



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 54

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
***(Hansard)***

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

3 June 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Labour,

MR. BLANCHARD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to inform this hon. House that the week of June 14 - 20 has been designated as Occupational Health and Safety Week across Canada.

On behalf of government, and as minister with responsibility for occupational health and safety in this Province, I am pleased to endorse this special week. In this Province and throughout Canada many special activities have been planned for the week to focus attention on health and safety in the work place. I encourage all citizens to support observance of this special week and the efforts made to minimize injury and disease in the work place.

Co-ordination of Occupational Health and Safety Week at the national level is an undertaking of the Canadian Society of Safety Engineering, an organization committed to the prevention of work place accidents and disease through promotion of health and safety programmes. We are fortunate in this Province to have an active Chapter of the Society comprised of safety professionals who volunteer their time to help

improve conditions in the working environment. My department works closely with the provincial Chapter and has supported their efforts to make this week a success.

This year marks an important milestone in the field of occupational health and safety in Canada. A national programme is being introduced to protect workers from exposure to hazardous products. The Work place Hazardous Materials Information System is the result of a co-operative effort by labour, management and governments over the past several years. The programme will protect workers through the proper labelling of hazardous products containers, the provisions of material safety data sheets, and training of workers to ensure they are familiar with hazardous products used in the work place. I have supported this programme along with my federal, provincial and territorial colleagues. Hon. members will recall that just yesterday an amendment to our Occupational Health and Safety Act in this Province received second reading in this hon. House which will enable WHMIS to be introduced in the Province.

The reduction of work place accidents and disease is a responsibility that we all share. I congratulate all those responsible for organizing Occupational Health and Safety Week.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, we, of course, wish to concur with many of the statements the minister made, I suppose practically all of them, in that we, too, welcome his declaration of June 14 to June 20 as Occupational Health and Safety Week in this Province as across the rest of the country.

The minister is right when he says that yesterday we did pass through second reading a piece of legislation which will, perhaps, bring down the number of accidents caused by hazardous materials in the work place. For example, as was pointed out yesterday in the debate, there are more working days lost through accidents than through labour disputes. That in itself is an amazing fact and one, if we are to up production in our economy and therefore improve the economy of Canada, that we should pay a great deal of attention to. While there is always a great deal of attention paid to labour disputes in the Province and in the country, there is very little attention being paid to some of the other things that increase or up the loss of production in the Canadian economy, such as hazardous waste and so on, and such as accidents that are suffered.

One other point, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the minister well knows - it was mentioned yesterday in the debate - that we spend some \$600 million in this country per year for rehabilitation of people who have been injured on the job. So we, too, Mr. Speaker, would welcome, and we welcome it with everything we can find, the declaration of this week as Occupational Health and Safety Week so that there is, perhaps, a greater focus placed on the cost

to the economy, to say nothing of the cost in human suffering across this country, and so that we can focus attention on that and indeed, perhaps, do something about it so that not only our people are better protected but that our economy is made to be much more productive as well.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I, too, wish to join with the government and the official Opposition in endorsing Occupational Health and Safety Week. I think that we have much to be proud of in this Province in that we have some of the toughest and most stringent legislation in Canada with respect to Occupational Health and Safety, including the right to refuse dangerous work on an absolute basis, which, Mr. Speaker, is a milestone, I think, in labour legislation and one thing that we should be extremely proud of.

As a matter of fact, the only problem with it, I would suggest, is that our objectives are quite high and they are well stated and so on, but it has been my experience in hobnobbing with people who actually are involved in endorsing the legislation itself, or having to work with it, namely those people who are on the Health and Safety Committees, that the procedure itself is not up to the high standards that the actual legislation itself sets. In other words, many of the committees which were required to be established throughout the Province in order to co-ordinate

occupational health and safety on the work site, many of these committees in fact have not even been struck, and very many of them do not meet on a regular basis. And I am not suggesting, by the way, that it is always the fault of the employer that they do not, sometimes the employees do not put the time and effort into it that they should, as well.

But it would be interesting, perhaps, if, at a later time - and maybe the minister could take it as notice on a question - he would indicate how many of our committees are in place and functioning properly. At a future date it would be interesting, I think, to hear what the situation is. I have asked the question of previous Ministers of Labour - when the member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) was the minister - and at that time he indicated there was a considerable number but there were problems. So it would be nice to have an update.

Mr. Speaker, I join in saluting our labour legislation which is some of the best in the country and, hopefully, eventually we will get to the point where our enforcement of it will be the best in the country, as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

At this stage I would like to welcome to the gallery Mayor Ella Noel and Town Manager Maurice Kelley from Port au Choix.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, this seems to be my day. I either have none or I have all of them.

On 8, May, 1987 I received a request from the Canadian Paperworkers Union for the appointment of a Conciliation Board to deal with a dispute over the renewal of a collective agreement between Abitibi-Price Incorporated and the mill unions. Since the negotiations were being done on a national level, a conciliation board was not appointed; however a conciliation officer from my Department was assigned to the dispute. Negotiations have been ongoing in Ottawa for the past ten days.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report today that I have received confirmation from the conciliation officer that the parties reached a tentative agreement this morning at 4:00 a.m. This tentative agreement covers operations in Newfoundland, Ontario and Quebec.

The new three-year agreement will be presented to the union membership in the three provinces for ratification in the near future. The approximately 1,200 employees in this Province affected by the new collective agreement are employed by the company at their operations in Grand Falls, Botwood and Stephenville.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, details of the settlement will not be released at this time because the union membership has to vote on the tentative agreement.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

If we keep going along in this mood we are in, I am soon going to ask Your Honour to bring in a bit of music so that myself and the Minister of Labour can get out in the middle and waltz.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the minister that we welcome the news that a tentative agreement has been reached between the Paperworkers Union and Abitibi-Price Incorporated. Of course, it has to be ratified, but one would expect, in the normal course of events, that that would take place. We welcome it for a number of reasons, one being that the chain effect of a shutdown due to a labour dispute at Abitibi-Price in Grand Falls and Stephenville, for example, would be felt by loggers and by people who work in the woods side of the industry, and God knows that those people now have enough trouble finding work to keep them going. For example, where those people would work six, seven, eight months of the year, many of them now find themselves down to fourteen and fifteen weeks. So on that basis, if for no other, of course we welcome the news.

We wish the Minister of Labour could have given us more of the same kind of statement over the past couple of years, during his tenure as Minister of Labour, but that has been impossible for him in many circumstances. We welcome for at least some of the unions in this Province and some of the private businesses in this Province, and we wish government could get their act together in the same way and treat their workers in the same way. But we

welcome the kind of statement that he has made here which shows that indeed our economy is moving, at least in one sector, the way it should move.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, we, too, are quite pleased to hear that one of the largest industries in the Province has successfully negotiated a collective agreement, has successfully negotiated in a situation in which no job action on either side was necessary.

I think one of the things that it does point out, Mr. Speaker, and I think the Minister of Labour would agree with me, is that something in excess of 95 per cent of the collective agreements in our Province, and perhaps even higher, are negotiated successfully without any job interruption whatsoever, without strikes on the part of the employees, without lockouts on the part of the employers. Although we did have a number of highly publicized strikes in the last number of years, quite frankly labour relations in our Province are actually on a decent footing. When the negotiations are in good faith on both sides, we usually find a way in which to get collective agreements that are of benefit to both parties. I think this is an example of the positive climate of labour relations that that establishes, at least in that industry, and hopefully it will extend to other industries, including the iron ore industry which is very important to my district, and including the public

service, which, of course, is very important to the government, in which we have not had the best reputation in the past.

### Oral Questions

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker, my question was for the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) and he is not in his place. I would have gone to the Acting Premier (Mr. Ottenheimer) but he is not in his place. I do not what is happening, Mr. Speaker, to the front benches, whether they are ducking out. So I will have to ask my question to the acting Premier.

MR. TULK:  
He is over there, look.

MR. FLIGHT:  
He is not in his seat. He cannot answer the question from the Minister of Transportation's (Mr. Dawe) seat.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
You said the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. FLIGHT:  
But he is not in his seat and the question is going to the Deputy Premier. So, Mr. Speaker, my question to the Deputy Premier is last we saw a scandalous rash of political -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:  
Last year we saw a scandalous rash of political patronage permitted by the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth in hiring for provincial parks. We saw glaring cases of parks being filled by friends and supporters of the ministers and, unbelievably, Mr. Acting Premier, it is happening again this year. I wanted the minister and now the Deputy Premier to tell me why the minister is bowing to pressure, why he is aiding and abetting ministers to put their friends and supporters in Summer jobs in those parks while ignoring the needs of students and the youth in the areas where the parks are located?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker, I am sure if the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth were here that he would be able to give a very fulsome and informed answer to the hon. gentleman's question. My answer would be obviously briefer, and brevity is one of my strong points, like when the chap said: 'Humility is my greatest virtue.' But I am sure that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth will administer all of the programmes under his ministry with the impartiality, intelligence, sensitivity, finesse, intelligence and commitment that he is known for. He is a very dynamic, progressive, hard working, dedicated and progressive minister.

MR. FLIGHT:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, what the Deputy Premier said might apply if he were the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, but I would draw to the Acting Premier's attention that Catamaran Park is located very nearly within the town of Badger, and it is vitally important to the economy of Badger. Dozens of young adults and needy students are competing for Summer jobs created in that park. Now, why has the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth co-operated with the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) in placing students from the the district of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, from Grand Falls, into that Catamaran Park at the expense of needy students, students who come from low income families, Mr. Speaker, and need those jobs? It is pure political patronage. I do not think the Acting Premier would condone it but his ministers are. I ask the minister if he would tell the House why this is permitted to happen because it is scandalous and it is happening?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth apparently is in Ottawa attending a meeting of Ministers Responsible for Sport and obviously would not be able to give the analytical and fulsome and thorough answer that if he were here he could, being directly responsible for the department. Mine would have to be at a more

general level but again brevity being the essence of virtue, it will have the virtue of brevity.

MR. FLIGHT:

You are not very funny, Gerry.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I am not attempting to be. In all of these positions there are more applicants than there are jobs. We all know that. There are many more applicants than there are jobs. I would assume certainly the highest percentage, and it could well be all of the applicants are deserving people who want the work, who can do the work, and wish to have it for very legitimate reasons. It is impossible to give the limited number of jobs which are available to all of the applicants. All I can say is, I am sure that the people who were appointed were deserving, are able to do the job, and that the appointments were made in a fair and intelligent and reasonable manner. I am sure that is the case. But we all know that for every one of these positions - I do not know what the ratio is, maybe it is five to one - but there are many more applicants than there are positions. Obviously people who do not get the positions are not going to feel happy about it, and that is understandable, and I suppose it is inevitable.

MR. FLIGHT:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, there are dozens of applicants for this particular Catamaran Park in Badger, applicants who are needy students

and young adults who come from low income families and one parent families.

My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the acting Premier -

MR. MORGAN:  
Ask your question.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker, will you protect me from the mouth from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), please?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:  
He is not even in his own seat, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:  
Mr. Speaker; I would ask the acting Premier if he would use his considerable influence and his sense of fair play and see to it that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth will use his prerogative as minister and not betray the trust put in him by the young people of this Province by allowing Summer student jobs in parks to become the subject of crass, political patronage, which it has become and which is happening right now this day in this Province in the parks?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleague, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth always acts in an honourable and decent manner. I have no doubt that people who applied for the

positions from Badger, and from any number of other communities, are all deserving of it, not only from Badger but from other communities in Central Newfoundland or whatever part of Newfoundland that they applied from.

I am confident that the minister, in making available whatever number of jobs he had out of a huge number of applicants, used his intelligence and his judgement to the best of his ability and did it in the honourable, decent manner which is associated with the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, and one of the reasons he is held in such high esteem across this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) but he is not here today. Since the Parliamentary Secretary for Social Policy, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), is here, I would assume that I can ask him the questions since that has been the ruling. I would like to ask him about the Advisory Committee on Recreation Facilities, whose report was submitted a long time ago, I believe, to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth. I would like to know what can the Parliamentary Secretary tell us



about the status of that report? Has it gone to Cabinet, has it gone to the minister, and what have they decided to do about it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, before making a comment on that question, I want to inform the hon. member that in the absence of the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth there is an alternate minister who is looking after that department. As a matter of fact in his absence there is a second alternate, and in his absence there is a third alternate and then I assume you would direct a question to the Government House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, can you tell me what that was? I would like to know. I mean is that an answer to the question? Can somebody tell us who the alternate, alternate, alternate minister is, then? Who is the alternate minister?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Now, I ask my question again? Will the Acting Minister of Culture Recreation and Youth answer the question that I directed to the Parliamentary Secretary, who does not want to answer the question?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the

Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. the member for Stephenville that that report is in the hands of the minister, my colleague from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), right now and it is being considered in that department right now. I am sure that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth will inform the Legislature in due course of what action he will take on it.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, my further question to the minister is that that committee finished its hearings in November of 1985, that is about eighteen months ago, and we have been told that the report has been in the hands of the minister for some time. Now, we have requested numerous times the information concerning the allocation of capital grants around the Province, and the minister's office has said they cannot give out the information, or go see the minister and try to get the information from him. To this date our numerous requests have not gotten the information. Could the minister tell us why the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth will not release the financial information concerning his department for the allocation of grants?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

I thank the hon. member for the question, Mr. Speaker. I believe hon. members will know that just recently we passed the estimates of the Department of Culture, Recreation and Youth, but these are complex issues, Mr. Speaker, and it takes some time. I do not think it is unreasonable to have a few weeks wait after estimates are passed to finalize all decisions on these matters. The minister has to take it to his colleagues in Cabinet for ratification.

MR. DOYLE:

They have to filter down through the system.

MR. BUTT:

That is right. It takes some time. The minister is dealing, I know as I do, with colleagues on both sides of the House every day, trying to make final decisions on this. So I would suspect that it will be in place within a two week period from now.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, we have brought this to the attention of the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth on numerous occasions, and they have come back with the same response over the last two to three years. Will the minister tell us when they are going to decide to give us the information, which rightfully should be given to members of this House of Assembly in the Opposition, about grants that are given around the Province? Or are they just withholding information until the House closes down so they can go

pork barrel more money all around the Province?

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

I think the hon. member is not requesting information now but rather becoming quite partisan. The hon. the member for Stephenville knows that the member for Grand Bank, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, is very forthcoming with information to all hon. members, Opposition as well as government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

He has a large constituency out there to try to address when it comes to recreational needs in the Province. He has done a tremendous job to date. I can assure the hon. member that in the next couple of weeks that the minister, through his office, and I guess through other ministers, if it is appropriate, or other members, will be making announcements on the allocation of recreation capital funds for the Province for this year.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell). The minister has publicly stated on many occasions that multinational oil companies

have ripped Newfoundlanders off at the gas pumps and on home heating oil. And he has seen, Mr. Speaker, what has happened in Nova Scotia - \$60 million saved for the consumers there. Now we raised this over a month ago in the House of Assembly and at that time the minister gave a commitment to bring it to Cabinet to force the multinational oil companies to appear before the Public Utilities Board. Has the minister honoured that commitment, and if he has, what was the result?

MR. RUSSELL:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:  
Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. It is correct that I did undertake to bring something to Cabinet so that Cabinet could consider some options in dealing with the matter of high fuel prices in the Province. Subsequent to the some reorganization within the Department of Mines and Energy, when my colleague, the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) became responsible for energy matters, we had some discussions on it. There has been an interdepartmental committee struck. They have been gathering some information. In fact I think some officials from the minister's department visited Nova Scotia and took a look at their legislation and what they did in implementing their regulations and legislation under the Public Utilities Board.

The interdepartmental committee is now in the process of putting that information, along with information that we already had,

together for a Cabinet submission.

MR. FUREY:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, what the minister is saying is that he has completed all his research, he has looked at the Nova Scotia model and he is bringing it before Cabinet. So can I assume from what the minister has just said that he will recommend to his Cabinet colleagues that these multinationals that are ripping off Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will be forced to appear before the PUB, as they are in Nova Scotia? Can we assume that?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will know that perhaps in the world of politics and governments one should not assume anything. It is certainly one of the options, the option of placing the oil companies, if you will, under the Public Utilities Board. There are other options which I am sure will be submitted to my Cabinet colleagues.

The hon. member will also be aware that I am certainly not at liberty as a minister to tell the hon. member at this point in time what I am planning to recommend to Cabinet.

MR. FUREY:  
That is what you said a month ago. A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister also gave a commitment to look at The Natural Food Products Act, Section 11, subsection (j), which empowers him to force milk processors to appear before an enquiry to justify an increase of six cents on two liters of milk.

Now, what has the minister done about that since he found out about this enabling legislation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, number one, I know the member is directing his question to me as Minister of Consumer Affairs about the Natural Products Marketing Board. I think the day that the hon. member posed his question there was a little bit of confusion between him and me as to which board he had referred to.

The minister, under The Natural Products Marketing Act, is my colleague the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward). I asked my deputy minister to look at the act subsequent to the hon. member's question and we are not really sure whether it does give us the authority to do that or not.

MR. FUREY:

It does.

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, that is where the hon. member and I may have a difference of opinion on that matter.

MR. FUREY:

It is your law.

MR. RUSSELL:

In any case, I have asked my colleague to take a look at it and we shall be discussing it further.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and it concerns this year's caplin harvest. Now that the caplin harvest is about to start, I believe next week some time, I have heard some fears expressed by processors and fishermen as to the price being paid this year for caplin and the availability of markets. Is the minister able to maybe enlighten the House, Mr. Speaker, and the fishermen of the Province as to exactly what the situation is with respect to, first of all, the price that they can expect, and secondly, the quotas that they can expect to get from the buyers?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank my friend from Twillingate for his very timely question on caplin production and prices for this year. First of all, on price, let me inform the hon. gentleman and the House that there had been a number of discussions and negotiations between representatives of the Newfoundland processors and the Japanese over the last number of weeks, and days, as a matter of

fact. Those discussions and negotiations are far from completed. I guess as has been the trend in the past years, particularly in 1985 when members of the House will recall that the caplin fishery was actually started in St. Mary's Bay while negotiations on price was still continuing, the Japanese are playing it down to the wire, no doubt that is their strategy and that is continuing. We are monitoring the situation very closely, both with the processors and the buyers, and stand ready to assist in any way we can to bring the discussions and negotiations to a successful conclusion, hopefully before the season starts so that fishermen and processors all know where they are.

On the question of markets for this year, it is anticipated that the market potential will be somewhere in the vicinity of 25,000 tons to 30,000 tons. That will be down slightly from last year but it is not quite known yet exactly how much. The big question at the moment is the question of price, and Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, that is certainly yet not finalized.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his answer. I wonder is the minister able to tell the House if there is a mechanism in place whereby monitoring can occur with respect to the demands made by Japanese buyers, for example, with respect to the quality of the caplin? I know in my own district last year there were tons of caplin dumped. The fishermen still believe that they were

unfairly treated. Is the minister able, Mr. Speaker, to give the fishermen some assurance that their interests will be protected in terms of deciding on the quality of the caplin, for example, and their acceptability in the marketplace?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Another very, very important question raised by the hon. gentleman, and I am very pleased to be able to tell him, and to tell the House, that my department has received numerous representations, over the past Winter in particular, from all the processors involved in caplin production in this Province and from the representatives of the fishermen, principally the Fishermen's Union, and there are two things that are abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker. One is that the percentage of red feed permitted by the Japanese is unusually high in this Province compared to their percentages allowed in other countries where they buy. Secondly, the percent of overpack provided by our processors to the Japanese buyers have been severely out of wack with the regulations in other countries from which the Japanese import female caplin.

On those two particular issues, the union representing the fishermen and the various associations representing the processors - FANL, the Caplin Producers, and so on - have asked this government to implement a legislative regulatory regime on those two issues for caplin. What we have decided to do this year, and which we have now informed the processors of, is that we are

going to put in place, with the help of the Federal Department of Fisheries, a very stringent monitoring programme so that we can go into any caplin plant in this Province and randomly check the packages, find out what the per cent of overpack is, find out what the red feed guidelines are, and, if as a result of this experience this year, because we are actually giving away resource when we are allowing 20 per cent or 25 per cent overpack when other countries are only allowing 5 per cent, as an example, if the experience of the monitoring process this Summer justifies it, then I have informed in writing the processors and the fishermen in this Province that legislative requirements will then be put in place for 1988.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I wonder if the minister could indicate whether his department is contemplating relocating gasoline tax inspectors from several rural areas of the Province to the larger regional offices, such as Grand Falls and Corner Brook, and if so what is his rationale?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, there is a review underway, it does involve gasoline

inspectors, but that is certainly not the only objective and I am not even certain it is the primary objective. The objective is to try to get more efficiency. What happens now is that we have inspectors for gasoline, we have inspectors for retail sales tax, we have inspectors for other types of tax collection, so there is a review underway to see if we can co-ordinate and get more efficiency out of the personnel that we employ. This may mean that there might have to be some placing of some of the current inspectors in more central areas because they will need to be under a wider supervisory umbrella than if they are just dealing with one tax.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

These tax inspectors presently operate from such rural areas as Gambo, Springdale, Grand Bank and the like. Would the minister admit that this is another measure which is discriminatory towards the rural areas of this Province, where even one job is absolutely important?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are aware of that. Any change is looked upon to see, if there are any negative effects, how we can decrease those negative effects to the extent possible. Incidentally, it does not necessarily mean that because an inspector has to widen his area of activity that he has to change

his location. Sometimes yes, but it is not necessarily so. We are looking at each case on its merits and we are giving as much consideration as possible to not causing disruption to where the person lives and that type of thing.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:  
Would the minister indicate, Mr. Speaker, whether this move now represents a much larger plan by government to relocate all government services from the smaller rural areas of this Province to the larger urban areas, such as Corner Brook and Grand Falls, thus dealing a severe blow to these smaller rural areas of the Province?

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, the effects of any organizational or administrative change cannot be always precisely foreseen, I suppose, nor can they always be neutral, but certainly there is no plan to do what the hon. member is saying. We are looking mainly to get a bigger bang for the buck, I guess, and we are trying to do it in the most sensitive way possible. This government has been keen to decentralize rather than centralize, and we have put workers, for instance, in Labrador for certain governmental activities, that type of thing, which was an innovation. We are trying to persevere the public Treasury to give better service

and we are trying to do it in the most sensitive way possible.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Aylward). Since he is not in his seat, although I have seen him in the environs of the House, I will have to ask his Parliamentary Assistant. Oh, here he comes.

Mr. Speaker, the question concerns, of course, what I am coming to call the great hydroponic caper out in Mount Pearl. Mr. Sprung is quoted in one of today's newspapers as saying that it would take at least fifty projects the size of the one in Mount Pearl to meet provincial needs. I ask does the minister agree with that statement? And, indeed, has Mr. Sprung shown him any data to show that is the case? Is the government going to commit the funds necessary to see that Mr. Sprung puts up his fifty projects, which I suppose would create somewhere in the vicinity of 8,000 jobs? I wonder does the minister agree with that statement?

MR. PATTERSON:  
We are going to grow leaders for the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, to grow leaders for the Liberal Party we need more than fifty. But would it not be exciting, Mr. Speaker, if we did have fifty of those greenhouses in this Province? Mr. Speaker, would that be great for this Province.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I take it that the minister does not know because he did not answer the question.

Mr. Speaker, the minister, I think it was on public television either last night or the night before, also made a statement that New Brunswick itself -

MR. MORGAN:

All television is public.

MR. TULK:

Oh, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) tried to get a private one, on Fogo Island, I think, for himself at one point, and failed.

MR. MORGAN:

Yes, I have four or five now!

MR. TULK:

He probably has.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister if indeed he has agreements with provinces like New Brunswick? For example, he made the statement the other night that New Brunswick consumes I think it was 9 million pounds of cucumbers,

and I think we are going to produce, with this hydroponics complex, some 7 million.

I wonder if he could tell us has he agreements with provinces like New Brunswick that indeed they will buy from the Sprung Group over a certain period of time, that the produce will all be sold, and if the Sprung Group have contracts that extend over a certain number of years, or are we, again, flying by night here?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, what I did actually say is that Statistics Canada's International Trade Statistics showed that in 1985 New Brunswick imported from the United States and Mexico approximately 9 million pounds - it was a little more - of cucumbers and tomatoes, some 4.6 million and 4.9 million, I believe, in that order.

Mr. Speaker, we do not make contracts with provinces to buy cucumbers and tomatoes. The contracts would be made with private businesses, Mr. Speaker, to sell these cucumbers and tomatoes.

MR. TULK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman telling us - he is not telling us very much - that he does not know whether Mr. Sprung has contracts with anybody to sell this produce,



let alone the fifty projects that he is now saying this Province can handle? Just what is the hon. gentleman saying? Does he know or does he not whether there are signed contracts for the sale of this produce? Otherwise, it becomes very, very difficult to see what the margin of risk is for the Province. It was put up, and guaranteed in various forms, \$12 million to \$13 million. Some people say \$12 million. Some more people say \$13 million. It is hard to say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask him another question. Is it also correct that the Sprung Group is working on seven other deals, as is reported, in Canada? Is that correct? And will that have any effect? Has he researched or enquired of Sprung whether that will have any effect on their ability to carry on the export of those cucumbers and tomatoes, or whatever else they choose to grow in Newfoundland? Does he have any information or is he just not going to give it to the Legislature, as is common for this government anyway?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, there are several questions involved in that little speech that the hon. member just made. Mr. Speaker, we know there are adequate markets for the facility. Anyone can know that. It is very interesting to go back a little bit and follow the debate on the Sprung hydroponics system, Mr. Speaker. First when it was announced, the Opposition and the people opposed to this said, 'it cannot be done', 'it will never be

done', 'you cannot produce' - these types of comments were made, Mr. Speaker. We have crossed one hurdle because the debate now is that it can be done, but can we sell them, Mr. Speaker. That certainly is progress. I am delighted to see that hon. member opposite and people opposed to this greenhouse in the beginning have finally come around to realize that this is a project of the future, Mr. Speaker, and that it can be successful in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, we know that there are markets available and we know that we have to go and work hard and get these markets. Mr. Speaker, that is how you set up a company, you go and get your markets.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

#### Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, under this heading I would like to table - and there will be copies for hon. members - a copy of the statement to the press which the Premier made on the occasion of the Constitutional meetings in Meech Lake.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

## Orders of the Day

### MR. SPEAKER:

Today is Private Members' Day, and the motion is in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

### SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### MR. PARSONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very sorry I delayed the hon. House, but I had business, a call from the district.

### MR. PEACH:

A good member, boy. A good member.

### MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity today to introduce this resolution which deals with something that is becoming one of the most important and challenging social issues facing our country today. I do hope that the debate will be productive, since the provision of safe and accessible day care addresses each and every one of us because it is about our most precious resource, our children.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to read the text of my resolution, which addresses the need for expanded day care services and a fiscal arrangement to accommodate the growing demand for those services.

The Resolution:

WHEREAS children are our most precious resource;

AND WHEREAS the necessity for more accessible, quality child care in Newfoundland has been documented by several studies, including the

Cooke Task Force on Child Care and the Report of the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment:

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 child care centre, and providing the province's first work place child care centre for public employees;

AND WHEREAS the federal government has indicated its willingness to be responsive to the needs of individual provinces in providing this valuable resource;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House strongly urge the federal government to endorse differential cost-sharing for poorer provinces so that those with the least economic resources can provide services for their children comparable to the country's standards.

Mr. Speaker, before I discuss the Canadian experience, I would like, perhaps, to touch on some of the day care centres, or some of the day care institutions in other countries, because I feel that in doing that there may be some lessons that we could learn here in Canada.

Day care services in the Scandinavian countries are unusually administered through a municipality with several other social programmes, but there are extensive cost-sharing grants provided by the federal governments for the building of those day care centres.

It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, to compare services in Canada with

services in the Scandinavian countries. As we all know, those countries have a long history of social democrat governments which have a traditional history of social plans, social structures as it pertains to their government. But, Mr. Speaker, in saying that we have to take into consideration and realize that 45 per cent of the wage earners' salaries, his or her salary, goes for taxes which in turn pay for those services. We have to remind ourselves of this fact when we are admiring the services that are extended to the people of those countries.

For us to provide similar services, Mr. Speaker, would require a drastic change in our social and economic values and a much great commitment from our population to provide the revenues that are needed for such services. However, there are many interesting points of view and approaches to day care in those countries that we could use in Canada.

Many day care centres in Scandinavian countries take children from infancy to pre-school age. Also, in the building of new housing developments provision is made for day care centres, parks, playgrounds and other recreational services.

In several of the day care centres in Copenhagen, there is a range in age from babies up to twelve years of age, and usually this is done on a family sort of basis. By doing this, the family group bit, it eliminates a lot of problems like the distribution of toys, and it also enables families to stay together. The other plus in this respect is that older children learn the needs of the younger

child in the home, or whatever. Also, younger children have natural models for speech and behaviour. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it could be said that that has its minuses as well as its pluses, but, in the overall picture, it certainly works well.

Also, in the Scandinavian countries country day care is developed and this alleviates the natural problems associated with the inner city zoning regulations. Many of those country settings are beautiful, recreational type environments where the setting is relaxed and non institutional.

Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to impart to the hon. House that the institutional part certainly does not go over big with me. I believe there are certain areas in our country where, perhaps, the institutional part as such could go over big, but in Newfoundland, although in the urban areas we would certainly have to go along with the institution as such, in outlying areas some day care practices are working very well at present; a homely affair, with a mother or someone looking after the children. Certainly this would be desirable of many people, but, again, in the urban areas these people cannot be accommodated so we would have to go with some sort of institution.

Many special needs children are cared for in family day care homes, and therapists and teachers visit the homes on a regular basis to give treatment and advice on handling the children. These are organized through neighbourhood offices. These offices are staffed by trained day care personnel who usually have about twenty-five homes to look after.

In Copenhagen, itself, there are 500 of those homes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say here that in St. John's we have a home something similar to that. It is called Day Break, and it is situated on Barnes Road. That home is a very, very fine home for special needs children, but, again, it is a costly operation because you have to have professional people on staff on an ongoing basis. It is being subsidized, I am led to believe, by the Department of Social Services, but when a special needs child is in a family where perhaps the father and mother are a working couple, these homes tend to be rather expensive.

One of the newest projects in the Scandinavian countries is the emergency care home. These homes provide interim care for children during family emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, many of these arrangements may seem idealistic to us, but many of them could work in Canada. I certainly feel that a lot of those should be tried in Canada. However, we must recognize that those programmes come at considerable cost. Following economic slow downs in the Scandinavian countries, day care services were frozen and in some instances reduced.

Again we have to go a little farther afield and look at the situation in the Soviet Union. Day care and education are stressed jointly within the entire state. It is universal. It is not only witnessed by group learning centers for pre-school children, but in the philosophies of libraries and whatever, publishing houses, health services and in the general general

citizenry. The goals for their combination focus on the intellectual, physical, moral and esthetic groups. The development is their prime concern and relates distinctly to their overall pattern as a country, and it is love of labour and awareness of the environment. Again, Mr. Speaker, I think that this criteria that is laid down, the love of labour and the awareness of the environment, should, perhaps, be uppermost in our minds as it pertains to day care and education.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are at the crossroads in day care in Canada. It is obvious as Canadian families have to work in the work place, that day care facilities have to be expanded. We have to make sure that provision is made for parents and professionals alike. Quality care is no longer considered a luxury, it has become an economic necessity for millions. In the US, 13.6 per cent of all families are now one-parent female headed family.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What was that, again?

MR. PARSONS:

Thirteen point six per cent of all families in the United States are one-parent families headed by females. In 1976, 12 per cent of Ontario's children were in single-parent families. That is the latest statistic that could be found, 1976.

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

I do not know. I imagine that 12 per cent has certainly doubled by now.

As well, 51 per cent of Canada, in relation to married couples, would be poor if the wife had not gone to work outside the home. It is as simple as that, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Below the poverty line.

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, below the poverty line, 51 per cent.

In many cases, if you look at day care, you have to look at how much money has to come from the federal government to offset the cost. Because, you know as well as I, that a lot of the people who need this service are not the affluent type and we are looking at many areas in Newfoundland: We are looking at people in fish plants, we are looking at people whose wages are, perhaps, less than \$15,000 a year.

MR. TULK:

The lower and middle class.

MR. PARSONS:

Right. Lower than middle class, really. Their salaries are such that if they have to pay enormous amounts it is better for those people to be home with their children rather than out in the work place at all. So, there are many aspects of day care which have to be addressed.

If we are going to accept women in the work place, and if that means the lessening of poverty to a degree through employment, then there is no doubt at all that the day care situation will have to be addressed.

The lack of day care space creates several problems: Number one, it creates a problem, as we just talked about, for the low-income

families, and the high cost of day care creates a problem when it has to be paid because both parents are working. In many of those institution type homes, the cost is very, very high. No matter if it is a lower income or a middle income group, that is always the end result. If we do not have day care centers, if we do not have the right facilities, then the one group that suffers more than anyone else is our children.

There is no easy solution to the problem, none whatsoever. The CBC recently repeated a Journal production of WHO'S MINDING THE CHILDREN. I watched it, and I am sure many other people in this hon. House watched that show. The major theme, I think, that evolved from the discussions was that the federal government had to have a large input of funding to facilitate especially the poor provinces. There were even suggestions made at that time, or it was certainly talked about, that some provisions should be made for mothers who stay home and look after their children. It certainly was a school of thought, because if a mother finds that she does not want to leave her children and stays home, certainly she has an argument along those lines.

The hon. Jake Epp indicated at that time, on the Journal, that the federal government was committed to accessible and enlightened day care, although the level of funding had yet to be determined. But, by the same token, it certainly came across strongly to me that the federal government were committed, but, again, the dollar and cents part of it was not clearly defined.

Mr. Speaker, whatever approach or

combination of approaches will tend to direct us as far as child care is concerned, we have to view it, I think, most wholeheartedly as an investment in our children. Like roads, bridges and health services, day care is no longer considered a pay-as-you-go proposition. Neither is it a proposition that will tolerate procrastination. Surely, given our present levels of unemployment and our present levels of young people and their educational standards, we have, perhaps, the power to create the best child care in the world.

The other thing that strikes me as I go along with this is that child care, day care, whatever, is labour intensive, and it is certainly a good choice as a component for a job creation programme for unemployed youth. In some countries of the world, there is even emphasis placed on the elderly. They are in a position to supply part-time help in those homes, or whatever, and it would certainly help them to keep their homes and make them more stable as far as the monetary situation is concerned, and achieve, or hold on to the basic amenities of life. Again, the elderly is certainly a resource that could be called upon.

Mr. Speaker, time does not permit me to deal with a host of other issues related to day care, like nutrition, children with special needs, research and evaluation, staff training, facilities and equipment. We will leave them, because those conditions or situations which would have to be considered by professional educators and health specialists.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to commend the Minister of

Social Services on the excellent progress that has been made by his department. In 1975, he brought in a Homemakers Services Act, and this year, day care and personal licencing requirements, which is advantageous to people who sought to get involved in this day care situation as it pertains to the building of homes or whatever. Mr. Speaker, I did take a look at the new facility here in this complex, I asked a few questions during my short time there, and I was delighted at what was taking place. In the case of children aged three to five, there were eight pupils to one teacher or helper. For two years and under, there were six to one person.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. PARSONS:  
By leave?

MR. TULK:  
By leave, just to finish up.

MR. PARSONS:  
Just to finish up.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Leave is granted.

MR. PARSONS:  
The number of people who had applied to have their children in there amazed me. I think it is because of the time of year. It really does not officially open until the Fall. There were only seven children when fifty could be accommodated.

The cost, \$70 a week, was not bad. In fact, I thought it was a good deal. In rural areas, \$70 a week is a normal fee, which is excellent and certainly speaks

well for this government's initiative.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, children are our most precious resource. If we begin with this premise, we will resolve, I suppose, the best of both worlds, where a child in St. John's or Vancouver could be offered a standard of accommodation equal one with the other.

I know the only way we can realize that is through a fiscal arrangement with the federal government for a great influx of federal moneys.

I look forward to a high level of debate on this very important social and economic issue.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to have a few words to say on the resolution. We, on this side, regard it as an important resolution in that it addresses an issue that ought to command our attention. It is not commanding the attention of the government very much, but I will come to that.

First of all, in direct response to the gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) who has had the good sense to put down the resolution, I can say to him that I wish he had followed through on that good sense in his last few comments there. I do not know why it is, Mr. Speaker, but the tradition of private members, and

this is Private Member's Day, this is the day when members of the House behave first as individual members rather than as elements in an entourage or as people who carry the train of their masters. So it is always a bit annoying to me that members, under the guise of speaking to a private member's resolution, would want to sing the partisan praises of the government that they happen to support in other circumstances.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is the one occasion in our weekly agenda when members ought to be able to get up and declare themselves as being in favour of certain objectives and initiatives, whether or not those initiatives happen to coincide with government policy. But I have been noticing week after week, speaker after speaker on the government side, they spend such a disproportionate amount of their time being pandering apologists for a callous and uncaring government when they ought to spend that time -

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

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

MR. PARSONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify some of the things that have been said by the Leader of the Opposition. He goes away from the whole experience of what I said by saying that I attributed all the grandeur, or whatever, pertaining to day care to the Minister of Social Services. In my research I found that the Minister of Social Services did do a good job and I had to recognize that as well as I recognized everything else that pertains to day care. If it had

been a Liberal Government, I would have said the same thing. I am being truthful, and if you can be slated down for being truthful, then I, personally, do not see it. I was being truthful, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

If the gentleman finds the criticism a little sensitive, I have not said he was untruthful. What I ought to have said and will now say is that he certainly did not tell us the full truth in talking about the great role being performed by the Minister of Social Services; he did not bother to point out that same minister just cut back social services positions by thirty-five; he did not bother to point out that in the last month or so the minister has written an organization in Corner Brook refusing a regional child care consultant. If he wants to talk about the performance of the minister, he should lay it all out. What I have said he ought to do instead, Mr. Speaker, is stop being a pandering, unwitting apologist for a government that cannot even spell child care and get on with what is a good cause. He has got here on paper, Mr. Speaker, a cause that is marvellous and he should pursue that. But he subtracts from it, Mr. Speaker, he subtracts from the purity of his cause by making those inane comments about a very inane minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is

no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's East Extern, as Joe Smallwood used to say about other people, has his heart in the right place on this one and he is to be commended for putting down the resolution. He is in the right church, but if he wants to make any headway on this issue, I tell him, he is in the wrong pew. Because, Mr. Speaker, as long as the present Minister of Social Services is in the driver's seat on this issue, this issue is going nowhere - well, it is, it is going downhill very fast.

He is dealing here with a minister who has no concern for single women, for single mothers, for the low/middle class that he talked about. He has no concern about that at all. He is dealing with a minister whose attitude is if they do not agree with me, their ideas, their concerns are worth nothing at all. That is why he is able to write those callous letters, of which I get copies once in a while, rejecting any need for a regional child care consultant on the West Coast, and gutting the department, taking out thirty-five positions. At a time when issues like family violence and child sexual abuse is now gaining some profile and some recognition, when child care and day care services are in ever increasing demand, what does the minister do? He rushes out and cuts back on the number of consultants and child care workers and social workers available in those areas.

So, do not, unless you want to get my dander up, stand there and tell



me about what a great job that minister is doing. Because, Mr. Speaker, even the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) who has been harrassing the people of Bay d'Espoir these past few weeks, even he ranks well ahead of the Minister of Social Services.

MR. WARREN:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:  
Now, there he goes again, Mr. Speaker, with his half-witted attempts at personal abuse.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Could we have order, please, while the hon. Leader of the Opposition is debating?

MR. SIMMONS:  
The gentleman from St. John's East Extern's heart is in the right place.

MR. WARREN:  
That is more than we can say for you.

MR. SIMMONS:  
I know the member feels this half-witted need to babble on and on half-wittingly, but could he just restrain himself for a few minutes? because I want to talk about child care.

MR. WARREN:  
Childish care. Childish care.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Child care. If I said Torngat care, would he understand that? Garfield care, would he understand that?

MR. WARREN:  
The ten day wonder care.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Child care.

MR. WARREN:  
Tell us about your ten days.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Is there something new and original the member would like to say before I get on with this obviously less important subject than the subject he wants to pursue?

MR. WARREN:  
Go ahead! Go ahead! Make a fool of yourself.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Could we have order, please?

I will ask the hon. member to my left if he would please be quiet.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Now, if I may use one other expression related to the heart, I would say, watching the performance of the gentleman from St. John's East Extern, that his heart was not really in it today. He read rather ritualistically all the right things about people with special needs and single mothers and low income people, and so on and so forth, but when it came down -

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

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

MR. PARSONS:  
Before he goes any further, I want to be explicit enough to tell him that we were involved in this type of thing. My wife has been a public health nurse for twenty-two years. We were involved in it. I have talked with her. We have

discussed it openly. At my home, we had many people come, far more I will guarantee him than he did. We had experience in this field. If I got up and read things, I was only reading statistics. If he wants to try to get at me, it is impossible. He is not man enough to do it.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

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

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's East Extern is a good and honourable gentleman. Nobody argues that. What we do argue and what we are supposed to argue maturely in the people's Legislature is the substance of any issue. What we have here is a very substantial and important issue. So if there were any comments made personally, and I submit to the hon. member there were none, but if he chooses to see that there were some, that is obviously from his perspective. Mr. Speaker, we want to rise above personalities. We want to rise above getting involved in cheap shots back and forth across the House. That is not what this is about. What this is about is a substantive issue. The Minister of Finance can laugh and smile, but he, too, knows that that is a very important issue to a lot of people who are a lot worse off than himself in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

DR. COLLINS:  
Could I just have a word?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No, no.

MR. FUREY:  
Sit down and do not make a fool of yourself.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member -

MR. SPEAKER:  
I have ruled there is no point of order, unless the hon. Minister of Finance wants to rise on a new point of order.

DR. COLLINS:  
On a new point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) did his very best to try to dig the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) out of a hole he got himself into. He was clearly losing a battle there and the hon. member for St. Barbe tried to dig him out. He did not do a half bad job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as was stated, we are on a very substantive issue and the Leader of the Opposition got up and his first attack was to be abusive and to attack the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). That was rising above the issue! I suggest to the contrary. This was actually denegrating this issue.

The hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) gave a very reasoned approach and a very thoughtful approach and immediately the Leader of the Opposition turned it into a partisan battle and to a rather abusive battle against the

Minister of Social Services. I think he is out of order in that regard.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Further to that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:  
The House is aware I have twenty minutes to speak in this debate and I can see the tactic of the gentleman from St. John's East Extern. If I do not happen to agree with his version of reality, he is going to interrupt me on points of order. Well, be my guest. If I have to make my speech on points of order, that is the way I will do it. I have only got twenty minutes. I am aware of what the member is doing and what the minister is doing. The Speaker will know that every minute they chew up on points of order is a minute less I have.

If they do not want to hear what I want to say in the House, I will say it otherwise because I have some views on child care and some experience in the area too. It might be different than the member's, but that makes it no less in quality, despite what he thinks.

MR. PARSONS:  
I did not say that.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:  
If you did not say it, just quit

your nonsense and hear what I have got to say.

So you had twenty-two years talking to your wife. Well, I have had fourteen talking to mine. Alright? Alright.

MR. PARSONS:  
That is fine.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Okay. What has that got to do with the price of fish in China?

MR. PARSONS:  
What has that got to do with you, period?

MR. SIMMONS:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, I trust this has to do with the high level debate that the gentleman called for in his concluding remarks.

What I have said to him and if he would listen -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
How can he do it when you are here?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Could we have order, please?

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:  
With the animosity I feel I recognize it might be difficult for the member to do it while I am here, but I am here for a while. I have news for him.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from St. John's East Extern that when he rose on a second point of order, what I was basically saying was two things: First of all, I commended him for bringing in the resolution and,

two, I told him that I disagreed with some of his statements, as is our privilege in this particular Chamber. If that is going to spark more points of order, he should get ready because he is going to be up within a few seconds.

I happen to disagree with him when he tells this House something that is blatantly untrue, that that minister is doing a good job in Social Services. That minister's record in terms of his ministerial role - a man of integrity personally as far as I know, that is not what I am talking about - in his ministerial role, he is a walking disgrace to this Province in terms of what he is doing in Social Services.

He is setting the whole procedure back in terms of child care, in terms of the provision of social services, he has set the thing back about ten or fifteen years since he took over. Mr. Speaker, it is an absolute disgrace and I am going to continue to say that until the Premier twigs to the monumental disgrace that that minister is, as a minister, and then, hopefully, they will get rid of him and put someone in there who has some compassion for people who have needs in terms of child care, in terms of counselling because they are in transition houses or because they are in less than happy family circumstances. That is what we are asking for.

Mr. Speaker, if that is a personal attack, yes, that is a personal attack I guess, if you want to characterize it as such. I have been sent here by some people in Fortune - Hermitage to make a plea for those people who find themselves in less than equitable family circumstances economically and socially, who find themselves

the victims of family violence situations, who are disabled because of crime. I am asked to speak out on behalf of those people, Mr. Speaker, and if, in speaking out, I have to finger the less than perfect performance of a minister, I will do that, and if, in consequence, I have to be told that I am heaping personal abuse, well, that is their defensive every time, Mr. Speaker.

Every time you say something other than commend them, other than tell them what a great bunch of heavenly beings they are, they start screaming, 'personal abuse,' 'personal abuse,' 'personal abuse.' Well, Mr. Speaker, I give them notice. If that is their version of personal abuse, they are in for a lot more personal abuse before I am through and before my colleagues on this side of the House are through. We are not going to stand here and pander and say that people are doing a good job when they are doing an absolutely God-awful job, and I am talking particularly about the Minister of Social Services.

The member for St. John's East says, 'We are at the crossroads in child care.' Yes, I guess we are at the crossroads. I will tell you where we are particularly at that crossroads. We are out in the ditch beside the crossroads on child care. We do not even have this thing on course. Child care in 1987 in Newfoundland is one of more lamentable disgraces that I know about. All the right words are being said, all the right things are being said, but very little, Mr. Speaker, is being done to address the 15,000 to 20,000 youngsters out there who need child care or to address the particular circumstances a mother, usually the mother, sometimes the

father, but almost always the mother who cannot take a job in the community with the economic benefit that will flow from it, and with the personal benefit that will flow from that mother being able to get out of the home on a daily basis, away from her normal home routine, with all the benefits that would flow from that, she cannot take that job because there is not adequate child care provisions.

What do we hear in this resolution? It is the federal government's problem again, like everything else about this government. Do you remember the Budget Speech of the Minister of Finance a month or so ago? 'If the federal government would only bail us out one more time.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, as a result of our latest constitution maker up in Ottawa, lord knows if we will be able to get much else from the federal government, but that is another subject for another time. Suffice it now to say, yes, we on this side recognize that part of the problem can be addressed by the spirit of the resolution which says that the House strongly urge the federal government to act.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to let them off quite that easy. That is half of the solution, but the other half of the solution lies with this government here doing something about the problem.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to move an amendment to the resolution. I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the third WHEREAS be stricken because it is blatantly untrue. It says now: "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 child care centres, and providing the Province's first work place child care centre for public employees." I want to strike that, because that idea of commitment is absolute fantasy. That is the whole problem here. There is no commitment from the government on this important issue of child care services and facilities.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to amend by deleting that WHEREAS and then I want to further amend by adding the following at the end of the resolution:

"AND BE IT FURTHER 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.

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

Mr. Speaker, I submit to the gentleman for St. John's East Extern that that lies well within the spirit of his speech today and well within the spirit of the overall resolution. He has come here and said to the House, 'Not enough is being done. Let us get after the federal government.' We say to him, 'We support you 100 per cent on that. We will assist you with our votes in getting after the federal government. But we are saying to you that is only half the issue. The other half of

the issue is you cannot let the administration that you support off the hook on this one.'

The real problem here is that this administration has not taken the initiative it should have taken and, as a result, Ottawa hardly even knows about the plight of child care services in this particular Province.

DR. COLLINS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has brought in an amendment to the motion and, as far as I can gather, is now going on to debate the amendment. He has carried on for minute after minute after minute after bringing in his amendment. I think Your Honour first has to consider whether the amendment is in order. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment is not in order. By doing what the hon. member said, it changes the whole thrust

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right on!

DR. COLLINS:

- of the original -

MR. SIMMONS:

How would you know?

DR. COLLINS:

- resolution and that turns it on its head. It does violence to the body of the resolution which states that "the House urge the federal government to endorse differential cost-sharing with the

poorer provinces so that those with the least economic resources can provide services."

Now what the hon. member is doing in his amendments is directing the whole thing towards the Province itself and urging the Province to put money in it, which is good in itself perhaps, but it is not what the body of the resolution says. It is directed towards the federal government to endeavour to encourage them to cost share with poorer provinces. So I suggest that that amendment is totally out of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I guess we will have to bear with the Minister of Finance. He does not do terribly well on projecting budget deficits so I cannot expect too much from him in terms of his understanding of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, for his information I let stand the resolution. I moved that we pull out the dishonest, the untruthful "WHEREAS". Insofar as the main resolution is concerned, I have said in my resolution, Mr. Speaker, that that one would stand and then we would add two other further resolutions. As Beauchesne will show, you cannot negate a resolution, but you can add to it. I said we will support the resolution -

MR. PEACH:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the member wants something useful to do, he should go down and support the postal employees that he is running away from in Carbonear district. That is what he should do. Okay?

Mr. Speaker, my amendment would embrace the initial resolution, but it would add two more initiatives and in that sense, Mr. Speaker, I submit it is quite in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is difference of opinion between two hon. members. The amendment is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Meanwhile, the hon. member's time is up.

MR. PEACH:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PEACH:

The statement that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition just made, Mr. Speaker, concerning me and my district is not correct. The hon. gentleman is referring to a telephone conversation that he received today from a constituent in my district and the comments he made are not correct, Mr. Speaker. I have given in writing to the postal group he is talking about the position of this government, my position and I had arranged a meeting with our federal MP, whose jurisdiction it comes under rather than provincial

jurisdiction, and because the federal MP was not attending that meeting on Monday night coming, I felt that I should not be there on a federal matter either.

I want to set the matter straight.

MR. TULK:

How times have changed.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

First of all, I thank the member for confirming the truth of my allegation that he is running, but secondly, Mr. Speaker, notice the statement he made about a conversation that I was alleged to have received. I hope that in addition to all the things the guys are doing over there, they are not now monitoring my telephone conversations.

I was aware before today that the member was not prepared to face his own constituents at a meeting. I was aware before today that his reason was that it was in federal jurisdiction. That does not stop him, Mr. Speaker, from casting across this House all kinds of personal abuse and allegations from time to time. He is not then particular as to whether it is federal or provincial jurisdiction. But today he is being very precise, Mr. Speaker, because he knows on this one he is on a very sticky wicket. I say to him that instead of standing up here -

MR. PEACH:

I support the workers.

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, I listened to this gentleman. In addition to supporting them in writing and ducking behind a pen, let him go out like a man to the -

MR. PEACH:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Let him go to the meeting on Monday night and stand before his constituents and tell them why he is not prepared to support them on keeping open rural post offices.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PEACH:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, go to the meeting on Monday night.

MR. PEACH:

You put in writing what you said (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Could we have order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, is the member not aware that we have in this House a thing called Hansard and that everything I am saying now is going to be in writing? Does he not understand that?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I invite him to join me on Monday night in his district to help protect those postal workers who are being savaged by a Tory federal

government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. SIMMONS:

If I may continue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes. But, Mr. Speaker, we had given the gentleman from St. John's East Extern some leave and I thought that the same courtesy would be extended to me to put a few concerns.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought they would do that.

As I was saying -

AN HON. MEMBER:

No leave!

MR. SIMMONS:

No leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Leave is not granted.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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



MR. TULK:

It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as you hit the government with the truth, the hon. gentleman from Torngat and the member for Carbonear are not prepared to give leave as we gave to the person who introduced the motion, the member for St. John's East Extern. It is amazing! The actions of the hon. member are amazing! Is that not terrible? The member will not give leave in the spirit that we gave it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let it be noted that that is the case and we will reserve our judgements on leave for the future.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, this is clearly not a point of order. The hon. member made a great speech. I always think that whenever he gets on his feet he makes a great, great speech and I enjoy hearing and listening to him, but I am afraid that he has not made a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the motion put forward by the hon. member. Before I get into my few remarks, I would like to suggest that the hon. member who just sat down over there - the hon. member for what?

MR. WARREN:

Oh, three or four places.

MR. BRETT:

Three or four places. He just suggested that everything that he has said in the last ten or fifteen or twenty minutes is recorded in Hansard. That is very true, Mr. Speaker, and if I were that hon. member I would be very much ashamed of myself because if one were to analyze what that gentleman has said since he got on his feet, there is really nothing to it. He has not said anything. Now, whether that was his fault or because he was interrupted a lot, I do not know. But I can assure the hon. member 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.

I would expect that anything coming from that hon. gentleman, a former teacher, a former MP, that what he said would be both constructive and intelligent. People in the House and people in the galleries would be able to go out and say what a great speech he made, particularly on this issue that is of such great concern to all Canadians, or at least to a lot of Canadians. So he should read it tomorrow and I know he is going to be ashamed of himself because really he did not say anything at all.

It is an issue, Mr. Speaker, of great importance. It has been talked about -

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:  
In the tradition of the gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) and for the same reason, I would like to raise a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Trinity North (Mr. Brett), the minister, is being his usual inconsistent self. He has first of all said I said nothing and then somehow I should be ashamed for what I said because it was unintelligent. Now he should make up his mind.

In case he missed it, one thing I said and he can refute this, I said that he laid off thirty-five employees of his department. Is he confirming that that is not intelligent? Because if he is confirming that, that is what we have been saying to him all along. Thank God he has finally got the message that his layoff of thirty-five employees at this particular time, one of the things I said in the last twenty minutes, his layoff is one of the more unintelligent, callous, inane things we have heard in a long time. Would he confirm that is what he means when he says my remarks are not intelligent, and more to the point would he agree now to reinstate those people so I can make more intelligent remarks?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Social Services. Are you speaking to the point of order?

MR. BRETT:  
No, I am not speaking to the point of order. There was no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:  
That is par for the course, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member gets up and he goes on again for another two or three minutes on a supposed point of order and everybody in the House knows that there was no point of order. So the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is just proving what I said, for an intelligent man with a lot of education, he continues to get up and babble on and say nothing. We are all very disappointed in the hon. gentleman. We expect better from him.

However, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, over the last year in particular, this subject has been one of great debate and discussion in every province of Canada. The federal government did set up a commission and the commission has reported. The federal government has committed itself to make known to the people of Canada what it intends to do in the field of child care.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Social Services, I understand that I and all of the ministers of social services for the ten provinces and the territories will be meeting with the federal minister in Ottawa sometime in June or possibly July at which time we will be made aware of exactly what the federal government intends to do.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, that I acknowledge the need for more services in the field of child care but I believe that the extent to which we can fulfil that need depends largely on what comes out of that meeting in Ottawa in June or July. I can also say, Mr. Speaker, that if it is not a direct contribution to the Province, then you are not going to see a great increase in services.

We are spending all that we can with our limited -

MR. TULK:  
How much?

MR. BRETT:  
Well in excess of \$1 million this year. I will give the hon. gentleman some figures later on. But unless the contribution from the federal government is a direct contribution, then you are not going to see a great difference in the foreseeable future.

I indicated, Mr. Speaker, when I got up first that this is a matter of great concern. There are also many varying opinions across Canada as to exactly what should be done in the field of child care.

I agree very strongly with the

federal minister, Mr. Epp, when he indicates that whatever the federal government decides to do, the people themselves must be given a choice. Many people today decide to stay home and care for their children, sacrificing their profession, to become mothers or fathers, whichever one decides to stay at home. Other people choose to continue to work in their profession and have somebody else raise their children. I suppose both are commendable but I repeat that they certainly -

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
I do not mean to interrupt the minister, I am sorry. The minister said they are spending in excess of \$1 million on day care this year. I see in the estimates the total for DAY CARE AND HOMEMAKER SERVICES is \$650,500.

MR. BRETT:  
There is a fair amount in the SOCIAL ASSISTANCE vote as well.

MR. FUREY:  
SOCIAL ASSISTANCE?

MR. BRETT:  
Yes, there is a fair amount there. I will refer to some tables later on.

MR. FUREY:  
Can you get us a break down?

MR. BRETT:  
Yes, I will.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

I would like to go on record as saying, Mr. Speaker, that while we need more child care in our Province today and, as a matter of fact, in Canada, I also believe that we need more mothers. I am not going to make a lot of friends, I suggest, in making that statement.

Our correctional centers in Newfoundland today are full. They are bursting at the seams. I assume people get married and make a conscious decision to have a family. I sometimes wonder if we would not have as many people in our correctional centers if these people continued on with a conscious decision to stay home and raise their children.

There are a lot of children in Canada today that are referred to as latchkey children or something like that, children that come out of school and the key is under the mat on the front bridge or the back bridge and they open the door and they go into a empty home.

Now I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that there are people who must work to survive. In many cases it is necessary for both the male and the female or both spouses to work in order to survive. I believe that in this case, where it is necessary for both to work, I believe government has a moral obligation, if not a legal one, to assist. Then we also have a number of people who choose of their own free will and volition to continue their career and to let somebody look after their kids. It is their wish and desire to have government provide spaces so that somebody can baby-sit

their children, not necessarily, I suppose, at the expense of the taxpayer because I know a lot of people would like to see an increase in the number of spaces that are available for day care and are not necessarily asking government to pay for it. However, it inevitably ends up at some cost to the taxpayers.

So, Mr. Speaker, as one minister in Canada who is responsible for child care, I want to go on record saying that I wish we had more conscientious mothers, more people who would be willing to sacrifice their career, stay home and raise their children.

There is no -

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible) just said. Is he saying that as the Minister of Social Services in this Province he believes that only those mothers who have to go to work in order to survive should do so, that the rest of them should stay home and take care of their children, regardless of whether they want to pursue their careers, that they have to make a choice between a career and the family? Is that what he is saying they should do or otherwise our institutions for delinquent children are going to become overfilled and overflowing? Is that what he is saying? That is what it seems like to me.

MR. BRETT:

Was that point of order, Mr.

Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. I believe that the hon. member is taking the time of the House to interrupt in this debate to ask a question. In order to ask a question in the debate, he must have the permission of the person who is speaking at that time. I would remind the hon. member, if he has a valid point of order, make it, rather than get up to and ask a question. There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying - and I want to go on record as saying it - is that there is no substitute for a mother's loving care. I happen to believe that not only as the Minister of Social Services, but I happen to believe that as an individual. I stand by that, Mr. Speaker, and I am prepared to argue and discuss that.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that as Canadians we are free to choose whether or not we want to stay home and raise our children. We can choose to continue our career. That is a choice we have. I am not saying that we do not have that choice. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that there is no substitute for a mother's love, and if we had more mothers or fathers, whichever one chooses to stay home and raise the children, I believe that probably a lot of the ills we have in our society today would not exist.

Mr. Speaker, there have been suggestions made that we are uncaring, that we are not doing

anything for day care in this Province and, of course, Mr. Speaker, nothing can be further from the truth.

I realize I have only twenty minutes and I am not very likely to get any leave, so I would like to quote some figures.

Before I start quoting figures, Mr. Speaker, I want to say very clearly, I recognize the need for more child care, day care. But I also recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there is only so much that we, as a Province, can do. You know, we only have a half million people, Mr. Speaker. We have 560,000 people in a small province, not geographically small. I sometimes refer to it as a bald rock in the middle of the Atlantic, but it is not a bald rock, I suppose, we have some trees. But our tax base is very, very small.

And we, in the Department of Social Services this year, Mr. Speaker, are going to spend almost \$180 million. When one sees the number of unemployed in this Province - and I know the few who are working must say, 'Well, how long do we have to bear the burden?' You have the blue collar workers who are being squeezed to death, and we just cannot keep on spending.

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? Do I take it from the widow with two or three children who is not getting enough, or do I take it from the juvenile delinquents who do not have a proper institution to go into if they get in trouble? Do I take it from the mentally retarded people in the Province? Do I take it from the

people who need rehabilitation so that they can go back to work? From whence do I take it, Mr. Speaker, and how much more can we spend?

If you would add together the money that is spent in social services, education and health, it would just boggle your mind. You would wonder how we exist as a Province, because really, there is so little left to develop the natural resources that we have. It is no wonder that we have been unable to develop our resources.

Mr. Speaker, we are doing as much as we can and, I believe, as much as a lot of people expect from us.

I would like to give the House some figures, if I could. They may be of interest to you. We will start off with 1980, 1982, when we had thirty-six licenced centres in this Province. Today, Mr. Speaker, or up until the end of 1986, we have gone to sixty-two. The full-time spaces went from 493 to 922. The total number of spaces, both full-time and part-time, went from 812 to 1,444.

Somebody was asking about the total spending in SOCIAL ASSISTANCE. Subsidies paid under the income test back in 1980 - 1981 was \$235,000 and, Mr. Speaker, this year we are going to pay out \$419,000. The hon. the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) asked me just now where I was coming up with this figure of over \$1 million. Well, subsidies paid under SOCIAL ASSISTANCE - this is people who would be on social assistance and could not afford to pay day care. In 1981 - 1982, our subsidies in SOCIAL ASSISTANCE was approximately \$152,433 and in 1986 it went up to \$494,470. So that

is quite an increase.

Everything has been increasing like that, Mr. Speaker. There are many other statistics I would like to give, but I was just told I had four minutes and I must have two of those gone.

I would like to point out to the House that a first in Newfoundland in child care happened this year. Just a few days ago we opened a child care centre or a day care centre here at the Confederation Building Complex. This complex cost this government almost \$700,000. In renovations it was \$440,000, I think, then the furnishings and renovations, the two added together came up to almost \$700,000. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker,-

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible) Premier's Office.

MR. BRETT:

I am used to that, that is the kind of stuff that I expect to come across the House, so it does not surprise me.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is the truth.

MR. BRETT:

It shows your intelligence.

Mr. Speaker, the start up grant to them was \$12,000. The age range of the children that will be attending is from two to five. They will be children of government employees. It will be operated by a co-op group. The centre is called the Confederation Parent Co-op Day Care. These people who make up the co-op are public servants or people who work with government. They have already hired their director who is one Deborah Kapps.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is a first for the Province. I am very proud of that. Mr. Speaker, by the way, there are fifty spaces in that new day care centre. That is a first to the Province. I hope that there will be many more.

When we decided as a government to put a day care centre here at the Complex, it was done with the hope that the private sector would take a cue from us, I guess, for the want of a better word, and that we would see day care centres start up in other areas in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, I really do not have any more to say at this time.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is making contradictory remarks. As a result of that, he should not be - his actions contradict his remarks. A few minutes ago he told us that the women should stay home unless they had to get out and make a living to support the family and now he is telling us -

MR. BRETT:  
I did not say any such thing. Do not be so foolish.

MR. TULK:  
Well, that is what you said.

MR. BRETT:  
I did not say that.

MR. TULK:  
You said only those people who have to get out in order to stay above the poverty line should do it.

MR. BRETT:  
(Inaudible).

MR. TULK:  
Yes, but that is what you said. Now the hon. gentleman is telling us that they spent \$500,000 on a day care centre for Confederation Building. I say to him just slightly under half the cost of the Premier's Office, a matter of priority for the government. But if he believes one thing, ah, he is getting the advice now, Mr. Speaker. We have gone from bad to worse. Mr. Speaker, he cannot say one thing, that they believe they should build a day care centre and, at the same time, make the point that women should stay home and not be in the work force. If he has some advice from the gentleman for Torngat, he should stand up and give us that too.

MR. SPEAKER:  
There is no point of order. The hon. member's time has elapsed. I am going to recognize now the hon. the member for Stephenville.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today to rise and speak to the private member's motion presented by the member for St. John's East Extern which talks about day care, urging the federal government to participate more in the process, especially through funding. I commend the private member for St. John's East Extern for bringing the motion forward.

Also, Mr. Speaker, one thing has to be kept in mind. The member is a member of the government side which tells us every day that we cannot tell them anything because they make the policy, they are the government, and they will make the

decisions.

Mr. Speaker, they are making the decisions, they are making the policy, and they are allocating the money so we have every right on this side of the House to let fly with what we feel about any issue, especially when it comes to the allocations of money and the direction of policy.

In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised and disturbed to hear the Minister of Social Services make his comments, not only about more conscientious mothers being needed, but about people who are in our penitentiaries and our penal institutions probably being there because their mothers were not home when they came home in the evening.

I would suggest to you that most of the people - and I think studies have showed it - in these institutions are people from poor backgrounds, people who are from low socio-economic backgrounds which have not allowed them proper development. That is the problem that we should be addressing, not blaming and not saying that the people in our institutions are people who come from socio-economic backgrounds where the two parents are working all day so they came home alone and they grew up bad.

MR. FUREY:

'Kevin', if they had day care, the mother would not be home and therefore the kids will go to prison.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, I am disturbed to hear those comments. When I hear them talk about their record on day care,

the dollars they spent and the efforts they have been able to make on this issue, I think it is one that the government has not addressed properly. They have not had an overall policy to address the problems that exist. When you see a minister with such an attitude who is responsible for that, you can see why we have not made a whole lot of headway.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at the resolution or talking about day care, and specifically women's issues, I notice that the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies has a Women's Policy Office where they distribute, Mr. Speaker, to the people of the Province fact sheets about women's issues, women in the work force, and so on. I just want to read a couple into the record, Mr. Speaker, because it has a great impact on the future policy of government and on day care in the Province.

"The most significant change in the Newfoundland labour force in the past decade has been the dramatic increase in female participation. Between 1976 and 1986, the female working population has increased by less than 20 per cent, while the female labour population has increased by almost 60 per cent. By comparison, in the same ten year period, the male labour force increased by 9.8 per cent which is less than the increase in the male working population of 15.1 per cent."

So we have seen a 60 per cent increase in ten years in the labour force by women, which means that the resultant problem that arises is a dramatic need for day care centers in the Province and day care places for people to



bring their children. It is a dramatic increase. It is a problem that has arisen because of the changing society in this Province and here we have a minister that says mothers should be more conscientious.

I have a problem, Mr. Speaker, in trying to determine how this government is going to get to where they are supposed to be when it comes to women's policy and to day care policy in this Province. It seems as if we are going backwards instead of forwards.

When they talk about the money they are spending, Mr. Speaker, under the Social Services Department, one of the things that I noticed in relation to day care and looking at the resources that they spend, that under COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS they budgeted last year \$17,950,000 and ended up spending \$20 million. This means that the unemployment rate was probably so bad that they had to get people on these social assistance projects so they could get them some money and get them on the UI program. Mr. Speaker, this gets them on federal funding, off their rolls and on to the feds.

I see that increase and I see them not doing too much about the economy. They say, 'Well, we are doing as much as we can. We are not blame. We only have so much money. We are not to blame for the problem. We are not to blame for the lack of day care services in the Province. We are not to blame for trying to talk to the federal government and get more money from them. We are not to blame for the unemployment rate. We are not to blame, because the rest of the world has been in a recession for the last fifteen years. We are not to blame

because we have been trying hard but we just have not been able to do this and we have not been able to do that.' So it is all, Mr. Speaker, about not accepting responsibility. That is what it comes down to.

Obviously, when you look at the way the minister addresses the problem by talking about people who should stay home and mind the shop or the result will be bad kids, it is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, we have a problem trying to get day care approved in this Province.

Let me look further at the government's own documents that they send out on women, Mr. Speaker, and look at the participation rates for females in the Province. "In 1976 women comprised just over 30 per cent of the total labour force, while in 1986 women made up 40.3 per cent." Again, there is another increase of women participating in the labour force, which means you have a problem because you have to find more day care services which this government seems as if they are not too concerned about. It is obvious from the amount of money that they are putting into it out of that big \$180 million budget for Social Services. If they are not putting the money into it, Mr. Speaker, then you cannot address the problem. The stats that one government department puts out does not coincide with what the Minister of Social Services is talking about when he talks about the amount of day care centres and services that are also being increased at the same time. So we are falling way behind.

We have women in this Province, a lot of them single mothers, single

women, and single fathers, people who have been separated or divorced, these people have families to raise, they have a desperate need for day care around the Province and we are here with one government statement coming out saying that we recognize that fact, but the other government minister saying that they should stay home and mind the shop and take care of the kids.

I like the consistency, Mr. Speaker, or the direction of policy of this government. It is very obvious they want to go in the one direction. On one hand they are going this way and, on the other hand, they are going that way. It is a tug of war, back and forth, and it is shocking to see it to tell the truth, Mr. Speaker. I did not think that it would come out so blatantly so that the natural inclination of what they really are doing would come out, but it has.

I support the amendment brought forward so ably by the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it puts some more teeth into the resolution and I will read it into the record.

"BE IT FURTHER 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 his financial case in Ottawa;

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

Mr. Speaker, a good resolution is

now amended. It is a resolution which has a bit more teeth to it. We support the amendment. We feel that it would give more impetus to the government to move ahead and to change and improve their policy.

Mr. Speaker, talking about child care and day care, **The Globe and Mail** today talked about the outward migration of young people in this Province. It is directly related to day care, Mr. Speaker, and child care, directly related. I do not know why we are worried to tell you the truth about day care, Mr. Speaker. Why are we worried? They are all leaving anyway, so what is there to worry about? There will not be too many around to worry about anyway.

The population is decreasing and the Premier talked about creating 40,000 jobs a few years ago. It is unbelievable! We see an outward migration from this Province and policies not addressing the problem. A Women's Policy Office was established that puts out policy statements and we see the Minister of Social Services saying, "We think that more women should probably stay home now and mind the shop." I like the consistency of the policy. I think it is number one. I can see we are going to move very fast.

All the facts support more child care services. All the facts support helping this sector of society, women, who have traditionally not been taken care of in a very good light, not provided with the services to participate in our society and in this economy as they should. Many of them, and the facts support the case, are in need of such services. They are in need of them and this government is

blatantly not recognizing that fact. While they put out the nice brochures, Mr. Speaker, they do not back it up with actions.

I think that seems to be the tradition of this government, to preach the words, Mr. Speaker, but preaching words does not solve the problem. There is a problem there. Many people and organizations are lobbying government about day care and the problems that they are having, and these things have to be addressed.

I am very concerned about exactly what the present government in Ottawa want to do with day care because we wonder about some statements that they make. I am not too crazy, I am not going to hold my breath waiting for them to provide more financial resources to this Province when it comes to anything, let alone day care because we have seen the results of that, Mr. Speaker, from their cutbacks in all kinds of federal government programmes and government services.

So even though we want to bring a resolution before this House which says, let us get after the feds and tell them to give us some more resources, Mr. Speaker, we have to maybe find a new strategy to do that because they have not been recognizing us very well to this point, especially in the last couple of years, this administration in Ottawa. It is time that we came up with a long-term strategy to deal with day care and that is what the amendment to the resolution talks about. It talks about a long-term strategy, it talks about developing a plan, it talks about putting forward a plan of action where you will see results to address a problem.

While I welcome the resolution of the member from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parson) today, I think that the amendment gives it a little bit more of a solid foundation. I would hope that the House would look upon that as a solid foundation and deal with it as such.

Mr. Speaker, I want to look now at training programmes for day care workers. I think there should be at the very least a programme where people who are presently trying to get training in day care centers can get it. I know of some of them who are trying to it through correspondence and having a difficult time. They are trying to do it part-time so that they can work and participate and also get some good training. I have been dealing with the federal CEIC, Mr. Speaker, and having some trouble in trying monies for their training. I think that this is one way, if we approach the federal government to loosen up some of their regulations, we might be able to get more funding out of them to train day care workers in the Province, to help train them, to get them properly trained in the work of day care in the Province. I think it would be a good move to make and we would see a properly trained work force.

I think it is an avenue for many people to get into. There is definitely a need for it. There has been an increasing need as the statistics from the Women's Policy Office talks about. There is an increasing need to address the problem to deal with more women in the work force and single parents. There is an increasing need to give these people the chance and the opportunity because our society is changing to

participate fully, as much as possible without having to suffer the financial setbacks and the financial hardship that they have to get ahead in this society and to get ahead in this life.

I feel for many of these people who have to seek day care. Mr. Speaker, I was raised in a family where both parents worked. I think the product was quite good, Mr. Speaker, but I feel that day care services would be an excellent option, an excellent field where people like myself and the many young children in this Province can then have, Mr. Speaker, a lot of help growing up.

I say to the Minister of Social Services, when he talks about the people in the penitentiaries, if we had improved day care services, we would have a blending of young kids, we would have a blending of people so attitudes would improve, Mr. Speaker. You would not be confined to the socio-economic status that you come from. That seems to be the syndrome, Mr. Speaker, that we have entered into where we have people who, for years their parents have been on welfare or social assistance or whatever, and it seems like a family tradition.

We have got to break that tradition, Mr. Speaker. One of the ways you could break it is by providing more employment. That has to be done. Another one, as part of the plan, would be to have a good child care system where kids, on an equal footing and basis, can participate and grow up in the same type of environment because the environment is so crucial and important for child development. If that was provided, I think that is would

help address the problem in the long term of making a product - I say it not in that sense but in the sense of children who would grow up and contribute more to society and would also have a better chance of rising on that ladder of success that we all preach about, that we all talk about, that we all say that our country is providing and that it does in many ways. But in some ways, Mr. Speaker, and at some levels, we have put so many walls in front of people that they will never reach and will never have the opportunity to reach a status that many of us have had the opportunity to achieve.

So I see a long term policy, if it can be developed, and I tell the government that it should be developed. If this can be done, it can help address that problem, it can help address the problem of having this traditional syndrome of young kids growing up - I see them every day with the constituents that I deal with - who can be given an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to equally participate, at the very least, to have an opportunity to grow up, especially very early in life, so they can develop good attitudes. That is very important.

I urge the government, even with its financial restraint, as we are well aware, to make this a priority, to deal with it as such, and to develop the attitudes that need to be developed to address the problem.

I support the amended resolution, Mr. Speaker. I commend the member for St. John's East Extern for bringing the resolution in but I also support the amendment so ably presented by the Leader of the Opposition because I feel it gives

a little bit more teeth to the resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased to rise in my place today and speak to the resolution presented by the member for St. John's East Extern. I think I would be also in support of the amendment as presented by the member for Fortune - Hermitage inasmuch as I would agree with the contentious nature of the 'WHEREAS' which suggests that the provincial government has demonstrated considerable commitment to improving child care resources in the Province, to delete that and then to add two more clauses calling upon the provincial government to live up to its own responsibility and to put in place a long term financial commitment to achieve this social goal.

I was prepared to speak in favour of the original resolution, but I think the amendment would get the support of this party inasmuch as it strengthens the resolution and also points to the problems of a lack of commitment by the provincial government, calling for the provincial government to assume its own responsibility.

The original resolution, as presented by the member for St. John's East Extern, focuses on the problem with respect to federal responsibility and the lack of

fiscal support from the federal government. I think that is not only a very critical issue but a very timely issue given that we expect the federal government will soon be presenting its own plan to introduce some kind of child care programme across the country for the coming years.

The commission that travelled across the country receiving submissions for the Task Force Report on Child Care unfortunately did not respect the submissions that were presented by working professionals in the field, single parents, volunteer associations and womens' groups that are working around the issues of child care. The commission ignored many and most of the substantial recommendations that were brought to it, calling for a comprehensive federal programme with federal and provincial responsibility, but most of the monies coming from the federal government to introduce a comprehensive, universally accessible child care programme in this country. Instead, the response of the Commission in its report to government was to propose a tax credit system. Since then there has been much debate across the country, and we in this party, provincially, have added our voice to the criticisms of this measure. A tax credit is not nearly what is needed to introduce child care services in this programme and to deal with an appalling lack of financial support for child care programmes.

The need over the last couple of years has been increasingly demonstrated and increasingly understood, not only by women and single mothers and families who are trying to avail of child care, but also by professionals in the field and, indeed, by politicians

of all political stripes and by public leaders. There has been a recognition of the changing nature of the work force, the increasing involvement of women in the work force, the changing nature of the family in our society and a broad recognition of the absolute need for child care services to be made available to people. Unfortunately the federal government does not see its own responsibility in this area as a primary vehicle for investing public funds into the start-up of new child care services, and an expansion of already existing child care services. Instead, it is proposing simply a tax credit which will not go very far in the way of making new spaces available and will not address the other concerns that have come forward.

The need to regulate child care services and the need to make sure that there is quality child care is a fundamental goal of any child care programme inasmuch as child care workers need training to be able to provide quality child care. There needs to be regulations to ensure that child care is not introduced simply on a profit motive, but that there is a public programme with regulations in place that will ensure that a new child care programme in this country, initiated by the federal government, will have minimum standards of quality both in terms of the workers who are providing the child care and the services that are made available. Services must be regulated, there must be training for the workers, and that both provincial and federal governments must take responsibility to bring in regulations to govern all child care.

I would support the initiative and

commend the member for St. John's East Extern for bringing in his resolution. I would support the emphasis, to some extent, of calling upon the federal government to take action to put in place the necessary monies to implement a comprehensive child care programme, and would suggest that a proposed tax credit scheme is not going to do enough to address the problems, especially in our own Province.

But more than that, I would like to come to the situation in this Province, having recognized that there is a real need for a federal involvement here, and express my own amazement at the comments the minister made today and suggest that the remarks by the minister about what we need in our society, and I guess, in particular, in this Province, is more mothers and more conscientious mothers to stay at home, that such a comment, as he suggested, would probably not make him friends. Well, that is an understatement, I would suggest.

He has clearly made a commitment to his own personal belief on this issue by wanting to go on the record. But what the minister has said in the House today in speaking to this resolution is going to be a slap in the face not only to all of the people in this Province who have been calling for more support from both provincial and federal governments, but I would suggest also to the person who moved the resolution and brought it into the House today, and to anybody who is speaking to the resolution with a genuine concern for the need to expand child care services.

It is absolutely appalling that a minister of the government would

come in and address an issue of such importance facing the people of the Province and begin his remarks in talking about the needs of people in this Province as it relates to day care, and suggest that a real source of the problem is that too many women are moving outside of the home and somehow we should move the clock backward and hold women responsible for the problem of child care.

How the minister can expect to be taken seriously in making an intervention in this debate or to be taken seriously when he appears to express some concern about the situation of child care, and pretend to represent the commitment by this government to deal with the lack of affordable and available quality child care in this Province when he begins his remarks by saying that the problem is we need more mothers? It is an absolute slap in the face to the people who are bringing these concerns forward, to the person who moved the motion and to anybody else who has the interest in dealing with this issue. It is a ludicrous suggestion that -

MR. TULK:

I wonder how many more do we need? Are they single mothers or married mothers?

MR. LONG:

As I say, it is hard to take the minister's comments seriously. I would imagine after he said what he said in the House today, there will be more debate following from that.

The contradiction is that this is the minister in this government responsible for the problem of a lack of available quality and affordable day care in this Province and he stands up in this

House to speak to the resolution and, in all seriousness, suggests that the main problem with lack of child care in this Province is that too many women are in the work force. And then to suggest that the problem with juvenile delinquency and juvenile offenders and the problem of providing enough services in this Province to deal with juvenile offenders is because they come from homes where mothers are not being mothers. That that somehow is related to the issue of day care, is an absolutely a ludicrous proposition. Indeed, it does not say anything about the actual fact in this Province where we have per capita less juvenile offenders than any other province in the country.

In any case, the idea that kids are being sacrificed and their health and welfare being compromised by mothers who want to leave the home, either out of necessity or out of a genuine desire to pursue a career, and that they are responsible for their own difficulties in providing care for their children, is to suggest that, in fact, the government is not taking responsibility for this issue.

I would not be that surprised if the minister were to come in and say that the main responsibility for providing child care should be in the private sector, because that is the tendency that this government and Tory governments have and that is what we are seeing from the federal government. That is to say that it is not a question of public responsibility but, in order to have an expansion of child care services, we need to find ways of encouraging private child care operators to set up their own

operations and that the government may introduce regulations or may provide incentives, but that in that way governments, provincial or federal, will not take the leading responsibility and will not assume a public responsibility for providing child care.

I could understand that position because that, in fact, is part of the debate that is happening in this country over whether or not both levels of government have a primary responsibility in addressing the shortage of child care facilities. If government ministers were to say that the primary responsibility belongs to the private sector, then I can accept that and debate that on its merits. I would suggest, as I have earlier, that there are indeed very real problems with placing the onus, the responsibility for child care, on the private sector. It is, as we have already seen, producing very real problems in the delivery of quality child care inasmuch as workers are paid very low, they are generally without training, and, in the case of this Province, they are no regulations governing private day care operators and, in fact, there is even a shortage of private facilities.

For the minister to not argue the issue on the merits of whether the government has responsibility or whether we should encourage a private sector initiative in this area, instead, for the minister to come in and suggest that, in fact, child care is perhaps something that is not needed at all, to not take seriously the recognition that is increasingly being accepted by everybody in our society, that women are coming into the work force, that the nature of the family and the roles

within the family are changing, and to suggest that women, in order to deal with the question of child care, should go back to the home, is just a ludicrous proposition.

As I say, I am shocked that the minister would come in and make those comments. I guess I respect to whatever degree that that is his personal belief, but I would suggest that as a minister of this government responsible for providing child care in this Province, I do not know that what he has said would square with other members of the Cabinet that must sit around and deliberate questions over the allocation of funding and how much might go in one department or another.

When people come to the Cabinet table and have representation from other MHAs -

MR. BRETT:

(Inaudible) one part of my speech and you do not know what you are talking about.

MR. LONG:

It was the critical part that the minister opened his remarks with. I was very taken aback in my chair when I listened to what the minister said, and I simply wonder how other ministers and other members on the government side feel about the remarks that the minister has made when there is such a public concern, such a broad, genuine, serious debate happening in this Province, as there is across the country. The complete lack of respect that is shown for the people who are bringing forward these concerns and the comments that the minister has made today is something that comes out of the dark ages. It is a slap in the face to women. It



puts the blame on women. It says that not only is the government not taking the responsibility, leaving the question of the private sector aside, but it is women who have the primary responsibility for child care. I think that simply ignores the reality of other information, as the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) brought forward in his comments.

The Women's Policy Office, through the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies, just recently provided all MHAs with a circular about the dramatic increase in the participation rate by women in this Province in the work force. So, we have one department of government coming out and providing information and trying to help our society deal with the changing nature of the involvement of women as workers and the changing role that women are playing in our society, and within that there are major concerns that arise, one of which is the provision of child care. For the minister to come in and say that it is not the government who has the responsibility for providing child care, that the problem is that we need more mothers and that there is nothing that can replace the care of mothers, is, in the first instance, a red herring, it suggests that somehow the women who are calling for more child care are denying their own fundamental role as mothers in taking care of their children and suggests that they are, in coming into the work force in increasing numbers, ignoring their own responsibility. I would suggest that the remarks made by the minister shows complete disrespect for women in our Province who are out there struggling to not only

survive and play a productive role and find work and pursue careers and bring resources into the family household but are also within that trying to struggle to provide care for their children, either inside the home or outside the home. The comments made by the minister are so lacking in respect and so lacking in knowledge of the situation that women in this Province are facing, particularly single mothers who are in the position of being the only breadwinner for a family household and who are forced to be in the work force, who are the women in this Province struggling with the economic conditions of high unemployment, of an incredibly high cost of living, who are trying to survive on their own terms, using all the wits they have to compete for whatever jobs might be available, and trying and deal with the reality of providing care for their own children in the absence of any real programme of child care, of the lack of subsidies, of the lack of quality child care, of the lack of availability of child care. For the minister to come in and say what he has said in the House today shows incredible contempt for the position that these women are in. It certainly shows a lack of respect for the debate that is continuing in this Province and across the country on the various merits of one programme or another: The response to the federal government's initiative, the criticisms that have been made that the tax credit programme will not really do anything to alleviate the situation, especially of lower income women and single mothers, but would also not do anything to initiate the development of new child care programmes across the country, offers nothing to the provinces in

the way of fiscal support to put in place any kind of integrated day care programme that deals with quality training of workers, wage levels for workers, an integrated, comprehensive programme that is accessible to low income people and that is on a par with our health and education systems in this country.

The demands by people across the country for the federal government to take an initiative in providing child care has provoked a very dynamic debate in this country, and then we have the minister today coming to speak on the resolution presented by one of the backbenchers of the government, which would seem to indicate a real interest and a real concern by some members of the government about this very serious problem in our own Province, a province which has the lowest number of child care spaces available anywhere in the country.

MR. BRETT:

That is not true.

MR. LONG:

It is absolutely true. The numbers are very clear. Per capita, we are in a disastrous situation. There is a real crisis of child care in this Province.

So, then we anticipate the minister to make an intervention in the debate and to talk about what his government is doing and what the government may be considering doing. I acknowledge the struggle that the minister spoke about in trying to negotiate some fiscal arrangement with the federal government in which the fiscal responsibility is not laid at the Province's doorstep. We, in this party, would acknowledge that, and have been consistently

calling for more monies from the federal government to allow the Province to put in place a real programme for child care and then would be obliged to bring in its own regulations governing child care to take care of quality and to not allow a proliferation of private, profit-oriented child care centres which have their primary interest in making money and not in taking care of children.

In any case, in the context of this debate that is happening in the country and in the Province, for the minister to say what he has said today is absolutely disgraceful. I, for one, as one member of this House, would make a call today in my own intervention in this debate, and by way of conclusion, that if this is what the minister really believes, and if this minister as a representative of the government in speaking to the issue of child care has this to say to the women of this Province, then I would think he should resign. I would look forward, in the coming days, to the response by women in this Province, by women's groups, by people who are concerned about child care and the lack of child care in this Province, and for the debate to come forward to challenge the government, to challenge other ministers, to challenge the Premier, to challenge the Cabinet to respond to the comments that the Minister of Social Services has made in this House today, the minister responsible for child care.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, our hon. colleague brought in an extremely good motion. I think it is worthwhile just reading the resolution itself:

BE IT RESOLVED that this House strongly urge the Federal Government to endorse differential cost-sharing for poorer Provinces so that those with the least economic resources can provide services for their children comparable to the country's standards.

Now, what that obviously says is that some poorer provinces are not in a position to supply child services that will meet the Canadian standard and, therefore, the federal government should give them greater help than they would give to a province that is fortunate enough to have the means of supplying services. This is quite in line with the thrust of this government. We are in a confederation and the only point of being in a confederation, or at least one of the points anyway, is that the central government, which has large powers and large levers at its disposal, should use those to help out the temporarily, anyway, less advantaged part of the country. So I think this is an extremely good resolution and it is quite in line with the thrust of this government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted for another reason that this was brought in, because it had the NDP on their feet. I love to see the NDP on their feet talking about public issues. I think it is doing a great service to the people of this Province. Because the NDP do not really gave the best of sense, and the more that people hear their drivel and hear their ideologic claptrap, the more

likely will that vital message be got across. Now, it is hard to know what a particular NDP stand is on any particular issue, because they change like the wind and it is very difficult to pin them down. But if one can pin them down anywhere on this child care issue, especially for clinics and so on, it is that they want a universal system; they want a system which is open to all and sundry. As a matter of fact, I think the hon. member said that he wanted one on a par - I do not know what he means by that, but I presume he means very similar to or even identical with - on a par with our education system and our health system.

Now, in our education system, of course, we have universality, because I think it is generally accepted that every one wants children to be educated, and you can do it in the home, I suppose, but it is generally accepted also that it is best done on an institutional basis, i.e., in schools and so on. I think that is generally accepted.

Now, on the child care issue, why would we want a universal system? Is it that all children should be in institutions before school age? You know, I do not think that has been the position of many thoughtful people. If there was a good reason for it, I think thoughtful people would be in favour of it. If this was just an expansion of the education system to an earlier age, if that was universally accepted, in other words, that children should start going to school at three as opposed to five, or two as opposed to five, or one even, sure, we should have a universal day care system. But I do not think that that is the case.

So what is the other reason for having it? The other reason, of course, would be if there are hardships on families having their children at home. I think that is a good legitimate reason to have day care systems. And there are undoubtedly families in our community, in Newfoundland and all other provinces, where that is so. But that is not a universal system, that is a focused system. Not every family is in such need to have their children taken care of for large parts of the day after they get out of the toddler stage, shall we say, because they do not have the means themselves. And that is nothing against those families, they just do not have the means and it is that they are out working or, even if they are not working, they just do not have the means to give adequate care and these children get better care in day care institutions. Now, that is a legitimate reason for having day care, but I suggest it is not a need for having universal day care.

Now, there is also another reason that perhaps some families, some parents, do not wish to give their children care for a large number of years throughout the day. Again, it is a free country. Why should people not decide that? If they feel that they want to do, as is said nowadays, their own thing, sure, they should be allowed to do their own thing.

Now, two questions arise there: Does that also require a universal system? I suggest it does not, because I think there are large numbers of parents who electively decide that they will devote themselves for four or five years, or whatever it is, for many hours in the day taking care of their children. And I would suggest

that is the majority of families, particularly the majority of mothers, who decide that way. So there is not a need for universality on that basis.

The other consideration, of course, is that if a person decides they do not want to devote themselves in that way and they have not the means otherwise, the state probably should come in and help even though there is not, shall we say, an absolute need. But, nevertheless, they should be given the opportunity of exercising free will as is anyone else. If a family has the means and nevertheless decide they do not want to devote many years to the upbringing of their children before school age, why should the state have to step in and give them assistance? That is, I suggest, bringing the state too much into every day life. If a mother decides that after nine months, ten months, twelve months or whatever, she has given enough of herself to her children and now she wants to go back to work and their family means are such that she can do that unaided, I would say, fair enough, let them do it unaided and there is no need to step in on the part of the state. If the state steps in, they are just intruding and they are going to bring consequences into play that probably are not foreseen and certainly likely would be undesirable.

So I suggest that from all these points of view we do not need a universal day care system. We need a focused day care system, and that is exactly what the hon. minister said, that is our aim. We are not to the point where we would like to be, because we do not have the means. If we had more means, we would have more

focused day care. Hopefully we will entice the federal government to co-operate and co-ordinate with us so that we will have more means and we will have more focused day care.

I would like to again point out that the NDP are so ideologic that they just see something up there without any thought. They will say, 'This is it and anyone else who does not go for it is a hypocrite,' and all the rest of it. 'Universal day care is sacred to us and we go for it. We will not think of arguments. We will not think of rationale. We will not think of cost. We will not think of anything. We want universal day care. We are NDP. We have the right to demand this. If you do not agree with us, you are foolish, you are mean, you are not discharging your responsibilities, and you are callous.' All these things spew forth from the NDP. I am pleased that that is happening, because I think the word is getting around that this kooky bunch have an agenda that will ruin this Province if they ever take over control of government, as they ruined the U.K. when they took over - they will probably never get back into power again in the U.K - as they ruined B.C. - they practically put them into bankruptcy and they have been struggling ever since - as they have very largely done in Manitoba. We used to hear a lot about Manitoba at one time. This was the model. This was something to emulate. This was something to go for. You do not hear that any longer now; we only heard that throughout the early days of the NDP government there, when all this kookiness really had not come to the surface and people could not see it for what it is. But

now they see what it is, and the province is just running out of everything.

MR. LONG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance is talking about the NDP government in Manitoba. I would just remind the minister that when it comes to day care that government is widely recognized as having a model programme, the highest standards, the highest quality, the most available child care in the country.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is not a point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I agree with Your Honour, it is not a point of order, but one, I suppose, should answer it.

MR. LONG:

The best child care in the country is in Manitoba.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes. The hon. member does not care about all the other aspects, he just says child care. What about their financial situation?

MR. FENWICK:

It is better than ours.

MR. LONG:

People are working. Everybody is working there.

DR. COLLINS:

Right, it is better than ours. But where did they start? Where are they now? Where did we start? We started very low and we are in a much more credible position than they are; they have taken their opportunities and they have turned them into dust because of this ideologic claptrap that we have just heard.

MR. LONG:

Everybody is working. There is very low unemployment.

DR. COLLINS:

They take a narrow, ideologic view of things without any consequences being thought of.

We would like to see the NDP defend the NDP Government time and time again. The more the NDP defends the overall programme of the Manitoba Government the better. I think this will then get through to the people, that if the NDP ever took over control in this Province they would turn us into another Manitoba, where they had a very credible economy, a very credible financial situation five or six years ago and now their economy is in a shambles, their finances are in a shambles.

So the more the NDP praises the Manitoba Government and the Manitoba programme the better, and I hope the hon. member for St. John's East will do that time and time and time again. I would also like to see him praising the labour government in Britain.

MR. LONG:

It is not a labour government. Britain is falling apart.

DR. COLLINS:

I would like him to point to those as the way that we should go. I would like you to even go -

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

How about General Jarulzelski.

DR. COLLINS:

Yes, Jarulzelski in Poland. They should point to him too because he is of the same ilk.

MR. LONG:

England is dying because of the Tories.

DR. COLLINS:

The communists countries, they are NDP more full blown. I would like the hon. member for St. John's East to also point out the good parts and the great qualities of the communist countries. The more the NDP pick out those places, like Manitoba, like what they did in BC, like what they did in the UK, what is going in Eastern Europe, the more they emulate that, the more they point out that this is the way we should go, the more I enjoy it because I think it is really getting the truth through to the voter, and that is very important.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I have to echo some of the Minister of Finance's comments with respect to the socialists. There is no doubt that they are a lubricious lot when you see them in Montreal sidestepping some of their most controversial policies because now they are lusting for power, because the polls are tempting them and they are lusting for power. So they will do anything

and they have the luxury to say anything because we believe they will never have power in this Province. But federally they are lusting now at the trough of power and their lustiness has got them saying anything about anybody and about any policy as long as they get power.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I echo the sentiments of the Minister of Finance when he talks about the concept of universality for day care across this nation. My God, where would we get the piles of money necessary?

MR. LONG:

Take it from the banks.

MR. FUREY:

"Take it from the banks," he says. Yes, take it from the banks. Well, Trotsky in the corner says, "Take it from the banks."

Mr. Speaker, I want to take the Finance Minister to task, though, on his concept of universality because you cannot say on the one hand that universality is a bad concept when on the other hand you apply it to your benefit. Let me say what I am talking about: The Finance Minister uses universality when he collects school tax under the authority of the School Tax Act. Whether you have or do not have children is irrelevant; whether you have children or you do not have children, he will collect tax from everybody. So your universal school tax does not jibe with your definition of universality when it comes to day care. So you must be consistent not only in what you say but in how you act.

I do echo the Minister of Finance's comments with respect to

the socialists and their attitude of having the luxury to say whatever has to be said with respect to day care, but I want to draw to the Minister of Finance's attention not my own statistics, Mr. Speaker, but statistics that come from Dr. House's Commission, which was authorized by this provincial government and which cost the taxpayers of this Province nearly \$3 million. What did Dr. House say? He said the net out-migration figures show that in the past seven years, that is to say from 1979 to 1986, when the new regime took over after Premier Moores, when Premier Peckford took over, 25,104 people left the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador to find work with other companies in other areas and other provinces across the nation. That is a pretty telling statistic, one that we ought to be very ashamed of, all legislators in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, what else does Dr. House say in his \$3 million report. In his report he draws our attention, on page 257, to day care. What does he say? He says, 'Perhaps the most pressing concern for urban and rural women is the lack of adequate and affordable day care services. Married women with pre-school children and full-time jobs need these services, part-time workers need flexible day care arrangements, women who wish to pursue education or training and single parents, both male and female, who want to work outside the home require day care.'

Mr. Speaker, Dr. House's words not my words, not the words of anybody in this Legislature, and these words led to a series of conclusions. Let me read a few of those conclusions, again not my

words, Dr. House's words from the \$3 million study on unemployment and employment opportunities in this Province. Recommendation number 1: 'More public funds should be made available for the establishment of day care facilities and child care services across the Province.' Now, Mr. Speaker, he was talking to the provincial government when he wrote that recommendation, because what he was essentially saying was that the provincial government is not providing enough. Now, while I do not believe that we can ever hope to provide universal day care, that is a nice ideological concept, but in the real pragmatic world, in street living, day-to-day living from nine to five, it takes dollars to do this. Dr. House is saying that we are nothing putting in enough dollars. I am not saying we have to swell the deficit beyond control to have universal day care, no. In fact, I subscribe to a mixed form of day care, in partnership with the federal government, in partnership with the provincial government and, in some cases, in partnership with the municipal government and hand and hand with the private sector. It is a mixed form of day care.

Let me offer you an example of a model that is working extremely well, and the model is the model called the Lavalin Corporation in Montreal. What do they do there, Mr. Speaker? The company provides the facilities, so when a mother or a father gets a break period or a coffee break, what can they do? They can go down and see their kids and see what their kids are doing and learning, what kinds of experience -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
And participate.

MR. FUREY:

And participate in that very thing that they may be doing. That is right! It can be a participatory thing.

Lavalin provides, this company provides the facilities. The company also asks that the employees through payroll deductions pay a little bit toward the instructors 'so they get competent, good, and reliable instructors so their kids are just not being put in front of television sets and cartooned to death. That is not good enough. We cannot just dull their minds and steal from their senses because that is depriving them of learning. All experiences ought to be worthwhile learning experiences.

What else do they do? They ask the federal government to put so much money into this, they ask the provincial government to put so much money into this, and they ask the municipality of Montreal to put so much money into this. So, taking the total picture, the payroll deductions shrink because there is public input from these three sectors. And because the company owns up to its responsibility and it believes it has a moral responsibility to make not only the work place safe and healthy and enjoyable for the employees but an extension of the employees are their children, to bring those children to the work place they carve out an area in that work place so that mothers are not running in taxis or sending kids off to this area of town or that area of town, it is all an extension, as the member opposite says, of the home.

What else does Dr. House say? He calls upon the provincial



government to look at its budget. One million dollars is a lot of money. I am not going to laugh that off or shake it off. I congratulate the government for increasing its expenditure, but I ask the government to look again and if there is somewhere in there you can find more money, this is a very important and vital area to expend that revenue garnered from taxes.

Dr. House goes on to say, 'The regulations governing day care services and facilities should be amended to include regulations governing the qualifications of day care and staff.' Now, that is not going to cost the government a cent. What are they saying? They are saying bring in an amendment to the legislation and the Social Services Department to force people to upgrade their skills, to educate them. We want the best for our children. Well, the teacher is an extension of the child and what that child sees that teacher doing and how that teacher behaves and the stimulation provided by that teacher in the environment leads to be a better quality day care. We can do that through amending our legislation.

The last thing Dr. House points out: He says, 'Recognizing the job creation potential of small enterprises, government should use a range of support and promotion strategies to actively encourage women to undertake enterprise initiatives.' I would add to that, to actively encourage men and women to open day care facilities in the private sector, hand in hand with the various public sectors to draw on quality teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I will adjourn debate

and pick it up next Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member has spoken for ten minutes, so he has ten minutes on Wednesday next.

It is now six o'clock. The House stands adjourned.