



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 58

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Wednesday

10 June 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not see the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) in his seat today.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
He is out of town.

MR. EFFORD:  
He is out of town. That is fine.

I will direct my question to the Premier. I ask the Premier, in light of all the problems that have taken place and the fact that every women's organization in this Province has condemned the Minister of Social Services for his outrageous opinion on the working parents of this Province, and the Premier has heard some of his own cabinet ministers condemn these opinions, and he knows that the minister holding those views on child care and young offenders cannot properly or responsibly discharge his particular duties under the Social Services portfolio, has the Premier asked the minister to resign, since all of these things have come to light, and if he has not, will he do it now?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say to the Premier that we are speaking for everybody in this Province, not only women's organizations but also all parents in the Province, and we are going to continually ask the question until we get some satisfaction. I ask the Premier how can he tolerate in the portfolio of Social Services a minister whose expressed views are so completely hostile to the people he is supposed to service? How can the Premier leave in Cabinet a minister whose views on the concerns of working mothers are publicly condemned even by senior members of his Cabinet?

MR. J. CARTER:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:  
It is quite obvious to me and it is quite obvious to anyone on this side that the hon. member is reading and not even doing a very good job of reading his question. It was obviously written for him and I would suspect that he is reading it now for the first time. Is this proper conduct? Is this allowed? Is Question Period just a matter of reading, parroting off some text that some dreary assistant has gotten ready for you?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I have mentioned on a number of occasions that questions and answers should be as brief as possible. There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question was very brief. I asked the Premier very simply how can he tolerate and accept the Minister of Social Services in his Cabinet when already several of his own Cabinet Ministers have expressed the view that they do not agree with the Minister of Social Services and they think that every statement that the Minister of Social Services made last week was totally wrong and opposite to government views?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the issue of day care and homemaker services is in recognizing the reality of the population of the Province whereby, over the last seven or eight years, the increase in the labour force of 25,000 people means 21,000 females entering the work force and 4,000 males. In response to that fundamental reality, and that is the issue we are dealing with, the issue is are we responding to what is the reality out there in the labour force today. We have increased the budget of the Department of Social Services from \$45 million to \$111 million, we have increased day care from \$350,000 to \$650,000, and we have increased our funding to transition houses - we are the government and the party that introduced funding for

transition houses - from zero to \$381,000. Those are the issues, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If those are the issues that are important to the hon. member, I say to him that we have responded to those issues and we will continue to respond to those issues to ensure that we provide as much money as is possible. As a matter of fact, it would be difficult to find other programmes in government that have increased their budgets as much as they have increased in the day care - homemaker - transition house area, as well as in affirmative action, matrimonial property rights and the like. And just in the last couple of weeks we have opened the first day care centre right here in this Confederation Complex.

So our record is clear, our policy is clear and we intend to expand in those areas and all others to ensure that the fundamental reality, the demographics of our labour force are recognized by government. We do have a responsibility and we will carry out that responsibility in the most eloquent way possible, and that eloquent way possible is to put more money into these programmes to ensure that we are doing a good job for all the people of the Province.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Premier, he cannot keep skating

around the answer. The answer that we are looking for is the resignation of the Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:  
Let me ask the Premier how can he explain when he said two days ago in the House of Assembly, that this government takes a back seat to nobody when it comes to day care services in Canada, while all statistics prove very clearly that Newfoundland ranks number ten in Canada in the amount of money that it puts into day care services?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, one cannot look at the absolutes of money, because one has to look at the relevant issue in each jurisdiction. Based upon our ability to pay, based upon the needs that have come forward in the last number of years, we have responded and we have increased the budgets of day care and homemaker services, transition houses, and so on, by 100 and 110 and 120 per cent. My point is that we are responding to it. It is not an issue of an individual, but an issue of whether we are responding to it, and, Mr. Speaker, we are responding to it and we are providing additional funds for all the areas that are important to ensure that what is happening out there in society at large is being responded to in a socially progressive way by this government. We are doing that, we will continue to do it, and we will continue to expand those services to ensure that we are responding in an effective manner.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I had not intended to rise on this matter, but the Premier in giving the answers that he gave on Monday and his colleagues have given in the last week, must realize that these are not the issues. There is no dispute about the amount the government is spending. That is on the public record. If the Premier wants to finger what is the issue -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, what is in dispute is the propriety of the continuance in Cabinet of the Minister of Social Services. That, I say to the Premier, is the issue. Will he indicate to the House if he finds the minister's continuance in Cabinet under the circumstances to be improper and, if so, what steps he intends to take to address it?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the Leader of the Opposition. The issue is whether we are dealing with the women of this Province in a responsible, effective manner. That is the issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Is this government responding to what is happening in the labour

force, what is happening in society at large? Are we responding by trying to provide more day care services? Answer: Yes, with a 100 per cent increase over the last several years. Are we responding on homemaker services? Are we responding on affirmative action? Are we responding in transition houses? To those things that matter, are we responding? The answer to that is we are increasing the budgets of all those areas every single year. That is the issue. Are we doing a good job on responding to social concerns in society at large? My answer to that is an unqualified yes. We need to do more. We will try to do more. Mr. Speaker, we are increasing the budgets for those areas quicker and in a larger percentage-wise than in other areas of government.

Therefore, if you look at the totality of government services, we are doing more in those areas than we are doing in other areas. The other people who are in those other areas could easily complain that they are being somehow sacrificed for these new areas. We will defend what we have done, and we will say that we have a lot of catching up to do in making women equal partners in the whole of society and the work force. We have more work to do, and we intend to do it, Mr. Speaker. That, in our view, on this side of the House, is the issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:  
My question is to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). With this year's inshore ground fishery, especially on the Northeast Coast, getting off to a very slow start, indeed in most parts of the areas affected there has been practically no groundfish landed at all so far, and with Unemployment Insurance Benefits having been discontinued on May 15, will the minister tell the House if he has taken steps to ask Ottawa to maybe extend the Unemployment Insurance Benefits to help the affected fishermen over this slack period?

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
No, Mr. Speaker, we have not asked for an extension of the UIC programme so far this year.

MR. W. CARTER:  
A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this is a very serious problem, in fact one that does exist, will the minister undertake to contact his federal counterpart with a view to having some kind of assistance made available to fishermen? And will he also, Mr. Speaker, then again make further representation to the federal government to resolve the anomaly with respect to unemployment insurance to fishermen whereby it is discontinued on May 15

irregardless of the state of the fishery? Will he have that inequity removed as well as getting some temporary assistance now when it is need?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all we have made representation in the past and will do so again on correcting the anomaly. There is no doubt about that. It has been unanimously the position, I suppose, of all people in this House, that the arbitrary May 15 cut-off of UIC for all of Newfoundland and Labrador is not an equitable programme. We have done that in the past and we will do it again.

In terms of the first part of the hon. gentleman's question, we have had some discussion over the last day or so along the lines of making the kind of request that he has been referring to. And I hope we would have that finalized very shortly and will in fact be so doing.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you.

I have a question for the Premier and it concerns youth unemployment. I posed a question yesterday to the Deputy Premier who told me to go back and look through some programmes that your

government has. I would like to ask the Premier, besides the great number of programmes you now have out there that are tackling the problem, since youth unemployment officially is only about 40 per cent, could you tell us if you have any other plans in mind to tackle the problem that is out there, which is presently going up and has increased 11 per cent since you took over?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we are doing all we can as it relates to youth unemployment in a whole range of areas. I think one of the keys to employment generally, and youth unemployment, is in the issue of training. We are spending I do not know how many tens of millions this year on the re-organization of our whole post-secondary education system, especially as it relates to what were traditionally called the vocational schools, combining them into community colleges to provide more up-to-date courses for students so that the courses that they do take give them a greater chance of getting a job afterwards than some of the courses that have traditionally been offered. So I think the whole educational system is being revolutionized over the next year or two to try to respond to it, and I think that is more the long-term answer than any short-term things we can do, Mr. Speaker.

Secondly, of course, as the hon. member has acknowledged, there are a lot of programmes now in place which are attempting to respond to that very difficult problem in the area of the job creation, projects through the various departments

where are a lot of youth will get a chance to have employment opportunities during the Summer, through our private sector employment initiatives, which have been very well received, and we will, over the next number of weeks, be announcing hundreds and hundreds of more jobs, many of which will go to the youth of the Province. But the long-term answer is a more responsive education system. We are working, therefore, both on the short-term, through our job creation initiatives this year, and in the long-term, through a revolution in the post-secondary educational institutions of the Province.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Premier there will be a revolution all right, but I do not think he is going to like it, because the job that you have been doing on tackling the youth unemployment problem is one that the people of this Province are not too pleased with. Since he talks about these great programmes, most of them Liberal thoughts from this side that we have given him over the last twelve years, by the way -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
- would you consider doing what the Nova Scotia government did to tackle their problem of youth unemployment when Nova Scotia set up a youth initiatives office in all different parts of that province to give career

counselling to young people all over the Province of Nova Scotia? Nova Scotia is just across the water over there, it is not up in Ontario. Would you consider an initiative such as that that could help tackle the youth unemployment problem instead of the 11 per cent increase that has happened while you have headed your administration?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, we are willing to accept ideas from anywhere. Where they come from does not make any difference to us as long as they are sound and reasonable. I think what the hon. member is referring to is what we are now setting up through the reorganization of the vocational schools, because we will be providing a far better counselling service, through the new post-secondary revolution that I talked about, than doing it on an ad hoc basis like they are doing in Nova Scotia. It is better to do it on a longer term basis. That is what the whole reorganization of the post-secondary institutions are supposed to do.

For example, Mr. Speaker, in a lot of that reorganization there is the requirement for enlarged libraries and counselling services in all the community colleges. That is where we have to get the young people. As they graduate from high school we have got to get them into programmes and get them into an educational system which will advance beyond the high school certificate level to that level where they can get a trade

or can get some counselling and get into the work force through that procedure. So rather than doing that on an ad hoc basis, we are doing it on a more organized long term basis.

Whilst we will have to watch and see what Nova Scotia does, we believe that our approach to the system is far more to the core of things, not just dealing with the surface.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier about a more insidious use of the few, and I reiterate the few, student jobs that have been created. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, Catamaran Park is located next to Badger. It is a major contributor to the economy of the town of Badger. It is seem, and rightly so, as a source of employment for students or other people of Badger. Yet with ten jobs created at Catamaran Park, not one job went to Badger. Why is the Premier allowing his ministers to turn his Summer employment programmes into vehicles for blatant political patronage?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I am not familiar with the situation at

Catamaran Park at all. I would have to find out. I would have to ask such questions as where did the applications come from, were there a massive number of applications from the Badger area, were there applications from the Millertown - Buchans area, and were there applications from other communities that are near Catamaran Park. I guess whatever applications were in the department would have to choose from those applications.

So I do not know if the hon. member has at his disposal information which would indicate that there were ten or fifteen or twenty or thirty applications in from Badger for those jobs. That would have to be one of the questions. But I have not got all of the information here at my fingertips. I will try to get it for the hon. member in the next couple of days, and then respond to him in a more specific manner. But for him to make a charge or to allege that certain things were done wrongly without giving me all the information leaves me at a decided disadvantage. I would like to know how many youths from Badger applied, how many from Millertown applied, how many from Buchans, how many from Grand Falls, how many from Windsor, in the hon. member's district, and then on the basis of that and other such relevant information I would be able to make a judgement as to whether the things were handled properly or not.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:



Mr. Speaker, I would like to, very quickly, give the Premier some of the information. I can tell him that there are twenty-five or thirty needy students from Badger, young men and women from lower income families, and wherever the applications came from certainly a lot came from Badger and I am aware of those applications. But the ten jobs were designated for one community in Newfoundland, for Grand Falls, which is in the district of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms). Maybe the Premier is right. He intimated that maybe there was no political interference or patronage involved, but would the Premier tell me what possible criteria could be used that saw ten jobs created at Catamaran Park and not one of those jobs going to the town of Badger? Now, what possible criteria could have been used for that to have happened?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I just have some information here which might help the situation. Projects are handled by the Parks Division of the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth as part of a provincial parks employment programme designed to improve the parks. Two hundred and twenty-five people have been hired in thirty-five parks all over the Province. People from all over our Province are eligible, such as at Wooddale Nursery in Grand Falls, where there are people from Windsor, Bishop Falls and Norris Arm working, for example. Positions have been filled by unemployed people who had applied for these

special parks projects and all fit eligibility criteria, because 40 per cent of those employed must be under twenty-five, not necessarily students but under twenty-five. The minister has informed me that he received no representations from the member for Windsor - Buchans at all for these special provincial job creation projects. That is the information I have right now, so I will have to get more to respond to the hon. member.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker, I realize one has to be relevant here but the Premier has suggested things that I would be tempted to respond to in a third supplementary but I am sure the Speaker would stop me, as he so should do. I suggest to the Premier that we have seen in this Province many demonstrations against many policies of this administration, and now we see students, needy, unemployed students and young people, having to demonstrate against what is perceived as summer employment programmes being used for political patronage. So I ask the Premier what advice does he have for the students of Badger who demonstrated yesterday and are demonstrating at Catamaran Park to support their rights to some of those jobs at Catamaran Park? What advice does he have for them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to give advice to anybody, I am here to answer questions that relate to government policy. All I can say to the hon. member is I do not have all the information. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans does almost every year is not to be on to his constituency and ensure that students got applications in for all of the opportunities that are going to come up this Spring, he refuses to do that, he waits until the worst happens, and then comes in this House of Assembly to try to make a policy football out of it and get his name in the paper, in **The Grand Falls Advertiser** and on TV tonight so that he can then proudly boast to the people of Windsor-Buchans that he is representing them well in the House of Assembly.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. If you check with the Newfoundland Statistics Agency you will find out that since 1979, when the Premier and his Administration came to power, 25,000 people have left this Province, which is the population of the entire City of Corner Brook. Can the Premier tell this House and the people of this Province how we have reached this crisis of out migration, many of them young people, since he has come to power? How is it that since he has come to power 25,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have left their homes?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have to say it once again, that that is a question which isolates the facts to the advantage of the hon. member. One would have to look at the out migration of Newfoundlanders ever since 1900 or 1920 or 1930, 1940, up through the Smallwood years, from 1949 to 1971, in order to weigh whether in fact the out migration during the last period of time, in the period of years from 1979 to 1985 or 1986 or 1987, is any different than or better than or worse than the out migration before in order to make a value judgement on this administration and its job to try to create more jobs in the Province. One cannot do it in isolation. And I really am disappointed in the hon. member, because he usually asks good questions, for him to try to isolate one particular group of facts to prove his own point without looking at the totality of the situation, and then making the reference or the comparison, because then he might have a legitimate question and built into his question a legitimate allegation.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier commissioned a study on unemployment in this Province, which cost nearly \$3 million. Now if he read that study he will see that Recommendation No. 105 states, "Both federal and provincial funding for youth employment programmes...should be increased substantially." Why has

the Premier ignored this recommendation of a Royal Commission which cost nearly \$3 million which could have kept some of our young people home?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A well read question, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member. We are responding to what the Royal Commission has to say. Do not isolate one recommendation of the Royal Commission. They also went on to suggest changes in our post-secondary educational system, which is at the heart, in many ways, of our youth unemployment problem. And as I answered in an earlier question today, Mr. Speaker, we are trying to get at the root of the problem, and that is to improve and change the educational system, at the primary, elementary and secondary levels as well as at the post-secondary level, because that is where the core of the problem exists and that is what we must try to change as it relates to the drop-out rate and so on. We must get at the core of the problems, and that is the core of the problem, the educational institutions of our Province, if we are truly to make significant gains in lowering not only youth unemployment but latterly unemployment generally. We are in the short term introducing programmes, as I indicated, through the parks and Fisheries, through Rural Development and so on. Hundreds and hundreds of new jobs have been created in the last couple of months, and hundreds and hundreds more will be created in the next few months. And on the

private sector programme, we are trying to encourage employers who participate in that programme, and they are being very responsive, to ensure that they hire a significant percentage of youth in those jobs that are to be created. So we are trying to tackle the long term through our educational system and we are trying to attack the short term in the creation of new jobs through the programmes I just mentioned.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, Dr. House thought that this problem was significant enough to isolate it. In fact, there are only a handful of recommendations that he talks about in terms of youth and unemployment. One of those was Recommendation 105, the other is Recommendation 112, which talks about the establishment of businesses for young people. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, can stand there and waltz around the question until the cows come home, but the fact of the matter is that an awful lot of young people have left while he has held the reins of power. What are you going to do about it? And what do you say to those young people in Calgary who said to you, when can we come home?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I notice in the hon. member's question that he has not

acknowledged the fact that we have this year set up a new Youth Entrepreneurship Programme to respond directly to the Royal Commission's report. The Development Corporation, which comes under the Department of Development, has now in place a Youth Entrepreneurship Programme for the youth of the Province to participate in, to go to the Development Corporation, sit down and discuss their idea, and there might be equity contributions from the Development Corporation for young people who has that idea to get them off the ground, and to provide them with some money to start new businesses. So in the very area that the hon. member just mentioned - I do not know if he read the Budget Speech or has listened to what is going on around the Province - there is in place right now a brand new Youth Entrepreneurship Programme to respond directly to that particular recommendation by Dr. House in his report, Mr. Speaker.

So we are responding directly to what the Royal Commission said. There is today in existence in Newfoundland a Youth Entrepreneurship Programme. Additionally, we are revolutizing post-secondary institutions to make them more responsive and provide more counselling, more training, Mr. Speaker, than ever before in the history of the Province. On the short term we are bringing in the programmes through parks, through Fisheries, through Rural Development, and on our private sector programme, 40 per cent youth must be hired. So we are responding on all fronts, Mr. Speaker, to youth unemployment.

I would ask the hon. member would he please, if he is that interested in youth getting

involved in business, sit down with the Development Corporation and understand that new Youth Entrepreneurship Programme which has been launched as of April 1 this year.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Premier. One of the problems with youth unemployment relates to training, and I talk about the trades especially, Mr. Speaker, for example, where an apprentice carpenter cannot become a journeyman because he cannot get his work experience, a navigator cannot get sea time.

I ask the Premier, what solutions is he offering so that young people can finish their trades rather than remain apprentices all their lives? Surely the Premier realizes we have enough unemployed apprentices in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I was very proud yesterday to see some of the people that the hon. member mentioned, apprentices and the like, on the Come By Chance site working. There are 420 or 430 out there -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
- and 98 or 99 per cent of them are Newfoundlanders, a lot of them in the apprentice field. As a

matter, in a certain component of that refinery which was supposed to be torn down, that Liberal white elephant which has now become a P.C. success, they have developed a number of innovative ways to do things out there which otherwise would have cost the company a lot of money, and a lot of good, young Newfoundlanders are working. What we have to do is create more opportunities like that in the Province. There is a responsibility upon the government and upon the private sector and the society as a whole to create more and more opportunities so that they will have the work experience, so they can get on to their next stage, journeyman and so on. That is what we have to do. That is we are doing. We are doing it in St. Lawrence. We are doing it in Baie Verte. We have done it with the Kruger mill in Corner Brook which Bowaters were supposed to close down. We are doing it all over. We are doing it at Hope Brook. There are young Newfoundlanders who have trades who are working there. Now we have got to do it with small and medium sized business, Mr. Speaker, through the Youth Entrepreneur Programme or whatever.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are responding to that problem, and it is a response of creating more opportunity so that there therefore those opportunities are available for those young people to become more than just apprentices in their trade.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, a supplementary.

MR. DECKER:

He says it all with a straight face which 18,000 youth are still unemployed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

The hon. Premier reminded the member for Windsor - Buchans that he did not go to the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands for jobs for his constituents. I ask the Premier, in the future should applications made by the youth of this Province for government jobs be accompanied by a letter from the MHA, and if the sitting MHA happened to be a Liberal, does the Premier think the applicant would actually have a good chance of getting that job, or would he suggest that he go to another MHA?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker. To respond, the hon. member has now changed in his supplementary to another issue rather than the one he started his original with because the response on the original was too good to suit him, and he could not continue so he had to go to another issue. That is fine. I will take him on on this issue too, even though it is really irrelevant and out of order for a supplementary to be on another subject. But, Mr. Speaker, just let me respond to the hon. gentleman just the same. What I said was if the hon. member was doing his work as a representative of Windsor - Buchans, he would be out to all of the communities with letters and with his own personal representation physically to ensure that the young people out there knew the avenues through which they could quite possibly

and quite probably find jobs and have applications in to all of the various agencies which are going to be creating youth employment this Summer, Mr. Speaker. That is what I am saying, that the member himself has a responsibility, as does the hon. member from the Great Northern Peninsula, as a member of this House to make representation and to push for people from his district to be hired and to get as many jobs as he can get, not that it is necessary for a politician to have his name attached to any youth application on any programme. But we all understand in this House that if we are here as members representing a constituency we must represent the youth as well the aged, we must represent all, and therefore the lack of representation by the hon. member tells me something, that the hon. member is speaking in a very hollow way. One would think that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands would have been deluged with letters from the member for Windsor - Buchans supporting job activities in his constituency for the Summer so that youth could get jobs. One would think that that is a legitimate role for a member of the House of Assembly to play and I am sorry to think that there are members who are not taking that kind of initiative.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. FLIGHT:  
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker, Hansard will show that in answering my third question the Premier accused me of creating situations in my district and then turning them into a political football. So I would just like, Mr. Speaker, to set the record straight.

Number one, I would tell the Premier that at least a week and a half ago, I called the deputy minister -

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
That was a week and a half ago.

MR. FLIGHT:  
A week and a half ago, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker, I called the Deputy Minister of Recreation and tried to head off the kind of situation that we have in Badger. Does the Premier want the number of letters that I have written on behalf of the constituents delivered to his office today and a list of the phone calls made?

But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, and to the point, having watched this hon. crowd and watched this honourable ministry perform, every time that I have had a constituent from Windsor - Buchans, whom I represent in this House of Assembly, ask me to support his application for a job, I had to make a judgment, Mr. Speaker, whether or not my supporting him would hurt his chances of getting that job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I have seen evidence that indeed it would.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To the point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The hon. member demonstrates his ignorance of the rules of this House under the guise of a point of order. To get up to make a statement like that is not a point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members, as the hon. Speaker no doubt will rule in a few minutes. In the same way, Mr. Speaker, under the guise of the House of Assembly, he gets up to make a political statement about the lack of jobs for youth in his district when he has not done his work in the first instance. The two of them are very similar.

The hon. member, at least, is very consistent in the way he approaches things. He does nothing. A week and a half ago! A week and a half ago! Does not everybody know that a budget comes down in March, and that during the Winter the hon. member should have been doing his work. Once again the hon. member is showing that he is doing things under a guise for politics which he should be doing legitimately as a member.

MR. SIMMONS:

Let me speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) wants to make a brief comment, I would hear it.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do. I hesitate to rise given the obvious frame of mind and temperament of the Premier today. He seems to be under the same kind of strain he was under 4:44 that morning when he was writing that Sprung statement. I do not want to do anything to aggravate his condition. But, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

- I rose to make a very particular point which the House needs to have its attention drawn to. The Acting Premier yesterday gave the assurance to the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) that the applications were being considered under merit by people within the department, and that there was no political interference. The Premier, in an unfortunate move for him, slipped in accusing my friend for not writing the minister. He has, by implication, told the House that the way to get the jobs is not the way the minister said yesterday at all, but to cozy up to the minister, to play politics.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they both cannot be right. I suspect the Premier inadvertently told the truth today when he admitted it is all one great big political boondoggle.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr.

Speaker.

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier. A brief comment by the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Number one, I know the in-House Leader of the Liberal Party had to get up to try to defend his member who has done a terrible job on Question Period.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I know and understand that. That is part of the game.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, in response to the specious point of order raised by the member for Windsor - Buchans that in Red Bay - where is Red Bay? Is that in a PC district or a Tory district? It is in a Liberal district, and twenty-six of the thirty-two jobs that are going to be created there under the programme that we have announced for Red Bay are coming from the community of Red Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, Red Bay is where they are coming from. So that just demolishes anything that is left to the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I think I let that point of order develop too long. There is obviously no point of order.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of some forty people from the Bay St. George area. It is just a further addition, Mr. Speaker, to the number of petitions that we have been sent from all around the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador because of the recent cutbacks in the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, we want to tell the present administration very clearly that as long as it takes us on this side of this House to stand to our feet and try to beat the message into their so-called thick heads, we are going to do it. If it takes six days, six months or six years, Mr. Speaker, whatever it takes, the Opposition is going to keep sending the message until someone on that side, someone with some caring, someone with some responsibility for the Department of Social Services listens, Mr. Speaker, and changes some of the crazy and the stupid statements that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) has recently made, along with the recent cutbacks in the Department of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, while the Premier is in this House of Assembly, I would like to make a couple of points. One of them is that I am very disappointed. I have heard it very clearly around the districts and around St. John's, all the



people you are talking to are also disappointed that the Premier would allow the Minister of Social Services to go up to the conference on Social Services in Nova Scotia just recently, or just Monday, and represent this Province. What we find very strange is that the Premier would allow the Minister of Social Service to go and represent this Province as Minister of Social Services where he will be presenting his views, and we say his views because, obviously, it is not the view of the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), it is not the view of the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), and it is not the view of the rest of the Cabinet, it is his own personal view that he is going to be presenting to those people.

We are wondering, Mr. Speaker - I am sure we have not got to wonder too long - what kind of an impression the Minister of Social Services is going to leave with the rest of the ministers who are at that particular conference in Nova Scotia. If he even repeats in any way whatsoever just part of the statement that he made in this House of Assembly last week and many, many times since the House of Assembly, over the weekend to the news media and privately, we are going to find it very strange that the Premier of this Province can hold his head up when talking to anybody outside of this House of Assembly when it comes to the parents of the children of this Province, not only the women, but when we say parents we should remember there are a lot of single parents, male and female, who have to use the day care services in this Province, or the little day care services that are there for them.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to the petition and the number of people that has been laid off, there is now some talk and some fears among some other areas in the Department of Social Services, some of the district offices and the regional offices, that there may even possibly be some further cutbacks. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is something nobody in this Province can tolerate, any further cutbacks. We cannot even tolerate or begin to tolerate the recent cutbacks.

Mr. Speaker, what we have to do is everybody in this Province has to send a message very loud and clear that we are not satisfied with the little amounts of money that the Minister of Social Services and his department are placing into the day care system; we are not satisfied especially - we are not satisfied in the urban areas - but especially, Mr. Speaker, we are not satisfied in rural Newfoundland because that is where, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Social Services is really falling down on the job. Those thirty-five jobs that were just recently cutback are having a great effect on the Social Services Department throughout the Province and especially in rural Newfoundland. Child care is really falling down.

I was just talking to a social service worker in the Department in my area the other day and she was telling me there is absolutely no way, Mr. Speaker, she can handle her case load. There is no way she can give the necessary service she is supposed to do in performing her job as social worker. Now what it is doing, Mr. Speaker, is putting a strain on those people. When anybody has a strain and has an overloaded case

load while trying to perform their duties that they were so clearly trained to do, what we are going to see is total frustration and confusion set in. We are going to see those people, number one, not able to perform their job in the way they should. They are going to be so confused and frustrated, you are going to see good, qualified people leave the Department of Social Services and seek other employment.

Mr. Speaker, we have to keep sending this message across to the Premier and across to the Cabinet Ministers on the other side because there is no alternative. There is definitely a major problem in the Department of Social Services, and the minister very clearly last Wednesday, Thursday and Friday and all weekend, he has told us very clearly where the problem lies. It is very, very clear that the Minister of Social Services is not competent in carrying out his duties as Minister of Social Services, and, in fact, as any minister. He could not take any portfolio.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:  
In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we know of no other answer to the problem only to keep putting pressure on the Premier of this Province and the Cabinet Ministers to immediately, not tomorrow, not next week, Mr. Speaker, but immediately ask the Minister of Social Services for his resignation.

Thank you.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague from the Port de Grave district (Mr. Efford) and I appreciate his comments on the petition. He puts them very well when he talks about the situation that lies out there in the Province for the people who are under the Department of Social Services, who get services from this department, who are the people who live day by day trying to improve themselves and to make a living, and who have to rely on the government's heart, Mr. Speaker, for a way of living and for a better way of living.

It is a sad statement, Mr. Speaker, because these people who have to rely on government funding and government money for a way of living are now seeing this government money or this government conscience or government incentive or government funding being cut back by several hundred thousand dollars in the department with the laying off of 35 people.

We see this going on, Mr. Speaker, while we see other tremendous amounts of money being spent in other areas where the priority, we feel, and I feel, does not lie. Where they should be addressing the problem, they do not seem to be bothered with it.

As you can see today, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's response to youth unemployment questions indicates the response of the provincial government to social issues in

this Province. We see in the area that I represent, specifically the Bay St. George-Port au Port area, there is a cycle of welfare that has been created over the last ten years where many of the children who are raised in that cycle have not been able to break out because of the lack of employment opportunities. From the Premier's response today on youth unemployment, we can see that that cycle obviously will be allowed to continue. We can also see, since they are going to cut back thirty-five more positions, we can see that even the people who have to survive on social assistance and who have to survive on the Department of Social Services are going to have to survive with less.

So we can see that this government is really moving ahead in dramatic steps to solve the problem, Mr. Speaker. I do not even know why we are getting up presenting petitions because everything is honky dory out there, Mr. Speaker. There is no problem at all! I do not even know why people are sending them to me to tell the truth because obviously there is not a problem. We are spending \$111 million and that is solving everything. I can see that. There is no problem whatsoever! There is only about twenty years or ten years of a cycle of people being brought up in a welfare cycle and are never going to get out of it, but that is not a problem. That is okay! We are spending this amount of money here and that amount of money there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

So we are spending this amount of money and that solves the problem.

Well, cutting thirty-five positions does not solve the problem, Mr. Speaker. It takes away from solving the problem. We are trying to get the message across to the other side that they should reassess the issue, reassess what they have done, and put those people back in there.

MR. WARREN:

Will you resign your seat for the new Leader?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

If I ever leave my seat, I will do it willingly, not be booted out on my behind, by the way. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that this government should get the message.

MR. TOBIN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if I heard the gentleman correctly. Did he say that the people on social assistance are in a cycle and they never get out of it? If he did, he should apologize to the families that are on social assistance. Hansard will show what he said.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. BAIRD:  
Apologize!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Get the Hansard, gentlemen.

MR. MORGAN:  
Let us send out the Hansard to all the households in Stephenville showing what he said today in the House.

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the yahoos on the back over there can do what they want. I have not got a problem with that. I am going to continue to bring to this House the issue of the laying off of people in an area where they are needed more. If this government wants to make a joke about it, then go ahead because they are making a joke about everything else.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I would like to support the petition asking for improved services under the Department of Social Services.

In that regard, we have this year increased the budget of the Department of Social Services from \$104 million last year to \$111 million this year. In other words, we are going to spend \$7 million more this year in the Department of Social Services than we spent last year. So, instead of cutting back, we are improving

the situation.

If you look at Group Homes, Mr. Speaker, last year we spent \$597,000, almost \$600,000. This year we are spending \$857,000, Mr. Speaker. We are improving the situation as it relates to social services all over the Province. Down through all of the budget areas, if the hon. member wishes to look at them, he will see in the area of mental retardation, from \$366,000 to \$418,000. In all that area we are doing more. In Special Child Care Allowances, we are doing more; Independent Living Services, we are doing more.

MR. TULK:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, we have been presenting petitions in this House for quite a while about those thirty-five layoffs. I just understood the First Minister of this Province, the Premier, to stand in his place and say that he supports the petition concerning the thirty-five layoffs and asking to have them reinstated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
He supports the petition. Does this now mean that we can stop presenting those petitions and that the Premier has agreed that if he will not himself reinstate the positions, he will take this petition back to Cabinet with his full support asking that Cabinet reinstate those thirty-five social

workers or are we just hearing the Premier get up and guff off about what is in the Social Services Estimates?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I support, as I said at the beginning of my speech in response to the petition, the principle of improved services through the Department of Social Services to the people of this Province, which underlines the whole principle of the petition presented by the hon. member.

I was just trying to indicate to members opposite that almost in every area of Social Services, right from Social Assistance right through to Work Activity Projects to get people off the welfare roles and into the work force, we are increasing our budget to these people and therefore trying to provide a better service and more money to these people so that we can get on with doing the kinds of things that the hon. member mentioned in the body of his remarks supporting the petition.

He talked about Community Development Projects, where we have another \$20 million this year. Employment enhancement initiatives, if that is not what the hon. member was talking about, I would like to know what it was. This is what we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, throughout all of the programmes that are in the Department of Social Services.

Even in family counselling services, which the hon. member is talking about, for individuals and families out there who might need some assistance and counselling services to help them, we are doing it, Mr. Speaker. Transition Houses: As we mentioned today in Question Period, throughout the whole budget there is \$7 million to do the kind of things that the hon. member wants done.

MR. TULK:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Fogo on a point of order.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the Premier in his listing of the social services estimates but the petition is very clear, I say to the Premier. I want to read to him Standing Order 92 of this Legislature, "Every member offering a petition" - and obviously those supporting it - "to the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegations it contains."

The material allegations contained in this petition is that the people of Bay St. George are asking that the thirty-five positions be reinstated. They are asking that the Department of Social Services reinstate them. Now, the Premier has said that he supports it. Will he tell us why he supports it? Will he tell us what he is going to do as a result of that support? And will he indeed take this to Cabinet and ask -

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, he cannot be asking

questions.

MR. TULK:

I am asking him to qualify his support.

Will he qualify his support and tell us that we do not need to put any more of those petitions on the table of the House?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier to the point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What the hon. member is really saying now is that his colleague who presented the petition was out of order. Because when the hon. member presented the petition, he got into the whole field of social services in the body of his remarks. Therefore, if the hon. member is going to be consistent in his point of order, he should have gotten up earlier and called attention to the fact that his member was out of order because he was not dealing with the specific principle of the petition but rather straying into all fields of social services. Given that there was no point of order, given that the hon. member was not brought to attention by the Chair, I took it upon myself to respond to the body of the hon. member's remarks in his support of the petition, indicating that I supported in principal improved services to social services.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. It is very difficult to keep any hon. member strictly to the exact wording of the petition. I must rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the Premier's time has now elapsed.

### Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

This is Private Member's Day. I call on the hon. the member for St. Barbe, who has twelve minutes left.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Before I get into my general comments about this particular resolution, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very wise to refresh hon. members' memories on all sides of this House to what the Minister of Social Services said in his opening remarks a week ago today, just after the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition took his seat. Here is what the hon. the Minister of Social Services said, and I am quoting verbatim, Page L2889: "But I can assure the hon. member" - meaning the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) - "that if tomorrow he would read back in Hansard what he said today on this motion, he would be ashamed of himself, because nothing that he said was constructive and nothing that he said was intelligent." Mr. Speaker, how a week can change the colour of somebody's commentary. Let us look at what the Minister of Social Services said in the aftermath a week ago that was constructive and intelligent. It is also worthy to note, as we saw here again today, that when the Premier or his administration gets in trouble they do one of three things: They distract, they

divert, or they mythologize. They distract by throwing numbers across this way; they are champions of the women's movement by marching out statistics which are supposed to make them heroes. They divert, Mr. Speaker, as we saw the Premier do on public television the other night, or they mythologize. Now, what is the myth they have created ever since this minister stood in his place to speak on this very important, very sensitive issue which affects a great number of our people, Mr. Speaker? What was the myth they created? Here is the myth they created: They said the minister was not speaking as the minister. Now, just imagine! The minister was not speaking as the minister. Well, he was speaking as one of three things, Mr. Speaker: He was either speaking as a private citizen, which he could have done any time outside this Chamber, he was speaking as a private member, which he could have done any time inside this Chamber, or Mr. Speaker, he was speaking in his place, I submit, as the Minister of Social Services responsible for day care in this Province.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the evidence is quite clear that not my words, not any words of the other fifty members in this Chamber, but the words of the Minister of Social Services are what will show, Mr. Speaker, clearly to everyone in this Chamber, to every member on all sides, from all three parties, that it was the Minister of Social Services who uttered those devastating comments of a week ago which put a scar across the face of this government that will take quite a few stitches to patch up.

What did he say? He said on page

L2891, and I quote verbatim, "As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Social Services, I understand...", and he goes on. Where else did he speak as the Minister of Social Services, Mr. Speaker? If you turn to his words on R2892, and I quote verbatim again, "So, Mr. Speaker, as one minister in Canada who is responsible for child care...", and he goes on and on. Again, Mr. Speaker, where does he speak as Minister of Social Services? L2893, and I quote verbatim, "I happen to believe that not only as the Minister of Social Services...", and on he goes, Mr. Speaker. Again on page R2893, Mr. Speaker, I quote verbatim, "So I guess the choice we have to make as a government and I have to make as Minister of Social Services is, from whom do I take it?"

Mr. Speaker, on four separate occasions the record is very clear. There are no more excuses. It cannot be made any more crystal clear, Mr. Speaker, than the four instances quoted, not by any of the other fifty-one members in this Chamber but by the minister in his capacity as minister, and he states it on the record on four separate occasions, 'I am speaking as the minister. I am on the record as the minister. I speak for this government as the minister.' Can it be any clearer? It cannot, Mr. Speaker.

So let us be quite honest and up front and straightforward on all sides of this Chamber. Let us not create myths that he was speaking as a private person. He could have done that outside the Chamber. Let us not distract and divert by saying that he was speaking as a private member. He, himself, says he was not.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that he was speaking as the Minister of Social Services for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, what did he say as the Minister Responsible for Social Services in this Province of ours? He said some things that made the Minister Responsible for the Status of Women very uncomfortable, Mr. Speaker. He said some things that the Minister of Justice, who is in her own right a great champion of women's rights, very uncomfortable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

And he said something, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier has been ducking and dodging for five days now. But, Mr. Speaker, this government has to own up to what this minister said. Now what did he say?

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, there are several points to be made while I am up on a point of order: One is that the gentleman is being tedious and boring, which I think somewhere in our rules is contrary to our rules, but, most importantly, he is, I believe, misconstruing the minister's remarks.

Now, it is true that you can point to isolated phrases that if lifted out of context would make what the minister said look not in keeping with the spirit of the rest of this side of the House. However, if you take the remarks in total and look upon them half sensibly and discount the disturbance that the member for Fogo interposed in the middle of it, then I think you will see that they were fairly well-reasoned, and a well-reasoned argument was trying to be put forward.

Just as importantly, it is now five minutes after four. This is Wednesday. After four o'clock we are not required to listen to an interminable debate, and I think the member should mend his remarks accordingly. I think it is intolerable. It is not fair.

Now, the one point that should be made is that the hon. member is saying far more about himself than he is saying about the Minister of Social Services, far more!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for raising the issue of context. How does one take the words from that minister out of context? You tell me how to take this out of context, Mr. Speaker, and I quote verbatim: "So, Mr. Speaker, as one minister in Canada who is responsible for child care I want to go on record as saying that I wish we had more conscientious mothers, more people who would be willing to sacrifice their careers, stay home and raise their children."



How do you take that out of context? It gives rise to the logical question, Mr. Speaker. This statement implies that mothers who work, who are forced out of their homes to work, widows and widowers who are forced to work are not conscientious. Mr. Speaker, that is outrageous, ludicrous and demands an apology from this minister without any more waste of time, without any more diversion, distraction, or mythologizing. This minister is clear, the context is clear, it could not be any clearer. What else did he say, Mr. Speaker? He went on to say, and I quote: "Our correctional centres in Newfoundland today are full. They are bursting at the seams. I assume people get married, make a conscious decision to have a family, I sometimes wonder if we would not have as many people in our correctional centres if these people continued on with a conscientious decision to stay home and raise their children."

Now, Mr. Speaker, logically what the minister is saying is that if the mother or father are not home with the children and these children are forced out into day care centres, these children are on the path to prison. There is no other way to interpret that.

Sorry, guys, that is the way it is, that is what the record says, those are the ministers words, and it cannot be diverted, distracted or mythologized any more. Mr. Speaker, these words are so insidious and cast such a slur across the working community of mothers and fathers in this Province who choose to send their children to day care, these words of that minister have put this government in such an embarrassing situation, the minister

responsible for the Status of Women so embarrassed, the Minister of Justice so embarrassed, the Premier so embarrassed, that I am going to now move an amendment to relieve them of their embarrassment, and I move that the resolution tabled last Wednesday be further amended by adding the following:

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that because of the refusal of the minister to retract or apologize for the statements made by him in this House on June 3, 1987, this House repudiate the Minister's statements -

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the hon. gentleman had exactly twelve minutes to speak. He has already gone nearly fifteen minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. member's time is not up yet.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying, and I shall repeat for the benefit of those people who choose to interrupt:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that because of the refusal of the minister to retract or apologize for the statements made by him in this House on June 3, 1987, this House repudiate the Minister's statements, apologize to the

working parents concerned and their children and request the Minister to resign.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

I would not mind, Mr. Speaker, if there were not ample opportunity for this minister to crawl out -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. FUREY:

By leave to conclude?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave. No leave.

MR. FUREY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that there is an amendment already being debated. The hon. member is bringing in a sub-amendment, and the first thing that has to be decided by the Chair is whether the sub-amendment is in order. We have not had that decision yet.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I was saying, in conclusion, that a lot of people across this Province including the Status of Women, the Nurses Union,

the Federation of Labour, parents and concerned people everywhere not just in the political realm, not in this arena but out there in the everyday street life, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing people who are very, very upset, and we are saying that this minister has had a full week to apologize publicly, to retract those awful remarks.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Is the hon. member speaking to that point of order?

MR. FUREY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, he is in a situation where he has to resign. It is as simple as that.

DR. COLLINS:

Further to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, on page 155 of my edition of Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, Section 438 (1), it says here: "The purpose of a sub-amendment" - and this is what we are dealing with now - "is to alter the amendment; it should not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment but it should deal with matters that are not covered by the amendment; if it is intended to bring up matters foreign to the amendment, the Member should wait until the amendment is disposed of and move a new amendment."

Now, Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the wording of this sub-amendment is that it deals with matters that are not in any way related either to the main question or to the amendment that was brought in by the Leader of

the Opposition, if my memory serves me correctly. So I move that this sub-amendment is out of order. If the hon. member had the right to speak again, which he does not at the moment, he could bring in another amendment after this amendment has been dealt with.

MR. TULK:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman quotes Section 438 of Beauchesne, page 155, and he uses as his argument that the sub-amendment should not bring up matters foreign to the amendment. Mr. Speaker, anybody who believes that the words of the minister and, indeed, the amendment itself are contrary to the demand for good day care services in this Province, which is a principle of this bill, is just looking for an argument that is completely out of order. The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the effects of the words of the minister, and the absence of an apology from the minister, upon day care in this Province speaks right to the principle of the private member's bill that was introduced - and, indeed, the amendment - by the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons). Mr. Speaker, I would go on and say to the hon. gentleman that we are looking at a situation here where two amendments can be proposed at the same time to a question, as is defined in Section 438 (2): "A sub-amendment must attempt to explain the substance of the amendment and may not substitute an entirely new proposal." This is not an entirely new proposal, Mr. Speaker, and it does speak to

the substance of the amendment that has been put forward, because the minister's actions and the minister's lack of action in not apologizing does indeed take away from the effectiveness of the day care system, and that is exactly what the principle of the main motion and the amendment is and, I would submit to Your Honour that it is perfectly in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before ruling on that point of order I will recess the House for a couple of minutes and review the sub-amendment.

### Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To the point of order raised by the hon. the Minister of Finance, the sub-amendment is in order. We will now debate the sub-amendment, the amendment and the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Just a point of clarification, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of clarification, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

My understanding now is that a sub-amendment essentially brings a whole new question before the House, so that anyone who has spoken before has the right to speak again on this new question.

MR. TULK:

No, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, if we were dealing with a

piece of legislation that was before the House, say a Finance Bill or something like that, a government bill or a government motion, that would be the case. As I understand it in this particular case, on a private member's motion I think the same rule would apply to a subamendment as it has been ruled applies to an amendment, and in the case of an amendment the rule has been in this Legislature that you cannot speak again if you have spoken on the main motion. So, I would submit to Your Honour that the Minister of Finance is wrong when he states that -

DR. COLLINS:

Can cite a precedent for that?

MR. TULK:

I think the precedent was established perhaps two years ago.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, any hon. member can speak to the main motion only at one particular time, and the sub-amendment would be regarded as part of the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of personal privilege. Inasmuch as I understand the rules, it is necessary to rise at

the earliest opportunity and this is the earliest opportunity to raise a point which relates to our debate in the House yesterday afternoon. I have just been reading the Hansard of yesterday and I would refer the Speaker to page 3074 which carries the debate, and at the top of the page, at the end of the debate by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), the Chairman said, "The hon. the member's time has elapsed." Then Hansard records the Chairman saying, "On motion, clauses 6 and 7 carried."

I am appealing to the Chair that our privileges were breached and I would refer the Speaker to Beauchesne, Section 766, in which it says: 'The clauses of a bill in committee must be considered in their proper order; that is, beginning with Clause 1 then taking up Clause 2 and so on, to the end of the bill. The Chairman usually calls out the number of each clause and reads the marginal note; he may read the clause at length if it is demanded by the committee. Each clause is a distinct question and must be separately discussed.'

My argument, Mr. Speaker, is that according to the transcript in Hansard the Chairman was incorrectly proceeding through the clauses under debate in Committee yesterday and my appeal to the Chair is that if the Speaker can take this under advisement, once we come back to this matter, presumably tomorrow, once the bill is recalled, that we would revert back to Clause 7, which we were not given an opportunity to discuss. That is my case, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of

privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of privilege, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

If I understand the hon. member correctly, he is referring to this section here where it says: 'Mr. Chairman: The hon. the member's time has elapsed. On motion, Clauses 6 and 7 carried.' Now, if I understand the hon. member correctly, he is saying that the Chairman said 'Clauses 6 and 7', and so and so and so forth. But I do not believe that is what it reads at all. In many places in Hansard there is a sort of an abbreviation put in and if something is carried that is all it says, 'On motion, Clauses 6 and 7 carried.' It does not mean that is what the Chairman said, it just says that those were the motions that were put forward and they were carried. That is the way Hansard records those.

I suggest, and if I remember correctly, this was the case: I think the Chairman said, 'Clause 6, carried. Clause 7, carried.' Then the hon. member got up and said, 'I want to speak to Clause 7, and Your Honour has subsequently ruled that Clause 7 was already carried.' But the Chairman of Committees did not say, Clauses 6 and 7 carried. He said the two separately, and that is just the way it is recorded, in a sort of an abbreviated way in Hansard. If you look through Hansard, in any number of places, you will find that is the way Hansard does things.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think Hansard will record that I rose shortly after that to point out, as the Minister of Finance said, that that is exactly what did happen. Clause 6 carried. Then Clause 7 carried.

The Minister of Finance is quite correct in saying that is the way it is recorded in Hansard, but if the tape itself were listened to, you would see quite clearly that Clause 6 was carried and Clause 7 carried. When the hon. member got up to speak, we were into Clause 8. That was the way it was and that is that. Although the written version of Hansard may not support it, certainly the taped version of Hansard will.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will have to review Hansard before I make a ruling on that point of privilege.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Another day, Mr. Speaker, I will wear a bright colour so you will not have any trouble noticing me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this discussion about public child care in our Province. The motion before us, made by my colleague, the member for St. John's East Extern, is extremely well worded. It is concise, but it captures the essence of the necessity of more supports for parents in this Province for the care of their young children. It refers to two

recent studies: There are others that I will get into later. It says, in its second recital, that the Province has demonstrated a considerable commitment, within its limited fiscal capacity, to improving child care resources. It goes on to call on all members of the House to unite in urging the federal government, in its imminent new national child care funding policy, to give a higher ratio of cost-sharing to poorer provinces, provinces such as Newfoundland and Labrador, so that we can continue to expand our publicly funded child care services, our supports for parents for the care of their young children.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the three elements of this motion one by one. First, the need for more accessible quality child care: Mr. Speaker, this is a need for the sake of young children. It is a need for the sake of families. Particularly, it is a need for the sake of mothers, not that mothers are any more indispensable than fathers to the care and upbringing of young children, but the practical reality of our society is that most of the burden of looking after young children rests with mothers, rightly or wrongly, and most of our growing number of single parent families are mother led. So the need for better supports for parents caring for their young children is critical for the sake of children, for the sake of families as a whole, and especially for the sake of mothers.

Mr. Speaker, the early years of life are the most important for learning and for development. This is a fact that has been demonstrated by several important psychological studies. It is

thoroughly documented in research. I will refer to some of the studies, longitudinal studies of children who have participated. By age five the brain has reached 90 per cent of its adult weight and half the final intellectual growth of the child has been achieved, according to a study by Brierley in 1980.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the minister. I find her views quite interesting. I do so strictly for parliamentary reasons, because I submit she is quite out of order now. If, Mr. Speaker, you refer to Beauchesne paragraph 304 (9), which is on page 100 in the Fifth Edition, it reads in part: "After an amendment has been moved, the question on the amendment is proposed, and any member who speaks after that question has been proposed speaks to it and not to the main question..."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister's views on day care are interesting, but they relate to the main question which was put down by the gentleman for St. John's East Extern. What the House would now like to know, and the member for St. Barbe would particularly like to know, is what the minister's views are on the sub-amendment which is now before the House. That sub-amendment relates, Mr. Speaker, to the refusal of the minister to retract or apologize for the statements made, that this

House repudiate those statements, extend an apology to the working parents concerned and request the minister's resignation.

Now, I understand that the minister in rising to speak to this sub-amendment as opposed to waiting for the main question to be called now wants to speak to the sub-amendment. I would suggest to the Chair that she be directed, therefore, to confine her remarks to the sub-amendment, to give the House the benefit of her views on the important subjects addressed in the sub-amendment, as she is directed to do by Beauchesne, paragraph 304, sub-paragraph (9), as I have read, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I raised a point of clarification a little while ago as to the speaking on a sub-amendment and it was ruled that we go by precedent. When the point was brought up by the House Leader opposite, I asked him for a reference. He said, 'There is no such reference. We go by precedent.' Now, Mr. Speaker, they cannot have it both ways. They cannot go by precedent when they want a ruling one way and then, when they want to counter something being done on this side, say, 'Well, now, okay, we will throw all that out. Now we will go back to Beauchesne and go strictly by Beauchesne.'

If we are going to have the precedent that the sub-amendment,

the amendment and the main question are all wrapped up into one on Private Members' Day in the debate, well, when the minister speaks, she has every right to speak to all aspects of what is placed before the floor at any time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, it has been the practice in this House to debate both the amendment and the main question together.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I might say that this is my one opportunity to participate in this discussion, and what I believe to be important to the people I represent in this House of Assembly are the issues of child care, and opportunities and rights of working mothers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to use the time allotted to me to address those issues, and I refuse to get distracted into a gutter-level discussion of personalities. What I am here to do is represent the interests of my constituents, and others in the Province, when it comes to concerns about good care for young children and supports of parents of young children.

Mr. Speaker, what I was saying when I was interrupted was that research has shown that the early years, the years from birth to age five, are the most important in a person's intellectual development. Further, Mr. Speaker, it has been shown by

research that preschool programmes, early childhood education programmes, nursery school programmes, play school programmes, a variety of care arrangements for young children at this critical stage, with care provided by care givers other than parents, and there are lots of models, when done well, when well planned, have substantial and consistent long-term benefits for the children related to their school success, related to their job opportunities and related to their self image. The research shows a firm link between the early years and later development.

Mr. Speaker, it has been shown that these kinds of quality care programmes for young children can benefit all kinds of children, no matter what the home circumstances are. No matter whether there are two parents at home full-time, one parent at home full-time, only one parent in the home setting, all children stand to benefit from good quality care programmes, with care givers other than parents.

But, Mr. Speaker, the research is clear in pointing out that there is a special benefit to children from disadvantaged homes, who have disadvantaged backgrounds, and there are many reasons for disadvantages. There are those around who refer to some mythical good old days when mom was there full-time. I think it is a myth that moms ever devoted themselves full-time and exclusively to the care of their children. In the good old days, there were large households; the average family size was quite great and, by and large, there were older children, there were other adult family members, if not fathers, to help mom in looking after the young children. But, Mr. Speaker, that

is changing in our Province as well as in the rest of North America.

According to the 1981 census, there was an average of only 3.8 adults in a Newfoundland and Labrador household. That compares to 4.6 people in a household in 1971, and 5 in 1961. So the average family size in this Province has decreased quite markedly, and the extended family is no longer as common as it once was; it is no longer as common to have a grandmother, grandfather, aunt, or uncle living in a household to help mom and dad raise the children.

Mr. Speaker, in our Province the divorce rate has gone up significantly, paralleling the trend elsewhere in North America. It is still lower than the North America average, but in 1981, according to the census figures again, the divorce rate in this Province was 96 per 100,000 population, whereas it had been 69 in 1975. In our Province, according to the 1982 census figures, almost 10 per cent of families with children were single parent families and the vast majority of them, Mr. Speaker, were mother-led families.

Mr. Speaker, according to the provincial perinatal programme study in 1982, 15 per cent of all live births in our Province are to adolescent mothers, many of these mothers unmarried, many who were choosing to keep their babies. So, Mr. Speaker, the demographics of this Province have been changing.

Women have been entering the paid labour force in unprecedented numbers, again mirroring the trend in the rest of North America. The Premier has referred to facts



which are in the government publication, *The Economy 1987*, showing that between 1979 and 1985 the annual average size of the labour force increased by 25,000, and of this number 21,000 are women. In other words, 84 per cent of the new entrants to the labour force in that period were women. Mr. Speaker, right now, of the total provincial paid labour force, 40 per cent are women; of the employees of this provincial government, of our provincial public service, 40 per cent are women. The average age is thirty-eight. A lot of people working for this provincial government are mothers. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are all facts pointing out why child care is critical, why supplements and supports to parents, whether they are at home or whether they are in the paid work force, are important for the sake of the children of the families, particularly for the sake of mothers.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has a deep commitment to providing these supports, to providing good care to our young children, and to allowing women to make choices for themselves so that they can do what is best for themselves as individuals, and what is best for their children and their families.

Mr. Speaker, first I will talk about what we have done for women in particular. We have established a Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and we have appointed to the Advisory Council committed feminists who are concerned first and foremost about the interests of the women of the Province. In that respect, Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that our Province is unique in the country. I do not think there is another Canadian

jurisdiction which has appointed such a strong group of advocates for women to its Advisory Council.

Mr. Speaker, we have established a permanent part of the public service called the Women's Policy Office, which is part of the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies, which is dedicated to providing for government research and analyses of public policy proposals so that we have the benefit of advice and can ensure that our policies are beneficial to women.

Mr. Speaker, we passed the matrimonial property reform legislation which had as one of its main features the equal ownership of the matrimonial home automatically, immediately during marriage, which has the effect of creating a joint tendency so that when the marriage ends through death or separation or divorce, the matrimonial home becomes the sole property of the surviving spouse.

Mr. Speaker, for our own public service, 40 per cent of whom are women, we have received a report of a Task Force on Affirmative Action for Women, which we appointed, and we are now implementing their recommendations.

We have provided collective agreement provisions for family responsibility leave. Now, each employee, man/woman, can take off up to three days a year with pay for family responsibility, to attend to a sick child, to go to school with a child, etc. We have also Labrador allowance and maternity leave provisions which provide the kind of supports I am talking about to women and men, in the case of Labrador allowance, so that they can look after their

children and also have good careers; we have a sexual harassment clause in most of our public service collective agreements; we have an accelerated management programme for women; we have an Affirmative Action Council made up of public servants.

Most significantly, Mr. Speaker, last week we opened the Province's first work place day care centre here at Confederation Complex for fifty children, children of our own employees. Mr. Speaker, this will serve as a model to other employers in the Province, public sector and private sector, and I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Workers' Compensation Board is already looking at copying the example.

Mr. Speaker, what have we done in terms of spending on child care? There has been a geometric progression of increase in spending on child care by the Department of Social Services. I have a breakdown here for the last eleven years which shows a big increase year after year after year. There was a 71 per cent increase from 1985 - 1986 to 1986 - 1987, bringing the total to \$1.3 million. This year the total is over \$1.4 million. This money is paid to day care centres for start-up, for capital requirements; this money is paid for training, and the bulk of it goes to subsidize child care spaces for children of parents who have low incomes, or children who are handicapped. Mr. Speaker, that is a huge increase.

A couple of years ago, Mr. Speaker, we began in one of our publicly funded post-secondary institutions, the Cabot Institute, the first publicly funded training programme for child care, day care

workers, and we are committed to beginning the second at Fisher College of Applied Arts and Technology in Corner Brook.

Mr. Speaker, we have all kinds of goals and policies worked out to continue to expand child care services throughout the Province. We need more staff in the Department of Social Services. We need to regionalize the services. We need child care consultants in each part of the Province. I can speak for the Corner Brook area, where there is a definite need for a social services child care consultant. We need these consultants to work with families, with community groups, with volunteer groups, with employers, to help people form parent co-ops, to help private agencies like YM-YWCA with their child care programme, to work with employers like fish plants, like FPI to develop work place child care centers.

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

The Minister of Justice just very clearly said that in the Corner Brook district office she would like to see additional social workers to work on the child care problem. That is needed not only in Corner Brook but all around the Province of Newfoundland. I am very confused. We have been presenting petitions in this House of Assembly against the cutback of thirty-five social workers.

MR. BUTT:

This is not Question Period, old boy. If you want to ask questions, you get up at another time. You are breaking the rules of the House. Sit down! You are making a fool of yourself.

MR. EFFORD:

Why did the Minister of Justice not get to her feet and support those petitions?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have already illustrated, Mr. Speaker, that this Province has been increasing funding for child care services by leaps and bounds, rates of increase completely out of proportion to the rate of increase in provincial revenues and the provincial economy. So, Mr. Speaker, clearly the answer - and this brings me to the motion - lies in increased federal funding, and in that respect we wait with anticipation for the announcement by the federal government of its new national child care funding programme. Mr. Speaker, we are urging the federal government, and I invite all members here to unite in supporting the member for St. John's East Extern's motion to have the federal government give this Province, being one of the poorest in the country in terms of few resources, a more generous cost-sharing arrangement.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

The hon. the member for the Strait

of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the Minister of Justice really and truly means what she said in that speech, which I thoroughly enjoyed, if she is not pontificating, then I ask what is she doing on that side of the House? Because she is saying exactly what we have been saying for the last seven days in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Why would she not reconsider where she should be sitting in this Chamber?

MS VERGE:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

As the member opposite said, they have only been talking about child care for the past seven days. Some of us over here have been working on it for a good ten years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

If she only had some of the vigor, if she only had some of the venom for the Minister of Social Services, who is a total disgrace to child care in this Province,

that she has for me, Mr. Speaker, then I would pat her on the back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

But, Mr. Speaker, enough of this name calling. First allow me to compliment the hon. member for St. John's East Extern for the second 'WHEREAS' in this motion which he put forward, Mr. Speaker. In the second 'WHEREAS' he refers to the Cooke Task Force on Child Care and the report of the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment.

The hon. member did not pluck this statement out of the air. He is backing up the resolution which he is putting here. Would to goodness, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Social Services would learn something from the member for St. John's East Extern. Because what does the Minister of Social Services do? He comes in this House and he says, 'Studies have proven that working mothers are the cause of child delinquency, young offenders. The jails, the reform schools, are filled with the children of working mothers.' He quotes studies. Did he table the studies? Did he give the names of the studies? No, Mr. Speaker. He plucked it totally out of his head. He misled the House. But the member for St. John's East Extern gives the names of his sources, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is bad

enough for the hon. member to accuse a member who is not here of misleading the House, I think that is bad enough, but he is saying the hon. member who is not here misled the House on the basis of his own interpretation of things, things that are not in Hansard. He is saying that certain things are in Hansard, and because of what he is saying is in Hansard, this is a misleading of the House. These things are not in Hansard. The hon. the Minister of Social Services said no such thing as the hon. member is accusing him of. It is, as I say, bad enough, but now he is saying that the minister misled the House. I think it is a tissue of misinterpretation, and it is maligning the minister who is not here to defend himself.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) quotes his sources, unlike the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) and he is doing this House a great favour by doing so. But I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he will even do the Premier a greater favour because ultimately the Premier is going to have to remove that minister who, I understand, is attending a day school center, who is attending some sort of a seminar for day schools or day care in Ontario. I am sure he is making quite a contribution to that. But the hon. member for St. John's East Extern is going to save the Premier's neck because

when, ultimately, the Minister of Social Services has to resign, then I am going to suggest to the hon. Premier that he replace him by a man who quotes his sources, who is not afraid to say what he means, and not afraid to say who he is quoting.

I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the member for St. John's East Extern would be the ideal person to replace the Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:  
Mr. Speaker, after just complimenting the hon. member, I very kindly, very gently have to say to him that in the third WHEREAS when he gets on with the foolishness about the "considerable commitment" of the Province, I would suggest, in kindness, that the hon. member just got a little bit carried away. He was just trying, I suppose, to curry a bit of favour with the Premier or with his colleagues, maybe trying to hasten the chances where he would some day get into the Cabinet, but he got a little bit carried away.

Thank goodness we saw his mistake and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was kind enough to amend that third WHEREAS, Mr. Speaker, where he replaced it. He asked that that one be removed, and I am sure the House will go along and support his amendment.

"AND BE IT RESOLVED that this House instruct the provincial government to live up to its responsibilities for child care by implementing a carefully thought out plan of action to adequately address the problem and to

strengthen its financial case in Ottawa."

Mr. Speaker, that takes all the foolish, all the political nonsense out of it, all the currying of favour out of it and it brings it right down and puts it in perspective. So I am sure the hon. member for St. John's East Extern will be quite satisfied to allow this amendment to go in there. This is not a great change. It just gives more strength to this argument which ultimately is going to have to be taken to Ottawa.

In his fourth WHEREAS, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member refers to the "willingness" of the federal government "to be responsive". I cannot say whether or not this is the actual fact or not, but I have no reason to doubt it. The member who gets up and quotes Cook and quotes the House report, I have no reason to doubt his fourth WHEREAS so I am going to give the hon. gentleman the benefit of the doubt and I too am going to say that there is a willingness on the part of the federal government to listen and possibly help us to do something about day care.

Mr. Speaker, let us, for a minute, put ourselves in the place of, let us say, the Prime Minister or in the place of Ottawa, just Ottawa, which I will put in parentheses. Here is a private members motion coming up from Newfoundland and the Premier of the Province gets up in the House and totally pulls the shores out from his Minister of Social Services. He says, 'The Minister of Social Services is spouting off with a philosophy that I do not accept.' The Premier goes far enough, Mr. Speaker, to have instructed his secretary that when she gets the

dozens and dozens and hundreds of calls that she is getting from the Status of Women, who they appointed and tried to stack with Tory members, when she gets phone calls from the concerned women and the concerned men around this Province, the Premier has instructed his secretaries to say, 'I agree with you. I disagree with what the Minister of Social Services said.'

The Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer), Mr. Speaker, gets up and he practically goes on and says the same thing. 'The Minister of Social Services is not speaking for me, I will have you to speak for me. No, he is not speaking for me. He is just spouting off.'

And then, of course, the ultimate, total insult is when the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) gets up, as she did today, and tries to wash her hands totally and says, "I am not a part."

Can you imagine Ottawa when this request comes up, if it is passed without being amended? Can you imagine what would happen if this request went up without being amended? What would they say? The Premier is saying one thing, the Minister of Justice is saying something, the hon. House Leader is saying something, and the minister of Social Services is saying something totally different.

Mr. Speaker, let us can the nonsense. Let us stop fooling ourselves. Let us stop the preposterous and foolishness here and now because the Prime Minister knows, and every single Canadian knows, that it is the Minister of Social Services who speaks for the government. When there is something to do with day care, when there is something to do with

social services, it is the Minister of Social Services who speaks, not the Minister of Justice, not the Premier, not the House Leader, it is the Minister of Social Services who speaks, Mr. Speaker.

The Cabinet is not unlike a piano keyboard. If you strike a certain key, you get one sound, and if you strike another key, you get another sound. If the thing is not totally out of tune, Mr. Speaker, as this government is, if it is not totally out of tune and you have the right person sitting at the piano, you will get some nice music coming from it. Unfortunately, that is not the case here. So let us not talk foolishness.

The hon. Minister of Social Services speaks for the government and when he stands up in his place in this House, he does not have the luxury of speaking as a individual, Mr. Speaker, he speaks for the government. And what is the government saying? What is the Peckford Administration saying? What is the Tory Administration saying to Ottawa, to the women's groups in this Province, to the parents, to the men and to the women of this Province, the Peckford Administration, the Tory Government, the administration which is presently trying to run this Province is saying, as it says in Hansard, Mr. Speaker, on L2892: "I also believe that we need more mothers." This is an absolute slur. This is not just the Minister of Social Services, this is the Peckford Administration saying, "I also believe that we need more mothers," and the tone! Hansard misses the tone, Hansard misses the venom, Hansard misses the full

impact of this slur which the Peckford Administration is placing on the mothers in this Province who have to go out and work or the ones who go out by choice. Whether they have to go out or not is totally irrelevant, Mr. Speaker.

What, Mr. Speaker, is the Peckford Administration saying? When the hon. the Minister of Social Services speaks, the Peckford Administration can wiggle all they like. They can put up the Minister of Justice, they can put up the Premier, but until they take the final step and force the Minister of Social Services to resign, they are saying, on L2892, "Our correctional centers in Newfoundland today are full. They are bursting at the seams." Why? Because mothers go out and go to work.

MR. HEARN:

He did not say that.

MR. DECKER:

That is exactly what the Peckford Administration is saying. The Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) can squirm all he likes, but as long as he sits in the same seat as the Minister of Social Services, "Our correctional centers in Newfoundland today are full. They are bursting at the seams."

MR. J. CARTER:

Lies, that is a lie.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is dead wrong.

MR. DECKER:

The hon. minister is accusing me of lying. I assume he can read the written word. The hon. Minister of Social Services speaks for the government. He is the one who speaks on social services

matters, Mr. Speaker and as long as he sits in that Cabinet, it is the Peckford Government which says that our correctional institutions are filled with the children of mothers who are working. That is what the Peckford Administration is saying, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we go up to Ottawa, if this particular motion was passed in this House and if it is not amended. It goes up with the Peckford Administration instructing its minister. They had to instruct this minister, Mr. Speaker. How, in the name of goodness, can a minister get up without following instructions?

I could see some backbencher even getting up and speaking without instructions, but I certainly could not see a minister. The minister is saying, Mr. Speaker, in R2892, that, "As one minister in Canada," and, of course, when he says as one minister in Canada, he is committing his government.

Let us enlarge on it. As one government in Canada, Mr. Speaker. So the word is going out to Ottawa, the word is going out to all the world, that Newfoundland believes that the place for the mother is in the kitchen, that the place for women is in the kitchen, Mr. Speaker, as my colleague said, barefoot and pregnant. Let us put an apron on her, Mr. Speaker, let us give her the scrubbing tub, let us give her the scrubbing brush, and let us give her the mop. This is what they are saying.

Mr. Speaker, what else would you expect them to say? There were

supposedly a lot of surprised people in Newfoundland and in Canada because the Minister of Social Services made this statement. I, Mr. Speaker, was not the least bit surprised. Let me tell this hon. House that there are 35,000 people in Newfoundland who voted for the Liberal Party in the last election. They were not one bit surprised either, Mr. Speaker, because what we have here is a very clear indication of the difference between Tory philosophy and Liberal philosophy, Mr. Speaker.

Tory philosophy belongs in the 1700's. Tory philosophy belongs in the Charles Dickens novels. Tory philosophy does not belong in this latter half of the Twentieth Century, Mr. Speaker. So I was not the least bit surprised when the Minister of Social Services got up and spoke for the Premier and spoke for the Minister of Justice and spoke for the Minister Responsible for the Status of Women, and spoke for the Government House Leader, and the Minister of Education and the whole works of them, Mr. Speaker, because he was expounding Tory philosophy, and he did a good job of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not mind the hon. gentleman saying what he has to say, even though I think some

of it is quite libelous, but, on the other hand, he should be able to moderate his tone. The microphones in this House are adequate.

I realize, with the new leader in the House, he is, perhaps, showing off, trying to make an impression, hoping that in the unlikely event that the opposite party should ever form the government, sometime in the next millennium, he might be able to sleaze his way into a Cabinet post. But, Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for him to shout, and I would ask you to call him to order.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

So as not to take up my colleagues time as that would be playing into the hands of the gentleman from St. John's North, I give him notice that at the appropriate time we are going to deal with his deliberate filibustering so my colleagues cannot make their points.

MR. J. CARTER:

Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Further to that point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

I suggest that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) entertain us with a light-hearted joke.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is



no point of order.

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know what is going on in this House. We all know what is going on. We have seen it before, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I am going to say that I believe that we should support this motion as put by the hon. member now that we have dressed it up, now that we have taken the political partisanship out of it. But, if this final amendment had not been added, if it is not passed, we are going to see the government in quite a predicament.

If this motion is passed without our amendment, Mr. Speaker, here is the predicament that the government is going to find itself in: They have two choices. They either vote against this motion as presented, and keep the minister in the seat. This is the choice without this motion being amended. They can vote against the motion and keep the present Cabinet as it is or, Mr. Speaker, they have to vote for the motion and ask the Minister of Social Services to resign. That is what they must do. Now that is the way the motion stood before we came to their assistance. Mr. Speaker, we do not want ourselves to look like an absolute total bunch of fools down here if this thing goes to Ottawa.

We are saying, "AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that because of the refusal of the minister to retract or apologize for the statements made by him in the House" of Assembly, "this House repudiates the Ministers statements." If the

minister does not have the decency to stand up here and apologize himself, surely goodness, if we have any respect for this Chamber, then we are going to see that these words are not allowed to stand. So we are giving hon. members a way out, we are helping the hon. the Premier out of his dilemma because he cannot support the motion as it presently stands, before the amendment, because to support that would mean that he would go against his Minister of Social Services, so he would have to ask him to resign. But we are softening it, we are giving him a way out, Mr. Speaker. We are saying, since the minister will not resign, then the House is going to do it for him.

And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is a proper way out of this dilemma that the Minister of Social Services put the government into and, by implication, put this House into.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to start off by saying, to put the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle's (Mr. Decker) mind at ease, we will not be voting for the sub-amendment. However, Mr. Speaker, I should say to the hon. gentleman also, it was only recently they elected a new

leader. I am just wondering what is the policy of their new leader towards women's issues? As the hon. gentleman has said in the past, he is speaking over there just now for the party. Is he also speaking for his new leader?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Yes.

MR. WARREN:  
Time will tell if the new leader has changed his mind. Time will tell, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let me just begin by saying that for the last two weeks in this hon. House we were talking about day care. Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible) Tell jokes.

MR. WARREN:  
No, Mr. Speaker, I heard jokes from the hon. member last Friday night, I do not want to hear any more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:  
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker will agree, I told a marvelous joke about 12 Downing Street, but this is not the time to retell it. What I would like to talk about -

MR. PEACH:  
You would not tell it here, would you?

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, with great delight, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:  
My version of it, not the gentleman's version of it.

Mr. Speaker, on my point of order, the gentleman for Torngat has, in his usual fine Disraeli, Gladstone, Churchillian style, thrown out a challenge that we cannot pass up, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal Leader is in our presence. If he is so anxious to hear the view of the Liberal Leader, if he does not take our word that we are reflecting the Liberal Leader's view, then he can have it firsthand this very minute. All he need do is persuade his colleagues to invite the gentleman who is the Liberal Leader to come before the Bar of the House and speak to the House on women's issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:  
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:  
First of all, I submit it is not a point of order. Secondly, the gentleman from Torngat Mountains just asked the question, 'Is the speaker from the Strait of Belle Isle representing the views of his party as he indicated the Minister of Social Services was?' A very good question. He also asked, 'Is the member representing the policy of the new leader?' That is a

very good question, and the new leader will get to come in here when one of the members over there is forced to resign and he runs in his place.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

I would say to the hon. gentleman opposite that maybe after our emergency caucus meeting tomorrow night, the hon. gentleman may have his chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

I tell hon. gentlemen opposite, you do not have to cast the dice to see who is going to have to resign.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us get back to day care. In the last couple of days I took the opportunity to look for every private member's resolution that was brought into the House of Assembly since 1975. I will table them from year to year as I go through. Let us look at day care and women's issues: 1975-76 none; 1977 none; 1978 none; 1979, the last session, none. Not one private member's resolution on day care or women's issues. In 1980 there were none; 1981 none; 1982 none; 1983 none; 1984 none!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Nineteen eighty-five, yes.

MR. SIMMS:

Who?

MR. WARREN:

Milton Peach, Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

What side is Milton Peach on? Mr. Speaker, the first resolution on day care to be brought into this House was brought in by a member on the government side. Nineteen eighty-six, yes. Where? The Strait of Belle Isle? No. Try again. One more try. The socialists? No. Mr. Greening. Where is he from?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Where are the issues? Mr. Speaker, 1987, yes.

MR. HEARN:

St. John's East?

MR. WARREN:

St. John's East Extern!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

He is the member, Mr. Speaker. There are three, Mr. Speaker.

Now, what about women's issues? The hon. the member for St. John's East brought in a resolution on wife battering. That is the only resolution concerning women's issues that has been brought in here by a member on the other side in the last fifteen years.

What did our socialist friends do in the last three or four years? Did the leader of the Socialist Party bring in a resolution on day

care or on women's issues in 1986? No. He asked leave to introduce a bill to amend the Public Service Act, probably to get more money in his coffers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Menihek on a point of order.

MR. FENWICK:

At the time, if the member remembers, I introduced six different bills, one of which was on women's issues, which, as the member very conveniently forgot, were ruled out of order by Your Honour. Unfortunately, the rules do not allow for any more than one order at a time.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, what about last year? Did the Leader of the Socialist Party in this Province bring in a resolution on day care?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. WARREN:

What did he bring a resolution in on?

MR. FENWICK:

I did. I did.

MR. WARREN:

Against jobs in Labrador. That is the issue you brought in. Let me tell the hon. gentleman opposite

that never, as long as Newfoundland has been a Province of Canada, have we had a Social Services Minister more concerned about children and women in this Province than the hon. Minister is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

No one opposite can say anything different, because all any hon. member opposite has to do is advise this House of a time they called the minister and the minister never responded to them. Not once. The minister has always been available, as has his staff been available.

All of a sudden, hon. gentlemen opposite, against the wishes of their new leader, have picked on a minister for some comments he made last week. Mr. Speaker, let me tell hon. gentlemen that in Nain there is a day care centre, there are ten to fifteen children in that day care centre, and the reason why some of these children are in this day care centre is because they are looked after in a proper manner and because of family circumstances. I agree that a day care centre can play two roles. I say to hon. gentlemen, if you have the opportunity, I will take you to Nain and show you how important a role day care centres play in this Province. There are 922 seats for day care in this Province and sometimes I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether we should not increase it to 923, one for the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, there are some 50,000 children in this Province who need

day care. We would like to accommodate them all, but we just cannot do it, Mr. Speaker. Furthermore, when the amendment to this resolution was brought in today I said, when I shouted across the House, that the hon. minister, who has not been here the past two days, said last Wednesday he was not going to be here. He said last Wednesday, if you would read Hansard, that he would be out of the Province next week attending meetings concerning day care. He said that last week, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentlemen got up today in Question Period, especially the hon. member for Port de Grave, and they asked where the minister was. The minister told you where he was going to be. I suggest to hon. gentlemen, I am sure your new leader will agree that you will never get on this side of the House if you keep using the negative attitude that most of you people are using. Why do you not get up and speak about some of the good things. It is not enough, we agree. Everyone here agrees we are not doing enough, we should do more. We want to do more.

MR. FENWICK:

The problem is you have (inaudible) the same as you did.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. gentleman that he is absolutely, completely out to lunch. I should tell the hon. gentleman about the poll down in his district. I am sure I might be out of line, Mr. Speaker, but if you will bear with me, I will tell the hon. gentleman that the best thing that has happened in your district, Sir, is that the Liberals are now second, and the hon. member has gone to third because of the stand he took in Newfoundland and Labrador against jobs, against

NATO.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What else would you expect a Mainlander to do?

MR. WARREN:

Yes. What can you expect from a transplant?

MR. FENWICK:

It is better to be a transplant than (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I end my remarks to the member from Menihek.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us continue on this resolution that was so ably presented by my hon. colleague, the member for St. John's East Extern. What the resolution asks is that we call upon the federal government to give us more money to do our job better. That is why we have a federal government. I am sure hon. members opposite would agree with that, that we have a federal government, we are part of Canada, so let us get our fair share.

The amendment, Mr. Speaker, that was presented by the Leader of the Opposition states: "AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House instruct the provincial government to live up to its responsibilities." Now, the hon. Minister of Justice spoke earlier and for fifteen or twenty minutes she outlined what the provincial government is doing. The provincial government is doing everything in its power for day care, for women in the work force and on women's issues, whether it is within the public service, whether it is on various boards.

In fact, I believe for good example of looking at women's issues all you have to do is look at the community college advisory boards. Just look at the appointments to the community college advisory boards. That is a good example. On the five boards, I believe either 48 per cent or 51 per cent are women.

I believe my good friend, Mr. Neary, said many, many times 'We must criticize.' But I believe I learned a good lesson from the late Don Jamieson who said, 'Criticize, but give credit where credit is due.' I am surprised that we have members opposite - and I refer specifically to the member for the Strait of Belle Isle - who can come in here and spend twenty minutes completely - Mr. Speaker, he was against the Minister of Social Services so, therefore, he is against day care, against everything that the Department of Social Services is doing. I believe, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the hon. member, they are all led by one string and once that string breaks, we know what is going to happen. We saw it before. The dagger came out. Once the string breaks, the dagger is going to come out.

I suppose I should give a warning to your new leader. The knife may be put away, but I am sure it is not very far out of reach. They did not sell it or get rid of it altogether. It is only just put back on the back burner. I would say to the hon. gentleman that it is highly wise for you to realize that all government programmes are for the best that can be done for the people of Newfoundland of Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention

of voting for the amendment and I have no intention of voting for the sub-amendment. I believe that we are doing a tremendous job, whether or not the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) has said some things that some do not believe.

There are good day care centers and there are day care centers that are not so good. Some day care centers could work perfectly, some other day care centers may not work at all, but that is up to the staff and everything else. Let us join together. We have the children in this Province, your children and my children and our children's children. We maybe long gone, but let us try to bring in programmes that will benefit them and let us not go and pick on little picky things, like taking comments from Hansard last week, one or two little paragraphs of what the minister said from five or six pages, instead of talking about all the other things that the minister said last week. It would have been better if the Opposition would just think sometime before they jump because, Mr. Speaker, I am sure their new leader must be upset. The new leader has to be upset with the attitude of the hon. gentlemen opposite in the last week or so.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would say we are striving to better the community in which we live for the children of tomorrow.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, how members opposite, number one, can stand in their places and try and rationalize and justify the adequacy of day care centers in this Province is absolutely incredible.

The first thing that must be done in the solution of a problem is to recognize that you have one and it appears that they do not even recognize that we have one, Mr. Speaker. One of the greatest problems that we have in this Province today, both in urban and rural Newfoundland, is the lack of adequate and affordable day care centers. These are the facts, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, to recognize the problem is the first step towards its solution but, secondly, how can we get the problem solved when we have a minister who does not believe in what the resolution is asking for? Mr. Speaker, hon. members can skate around this, they can prattle and they can sabre rattle and they can do what they like, but you cannot have a minister who expresses views that are diametrically opposed to the stated views of the government. It cannot be done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

What kind of a system are we running, Mr. Speaker, in this Province? What credibility is there left in this government when

the minister can speak and they will try and digress, they will try and squirm and wiggle their way out of it to say that the minister was not speaking on behalf of the government? When does the minister speak on behalf of the government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Certainly not when he is not putting his foot in his mouth because he is doing it all the time, Mr. Speaker.

Just last year that same minister said that the high unemployment rate in this Province was because of women entering the work force. They then tried to say the same thing, that he was not speaking on behalf of the government. When is this minister speaking on behalf of the government? I think the best thing we can do with him is shut him up completely, Mr. Speaker. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier and nobody opposite can try and squirm and wiggle their way out of statements that are made by ministers by saying that they do not speak on behalf of the government. Every time a minister speaks in this House, every time that a minister speaks publicly, he speaks on behalf of government.

MR. TOBIN:

Go easy, it is going to blow up in your face.

MR. YOUNG:

There will be forty running in the next election.

MR. PATTERSON:

Forty women in the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, this minister has said something very, very injurious, very, very insulting to the working mothers of this Province and to the children of the working mothers of this Province. Yet, Mr. Speaker, they do not have the courage to even apologize. They do not even have that courage. But the time for that has long since passed. The minister could have made amends. He could have had the courage to apologize for a statement that was made in the heat of debate, for a statement that was ill-thought through, Mr. Speaker, and for a statement that defies the facts. The minister certainly could have made amends at that point in time by apologizing.

But nobody on the other side had the perseverance or the courage to insist that the minister apologize. True to their arrogant form, they decided they would try and brazen out the storm, Mr. Speaker, that the thing would pass over, that they would go down, Mr. Speaker, and haul down the hatches, and hope when the storm abates that they would come up. I am afraid that this storm is not going to abate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

This is a hurricane.

MR. LUSH:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would again encourage ministers and members opposite - I know he is a new member - for goodness sake, when

we make a resolution in this House will we attempt to do what a resolution is supposed to do, will we embellish it with the language that is strong, will we embellish it with language that is not confusing, and language that is not weak? If we cared about day care centers, we would not be urging the federal government to create them, we would be telling them. We would be demanding it if them! Urging them! What kind of action is that, Mr. Speaker, to urge somebody to do something?

Look at government motion after motion, resolution after resolution. Urge somebody to do something! If you want them to do it, demand that they do it! Mr. Speaker, what weasel words are they, to urge somebody to do something? It is sickening, Mr. Speaker, absolutely sickening, that members, who have been sitting in this House for so long, cannot offer their members some instruction as to how to create a good, solid resolution, a resolution with teeth in it and a resolution with substance. I hope, Mr. Speaker, I never, ever have to allude to that word, urge, again, to urge somebody to do something. Show some creativity. Just the same, Mr. Speaker, as they have no imagination, no creativity in developing this Province, the same thing shows through with their constructing of resolutions. No imagine! No creativity!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Did you get your per diem?

MR. LUSH:

Yes, and I am happy to get it and I deserve it and I deserve more.



I deserve it for the next eight or nine days as well, but I am not going to get it. I take all my stipends and my cheques, Mr. Speaker, rather proudly and I would go back for more if there was more. I deserve every bit of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, members should be very serious. They have -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member has about one minute left to wind up.

MR. LUSH:  
They have a minister who has committed, Mr. Speaker, a serious crime in the parliamentary sense. It is not a flaw, Mr. Speaker, it is not a faux pas, it is not a mistake, it is practically a crime in the parliamentary sense. Minister after minister have denied and rejected that they stand by the statement. They have said that they do not agree with the statement, they do not agree with it. Yet they stand up here and defend what they have done in day care centres. That is not the issue, Mr. Speaker, that is not the issue.

They have a minister who does not believe in day care centres. They have a minister who does not believe in day care centres but believes they are set up only because they have become a necessity because of working mothers. They have become a necessity because of working mothers and he wants mothers to stay home so that we will not have the necessity for any day care centres.

Mr. Speaker, it is a serious breach of parliamentary procedure

and of collective Cabinet responsibility. Mr. Speaker, they think they can take the parliamentary system on their back and that is what they are trying to do.

If hon. members do not vote for this resolution today, they are not doing any favour to the parliamentary process.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. PARSONS:  
Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure I rise today to conclude the debate on this very, very important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose I will have to reminisce a little, but it is only a week old. Last week when I introduced the resolution I talked about areas that were better than we were in day care. I spoke about the Scandanavian countries. I talked about even going as far as the communist countries. In the Scandinavian countries where social programmes are ahead of ours, I spoke of the forty-five cents for every dollar earned going to pay for those social programmes. I spoke of the communist attitude towards day care, where education and day care were part of a system and surely God we all know what part of that

system exists for when we see the Russian hockey players come over here. They go around like robots. I would rather for my grandchildren to at least smile and come up through a system where behaviour yes, excellence in itself, but a bit of personal freedom as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Is that what we want? Is that what we want, Mr. Speaker? Do we want socialism? Do we want communism or do we want freedom? Mr. Speaker, I hear today from the Opposition and from the other side of the House about the programme that was on. What did the minister say on that programme? The hon. Jake Epp said, and I saw it as well as many more members in this House, that the federal government would have a real input in a monetary way as far as day care was concerned in Canada, and especially in the poorer areas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with the latter part of that resolution when it asks the Canadian Government, the government that is affluent as far as the monetary situation is concerned, for funds? If we did not do it you would be over there saying we are wrong! We are asking them for more funds! We are a poor Province!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, urging. We are not urging, we are asking, the same as normal people do, we ask.

Mr. Speaker, we go on and we address the situation as far as

day care is concerned knowing at what cost it comes. We have looked at children with special needs. I touched on that the day I brought in the resolution, in saying that special needs for children of special needs amounts to a great lot of money. We have one in St. John's that addresses that situation and again, the only two children that I know in that institution are funded through government because of their circumstances, but it is at great cost. I can see where a great amount of money would have to be put in that part of day care so we could help out the underprivileged.

Our socialists friends down here want overall, everything, everyone! One of the members from the other side of the House asked, where the money was coming from? He said, 'Take it from the banks.' Glory be, here is a resolution -

MR. DINN:

Jesse James did it.

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, he did it. Here is a resolution, Mr. Speaker, which goes right through our system, to our hearts. It concerns our children. Not for me, but it certainly does concern my grandchildren. My wife worked, Mr. Speaker. There is no holes barred in what I say, Mr. Speaker. She had to work, I guess. I was a police officer. I was in the fire department. My money was not that great and for to get a few of the niceties of life, she had to go to work.

Now, I am not saying she would not. She is a professional person. I am not saying she would not have went anyway, but it was

her privilege to go to work. I know many women and men, it is not a women's issue completely, it is a parent's issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a comment to the members on the other side of the House, especially to several of the members. I am disappointed really that a couple of the members did not get a chance to say anything in debate, but I have something to say to the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey). He talked about Lavalin in Quebec and I must say that really got to me. I comment that gentleman for that because at least he presented to the House a situation by which we could form a nucleus. He said this is what is happening in Montreal. There is the municipal, there is the provincial, there is the federal, there is the private sector, everyone combined and it is working. Now, again, I commend him for that because that was something that could be an infrastructure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

It could be the infrastructure for our - we have a day care system here now. Sure it needs to be improved on, Mr. Speaker, but so does everything else in our environment, but day care is one of the prime reasons why we are here today. It is our prime resource, it is our greatest resource. That is why we work, to look after our children. You cannot deviate. It is what we all think about.

But, Mr. Speaker, in saying that, I suggest to the new Leader of the Liberal Party that he perhaps could take the Leader and a couple more of his friends over there, of his colleagues, and have a heart to heart talk with them and tell them that they do not need to get up in this hon. House and be against everything. I can see the Opposition's role, sure, constructive criticism. It is what it is all about and I agree with that. I really do agree with it.

If you people over there had brought in this resolution, I would get up and praise it.

MR. SIMMONS:

What about your leader?

MR. PARSONS:

Look, we are a democratic organization.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

AN HON. MEMBER:

They do not like that.

MR. PARSONS:

Hold it now! Just a minute now! Seeing you brought it up.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Liberal Party was always that way.

MR. PARSONS:

The new Leader now, I will say again what I said, what he should do is have a heart to heart talk especially with the Leader of the Opposition and tell him about the birds and the bees and tell him about what you do not have to do. You do not have to be against everything. You know, all we are looking for is something positive.

The real thing that irks me about the whole thing is that, with the exception of the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) and the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), they did not discuss one thing as it pertained to day care. Not a thing! What they did in essence was they talked up to the gallery to get media coverage on an important resolution and never went to the soul and never went to the heart. All they did was backbite and personally attack people in the House. It had no relevance on what it was all about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

The media, again, because of the need to sell papers and getting people to view, they took it heart in hand and said, 'This is the issue that we have to follow.'

AN HON. MEMBER:

Some of them.

MR. PARSONS:

Some of them. Some of the media addressed it quite well, but it was not a general rule. They again saw it. The women's lib bit. I have all kinds of respect for women's lib, my goodness almighty, every bit of respect.

Let me tell you about day care, if you want to talk about day care. I was the Mayor of Flatrock and we built a park costing half a million dollars. What we did so the women could play ball was build a smaller park next to it to facilitate all the little children who would come with their mothers and play while they played ball.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Glory be to God, it was not yesterday we grew up.

MR. MORGAN:

They have their own ball park.

MR. PARSONS:

That is right. We did that years ago. There is a little park down there so the women could come and play softball and their children could be facilitated in a little park. This is not something new.

But, Mr. Speaker, we lost what the resolution was about. We had a chance in this hon. House to lay the foundation of day care in this Province. Now, I am not saying what has been done is not excellent. As I said last Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, I went down to the Annex of the Confederation Building and I went through that day care centre. I did not realize or could not visualize that that place was in existence. There is \$700,000 gone into it. The best, unequivocally, in North America, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Why did not the members get up and say, 'Look, you should be congratulated on what you have already done.' It has been stated over and over, there was no money in day care up until a few short years ago. We all know the monetary situation in Newfoundland, not alone do we know, everyone in Newfoundland knows. Tory times are good times, excellent times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, there are so many situations that should have been addressed that were not. I am sorry I could not go on for another day and perhaps we could get the hon. gentleman, with the influence of their new Leader, to have a bit of sense and look at the practical side and the need side of it and come up with some good sound solutions for the whole thing, something that we should do to make the thing better. We have a good system starting now, Mr. Speaker, but we need to improve on all aspects of our living, all aspects of the economy, environment and whatever. That is nothing new.

Mr. Speaker, again, there was so many things we should have addressed. We should have addressed the mothers that stay home and look after their children. It was never mentioned, Mr. Speaker, they never mentioned it. They did not care. Mr. Speaker, we live in a civilized world and in a democratic system where you have freedom. If a person wants to stay home and look after their children, are we are going to force them into day care systems? No. The Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) was the only one that mentioned it. They are all, again, reaching out to the media and trying to grab a headline. The Minister of Justice was the only one that mentioned the mothers that stay home.

How about a couple that decide that they are not going to have any family? Are they going to pay for the day care our socialists friends want to bring in? Are they going to pay for it? Mr. Speaker, we lost the time that we should have spent in doing what we should have done by rhetoric, we

lost it, Mr. Speaker.

As far as the amendments were concerned, what were the amendments about? There was no amendments there. We are asking the federal government for money. Who else are we going to ask? It was just to confuse the issue, to urge them, demand. Mr. Speaker, the minister already said that there are monies going to be made available and certainly with our representation in the federal government, we will get our share.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing I have to say is there was some constructive debate on this. I was reading Hansard today. I saw where the hon. Minister of Finance, Dr. John Collins got up. What he said was the truth. We would love to have all the niceties of life, we would love to have wonderful day care systems and we will improve upon them as the money becomes available. We expect to get a great amount of money from the federal government to make our day care system one of the best or one of the better ones in all Canada.

Mr. Speaker, again, the resolution itself was perfection. It addressed the needs of Newfoundland and Labrador. The amendment did no more than camouflage or throw into disarray the resolution itself. Then we had a second amendment, and again that had nothing, as far as I am concerned, to do with the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I thank the House for its indulgence and I adjourn the debate.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

We will deal with the sub-amendment first.

All those in favour of the sub-amendment please say 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Aye!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Nay.

MR. TULK:  
Division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Call in the members.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:  
Are you ready?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Is it agreed.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
It is agreed to proceed.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Some fellows are gone out. Just a second now.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:  
All those in favour of the sub-amendment, please rise:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons); Mr. Hiscock; Mr. Flight; Mr. Tulk; Mr. Callan; Mr. Lush; Mr. W. Carter; Mr. Gilbert; Mr. K. Aylward; Mr. Efford; Mr. Baker; Mr. Furey; Mr. Kelland; Mr. Decker; Mr. Fenwick; Mr. Long.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Those against the sub-amendment, please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe); the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge); the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout); the hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the President of the Council and Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer); the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins); the hon. the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor); the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young); the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews); the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn); the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt); the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle); the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward); Mr. Baird; Mr. Greening; Mr. Patterson; Mr. J. Carter; Mr. Tobin; Mr. Peach; Mr. Parsons; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Morgan; Mr. Warren; Mr. Mitchell; Mr. Woodford.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Is it agreed to stop the clock?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Is it agreed to stop the clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Agreed.

The sub-amendment is defeated, twenty-five against, sixteen for.

We will vote on the amendment.

All those in favour of the amendment 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Aye!

MR. SPEAKER:  
All those against the amendment 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Nay!

The amendment is defeated.

MR. TULK:  
Division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Do you want to call in the members, or should we have the vote?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
We are ready.

MR. SPEAKER:  
You are ready?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Is it agreed to put the vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Yes. Agreed.

MR. FENWICK:  
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PEACH:  
He does not know what to vote on again, Mr. Speaker. Sit down, boy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:  
Given the motion and the two amendments, it is somewhat confusing to know exactly what we are voting on this time. Would you please read out the amendment so that we know about it?

MR. SPEAKER:  
'The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage to move that the resolution be amended by omitting, "AND WHEREAS the Province has demonstrated considerable commitment within its limited fiscal capacity to improving child care resources in this Province by introducing direct funding to childcare centers and providing the Province's first work place child care center for public employees," and adding, "AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House instruct the provincial government to live up its responsibilities for child care by implementing a carefully thought out plan of action to adequately address the problem and to strengthen its financial case in Ottawa."

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this government be urged to increase substantially its financial commitment to achieving this social goal."

All those in favour of the amendment please rise:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons); Mr. Hiscock; Mr. Flight; Mr. Tulk; Mr. Callan; Mr. Lush; Mr. W. Carter; Mr. Gilbert; Mr. K. Aylward; Mr. Efford; Mr. Baker; Mr. Furey; Mr. Kelland; Mr. Decker; Mr. Fenwick; Mr. Long.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the amendment please rise:

Division

The hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe); the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge); the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout); the hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the President of the Council and Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer); the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins); the hon. the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor); the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young); the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews); the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn); the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt); the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle); the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward); Mr. Baird; Mr. Greening; Mr. Patterson; Mr. J. Carter; Mr. Tobin; Mr. Peach; Mr. Parsons; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Morgan; Mr. Warren; Mr. Mitchell; Mr. Woodford.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The amendment is defeated, twenty-five against, sixteen for.

Now, we will have the vote on the main motion.

All those in favour of the main motion 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Aye!

MR. SPEAKER:  
All those against the main motion 'nay'.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Are you ready?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Ready.

MR. SPEAKER:  
All those in favour of the motion please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe); the Hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge); the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout); the hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the President of the Council and Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer); the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins); the hon. the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor); the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young); the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews); the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn); the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt); the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle); the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward); Mr. Baird; Mr. Greening; Mr. Patterson; Mr. J. Carter; Mr. Tobin; Mr. Peach; Mr. Parsons; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Morgan; Mr. Warren; Mr. Mitchell; Mr. Woodford; the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons); Mr. Hiscock; Mr. Flight; Mr. Tulk; Mr. Callan; Mr. Lush; Mr. Carter; Mr. Gilbert; Mr. Aylward; Mr. Efford; Mr. Baker; Mr. Furey; Mr. Kelland; Mr. Decker; Mr. Fenwick; Mr. Long.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no one against. The motion is carried unanimously.



SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

It now being six o'clock, the  
House stands adjourned until  
tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m.