a guess that they would need more money in the area, not fewer dollars, for administration.

Programs for the Disadvantaged. I regret that I started rather late in the day to do some of the research, but I tried to find some of the specifics for the Programs for the Disadvantaged.

There's only a marginal drop of 2.1 percent. However, if you're one of those disadvantaged, that could be quite a substantial drop. I'm wondering who has access to this particular program. Is it the physically handicapped or the mentally handicapped? Is it areas in the province that have a rather high unemployment rate? Just who is able to access money out of vote 2.2.4?

In 2.2.5, Field Services Delivery, there's an increase of \$200,000, which is, I think, rather warranted in that I've talked with a number of people that are involved with the apprenticeship programs. They have some concerns with some of the changes, especially in the area of field services. The people that are going out into the field, while they're qualified in one particular trade, may be examining people that are doing their apprenticeship work in a trade that's entirely different. So do we have journeymen for one trade checking into apprentices for another trade? For example, do we have a carpenter in the area of field services checking out the qualifications of an apprentice gas fitter? Do we have a diesel mechanic in the area of field services checking out a second- or third-year refrigeration mechanic? I'm just curious to know. With the changes that have gone on in the department, do we have fully qualified journeymen checking out the apprentices that are in the field?

The Employer Delivered Apprenticeship Training program -- there again, there is no change from the \$500,000. But, Mr. Chairman, I'm curious to know which companies access these programs. Do they have an Alberta base? Are they home-based in Alberta? Are they based in western Canada, or indeed are they based in Canada at all? I'm wondering what standards are set, what guidelines are set for the employers who are involved in this apprenticeship training. If the minister could respond to that, I would be most appreciative.

Alberta Vocational Training program, which is vote 2.3. Again, I see that Administrative Support has been cut, cut by \$100,000. Now, I think it's rather strange that we have a very large increase in this particular vote in Training Allowances and Assistance of almost \$5 million and yet we've cut the Administrative Support. Surely to goodness, if we're going to be giving out more training allowance and assistance to those people that are involved in those particular programs, the administration costs would go up. I just question the fact that, again, the estimates show we have a drop in Administrative Support while the allowances are going up. What I find to be contradictory, though, is that in the vote following Training Allowances and Assistance we have Vocational Training Programs and Courses that have been cut by \$300,000. So we've got an increase in Training Allowances and Assistance for fewer courses, and we have fewer administrative dollars checking up on the delivery system. I would certainly like to have some clarification on that, because I see all kinds of area here where problems can be generated if we don't have proper administrative techniques.

Vote 2.3.5, Private Vocational Schools Support, which is \$2 million. Again, as I had asked who is accessing the Employer Delivered Apprenticeship Training program under the Apprenticeship and Trade Certification section, I'm wondering if the minister could be very specific and advise us in the Assembly which private vocational schools are receiving some of that \$2 million and how much each one is receiving.

The other area in the Vocational Training program is the skill enhancement program -- a substantial drop this year. Last year we had an approximately 5 percent drop and a steady decline, but now we have a 35 percent drop, from \$5 million down to \$3.2 million. I'm wondering if that's going to be picked up

elsewhere, because we still have a real need, I think, for retraining programs for some of the people that have been unemployed, chronically unemployed, and for some people that have not even been employed. Surely to goodness we have to provide some kind of service for them, and that perhaps is most properly directed in the area of skill enhancement.

Industry Based Training. We have the Administrative Support up 11 percent and programs up 15.5 percent. Just to compare it to what happened in the Vocational Training end, what happened in vote 2.5 makes some sense to me. There's a comparable increase in Administrative Support for the programs that have also gone up, whereas in Vocational Training we have a 9 percent cut in administrative services while we have a 31 percent increase in the Training Allowances and Assistance. I just draw it to the minister's attention, because I think that in vote 2.5 it makes more sense than what happened in vote 2.3.

My colleague the Member for Athabasca-Lac La Biche will speak about vote 2.6 a little later on this afternoon, if there's an opportunity. I've been advised I'm down to my last three minutes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If I could just briefly touch upon the hire-a-student program. I see again only a marginal drop of \$19,000, or 2.8 percent. Well, this cut comes at a time when the minister admitted in his opening remarks that we have a much higher rate of unemployment for youth that are between the ages of 16 and 24. We have a cut to the hire-a-student program at a time when tuition costs are going up at universities, and while it may only be marginal, it's a cut. If you were one of the students that could have accessed something out of that particular budget, for you it is going to be a substantial cut.

Employment Services: an overall cut of \$9 million. I'm surprised that we would have that kind of cut at a time when we're still dealing with rather high unemployment. We have STEP, PEP, and the Alberta business and community development program that are being cut. When I've talked with people who have accessed these programs -- community leagues, constituency offices, we all access these programs; hospitals use these programs and the unemployed use these programs -- I'm amazed that we would cut such a substantial amount of money out of a program that has been providing work for a good number of Albertans who want to work. Even at the wages that are offered through STEP and PEP -- \$3.80 an hour, \$5.50 if you're lucky -- there are a number of Albertans that don't want to be sitting at home or sitting in their parents' basement for the summer. They want to work. That's a point we have to drive home time and time again. Albertans want to work if they are given the opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, rather than go into the next vote, I would sit down and allow the minister to respond to these specifics or others to get into the debate.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to respond to many of the questions, particularly the specific ones. Firstly, I was remiss in my opening remarks, and the Member for Edmonton-Belmont brought it out. That is, what is the province doing to assist, say, the city of Edmonton or the city of Calgary or other municipalities in terms of job creation? The member should know, if he was here when the budget came down and, I believe, the Speech from the Throne, that this government has increased to \$57 million ample grants -- employment unconditional job creation dollars -- to the municipalities. It's \$57 million, Mr. Chairman. Those dollars, in all cases, aren't being used for job creation by the municipalities, and they're uncondi-

tional -- I should point that out. But that is a significant commitment to the partnership role that the province sees it must play, should play, and has a responsibility to play to creating employment and have it directed by the local municipalities.

Now, with respect to some of the comments the hon. member made, Mr. Chairman. Firstly, with regard to reference 1.0.3, Deputy Minister's Office: that is a deletion of uncommitted salary funds to accommodate Treasury guidelines. There was a reference in 1.0.5 to the 5.9 percent reduction. That is redeployment of staff to other divisions, plus a reduction to meet Treasury guidelines -- but basically redeployment of staff.

The hon. member then went to 2.1 in vote 2 and pointed out a 27 percent increase in Program Support. I should indicate to the member that the increase is dollars set aside for pending salary settlement awards in divisions 1, 2, and 12, so it's some unsettled salary negotiations.

I think he moved then into some of the subelements. I point out that his reference to 2.2.4 -- that is basically dollars that have been reallocated with reference to the programs for the disadvantaged. Those dollars have not disappeared, Mr. Chairman; they've simply been reallocated to subsection 2, vote 2.2.1. With regard to 2.3.4, there was some question there about a reduction. I should let the hon. member know that those dollars were also transferred dollars, transferred to the Opportunity Corps to cover academic upgrading courses for trainees. He mentioned his colleague from Lac La Biche may be here to talk about the Opportunity Corps. Possibly the member could pass that comment on to him: a bolstering of that particular area.

With regard to private vocational schools, there are a number of private vocational schools that assist us in training Albertans, providing them skills to move them into the labour force. I can't at this moment provide the member with all the names of those organizations. I'll look into it, and if appropriate, Mr. Chairman, I'll pass those names on to the member.

With regard to 2.7.1, those are not programmed dollar reductions. That's a transfer of one man-year to salary contingency.

With regard to his comments about PEP and STEP, there is a reduction, as the member pointed out, in vote 3. But the member has been here long enough to know that this government has a commitment to employment for youth, to the priority employment program and the summer temporary employment program. We have made a commitment that we will always review the demand on those programs and consider supplementing them beyond the existing budget where the demand shows itself.

So basically, Mr. Chairman, I believe I've responded to most of the member's comments. If there are any I've omitted, I'd be pleased to provide them to him in a written form.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Calgary-North West followed by Edmonton-Avonmore.

DR. CASSIN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to take this opportunity to compliment the minister and his department in bringing in these estimates. I think it's important to observe that the amount that has been voted has been decreased by some 4.6 percent, which is in keeping with the objectives of this government and our Treasurer to reduce our deficit and to help make this province that much more attractive to companies and to businesses. I think it's important to recognize, and it's been alluded to, that certain parts of the province perhaps are doing better than others and that Alberta has shown some improvement. Part of that is due, in fact, to the environment that is conducive to businesses and to entrepreneurs to take the risk and to

establish businesses and make things happen and work for us, and that is so important.

I would like to just refer back again to the comments of the Member for Edmonton-Belmont, who again alluded to the fact that perhaps the capital city was having more difficulties right now from the standpoint of the numbers of unemployed. That's something that bothers all of us, that there are these pockets in the province that are perhaps suffering more than others. I do believe that the majority of Albertans want to work and are prepared to work. I also appreciate that there is a small percentage who can't and don't want to work. But I'm not certain that in addition to the moneys that have been provided through the ample grants and through the other activities that, really, we want more involvement of the government.

I think the city of Calgary is an example of a city that perhaps has been able to thrive more on free enterprise and has less government buildings and less government structures. Perhaps there's a lesson there that we need less government and more people who are prepared to take risks.

I found it very confusing, Mr. Chairman, that last year when this government was taking the initiative to try and act as a catalyst to bring on a major project in downtown Edmonton that would create any number of jobs plus enhancing the business community the government was very severely criticized by members opposite. One has to recognize that in order to make things happen, certain risks have to be taken. One has to try and predetermine what's going to happen two or three years from now. Based on their judgment and their counsel, they make decisions, and those decisions make things happen. I really have to compliment the people in Calgary again. Yes, the Olympics were very successful, but it took a dream. It took people to put together a program and to call on the resources that were available to make it happen. That was a world-class show, but that type of thing goes on day after day.

It was again mentioned earlier today that there were some 17,000 new businesses started in this province. The comment from the opposition was how many failed. Well, certainly there's going to be some that will fail; that's part of doing business. That doesn't mean we quit and we rely completely on our government and on a social system; we continue, we carry on, and we strive for improvements. There are some 1,000 high-tech companies in this province, which again is an allusion to what's happening and the opportunities that are available.

But in reviewing these estimates, Mr. Chairman, the thing I find most encouraging is that having taken many cuts in different areas and particularly in administration -- and again, I find it interesting that we're criticized for cutting administration and putting the dollars into job promotions -- that perhaps the private sector is receiving more funds for taking some of the initiatives and responsibilities. Again, this speaks well for the province. It's a partnership between the provincial government, the federal government, and industry. And when we talk about industry, we're not just talking about the employer; we're talking about the employee and the employer. It's in their vested interest to make things work, to create jobs and continue to improve the economy of this province. But the increase of some 8.4 percent, approximately \$8 million, in career development is certainly a very welcome decision and, I think, a good allocation of our dollars at this time.

I had the privilege of sitting in on some of those hearings with the review committee, and one of the comments we received from many of the 243 applicants said, "Look, provide long-term incentives." We understand that there have been

some problems in the last four or five years. We've had to create jobs. We've had to bring in initiatives like STEP and PEP and other initiatives, but these are short term. They deal with maybe a seasonal problem which we have been conditioned to deal with over the years, but what's really important is that we look at the long term, that those dollars are placed in training, that we train our young people. Some of our social programs, in fact, may act as disincentives for these training programs, because perhaps we put the message out there that it's more important or it's advantageous for certain employers to hire people for short terms -- take advantage of the program and lose sight of the objective, which is to provide a good product and opportunity for our young people.

I think we could look at some other terms and other concerns, perhaps about the discrimination -- one example I think will be addressed later in this session -- with regards to insurance. The majority of the young people that are unemployed are male, between 16 and 25. Those individuals are discriminated from the standpoint of employment opportunities because of insurance. They have to pay a good deal more for their insurance, or their employer will have to pay a good deal more for the insurance to hire this young individual. Many of us can stop and think of how many jobs, particularly the entry jobs, would include some driving responsibilities. Many of these people are mature individuals who are being discriminated against unfairly. I think that has to be looked at, and I would like to think that the members of this Assembly will be able to do that later this year.

Mr. Chairman, the main area of interest that I have in the estimates and the direction of the Department of Career Development and Employment -- and I think that was a wise choice in name because the emphasis really should be on career development. I do believe the department has taken some very progressive steps in addressing that area; certainly the review of our apprenticeship program is a major portion of that. But we also have to recognize the important role that vocational schools and SAIT, NAIT, and our other postsecondary programs are providing for the people of this province.

I'm not certain how many Albertans realize that 23 to 25 percent of all the apprentices trained in Canada are trained in Alberta. This had a reflection on the boom economy in the 1980s, when many people came to Alberta and were trained. A lot of the projects that are taking place now in southern Ontario and elsewhere are being supported by people who were trained in this province. We've developed an apprenticeship program that is second to none, recognized nationally and internationally. This is referred to as our red seal program, and the objectives, certainly, of the department are to use that model that has been developed and is working so well and has been supported by people throughout this province to apply to the new trades and the new industries that are developing, whether that be the processing industry, the manufacturing industry, the hospitality industry, or the new and high technology that's developing.

I think of a very good example just in the last week, where we had a gentleman who immigrated to this country from Belgium who had a special skill in developing candies, particularly chocolate candies, and has a booming business, certainly during the Easter period, and is training some local people. Not only does that create jobs, not only does that provide opportunity for our young people, but it also provides another market for two very important industries, the dairy industry and the sugar industry, which are both part of our economy. That's the kind of thing that we have to address and to deal with.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's important that we recognize that this is not just government's responsibility, and it's not just provincial government but federal government. Alberta is one of the few provinces that put in additional funds to supplement the Canadian job strategy program to provide this training, and perhaps that's the reason we've trained so many apprentices. But industry feels very much part of this program, and they want to be involved, and we should encourage that.

The minister commented earlier on the upgrading, and I would like to again compliment the department for recognizing and providing the opportunity for people who are in the trade to upgrade their skills, not only to keep up with the rapid change in the technology within their fields but also to provide them the opportunity to move into different careers. I think many of us would be shortsighted if we were to advise our young people that they would have a career that would look after them for the next 40 or 50 years. Many of them will change careers frequently. It's important that the training has a generic base that allows them to move laterally, not necessarily to have to move out of the region, but that is also a possibility as the flexibility exists in various parts of our industries and in occupations, but that there is a generic program that allows that flexibility and that we also provide opportunities for those people who have to change their careers later in life.

We also have to address the problem of some of the discrimination, perhaps, or lack of opportunities for individuals to enter the work force, appreciating that the apprenticeship program only works for those people that are employed. So it's important for those individuals to initially be employed, and I'm certainly pleased with the statistic that there's been a 9 percent increase in the number of women who have been able to access the apprenticeship program.

I think we also have to look at those individuals who have perhaps been shortchanged in our traditional educational programs because of a learning disability who have very marketable skills in other areas, and that remedial programs are available to them.

I think we also have to look at -- it's sort of interesting -- a comment of a Michael Walker, who is reviewing the programs and initiatives taken in Ontario. It indicated that this recent study by the Ontario government recommended a Canadian training allowance which would involve the use of federal/provincial funds to provide long-term support for individuals undergoing apprenticeship training. It commented that we excessively subsidize universities for the skill acquisition that they provide to the young people but we inadequately stimulate the other kinds of skill acquisition. In Ontario each postsecondary student is subsidized some \$4,700 a year. A first-year medical student is subsidized some \$20,000, and yet the individuals who are in training programs or nonpostsecondary programs are subsidized some \$1,600 a year. Yet we say that we want to have equality, that those young people should have equality in training and opportunities.

[Mr. Musgrave in the Chair]

I think we have to look at this. It's been stated many times in the House that the jobs that are being created and have been created in the last two to three years are primarily in the service industry. We have to recognize that those people who enter the service industry are not going to be entering as part-time employees. They'll be entering it -- should be entering it -- on a full-time basis as a career opportunity, as a profession, as a trade

that they take a great deal of pride in, and that they will be rewarded as would other individuals in other professions.

Mr. Chairman, I could perhaps deal at length with some of the other considerations that have been taken by the department in addressing this whole question of career development and opportunity and the responsibility of government, but I'm certain we'll have another opportunity to do that later in the session. But I would like to compliment the minister and his department for the initiatives and the direction they have taken to move this province into the 20th century with a skilled work force who will be able to supplement and support the kinds of industry that we are developing in this province. I would like to think they would recognize and support the very important role that industry plays and that government shouldn't try to compete in that market. We should only be there when no one else is picking up the slack and no one else is prepared to provide that program. We should strictly be in a position of regulators, making certain that the regulations are fulfilled, that public safety is considered, that the work environment is conducive both to work and safety, and that we leave our schools and industry to be very much involved in this whole process.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Avonmore.

MS LAING: Thank you. I'd like to just raise a couple of questions in a couple of areas. The first issue I want to raise is the position of immigrant women. Immigrant women in the Canadian labour force have a higher percentage of participation than Canadian-born women. In 1985, 55.6 percent of immigrant women were working in the labour force, whereas only 52.1 percent of Canadian-born women were working in the labour force. Many of these immigrant women have little access to education, including education in one of Canada's official languages. This is because they often enter Canada as dependent or sponsored individuals and because of the designation of a single-head assessment, which holds that the husband or father is the head of the family and is assumed to be the only person that is going to be working for wages; that is, that these will be single-income families.

Therefore, many programs, in terms of education for jobs or English as a Second Language, are not available to immigrant women. Because these women do not have access to educational programs, either in terms of English as a Second Language in Alberta or job-training programs, they are trapped in job ghettos and they are unable to rise out of these job ghettos through the advancement of their education or their language skills.

If they are single parents, they are particularly vulnerable to living in poverty. Canadian census data shows that immigrant women are among the poorest in Canada and at the bottom of the wage scale. They are also relatively less powerful in the home and, particularly, in marital relationships and thus are particularly vulnerable to abuse, as they have no means of escape and often do not even have access to things like legal aid. In the labour force these women suffer the most from the disadvantages of employment insecurity and part-time work. They are also often subject to hazardous and exploitive working conditions because they do not know their rights. In addition, they suffer a higher rate of unemployment than other workers. In these job conditions the women are not able to increase their English language skills or their career skills, and so they become

increasingly isolated and marginalized, even from their own families, because they may in fact be the only one in the family that does not learn to speak English.

Under the conditions of the trade deal of which the minister spoke earlier, these women are most vulnerable to job loss. Even the Economic Council of Canada admits that there will be job losses, and many of these women may not be able to benefit from retraining because of their lack of language skills, their age, their family responsibilities, that kind of thing. So I would ask the minister if he has considered providing or ensuring that English as a Second Language training is available for all immigrant women regardless of their status. Will he take steps to ensure that such programs are truly accessible in the community?

I think one of the most distressing things about the loss of community school funding last year was that in some areas this was a real opportunity for immigrant women to develop their language skills and, in conjunction with that, their self-esteem. Then they have the self-confidence to move into job-related skill development. I'm wondering what commitment the minister is willing to make to reinstating these kinds of programs in community schools, which are accessible to women because they are in the community. Their children were there, and there was day care, child care, for them.

The second issue I'd like to raise is that the minister has spoken of the trade deal. I would ask: what program has he put in place for immigrant women who are displaced? What assessments has he done to determine their real needs? And will the programs be developed in accord with their unique needs, the things that I talked about earlier? -- that is, the need for child care, the need for second language learning, that kind of thing. In addition, I'm wondering if the minister has assessed the impact of the trade deal on women in general. Loss of jobs in the service sector has been predicted, and the service sector makes up 86 percent of the jobs for Alberta women; that is, there are 470,000 Alberta women working in the service sector. Under the trade deal they will be competing with U.S. firms, and this will likely result in loss of jobs in this sector through centralization to U.S. head offices, including the insurance companies, accounting, banking, communications. In fact, the Canadian Independent Computer Services commission calculated that between 1978 and 1984, 180,000 jobs were lost in that area, and they estimated that a total job loss of 500,000 would occur if the trend continued. And this was without the conditions of the trade deal.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's not true.

MS LAING: Yes, it is. You haven't read your stuff.

In addition, the Economic Council of Canada has said that six industries would be negatively affected by the trade deal, including leather products and textiles. Approximately 3,000 Alberta women are working in these industries. The Macdonald commission has stated that the clothing industry is also weak, and another 2,000 women in Alberta are vulnerable. So I would have to ask the minister what will happen to these women, many of them immigrant, many with low education. What kind of training/retraining programs will there be? It will not only be retraining but also training. What kind of job-creation strategies? Already one in 12 Albertans is unemployed.

Other concerns that we have to address are the improvement of working conditions, the raising of the minimum wage, pay equity, and affirmative action legislation. In a time of fierce

competition it is hard for me to believe that such initiatives will be made, and I would ask the minister to comment on that.

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could respond briefly. Firstly, with regard to English as a Second Language, there is actually quite a concerted effort on the part of this government to deal with ESL. There's an English as a Second Language secretariat, of which my department is a member along with four other provincial government departments. The ESL secretariat is charged with the responsibility of co-ordinating the activities of those Alberta government departments that are involved in the funding and delivery of English as a Second Language training here in Alberta.

I should also point out to the hon. member that I have expressed concern on a couple of occasions with my colleagues in Ottawa about the manner in which English as a Second Language dollars are available for the woman of the family, at least the individual that's not designated as the head of the family. As the member undoubtedly knows, the head of the family is designated under the federal programs to be the one that accesses English as a Second Language upon their arrival here. I have pressed my colleagues repeatedly, and I believe I'm getting somewhere. As a matter of fact, I was able to garner the support of all the other provinces in a proposition that would tie the level of dollars for English as a Second Language to the levels of immigration and not tie it to the Canadian Jobs Strategy.

I can assure the member that we are continuing to press. As a matter of fact, just very recently I have written again to, actually, the former minister of immigration, and I will write to the new minister of immigration and continue to press for dollars for ESL training for the women in the family. The member has quite appropriately pointed out that the head of the family gets the training because they are going into the labour force, the children pick up English at school and in the playgrounds, and the woman is basically isolated in the home and doesn't have the opportunity to access these programs. I agree, Mr. Chairman, that it's not appropriate. We are working to redress that issue.

I should also say that with regard to the member's comments that there will be dislocations or job losses, I guess, with regard to a free trade agreement, I acknowledge, as do my colleagues, that there will be some transitions. There will not be job losses here in Alberta. Every economic indicator -- the Economic Council, all of the organizations that follow free trade and analyze the impact -- has indicated that Alberta is the biggest net benefactor of a free trade agreement. In fact, I've just in my opening comments pointed out that there'd be 40,000 jobs created through a 10-year term of this agreement -- 40,000 new jobs over and above the hundreds of thousands of jobs that will be created by the normal economic growth.

Now, where we must play a role, Mr. Chairman, is in a transition period, whereby if there are areas where individuals -- as the member points out, their jobs may no longer be in demand. I don't necessarily accept it; I'd want to look at a particular case -- we've got textiles and so on, industries that basically aren't here in Alberta -- analyze it on a case-by-case basis. But I can assure the member that we will be making the resources of our department available to any individual that may be facing the possibility of having to change an occupation. Tens of thousands of people in this province change occupations through the course of a year. There should be no consternation or fear of this happening as a result of the free trade agreement, because there will be plenty of job opportunities. The training programs

in the department will be designed, as we move through the free trade agreement, to assist those individuals, and I can assure you that there won't be people who fall through the cracks. The resources of our department will be made available to those individuals.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to comment, first of all, on the budget in general. I was glad to hear the minister suggest that he intends to review the labour market strategy. I think that's a move in the right direction. I was, however, dismayed to hear the hon. Member for Calgary-North West indicate that we're getting ready to get into the 20th century. I had rather hoped that this government was past that, but there are other indicators that suggest perhaps they're not.

Mr. Chairman, I note in going over the budget documents for this year, as I have in other departments and other years, that there is still an immense paucity of information. I don't know from these pages what it is we're doing for the people of Alberta. I don't know how many units of service we're purchasing for one program or another. It really tells me very little about whether we're gaining or losing on the whole situation. The minister indicated that this last year -- the year before it was jobs first and training follows. Frankly, I think that's a regressive kind of thinking. I believe we may in fact have gotten it backwards, that either those two go hand in hand or we have to train people to take positions that suit their talents and skills, or else they end up in dead ends.

But I do note a great many swings in the budget from this year's presentation to last year's that make me very anxious about what, in fact, the department is planning to do over the long haul, what their emphasis is going to be. There is no question in the department; the name of it is Career Development and Employment, but the emphasis has moved to the unemployed. That undoubtedly is because we have a situation of unemployment that is unacceptably high in the province. It still remains unacceptably high, and the minister has spoken to that himself.

Mr. Chairman, the unemployment has resulted in a number of other very, very expensive situations in Alberta that have caused a lot of stress, a lot of economic distress in our communities: bankruptcies; people have left the province; we've seen a lot of family breakup. We've seen hunger demands on food banks and on community services, hunger in our schools. So the fact is that the evidence is still very much demonstrable that unemployment is still unacceptably high.

Last year we were all pleased and interested to hear the minister's glowing statements about the program in which he shares called employment alternatives, and I'd like to speak for a moment or two about that program. In the announcement of last year, Mr. Chairman, there were indications of how this agreement was entered into with the federal government. To be sure, the province of Alberta put in more funds in the short time the program operated last year than anticipated, to serve more people.

Just some statements out of the press statement on the agreement of last year. On page 3 it indicates:

The agreement also calls for increased participation of social assistance recipients in selected programs under the Canadian Jobs Strategy. The intent here is to ensure social assistance recipients continue to actively participate in the Canadian Jobs Strategy on an equitable basis.

Now, we haven't heard much from the minister as to whether or not this is working and, if so, how it's working and if it's producing the results that were anticipated.

Further in the next paragraph it tells us that

Accordingly, both governments will work co-operatively to identify and develop innovative approaches to further enhance the employability of social assistance recipients.

Well, what are they? What are those innovative approaches that have been developed along with the federal government? Because we haven't heard about those either.

We did in fact expect an employment alternatives program with considerable funding that would provide training and opportunities for people who otherwise would be dependent on social assistance to get into job situations. We don't know, Mr. Chairman, if there were new jobs; we don't know if there were permanent jobs. To be sure, the program has not yet gone its 12-month time period, but it seems to me that there could have been plenty of time to take off information, and in fact at the end of the year it was discontinued in order to make an evaluation, which I agreed with. But there was no guarantee in the original arrangements that the job would be permanent or would continue beyond the 12-month period. The evaluation we have not seen public. The support services, it seems to me, were always far too little and far too late, and the value to the community and certainly to the recipients has got to be called into question.

So we expected some things that we really didn't get. Who, in fact, does it work for? Well, it works very well as a wage subsidy to employers, and it has been picked up by many employers and, I think, has been quite positive for them. But there are a number of questions that need to be asked, because now we're having the program reinstated. We've been told that we've had a 69 percent increase in the funds allocated from the Alberta government. What we need to know, Mr. Chairman, is about this \$1,000 training grant per person. Is there any requirement that it be used? If it isn't used, where is it being reapplied? Unfortunately, only 2 percent of the employer applicants picked that up. It's clear that this was not necessary, or they didn't think it was necessary, in their undertaking a social assistance trainee. We need to know what the long-term training is going to be so that we can project these people into permanent positions.

Above all, Mr. Chairman, this program is really designed for the most employable of the unemployed, the people who had the best chance of getting a job anyway, with or without this wage subsidy. But we have no program, as I understand it -- even with the reinstated one -- for anything to help the very hard to employ, the people who've been out of work over a longer period of time whose age, education, and qualifications are against them, who are perhaps English deficient, who have problems with illiteracy.

Now, I'm hoping that the minister, in reviewing what has happened in that program over the last few months, is going to tell us that there is going to be another program running alongside it for the more difficult to employ that will deal with some of these particular situations that they face. I have no idea whether or not the minister has met with those community agencies who have studied the users, who know them well, and who have studied the potential users of the program, to get their input. We don't know how this is going to be monitored. We do know that there are employers calling our Social Services department and regional offices all across the province, but we don't know just precisely how it's going to operate. We haven't

heard anything to the effect that the program is now going to be available to private nonprofit agencies, who are desperately trying to keep up, with very limited resources and increased pressures. But those agencies are not considered to be employers that can access this program.

Mr. Chairman, it was said in an earlier news release that the department is studying ways to subsidize welfare recipients to start their own businesses. I haven't heard anything about that one recently. We haven't any idea whether or not that one is coming into effect. If it is, how is it going to work, and who will benefit from that capacity to start into business for yourself? Not everyone is capable of going to work for someone else.

But as I review the long-awaited announcement of the reinstated program, Mr. Chairman, I don't see any substantive change. I see changes in the amount of dollars offered as wage subsidy to the employer, but I don't see anything that says there's a sliding scale going downwards as we near the 12-month mark. I don't see any guarantee required from the employer that he create a permanent job. I don't see any real access to education and re-education, training and retraining.

It's my understanding that in collaboration with Social Services the intake process works from Social Services or elsewhere to employment support systems. It's also my understanding that in the Edmonton region there are five people who work in that office, and they have a computer. That computer has the jobs, and they type in whatever they need, and if the fellow or the girl fits the job, wonderful, they get it. But if they don't, that person goes back around into the Social Services department, back to a social worker who is required, with an already heavy caseload, to deal with the person regarding training and retraining. It is not thought by agents using the service to be a very satisfactory one to those other than those who have the best chance of being employed anyway. In fact, it is deficient in employment counseling and in training counseling for people who desperately need it.

What do we need to do? Well, we need to beef up that training and retraining and counseling part of it, and we need to develop a program for the hard to employ in collaboration with various agencies who are willing and eager to do it. Mr. Chairman, we desperately need a program for illiteracy. Now, I suppose this doesn't come under this minister's rubric; I'm not sure. But I would suggest that for a great percentage of the people who are finding difficulty over time in gaining and keeping permanent employment, the reasons are because of illiteracy. We have begged the government in Alberta to try to do something about it that's creative. There are programs happening in other parts of Canada that deal with this constant problem, and I believe we're overdue in this province of ours.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the minister is prepared to share what the agencies think of this program of employment alternatives or how he plans to evaluate it in the future.

I just would like to mention that at noon today I met some adult students from Bonnie Doon high school who are in the continuing education program. They were visiting the House, and they wanted to ask a lot of questions. I didn't have time to go through too many of them, but they tell me these are adult students who are trying to get back into the labour force who are getting retraining through one of our programs. They describe very inconsistent support systems available to them, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister. Some of them were able to get loans of different varieties than others, quite inconsistent as to what their needs were. They also described a circumstance where in the school they're not allowed to use the library. Now, it seems to

me we throw all kinds of barriers in the way of people who are trying desperately to get going again.

Mr. Chairman, the department in general. The minister talked in his opening remarks at some length about the job creation. We've already heard that's grown out of the economic development department for the most part. While describing in glowing terms the numbers of people who will find employment in our province in the near future, he didn't talk about the relationship between his department and that department in developing those programs and in making sure that our labour force is in fact available and trained to undertake them. Nor has he talked about the relationship to Education, which I would hope he would do, particularly in regard to illiteracy programs -- postsecondary education as well -- to the Department of Labour, nor to his relationship to the Department of Social Services through this program that I've just described.

Mr. Chairman, in the few moments left to me I would like to suggest to you that we have very little information about what this department is in fact doing and about its achievements related to real numbers of real people helped, real jobs created, permanent jobs created. I have not been able to find an annual report of the department since the '85-86 report. You know, since then the title has changed; the subjects have changed. It's very hard to compare things, so it makes it extremely difficult to determine precisely whether we're gaining or losing ground.

Mr. Chairman, we've said a lot from this side of the House about lotteries. I'm not going to dwell on it except to say that while I don't disagree with the beneficiaries of lottery funds in Alberta that have accessed these funds in the past, I do disagree categorically with the unconscionable method of the government dealing with surplus funds. I believe most Albertans think that is not operating in the appropriate way that it should. Let me say again that I don't have any disagreement with the beneficiaries, nor do I think anyone in my caucus does. But I do disagree that these funds are expended without coming to this House for a discussion about where they most properly are needed and should be used.

[Mr. Gogo in the Chair]

Mr. Chairman, just a few other subjects. The report contains nothing nor have I heard anything about native employment -- some references to it with the increase in forestry, in the pulp industry -- but perhaps the minister would tell us what programs, where they're buried if they're here anyplace, for native people in this province, if there is special attention being given to the very special problems they have and the situations they face. In particular I'd like to know if the minister or anyone in his department has addressed himself to the employment difficulties of native women, who are most particularly vulnerable.

The minister in last year's throne speech, a year ago now, talked glowingly about the Women's Career Resource Centre. Now, we've never heard that one since; it's never even surfaced. You know, what is the career resource centre? There are two people working in that, as I understand. But it showed up in last year's throne speech as something we could look forward to; it was really going to produce immense results. The career resource centre: I'd be grateful to know precisely what it's producing, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Minister.

The minimum wage. We've been told in the last week from a couple of sources that we are going to do something about it, and I'm grateful for that. I think that one, like many others, is

long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, the apprenticeship review. Perhaps the minister will tell us when it is we're going to get it and when we're going to have some of the recommendations of that review made public and whether or not he intends to act upon them. I think we've waited for that one. I understood it was to be available in the fall. We're now well into the next year.

Just a couple of other comments, Mr. Chairman. The minister has not, as I understand, seen fit to support pay equity legislation, either in the government as a first step or anyplace else. I would like to hear his opinion on that, because I believe this in many ways should come under his line of thinking. Pay equity legislation is holding up many women in our province as well as minorities.

Mr. Chairman, one last comment is on AMPLE. This particular program I welcomed when it was introduced a year ago, and I understand we have beefed it up this year. We put more of the moneys that were assigned last year into it ahead of time, and I'm grateful for that. There are, however, no strings attached to this program. Perhaps the minister, who says it's been used to create jobs, will tell us just exactly what and how they are, and he might also describe to us his relationship with the AUMA or other municipalities, who've had some excellent ideas about job creation. I would appreciate knowing just exactly how or if the minister has acted on any of those suggestions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. minister?

MR. ORMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I can respond -- I wasn't going to, but some of the comments made by the hon. member I think must be responded to.

Firstly, are we gaining or losing was, I think, your question with regard to our department's programs. I believe the state of the economy is basically a reflection of how our department programs are doing. If we are getting 500,000 people, visits, through our programs, through our career centres and our various facilities to counsel people, to train them, to give them job-creation opportunities, I believe we are winning. In fact, I think the nature of the economy to some extent is a reflection of the initiatives that are under the Department of Career Development and Employment.

I was quite surprised to hear the member suggest that she does not feel that employment dollars should be going into training dollars when, in fact, her colleague the Member for Calgary-Buffalo had suggested last year that it was a shortsighted position to move dollars from training to job creation. Now that we're moving from job creation to training, the hon. member suggests that's inappropriate. I would suggest that in fact the Liberal caucus might have a very good review and see if there's any consistency on job creation within their party.

With regard to the employment alternatives program, Mr. Chairman, the employment alternatives program is, in my view, a substantial success. I didn't review the success in my comments today because I think it stands on its own two feet, and the success is well known amongst the organizations. The member asked who we met with. Well, I can tell her. We met with the centre for income security and employment association, the Calgary John Howard Society, the Calgary food bank, the city of Calgary personnel office. We met in Edmonton. We met with the Citizens for Public Justice. We met with the Edmonton Family Services Association, the Edmonton Social

Planning Council, and the Boyle Street co-op. I met with them personally. I reviewed with them the program in its first seven months, and we reviewed with them the design coming for the future budget year. Now, obviously there will be differences of opinion at any particular time when you're dealing with a controversial area. I believe that the program, though, based on the review we've done, speaks for itself.

The member asked how many of these jobs are going to be permanent jobs. Well, as the member appropriately identified, until the subsidy runs out sometime in May, we won't know. But I can tell the member that we did a survey. We surveyed 561 employers, 561 employees. Seventy-five percent of the employers said that they would retain the individuals after the program subsidy expired; 85 percent of the employees said that they are learning job-related skills. Now, this is a random selection, Mr. Chairman. I'm not here to say that those are definitive numbers; I'm saying they're subjective. But the point is that the sense you're getting by the comments and by the rate of response is that the employers and employees are working well under this program; 75, 85 percent of both employees and employers are saying, "Hey, I'm learning something," or "Hey, I'm going to hire that person on after the subsidy expires." So that, I believe, speaks for itself.

Now, whether or not the retention rate is that high at the end of the program I can't say. I can't say it'll be that high. If it's half that high or a quarter that high, I'll be pleased, because to every one of those 6,000 people -- that's a statistic, 6,000 people; there's an individual attached to them. If we can get 3,000 or 2,000 of them from social assistance into permanent jobs, then I think it's a success, and it was well worth the effort.

The member speaks about the most employables: are we just dealing with the most employables? Well, I should let the member know that, in fact, we found that the individuals who were on this program, who were working under the employment alternatives program, had an average duration of two years on social assistance, and they had an average time, each time, of about two and a half times. So they were on social assistance, got a job, social assistance, got a job, back on social assistance. So we are dealing with more than just the superficial layer of social assistance recipients, and I reject the suggestion that we should discriminate within people who are on social assistance in the employables category as to whether you're more employable or you're not more employable and whether or not we want to deal with you because of that. I don't believe that's acceptable, Mr. Chairman.

Now, the member suggests that we should get into the business of social engineering; that is, "When the subsidy expires, employer, you must keep that person on the job." Well, I submit to the hon. member: is it just as appropriate for us to tell the employee that he must work for that employer after the subsidy expires? It's the same concept. I believe it's up to the individuals. If they're working well within the company and mak-

ing a contribution and the employer is happy and the employee is happy, then the relationship will continue. Beyond that I don't believe it's the role of government, in any case, to make those kinds of demands.

I wanted to respond a moment, finally, on the issue of illiteracy. The Alberta vocational training program spent \$12 million, actually, in 1987 on upgrading programs and student support for 12,000 adults requiring instruction in the grades 1 to 12 curriculum, in English as a Second Language. So I recognize the concern of the hon. member. But she asked, and I'm telling. We spend as a government a great deal of dollars and initiative on addressing the issue of illiteracy. It's a moving target, Mr. Chairman, and we will continue to do what we can to the extent possible.

With regard to native employment on our forestry initiatives, I believe that would be more appropriately brought up in the estimates of the Department of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife.

The apprenticeship timing, Mr. Chairman. We have one of the reports; the advisory panel is reviewing it for me. I cannot say whether or not there will be recommendations to changes in law made this session; I doubt it. But in any case, I will keep the Assembly abreast of the progress of that report.

The Women's Career Resource Centre. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said that she hadn't heard any more about it. I spent a good two or three minutes in my opening comments talking about the success of women's career resources. So all I can say is rather than take up the time of the Assembly and go over those comments, I just refer the hon. member back to my opening comments at the beginning of these estimates.

Thank you.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, does the Assembly agree with the request for leave to sit again?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, the House will sit tomorrow evening in Committee of Supply, and we will look at the estimates of Community and Occupational Health.

[At 5:27 p. m. the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p. m.]