



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 55

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

4 June 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to table here in the House and have available to all hon. members a copy of the Constitutional Accord that was consummated yesterday morning in Ottawa and signed by all First Ministers. I am going to table it in French and English. We are in the process now of getting it copied so all hon. members can have the total text for anybody who wants to read it in the other language.

Mr. Speaker, I will not go into any great detail on it, but allow members the opportunity to fully read the text of it. I would just like to highlight for hon. members' attention, when they do get the copies, two of the major parts of the Accord. One had to do with the whole question of Quebec, and that is in the schedule under number 2. (1) "The Constitution of Canada shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with: (a) the recognition that the existence of French-speaking Canadians, centered in Quebec but also present elsewhere in Canada, and English-speaking Canadians, concentrated outside Quebec but also present in Quebec,

constitutes a fundamental characteristic of Canada; and

"(b) the recognition that Quebec constitutes within Canada a distinct society.

"Then (2): The role of the Parliament of Canada and the provincial legislatures to preserve the fundamental characteristic of Canada referred to in (1) (a), which was the duality of Canada.

"Then (3): The role of the legislature and Government of Quebec to preserve and promote the distinct identity of Quebec referred to in (1) (b)."

Then there is the derogation clause which in this context was an extremely important one: "Nothing in this section derogates from the powers, rights or privileges of Parliament or the Government of Canada, or of the legislatures or governments of the provinces, including any powers, rights or privileges relating to language" which was an important one for Quebec, that there was no derogation of the existing rights and powers that they now enjoy as it relates to their pursuit under their National Assembly of measures relative to language. So that is one of the more important sections of the whole agreement.

There is also, which was not changed at all at the meetings in the last couple of days, the section on immigration which allows not only Quebec but the rest of the provinces in Canada to negotiate immigration agreements with the federal government and have them entrenched in the Constitution, which I think is something that is important to some of the provinces. At this

point in time, it is not necessarily of great importance to Newfoundland, but in the future could become very important to Newfoundland as the demographics of our Province change.

You also have the section on the Supreme Court of Canada which was not changed from Meech Lake, where there will be the involvement of the provinces. Then we come to the Supreme Court of Canada and the Senate, as well, of course, as it relates to appointments.

The next section that was extremely important was the spending power on page 4 in the English version: "The Government of Canada shall provide reasonable compensation to the government of a province that chooses not to participate in a national shared-cost programme that is established by the Government of Canada after the coming into force of this section in an area of exclusive provincial jurisdiction, if the province carries on a programme or initiative that is compatible with the national objectives." That is changed somewhat from Meech Lake in that there is inserted here, 'established by the Government of Canada', which tends to balance off some of the criticism that had come forward from some quarters as it related to the whole question of some people who are concerned about the Government of Canada's powers in this area.

But it does make possible the opportunity for provinces to opt out of national programmes and still be financially compensated if they carry on a programme in the same area but where the priorities might be different for that particular province, and one can think of many. That has to be

new programmes and it has to be in areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction.

There are many areas in the future where this section may be used by various provinces, but for simplicity sake. One can think of for example in the housing area if there is a new national housing programme that the federal government wishes to establish, and establishes, and where it is more focused on urban type housing developments, large high-risers and this kind of thing, it would be possible for more rural provinces like Newfoundland to opt out of the programme and yet be financially compensated and use the money in the housing area, but in rural Newfoundland for either rural rehabilitation or other types of housing structures which are not identical to the housing structures that would be established in Winnipeg or Toronto or wherever. That, to me, is a fairly good example. There are many, many others, of course. But it does allow for greater flexibility in the spending of money from Ottawa in the provinces. It is one thing that from time to time, I guess, all provinces have complained about in the establishment of new programmes and I think, therefore, it is given that it is balanced with the ongoing spending power that the federal government does have under other sections of the Constitution, one that is very, very acceptable, and, I think, over the long term will be very beneficial to many of the provinces of Canada.

There is another section which I think; Mr. Speaker, is very important for the ongoing evolution of Canada. And whilst some may say that it seems that

the First Ministers, or Canada as a whole through its leadership, are becoming preoccupied with the Constitution, I still think that given the way our society is changing it is necessary and there is a provision in here, in part (4), for a Constitutional Conference every year, starting in 1988. That allows for the opportunity of groups and individuals and citizens throughout our nation to be secure in the knowledge that they can, through the normal legitimate systems in the country, argue for other things to be placed on the Constitutional agenda as things change. So there will be a Constitutional Conference every year. There is no limit on that. There has to be at least one per year, starting in 1988.

And, of course, most important to Newfoundland, we were successful in having the agenda defined to the extent that there are only two agenda items now for discussion next year, one is Senate Reform and the other is Roles and Responsibilities in Relation to the Fishery. This is extremely important from our point of view. And because what I just read will be actually in the Constitution of Canada, it obligates all First Ministers to discuss in a constitutional framework the whole issue of fisheries and roles and responsibilities in that fishery. I am sure I speak for the majority of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, and I am sure for the other political parties, that a full-blown constitutional discussion on the whole issue of the fishery, so that the Province of Newfoundland and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador will have a greater voice and influence over new policies emanating on the fisheries, will be most important

for the viability and the continued involvement of our people in Newfoundland in fishery matters. Because the whole fishery issue is not going to go away, it is very key to our economy and we need to have greater influence and a greater role to play in the formation of fisheries policies in many areas. To me that is fundamental, and it is the first time in the history of Canada, since Newfoundland has been in Canada, that we have succeeded in getting this matter, not discussed in a federal/provincial conference, not discussed in a ministerial conference, not discussed by deputy ministers, but discussed (1) by all the First Ministers, and (2) within a constitutional context, which means we are talking about constitutional change as it relates to the fisheries in the country. So that is extremely important.

Another point that I think needs to be highlighted as it relates to the Aboriginal peoples and the multicultural nature of our society - the First Ministers did agree and it is in the last part of the text - is that we affirmed that all of the rights and freedoms and privileges that Aboriginal peoples had at the time of patriation of the Constitution in 1982 they continue to enjoy. There was some arguments around Canada in the last couple of months that by not mentioning the Aboriginal peoples and the multicultural nature of our society it somehow diminished the existing rights that they had; it did not, but it was a perception problem more than anything else. To correct that perception problem, if you will, the First Ministers are in this text reaffirming that all of the

provisions that are now present in the Constitution are being reaffirmed so that the Aboriginal peoples, in particular, have comfort in knowing that the governments of Canada are prepared to go on and negotiate with the Aboriginal peoples with the rights that they enjoy under the Constitution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I table a full copy of this in both official languages, and we will have copies for all hon. members as soon as we can. I think we have already provided a copy to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) and the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick).

MR. BARRY:
Could I ask a further question before you sit down?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Sure.

MR. BARRY:
Where it relates to the responsibility of the Legislature of Quebec to be responsible for the items in 1(b), I believe, what was your understanding of the discussions? Does the Government of Canada have less involvement in ensuring the protection of the fundamental nature of Quebec as a result of that?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No. It is my understanding that the federal government's powers have not been lessened to do those kinds of things. It says it does not derogate from the powers that Quebec now has, so the things that Quebec have been doing as it relates to language, which are proven to be Constitutional, they can continue to do. It is a tidy balance.

MR. BARRY:
And the shared jurisdiction with respect to that?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
That is not spelled out. One will have to take each individual case of what Quebec may or may not do and have it challenged by the courts to see where in fact the flow is going to be, if you want.

Here is a copy of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
First of all, I thank the Premier for making available a copy of the wording of the agreement entered into by the First Ministers yesterday in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, the major positive aspect for Canada of this agreement, for Canada as a whole, is the inclusion of Quebec as a signatory to the Constitution. That achievement in itself makes this Accord worthwhile, more than worthwhile. As a Canadian, I am very proud that a way has been found to accommodate the concerns of Quebec to the degree that its leaders, Premier Bourassa and the others, feel that they can commit to signing the Constitution.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the agreement raises considerably more questions than it provides the answers to. We hear the Premier's interpretation of what is involved in opting out. I point out to him that in

the period between April 30, the Meech Lake meeting, and the meeting of June 2, the public posturing by, for example, Premier Pawley on the one hand and Premier Bourassa on the other indicated that at least two premiers had vastly different notions as to what was involved in the opting-out formula, so I am sure the Premier will forgive those here in this Province who engage in the same luxury as did Premier Pawley and Premier Bourassa of reading various things into the opting out provision.

Mr. Speaker, I have some concerns on that and I believe the bottom line concern is that I suspect that the less well off provinces, including the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, will be less well off, will be more exposed as a direct ramification of that opting out provision. Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty with the notion that Quebec is a distinct society, but, then, again, I have no difficulty with the notion that Newfoundland and Labrador is a distinct society; I have no difficulty with the notion that the Native peoples of this nation constitute a distinct society, and so my question does not relate to why Quebec was included as a distinct society but why only Quebec was included as a distinct society.

Mr. Speaker, the tampering in the Accord with the basic principle articulated and embedded in the Constitution at the time of Confederation, 1867, the principle that the orders of government, the federals on the one hand and the provincial orders on the other, are separate entities with separate mandates and separate areas of jurisdiction, the tampering, as witnessed by the

provision that the provincial governments will have a hand in Senate appointments, I find regrettable and I find a backward step because it has to do with tampering, taking away from the very structure of the federation which has provided until now that the two orders of government are quite separate and quite autonomous in their own areas of jurisdiction.

I suppose one could carry it to its ludicrous extreme and say if the federal government has to be monitored by the ten provincial governments, then the ludicrous corollary would be that maybe we have to find a way for the federal government to monitor the activities and participate in the formation of the ten provincial governments. I do not subscribe to that, but for the same reason I do not subscribe to the notion it is necessary to have ten provincial governments having a say in the makeup of the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier in an interview given last evening at the airport, as I understand, and broadcast this morning on CBC radio, said that he saw more jurisdiction for the fisheries. Of course, he will be aware that there is nothing in this document that would give the assurance of any more jurisdiction. There is an assurance of some talk, and that itself is an achievement. But that he should publicly give the suggestion that more jurisdiction can be assumed is dishonest, and I am delighted to see in his statement this afternoon he backed away from that and put the emphasis on talk rather than any more jurisdiction. We cannot assume there will be more jurisdiction

until we see how willing the First Ministers are, at the appropriate time, to talk about the issue they have now committed themselves to talk about.

When the Premier is talking publicly though, Mr. Speaker, about the implication for the fisheries of this Constitutional Accord he would do well to address a couple of issues as to the cost of surveillance, and if we get a shared jurisdiction what kinds of dollars are involved and who will pay those bills, what order of government. He might also, Mr. Speaker, want to address the important question of infrastructure that would flow from the additional jurisdictional responsibilities. He might want, also, Mr. Speaker, to tell us whether his position would include having the provincial government decide, or play a role in deciding the size of foreign quotas, the setting of foreign catch quotas because that impacts very directly on how much fish is left to share domestically among the provinces and the various fisheries, offshore inshore, etc.

One final point, Mr. Speaker. I, and I believe millions of Canadians, share this view: I found the process of Meech Lake, and indeed the process of June 3, somewhat less than dignified, not unlike the Premier's 4:44 a.m. Sprung statement, and perhaps there is a message there, too. But I found the whole process somewhat undignified, that suddenly a group of grown men, who all happen to be First Ministers in their respective provinces, had to sit up all night for fear, somehow, they would lose the opportunity to get a deal. This is not, Mr. Speaker, a collective agreement whose imperfections you

can correct in the next round of talks a few months down the road. This is a Constitution they were tampering with and the haste was undue, and it was unwarranted. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the whole process could have been better served had there been a little more public dialogue.

I suppose we have to thank people like the former Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, and a number of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

We know the Premier's view of Mr. Trudeau, we saw it on National television and we were duly disgusted.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You might just as well be.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I know the name Trudeau still strikes fear in their hearts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we have to thank people like the former Prime Minister and a number of other constitutionally-wise people across the country for flagging some of the concerns that Canadians have about this particular issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
So I come, Mr. Speaker, in that context to my final point to the Premier: The Premier in his interview broadcast this morning said that he had not decided whether there ought to be public hearings on this issue. This is an important issue, and I would ask him to join certain others of his colleagues across the country, certain other Premiers, who have already committed themselves to public hearings and to commit himself now to something he was uncommitted to on that tape this morning. Would he indicate that there will be public hearings, maybe a select committee of this House, but, anyway, some vehicle, Mr. Speaker, which would allow full public hearings before the House is finally asked to make a determination on this matter?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I have a number of items that I would like to raise with regard to it, but before I do that I would like to add our congratulations to the Premier and to the other ten First Ministers who took part in what is going to be, I think, looked upon as an historic occasion. I do not share the Leader of the Opposition's concern that it was an all night session that had to do it. I have been involved in collective bargaining and sometimes all night sessions bring on more creative solutions to problems than the straightforward ones held during

the day. Again I congratulate the Premier on being part of the process to bring Quebec into the Constitution. I think that is extremely important. I believe there has been a price to pay on it, and really all I want to do is raise a few questions with regard to it. Having only had a quick look at the Accord, it is difficult at this time to be clear about them.

A number of points, and the first one has to do with the Senate: As I understand it, we, as a province, would be putting forward the names of Senators. They say names. I was wondering how many that would be. Is it one name possible, two, three? There is nothing in the Accord that indicates how many you have to put forward. One of the suggestions I would like to make to the Premier that I would follow, because, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Do not worry about it Peter. Your name will never go forward. Your name will not be on the list.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
My party, both provincially and federally, have no use whatsoever for the Senate as it is presently constituted. One of the suggestions I would like to make is that perhaps it may be appropriate to elect our own Senators and then put those names on a list and say that these individuals did run for the Senate in this Province and one or two names could be then put forward. I suggest that to the Premier. It is something that I would like to have a look at myself.

The second question has to do with the Supreme Court of Canada: It is my understanding in looking at the Accord, or at least as much of the Accord as I can see, that the Supreme Court would also be filled by nominees from the provinces, as well. Since I believe there are only nine Supreme Court Justices, I was wondering how we could split the Supreme Court Justices among the provinces. Perhaps there might be some indication of how, indeed, that is done. I notice that we are to nominate people forward. Considering that we will have ten or eleven jurisdictions putting forward names, it will be interesting to see how they will be selected, as well.

Third, and probably the most important consideration, is the shared-cost programmes, the new initiatives. I think the reason that we have a considerable amount of concern is because, as I read the wording, we would have to have programmes compatible with the national objectives and, of course, the one new programme that is on the horizon now is child care programmes. I would strongly suggest to the Premier that we do not opt out of child care programmes, because if the Minister of Social Services has anything to do with it, we would have no programme whatsoever in this Province compatible with anything, quite frankly. So, let us hope that there is a national programme that can overcome the natural prejudices of the minister.

Another point is the Constitutional conferences with regard to the fishery, and these are the ones that I have some questions about. For example, are we talking, then, about consultation with the Province of Newfoundland in terms of setting

fish quotas? Is this the kind of objective the government has in mind? And I think it would be interesting to go beyond the fact that we have it on the agenda so that the government would, perhaps, start giving us some ideas about the kinds of constitutional changes I would like to see in it. Are we talking about consultation on fish quotas? If we are, are we talking about Newfoundland being consulted alone or are we talking the other Atlantic Provinces being consulted? Are we talking about the opening of seasons, the closing of seasons, and so on? In other words, Mr. Speaker, it would be nice to see the government go beyond putting it on the agenda into specifying the kinds of objectives we have, and whether or not we will have to share those with the rest of Atlantic Canada? And, finally, Mr. Speaker, my last comment is I would echo the comments of the Leader of the Opposition; that we need a Select Committee of the House of Assembly in order to conduct hearings on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to advise hon. members, who perhaps have not heard it yet, of the fact that the Town of Grand Falls has been awarded the title Forestry Capital of Canada for 1988 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

- by the Independent Canadian Forestry Association.

MR. BARRY:

Is that the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers?

MR. SIMMS:

No, not the Canadian Council of Forest Ministers, the Independent Canadian Forestry Association.

This is the first time ever that a Newfoundland community has been named forestry capital since the award was established back in 1979.

It is based on a community's commitment to and dependence on the forest, as well as its civic-minded recognition of the importance of the forest. This certainly applies to Grand Falls, Mr. Speaker, since the town was built as a result of the first successful large scale development of a pulp and paper industry in Newfoundland.

The people of Grand Falls, Mr. Speaker, have good reason to be proud of this award, as it brings national recognition in a way that fits in with both the economy and the way of life in that town. I am looking forward to participating in planning for events that will be carried on throughout next year to mark this very important honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for

Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, and I am sure my caucus is pleased, to associate ourselves with this announcement. We congratulate Grand Falls. Mr. Speaker, maybe the minister will tell us later, but I do not know how a community gets to compete for this award and gets to be the recipient. Maybe having the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands for Newfoundland as the member may be a factor.

'The award is based on a community's commitment and dependence.' Well, Mr. Speaker, I can list for the minister a lot of communities which have commitment and dependence on the forestry of Newfoundland. Windsor, for argument's sake, who may have contributed just as much to Abitibi's success as -

MR. SIMMS:

Did you nominate Windsor?

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I only have half the time of the minister. I might say, also, for a community to be designated as the forest capital of Canada would indicate how important it is as the forestry capital of Newfoundland, and one would have thought, with a community that much related to the forest industry, that the minister representing the town would have supported that particular community for the forestry centre instead of supporting Corner Brook. I mean, having won this award by The Canadian Forestry Association one would have expected that would have been appropriate. But that was not to be. However, Mr. Speaker, we congratulate the people of Grand

Falls and I, too, look forward to participating in some of the events that will be carried out in the next year or two to mark this important honour.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am quite pleased to see that Grand Falls has been designated the Forestry Capital of Canada for 1988. I would suggest to the minister that he not plan too far into 1988, because if the Premier calls an election, he might not be there when the celebrations get going.

MR. LONG:
It is an NDP town.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the visitors' gallery fifteen adults from the New Canada Job Reentry Programme with their teachers, Janet Blackwood and Marion Cheeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I just have one short question, no supplementaries, to the Premier. Last Tuesday the Premier gave a commitment to get a final decision with respect to Teck Corporation's proposal to his government. In fact, his words were, 'We can expedite that matter for the hon. member, have it done either this week' - meaning last week - 'or early next week' - meaning early this week. Can the Premier give us the answer to that important question for these 165 miners.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The matter is under review right now by the government and we hope to have a decision in the next few days on it. If I had gotten back a little bit earlier we might have had the decision already. But we will have a decision on it in the next few days. The Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) is right on top of it and we will have a decision for the hon. member in the next few days.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) and it is in reference to a statement that the minister made yesterday in the House of Assembly, and I just want to read that statement. He said, 'As one

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

In view of this comment I would ask the minister is he telling the people of this Province and telling this House of Assembly that mothers who go to work do not care about their children? And is he also standing by the old-time slogan that women should stay home, barefoot, pregnant and in the kitchen?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Good question!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
No, Mr. Speaker, that is not what I suggested at all. There seems to be a philosophical difference, I guess, between the Socialists in the House and some Liberal members. My philosophy - call it a personal one or whatever - is that nothing in the world can replace the love of a mother. That is the statement I made and I stand by it. Now, that does not detract from the issue that was being discussed here in the House yesterday in the Private Member's Motion, which was the need for more child care, for greater quality child care. There is no philosophical or policy difference with anybody in the House on that matter. So I think the hon. gentleman should be aware that there are two different things.

It is simply a philosophical difference, that is all. I have no quarrel with anybody about the need for more child care or the need for greater quality care, absolutely none, and I would like to make that very clear.

MR. EFFORD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Let me remind the minister that I read from a copy of Hansard. He stated very clearly, and he was speaking as a minister when he said that people who went to work did not care about their children. The minister said that very clearly. Let me ask would the minister table the information to substantiate his statement that children of parents who are working are more apt to get in trouble or more apt to be in correctional centres than other children?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member has a copy of Hansard in front of him, and I am not going to get into hot water by saying I did not say anything that I might have said.

MR. EFFORD:
Well, it is in Hansard.

MR. BRETT:
Perhaps he should read it out.

However, I would like to tell the hon. gentleman that children are products of their environment, I

think that is a statement that is pretty well accepted, and again I have no problem in standing by that statement, that perhaps the erosion of the family over the last few years has resulted in more children coming into conflict with the law and this sort of thing.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, and while I do not have any documentation in front of me I think it is a well-known statement, that children are products of their environment.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the minister cannot make light of the fact, because the statements he made yesterday are very clearly copied in Hansard for anybody to read. The minister on the one hand says that people should stay at home, not go to work and look after their children, and on the other hand says that he is the minister responsible for better and more improved day care centers in Newfoundland. The minister cannot have two different views and perform his job as Minister of Social Services.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

I say to the minister, in view of statements like that the minister should do the proper thing for the people of this House of Assembly and the people of this Province and resign as Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at some of the things that I said. Let us take a look at Hansard. I quote from Hansard. "At this point in time, I acknowledge the need for more services in the field of child care." I said that. Listen to something else I said. "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."

That is, some people decide to discontinue their career and stay home and care for their children. Others decide to continue their career and continue to work. I said that people should be given a choice. I indicated on a number of occasions during my speech that people have the right to choose in Canada, and I acknowledged the fact that they have the right to choose, but I believe that both groups should also be given a choice whether they stay home or not. In both cases, if there are government subsidies, both should be paid.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social Services. If he wants to read from Hansard I will pick out five or six places where he spoke yesterday as the

Minister of Social Services where he states that - there is no way out of it for him - those mothers who go to work are not as conscientious mothers as those who stay home.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me read a statement to him, the same one as was read by the member for Port de Grave. "Mr. Speaker, as one minister in Canada who is responsible for child care, I want to go on record as saying that I wish we had more conscientious mothers."

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask him quite clearly - he is speaking as the minister; he has said that - is he saying that a mother who has to work and that those who work out of choice, either one, to further their careers, that they are not as conscientious as they should be? Or is he saying that those people who do not work are more conscientious about their children than those who do work? Just what is he saying? Will he either clarify the remarks that he made, apologize to the working mothers in this Province, or submit his resignation, as he should do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
It is going to be an afternoon of quoting, Mr. Speaker.

Now, can I further quote from Hansard?

AN HON. MEMBER:
No. Answer the question.

MR. BRETT:
Sauce for the goose but not sauce for the gander, is it?

"Now, I acknowledge" - quoting from Hansard - "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."

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I will read to the minister, if he wants me to, five or six statements that he has made. As a matter of fact, I will send him copies of them.

The minister has indicated that there is a causal relationship between mothers who work and juvenile delinquency.

MR. SIMMONS:
That is right. He said that.

MR. TULK:
You said that. Now I want that to sink into his head, that those mothers who work are contributing to juvenile delinquency in this Province.

MR. SIMMONS:
He said that.

MR. FLIGHT:
Yes, he did say that.

MR. TULK:

He made that statement. He referred to some of their children, as a matter of fact -

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

MR. TULK:
Did he refer to some of their children as latchkey children?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
He did! He did!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Would the hon. member please pose a question?

MR. SIMMONS:
That is a good question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:
I put a question. Did he refer to some of their children as latchkey children? Did he do that? Is that in Hansard? Did he say that some of those working mothers had latchkey children?

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, he did.

MR. TULK:
Is that not a shameful statement for the minister who is responsible for establishing day care in this Province to make? If it is, would he do the appropriate thing, as I asked him in the last question, and submit his resignation to the Premier?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
I cannot find it in Hansard, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:
Page L2892.

MR. BRETT:
What I said, I believe, in essence, was that there are far too many latchkey children in Canada today, and so there are, Mr. Speaker. There are too many children coming home in the afternoon and finding the key under the mat of the front door or under the mat of the back door. That is a sad commentary on our society, Mr. Speaker, a very sad commentary.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, if I could I would like to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Sit down.

MR. BRETT:
I am not finished, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Sit down.

MR. MITCHELL:
You asked a question. Sit down and let him answer.

MR. SPEAKER:
I understood the hon. minister sat down.

MR. TULK:
Do I give up my place?

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

MR. TULK:

I have no objection to the minister answering what is obviously a very serious charge, but I am not going to give up my place to him in answering this question.

The minister is responsible for establishing child care -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
I want to ask him, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BUTT:
It is a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If it is a speech it is not a very good one.

MR. FUREY:
Quieten the cucumber, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
I want to ask him, Mr. Speaker, does he believe as he said yesterday that the latchkey children in this country are a result of mothers working, or are they a result of his government not supplying the kind of child care that should be provided in this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. member that this government has been and is as cognizant, or more cognizant of the need -

MR. MITCHELL:
And done more.

MR. BRETT:
- and done more for child care and greater quality care than any government we have ever had in the Province. As a matter of fact, prior to 1979, when this administration took over, there was no such thing as child care in this Province. If it was it was so miniscule that nobody knew anything about it. Mr. Speaker, just in the last two years we have gone from 1,444 licenced spaces up to 1,804. We have gone, in the last seven or eight years, from a mere 200-and-some-odd thousand to \$1.5 million this year, so there can be no suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that we are uncaring or that child care and quality care is of no importance to this government.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Social Services. The minister expounds the old Tory theory that the women's place is in the home, as my colleague says, pregnant and barefoot. Now, how would the minister deal with the plight of single parents, who certainly cannot afford the luxury of staying home? Would the minister ban single parenthood?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Good question!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

The members of the Opposition will continue to make accusations like that, and I guess the best thing that I can do is ignore it because the hon. member knows that that was not my suggestion. I mean, I am part of a government which has affirmative action for women. I am a minister who recently hired a new ADM who is a woman. I am part of a government that is making sure that 50 per cent of all government boards are women, and on and on it goes. So, Mr. Speaker, that statement I choose to ignore.

And with respect to the hon. member's question about unmarried mothers -

MR. DECKER:

Single parents.

MR. BRETT:

Single parents. This year alone, through the Social Assistance programme, we estimate that we will spend between \$900,000 and \$1 million in child care subsidies to single parents and people on social assistance.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, the minister says, it is in Hansard, 'There is no substitute for a mother's love'. That is pretty well an apple-pie

statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Is there? Is there?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Can you quiet those cucumbers, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:

The minister says, 'There is no substitute for a mother's love.' Is the minister suggesting -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

- Mr. Speaker, that working mothers do not love their children?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. DECKER:

Is the minister not aware that the opposite is the case? It is because mothers love their children that they have to work to provide for them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. member, what is the substitute for

a mother's love? Would he please stand up and tell the House?

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. DECKER:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! A final supplementary.

MR. DECKER:
Obviously, Mr. Speaker, they are nervous over this. They know they have dug a hole for themselves. This is Toryism, Mr. Speaker. This is it. This is 17th. Century thinking, as we have been saying all along. If the minister is not going to allow mothers to work, what action has he or his department or his government taken to encourage his counterparts in Ottawa to bring in a pension or an allowance for homemakers who want to stay home? Is he making some preparation for that, if he is not going to allow them to work?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
If the hon. member would care to refer to Hansard, he would see

that in my remarks yesterday I indicated that I would be going to Ottawa either the latter part of June or sometime in July - now that is the information that I have been given, but maybe it will not be until August or September, I do not know - and I have been told, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial and territorial ministers will meet the federal minister the latter part of June or sometime in July at which time we will be advised and we will negotiate with the federal minister with respect to exactly what the federal government intends to do in the area of child care and the amount of money that is going to be spent.

I also indicated, and it is in the Hansard that most hon. gentlemen have, that unless it is a direct grant to this Province it will probably not do very much for child care next year or the year after. I indicated that I would be asking for a direct grant. Because if it is through CAP, the Canada Assistance Plan, or if it is through the tax system, I doubt if we will benefit very much.

So the hon. member, if you have Hansard, will get that answer.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social Services. Some time last year the minister made some statement to the effect that unemployed women, women who were never in the work force but are now gaining jobs through the Canada Job Strategy Programme, had

the result of increasing the unemployment rate in this Province. So I ask the minister, in view of that statement and in view of what he said yesterday about working mothers, does the minister believe that women, married or otherwise, do not have the right to work?

MR. TULK:
That is right.

MR. CALLAN:
That is what he is saying.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I remember very, very distinctly what I said last year or the year before, and I am also very proud to stand by it. It was a case of women, and it could be men - it did not matter whether it was women or men - it was a case of people who were reasonably well off, almost to the point where they were wealthy, who were taking jobs on Canada Works Grants, or whatever they are called today - there is a whole list of them - and I felt it was wrong that somebody who was almost wealthy, certainly reasonably well off, should take a job, whether it be man or woman, from somebody who was unemployed and had three or four children to feed.

Now if the hon. member thinks that he is going to shame me because I said that, then, brother, you have an awful lot of thinking to do, because I stand by that. I got more letters and telephone calls from across this Province in two weeks for saying that than you got all your life put together as a politician.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:
Table the phone calls.

MR. DINN:
Table the hon. member.

MR. CALLAN:
I will floor you in a minute.

MR. LUSH:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, the minister earlier today said that children, as for that matter are we all are a product of our environment. Now is the minister not aware that the very reason why, the very purpose, the very logic for setting up adequate and efficient day centres is to improve that environment? Is the minister not aware of that?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
The hon. member is somehow trying to give the impression that I do not agree with child care, day care, or quality care, and, I say again, read Hansard. I have said three or four times this afternoon that I have no quarrel with anyone, including the socialists over there, when it comes to that. There is a need for more child care in Canada and in Newfoundland, there is need for more quality care, and there is more need because we have so many single parents, because, to answer the hon. member's question, we have so many instances where it is

necessary for both people to go out to work, both spouses to go out to work. Of course there is a need. I have said that repeatedly. It has nothing to do with my philosophy, for the want of a better word, which is that nothing can take the place of a mother's love, and I will argue that to the day I die. It has nothing to do with the need for quality child care. It is two separate issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

Is the minister not aware of the abundance of study and research today demonstrating that there is no correlation between working parents and bad behaviour, juvenile delinquents and this kind of thing, that there is absolutely no correlation between bad behaviour, juvenile delinquents, whether these children come from working parents or non-working parents? Is the minister aware of that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is an expert in that field, that he has a library on that and therefore he knows whereof he speaks.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I stand by what I said, that children are products of their environment.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I had thought yesterday when the minister made the outburst that it was an irrational, isolated, emotional outburst by a minister on the run. But I now realize, Mr. Speaker, that he was just reflecting the view of the dinosaurs who sit around him. That is the sad revelation today, that others there are aiding and abetting what he has done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is what he did. He is interested in quotations. I will refer him to page L2892. Here are words out of his own mouth, if he wants quotations. "I sometimes wonder if we would not have as many people in our correctional centers if these people" - and the context shows he means mothers here - "continued on with a conscious decision to stay home and raise their children." I say to my friend from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), there is the answer to your question right there. The minister does make a direct relationship between the two.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister: How can he, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRETT:

Are you saying the member for Bonavista North cannot read?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

How can he rationalize that terrible, that insulting, that offensive suggestion, that there would be fewer people in correctional institutions if the mothers stayed at home? Mr. Speaker, why does he not do the only sensible, sane thing today and get up and apologize? But there is no way. He is just talking himself further into a corner. Why does he not get up and be a man about it, Mr. Speaker, and apologize for those intemperate remarks?

MR. BARRETT:

Do not be so foolish!

MR. SIMMONS:

I do not expect the dinosaur from St. John's West to agree with what I am saying.

Now, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Social Services get up now and apologize to the people of Newfoundland for that intemperate, insulting, abominable statement?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I was going to make some reference to 'minister on the run', but perhaps I should not. I do not think it is necessary for me to get down -

MR. DINN:

Do not get down in the mud with that.

MR. EFFORD:

How low can you get.

MR. DINN:

You should know how low a person can get.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BRETT:

It is not necessary for me, Mr. Speaker, to get down in the mud. It is not necessary at all. But I ask the hon. gentleman, who does he want me to apologize to?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Hon. members on my right now are creating a concerted row. I know that the hon. members on the left have not been very quiet, but there seems to have been a concerted row to stop the hon. minister from speaking on that occasion.

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I ask the question: To whom should I apologize? Should I apologize to the Socialists and the Liberals who do not agree with me? Or should I apologize to the dozens and dozens - my phone has been blocked the whole morning over at the office - of people calling in congratulating me for saying what I said yesterday?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:

Or do I apologize to at least five or six people who met me in the corridor today on my way to the House of Assembly and congratulated me for my

philosophical statement, for the want of a better word. As I said to my Socialist friends and my Liberal friends who think they are making some political hay out of this, if they believe there is a substitute for a mother's love, go and tell the press what it is so that the rest of Newfoundland can read it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is about one minute left in Question Period.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the minister asked whom he should apologize to. For starters, Mr. Speaker, he should apologize to his colleague, the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), because I cannot think for a second that she agrees with what he is saying -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
- that the numbers in institutions go up because the mothers are out working to earn a living. She does not agree with that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Charles Brett to Charles Dickens in one day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, whom should he apologize to! He talks about his phone calls. Is he telling us that it is a straight matter of

politics? That is the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I said, when I recognized the hon. member, that he had one minute left and that one minute has now expired.

MR. SIMMONS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

o o o

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

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

MR. J. CARTER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I did not want to interrupt Question Period because I did not want it to appear that we were interfering with the very interesting questions coming from the other side. Something has been distributed to all members in this House of a propagandistic nature, and it is not even very well done. If it were well done, perhaps you could excuse it. I certainly do not blame the Pages for doing what they are asked to do. The Pages are required to carry out the wishes of all

members of this Chamber, even if sometimes the wishes are contradictory. I think it is an improper use of the facilities of this House to ask the officials of this House - the Pages are among the officials of this House - to engage in assisting in what can only be called a poor effort at propoganda. If it were a good effort, or if it were intended to be humorous, perhaps one could overlook it. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is an improper use of the facilities of this House. I do not know what member is responsible for it, or what member or members. These are people who are talking about mother's love, but they show no love for their leader, no leader love.

MR. TULK:

There is no point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

I believe it should be a point of privilege because it is an improper use of the House facilities, but I stick with the point of order and I want to lodge an objection, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

I thank the gentleman from St. John's North for raising it. What he is talking about, in case hon. members are not aware, is a newspaper item that has been circulated, I understand. I have a copy here and it says, 'Stay home, Moms: Brett.' 'Juvenile delinquency increases as mothers leave home to work, says Cabinet Minister.'

I want to confirm that that is what the gentleman was talking about, this particular item. Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, if that is what the member is complaining about, and I understand that it is, that is the item - is that the item?

MR. J. CARTER:

Yes.

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the member has raised this issue. It is an important issue and the grounds rule here is that only a member of the House should be at the beck and call of the Pages. I would suggest to the Speaker -

MR. J. CARTER:

The other way round, you mean.

MR. SIMMONS:

Could I say what I want to say for a moment?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker might want, if he thinks it important, to determine from the Page whether this was requested of him or her by a member of the House. That is an appropriate question to put to the Page. The matter then should rest if the answer from the Page is yes, unless you do not trust the Page and I hope you do trust the Page.

The second point though, Mr. Speaker, is that I am delighted the gentleman raised this because he shows that there is a difference of feeling on the subject over there. You see, the minister has told us for a half hour that he is proud of this, so

nobody can be scored for putting out a message that the minister is proud of it.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member is not speaking to the point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I understood - correct me if I am wrong - that the gentleman rose about this matter here and raised objections to it being circulated. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that what can be more serving of members of this House, more serving of the Minister of Social Services, than somebody who in his charity, from whatever side of the House, would take his message which he wants to get out and circulate it for him among his colleagues, even the colleague from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) who happens not to agree with that? Mr. Speaker, somebody has done the minister a great favour by putting out this marvellous message.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, this matter has arisen before and, if my memory is correct, I think it was the hon. the Leader of the Opposition who raised the matter of distribution of literature by the Pages. I am going to instruct the Pages now and later that they are not to distribute anything other than messages by hon. members and official documents. It seems to me that the other one was a propaganda type of paper, and that is not the function of the Pages, it is to serve the hon. members and to distribute official documents. So the point of order is well taken.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, members will recall, and the Chair will certainly recall, that another important precedent was set in this House this day in that when the person speaking - it happened to a questioner, and it happened to me - at the time the thirty minutes for Question Period expired, the person speaking was interrupted by the Speaker and told that Question Period had expired. I think it is a delightful precedent, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to it being applied when a minister is answering as the Question Period expires.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
No. Of course, there is not.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Province of Newfoundland Pooled Pension Fund financial statement for the year ending December 31, 1985.

Petitions

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

I rise today with petitions that I have received from people of the Bay St. George area concerning the thirty-five cutbacks in Social Services. Mr. Speaker, the petitions are flowing in on a daily basis and they are being sent to various members of the Opposition. I am very pleased to rise in my place today and present the points of view these people would like to get out, because really they speak for many people around the Province.

Mr. Speaker, the thirty-five cutbacks in Social Services was a very bad move by this government. It shows the priorities of this government in dealing with people who are in desperate need. It also shows, Mr. Speaker, the alarming attitude of the Minister of Social Services and the policy of this government. As we have just seen in Question Period, Mr. Speaker, this government has now adopted a policy which is opposite or contrary to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies' policy, who talks about the Women's Policy Office he has established and which is putting out fact sheets on how many women are working in the Province and how the number has increased in the last ten years. They are putting that out from one government department, and then you have another minister over there saying, 'Stay home, moms.' You have one arm doing this and one arm doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what the policy is, because all of a sudden we have a contradiction in the policy. It seems as if I am a minister I am allowed to have a philosophical difference with what my department does. I am allowed to have that, it is no problem for me to do that. I am allowed not to believe in what my department is supposed to do. So you are allowed to do that now. That is a new precedent with this government over here, that you can get up and say what you feel like when you want to, and which is contrary to what your government is doing and what your department is doing.

Now, all of a sudden, we have a minister who talks about day care and child care when he just laid off thirty-five people. And they are getting heat from all over the Province on that. Now they come out with the statement that mothers should stay home because the kids are growing up wrong, they are ending up in penitentiaries and in institutions. Then they are questioning mother's love, Mr. Speaker. They are saying because a mother has to work during the day she does not love her children. Now, that is what that minister is saying; it has been said yesterday point-blank by the minister when he was speaking on day care; he was speaking on a private member's resolution presented by that side over there. He is the minister who is supposed to spread the good word about day care in this Province and he gets up and wipes out the whole argument that his own side is trying to put forward.

I think it is appalling, I think it is shocking that they can get on with such contradictory

statements and still be allowed to keep on moving policy statements, sending these things out in the mail to people talking about the good job they are doing when they are showing such an archaic attitude about women in the Province and single parents in the Province, because there are single fathers around this Province who also need day care, Mr. Speaker. Well, they are forgotten anyway. We will forget about them. But to see a minister getting on with this kind of stuff, I just cannot believe it, Mr. Speaker.

Today I spoke to the national representative of The Status of Women for Newfoundland - she has just been appointed - and she expressed total dismay and disgust at the statements made by the Minister of Social Services. As a matter of fact, she had a very difficult time believing that the minister in this provincial government responsible for bringing forward policy on day care, and approving, had made statements that are contrary to what they should be doing. It is unbelievable that they can get up in this House and defend the statements made and say that it is a personal philosophy, it is not the philosophy of the department. I would like to know how the two things can jibe, Mr. Speaker?

And the cutting back of thirty-five positions in the department where it does affect child care all over the Province has direct correlation and relation to what the minister has been saying in the last couple of days. I think it is shocking and appalling. We are going to be presenting petitions for as long as we have to to get the point across, because this government has to learn the lesson that they

just cannot say one thing, then put something out on paper and not carry it out.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I have responded to petitions of this nature on two or three occasions and to get up again means that I will basically repeat what I said before, that the thirty-five staff members who were let go were in excess of the staff complement of the department. I think there are many unfortunate aspects of having to lay off staff, but one of the most unfortunate things about it is that we have had to lay off the junior employees in the office because of the agreement with the union. This means, of course, that in many offices the worker who is dealing with child care, in the Child Welfare Division, has had to be let go, and that is most unfortunate.

However, I hasten to point out, Mr. Speaker, that whenever we have had to do this, another person is assigned to do that case load. On the West Coast we have transferred people from one office to another so that, in fact, even though a person has been laid off, there has not been a decrease in staff. So we are trying to cope with what is a very difficult problem for myself and everybody at the department, but we were operating above our staff complement and we have no choice in these times of fiscal restraint but to try to live within our staff budget.

That is what we are doing, and we are doing it in a way so that we can at least have somebody to cover the case loads of the people who are being let go. We know that there will be some who will have to work a little bit harder, but, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that our people who depend on us for whatever reason will suffer, that the services will be any less or of any less quality.

I can assure hon. members that it is not easy. There are over 1,100 on the staff of the Department of Social Services. It is a big department. We are going to spend almost \$180 million this year. And if the hon. gentlemen think that I delight in laying off thirty-five people or that government delights in laying off thirty-five people, well, then, I can assure you they are wrong. We are doing everything within our power to cope and to give the same kind of service that we gave before the thirty-five people were laid off.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the nice, empathetic tones of the Minister of Social Services are completely out of place in the mouth of the Minister of Social Services. Does he not realize, or is he still reeling from the shock, that his whole world collapsed yesterday, that he pulled it in on himself yesterday, and that all the nice, empathetic tones and the pretensions of sincerity are not going anywhere at all, they are not even getting out of this room? He fools nobody

anymore, Mr. Speaker.

Now, he cannot have it both ways. He cannot stand in this House and brag about the number of calls that he has had from people out there who are rushing to say, "Well done, dinosaur. Raise your head, dinosaur, well done." He cannot summon that as an argument for the rightness of his action and, at the same time, dismiss the many dozens of names on those petitions who say he is wrong in what he has done. If he is so quick to grab onto any opinion which supports his position, why is he so slow, Mr. Speaker, to heed some advice which is contrary to his position?

Now Mr. Speaker, the petition is one of two we have had today. I suspect we will see others in the days that follow, we have already had some, because this, Mr. Speaker, is a touchstone. This goes to show again the callousness of a minister who, first of all, does not have any commitment to the social services, to the women of this Province, to the children of this Province. He does not have any commitment and what, Mr. Speaker, is even more of an insult is that half his gang over there share his outdated views. Half his gang over there are straight from Dickens' age, straight from 200 years ago. That is the sad reality of it all, Mr. Speaker.

I watched his seat mate from St. John's West (Mr. Barrett).

MR. J. CARTER:
(Inaudible) wants to speak.

MR. SIMMONS:
The minister has been wanting to speak for years. As soon as he gets something to say, we are going to let him speak. Mr.

Speaker, I watched the reaction of the seat mate of the minister, the gentleman from St. John's West -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I guess if my wife and the many wives that the minister castigated, the many single mothers he castigated had a spouse or somebody who was out with a minister's salary and holding shares in half the companies in St. John's, yes they could afford the luxury of staying home or going to the cocktail parties as the case may be. But we are talking about people here, Mr. Speaker, who do not have that particular luxury.

MR. SIMMS:
Do not be so nasty.

MR. SIMMONS:
If the minister from Grand Falls wants an example of nastiness he just has got to look at what that man down in the corner, and in the corner is quite the expression today, he is more in the corner today than ever before.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I started to say is this, that he has to realize, he has to get it through his thick skull that his whole world collapsed yesterday. He can go through the pretence, he can have emotional support from his colleagues who would like to bail him out for their own political reasons, but the deed is done. He hurled an insult yesterday that cannot be retracted. It can be apologized for, and people will understand that it was a moment of intemperateness, but it cannot be retracted. The deed is done.

He is telling us our penal

institutions are all the more full because we have mothers who want to go out and work. That is what that man said yesterday. What are we doing here, Mr. Speaker, what are we doing here listening to that kind of an insult? Why does the Premier not do the people of Newfoundland a favour and ask the minister to step down because he is no longer capable of performing his responsibilities? It is shameful what we saw yesterday, and then more shameful today that he would even try and condone, try and profess that he means what he said yesterday. What a shame! What an insult, Mr. Speaker! If he insists on persisting in this, we will persist until he does the honourable thing.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present on behalf of twenty people from the Bay St. George area. In retrospect, it is the same as the petition just presented by the hon. member for Stephenville. It supports that petition, Mr. Speaker, which was against the fact that thirty-five workers in the Department of Social Services are being laid off. I want the minister to listen to this, because I want an answer.

The minister, in response to the statement, said that what they are doing is transferring people from one district to another where they find it necessary to do that. I would like for the minister when he gets the opportunity to explain

- this is the second or third time that I have tried to get an answer to this from the minister - the fact that he stated very clearly that we have equally as many people, or more, depending on social services this year as we did in 1986. If that is the case, the minister must admit that we cannot work with less people than we worked with last year and that the people who are presently working in those social services offices are going to be overworked. If they have more caseloads than they can handle in any one day, then, as stated in the prayer of this petition, the child care division of the Social Services Department, senior citizens and other people depending on those social workers are going to be neglected. The minister knows full well what he is saying. You cannot take away with one hand and give with the other and expect the two ends to meet.

Mr. Speaker, what we heard the Minister of Social Services say yesterday in the House of Assembly is a true statement as to why the Department of Social Services is in the state of chaos that it is, from the department to the regional offices to the administrative offices, it follows right on down through, Mr. Speaker, to the boys' homes, the Boys' Home in Pleasantville and the Boys' Home in Whitbourne.

We have seen examples, year after year, of where there have been continuous problems at the boys' homes. We have pointed out, as has the general public, as has the news media and as have everybody else, to the Minister of Social Services -

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not wish to take up the hon. member's time, but a member speaking to a petition should contain himself to the facts in the petition and also the numbers. I was wondering how many names are on this particular petition. We did not hear that, or I did not, at least.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order that I can determine.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

There was no point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

There was no point of order.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that the problems encountered at the Boys' Home in Whitbourne and at the Boys' Home in Pleasantville are a direct result of what is taking place in the Department of Social Services; we are seeing cutbacks and we are seeing restraint in the wrong areas. When those kinds of things happen, certain areas of the department have to be neglected. It is not happening in top management levels, it is not happening in the Deputy Minister's office or the offices of the highly paid officials, it is happening in the lower echelons of

the department. That is what we are seeing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that this is not going to be a precedent for the future. I beg to differ with Your Honour, but perhaps I could refer to our own Standing Order 92 which clearly states, "Every member offering a petition to the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegations it contains."

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the hon. member is supposed to indicate the number, and I am simply asking him how many names are on the petition. It is not too difficult a request.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I have already ruled there is no point of order.

The hon. member has ample time to indicate the numbers on his petition.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands is just playing little games. He sees the situation the Minister of Social Services has gotten himself into.

MR. BAIRD:

How many names are there on the petition, boy?

MR. EFFORD:

There are forty names on the petition. Now, if hon. members would like to come over and sit down by me, I will point them out individually, give them some assistance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member just gave the number of names on the petition just in the nick of time, because his five minutes have now elapsed.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague. There is a lot of concern being expressed by people around this Province as to just what is happening in the Department of Social Services. There is a lot of concern among the people of Newfoundland because of the statements the hon. Minister of Social Services made in this House yesterday, statements which one would expect to hear from a speaker of 300 or 400 hundred years ago, certainly not from a speaker in the year 1987 in a Western country. The hon. minister said, 'I want to go on record as saying that I wish we had more conscientious mothers, more people who would be willing to sacrifice their career to stay home and raise their children.' Mr. Speaker, when I heard these statements I just assumed that it

was the case of a minister or a man, a person, probably a bit tired, maybe experiencing a weak moment who got up and said something that he did not really mean to say and that after giving it some reflection he was going to come forward and apologize and ask to have the statement withdrawn. So you can imagine, Mr. Speaker, that I came here today expecting one of two things to happen; I expected that either the hon. Minister of Social Services would have been on his feet in the place designated or allocated to Statements by Ministers, or he would have taken the opportunity to rise on a point of order or privilege. I expected to see the hon. Minister of Social Services stand in his place today and apologize to this House for making such rash statements. And not just apologize to the House, I expected him to apologize to all the women, all the mothers across this land who have to go to work, the mothers in Newfoundland and the mothers in Canada. Because, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has insulted, he has abused women in this country who have to work to support their children.

If the hon. minister believes that the 500 women who work in the fish plant in St. Anthony, who worked there in January month when the temperature outside was 20 to 25 below zero, when they are in there, Mr. Speaker, to their knees in water and fish guts and slime, when they go home smelling like a fish plant, if he believes that this is a luxury and that those women are doing it because they have so much hate and so much disgust with looking after their children that they do not want to stay home with them but that they want to unload the responsibility of caring for their children onto

someone else's lap, if the minister believes this he is totally suffering from the affluence which buys insulation from the grim realities of life, Mr. Speaker, because the women who work in those fish plants, and there are thousands of them in Newfoundland as there are thousands of them around the world, work out of necessity. Let me say to him, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the minister that as long as we have a social system that his mentality expounds, then the necessity for the working mother will never go away. The minister, Mr. Speaker, is divorced from what the real world is, he is divorced from reality and this is what affluence will do, this is what Toryism is all about. We have been saying this. I expected an apology from the minister because I gave him the benefit of the doubt for a fleeting moment and thought that he would get up and apologize. Failing that, Mr. Speaker, I expected a resignation, because I believed that he had to be totally out of tune from the rest of his colleagues. But when we came here today, what did we see? We did not see an apology, neither did we see a resignation, but we saw his colleagues thumping their desks and applauding every time he made the statement that mothers have no business working. Every time he said that somehow a mother who goes out and works and tries to care for her children is somehow less than the rest of humanity, he got applause for that, Mr. Speaker. He was applauded for that! So what do we have? The disgrace is not just the Minister of Social Services, but the disgrace is to the whole hon. bunch of cucumbers over there!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

This is what has happened, Mr. Speaker. It is what we have been saying all along, and I have a name for it. The name for it, Mr. Speaker, is Toryism. It has nothing to do with Progressive Conservatism. It has nothing to do with any other recognized party in Canada. It is pure Tory philosophy. This is what my colleague pointed out about Charles Dickens, this is what Charles Dickens was pointing out -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oliver Twist.

MR. DECKER:

This is Oliver Twist all over, the man who dared to ask for more, the boy who dared to ask for extra porridge. This is the Tory attitude. It is coming through strong and clear, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in regard to this petition. Mr. Speaker, as we are well aware, this is a very useful procedure, the presentation of petitions. It allows the people to bring concerns to this Legislature which would otherwise perhaps not be brought forward in public view.

What this procedure is not for, is for callous, partisan, advantage. Mr. Speaker, the last member who go up hardly addressed the

petition at all. He just used it as an attack on the minister. That is not what the petition procedure is for.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is rather strange that these remarks were made in the House yesterday and suddenly there is a flood of petitions before this House.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

A person who rises, and I presume the minister is rising to speak to the petition, speaks to the petition and speaks in support of it or says he does not. Now, he is breaking the rule. He has gone absolutely outside the bounds of petition presenting himself by berating the member for the Strait of Belle Isle for what he did.

Now if the hon. gentleman is going to stand up and call the kettle smut - the pot calling the kettle smut - then he should watch his own behaviour. He should stand in his place and either support the petition as the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) was doing, I would suggest to him, by pointing out the attitude that has caused this petition to come before this House in the first place, then he should do so. Otherwise, he should stand up under some other form in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, the point I was making, and I think was making very effectively, is that this particular procedure should not be turned to partisan advantage. Petitions are supposed to be presented to present the viewpoint and to bring the concerns of petitioners to this House, not to be used by the party opposite to scourge a minister.

As I was getting into it, I was suggesting that there was something very strange about this petition, something very strange.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, I refer hon. members to our own Standing Order 92 (1). It says, "In addition to the member presenting a petition only two other members, one each from both sides of the House, may speak to a petition and in so doing shall not speak for more than five minutes each."

There is very little direction in that about the person speaking.

MR. SIMMS:

Further on, Mr. Speaker, it talks about no debate allowed and all that kind of stuff.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is very difficult for the Chair to decide when a member is actually getting slightly off what the petition is all about. I think the hon. member is in order.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Your ruling says there is no point of order. The House Leader opposite had no point of order. I accept you and your ruling.

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

He is speaking to the petition, boy.

DR. COLLINS:

I am speaking to the petition.

MR. TULK:

No, you were not.

DR. COLLINS:

Oh yes. Anyway, as I was saying, Mr. Speaker, there is something very strange about this petition. I suggest that this petition did not originate with the people. The way this came into the House so quickly, in such a number, I suggest there was an orchestration here.

Mr. Speaker, what was the hon. minister yesterday trying to do? The hon. minister -

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, - on a point of privilege. We cannot let that go!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

We cannot let that go, Mr. Speaker! That is the ultimate insult to the people who have still some rights here. There is a procedure here, Mr. Speaker, which allows members to bring in petitions and that an hon. minister in this House would get up and suggest, Mr. Speaker, first

of all, that it was a contrived petition, that assigns motives to members and he cannot do that under the rules of the House. That it would be contrived with the concurrence, the corroboration of members of this House or a member, that is wrong and unparliamentary. But more to the point, for a member to get up and suggest that a number of signatories would be party to such a contrivance, Mr. Speaker, that is completely unworthy of a member. He ought to retract it. It is not only unparliamentary, it is completely unworthy of him.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I designated this a point of privilege. I believe my rights here are being infringed when I have a member standing up suggesting that the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) or the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), in presenting petitions, have brought in to this House contrived petitions, and in the process suggesting that a number of signatories entered into that contrivance. Mr. Speaker, that is unthinkable. That is absolutely unthinkable! The minister knows better than that. That is completely unworthy of him that he would even suggest that.

Why does he not resolve the issue that I have raised just by retracting it and apologizing? In the event that he does not, Mr. Speaker, surely, Mr. Speaker, you are going to have to find that there has been a breach for him to suggest that a couple of members of this Chamber in presenting petitions have engaged in a contrivance to serve their own partisan ends. That is shameful! Shameful!

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) has made a number of incorrect statements there. Firstly, I did not say 'contrived'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

You did. You did.

DR. COLLINS:

I said 'orchestrated'.

MR. SIMMS:

That is right.

DR. COLLINS:

There is a difference between 'orchestration' and 'contriving'. Contriving is doing something that is not normal, not in the nature of things. 'Orchestrating' is arranging something. Now I have suggested - you read the Hansard. Also I did not say the hon. member, it suggests to me - I have that sort of mind - it suggests to me, one day after a minister speaks there is a flood of petitions from as far away as Stephenville and all the petitions are named the same way, and all on the same piece of paper, that, to my mind, suggests that there is a certain amount of orchestration here. Now that was the point I was making.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege, the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed with this Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and with this so-called House Leader over there alluding to certain contrivances. Let me tell him one little thing. If he had been in this House for the last little while, he would understand we have been presenting these petitions on a daily basis.

DR. COLLINS:

Did you orchestrate this?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Are you going to let me speak?

MR. FUREY:

Did you orchestrate the current account deficit?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

These petitions have been presented on a daily basis, but they have gotten little or no response from government side. Do you know what they are telling me out there on the West Coast? They are saying, give them to every Opposition member so they can get up and present them because they want to get the message across to the government on the other side that you are doing nothing over there, that you are not responding to the requests of people in this Province who are disgusted with social services cutbacks! You call it what you want! That is a well done petition! It is signed by people of this Province and it is presented in the right manner. If you have a problem with it, then you tell somebody.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of

privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of privilege, you cannot blame the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) if he believes, rightly or wrongly, that this petition is somewhat orchestrated. After all, the hon. member does live near a cemetery and he does consort with the dead, so it would not at all be surprising if some of the names on this petition were those who are now deceased. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, before petitions are allowed in this House, the names be checked.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To this point of privilege, there appears to be a difference of opinion between two hon. members. It is certainly no prime facie case of breach of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

There were allegations, allegations!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance. The hon. minister has just about thirty seconds left.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think I have made my point because the reaction of the members opposite is so violent that I think I have made a point of some validity.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of some twenty - If the hon. gentleman would be quiet, Mr. Speaker - on behalf of some twenty-one people in this Province who feel the thirty-five positions the Department of Social Services has recently axed are unjust, that they go right to the very heart of doing, of course, what the Minister of Social Services announced yesterday should happen. People would have to stay home -

MR. SIMMS:

Is this another petition?

MR. TULK:

It is a new petition, yes. If the hon. gentleman wants it, he can have a carbon copy of it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the prayer of the petition. It goes as follows:

"We, the undersigned, would like this petition presented to the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador.

"The prayer of our petition is as follows: The Department of Social Services has recently cut back thirty-five positions around the Province within its department. The Bay St. George Foster Parents Association is very concerned about these layoffs, as it will critically affect the services that are needed for our children and those whose lives are enriched by the services of social workers.

"Children who usually come to live in our homes are children who have either been abused mentally, physically, or sexually. The social worker is the link between the child and the system. Their services to the children are vital

to the well being of the child. As a Province, we must have increases of services by approximately 150 new workers. As citizens we feel that we cannot permit this reduction of services.

"We ask that this petition be presented to the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador and that the Minister of Social Services act upon our concerns."

Mr. Speaker, I want to support that petition. I want to beg the government, if you cannot beg the Minister of Social Services, to do what those people ask to be done. I doubt that you can, Mr. Speaker, after we have heard a Minister of Social Services utter the statements that the Minister of Social Services uttered yesterday. I will give some examples just to prove my point.

He says, "I want to go on record as saying that I wish we had more conscientious mothers." Now, Mr. Speaker, how can you expect that Minister of Social Services to keep the thirty-five social workers who are so relevant to seeing that the needs of children in this Province are cared for? A minister who believes, as my friend from the Strait of Belle Isle said, that working mothers in this Province who have to get out and work in fish plants - I would suggest to the member for the Strait of Belle Isle that there are women working in far worse circumstances than fish plants in this Province.

I would ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the gentleman who was just so eager to jump up in his place over there and try to defend the Minister of Social Services, to sit back and very carefully consider - he is an

influential member in Cabinet - if indeed we can expect those kinds of services with the Minister of Social Services that we presently have. He is a gentleman who believes that juvenile delinquency in the Province is caused by the fact that some mothers in this Province are working, a gentleman who believes that the people who work in this Province contribute to juvenile delinquents.

How does he tie that statement with the cut back? If there are so many juvenile delinquents in the Province who are caused by working mothers and there are an increasing number of working mothers, how does he tie that statement to the reduction of thirty-five social workers in the Province?

Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing here, as my friend from Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) said, is a government where the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) is supposed to be the champion of women; the Minister of Career Development, who will not stand in his place and use a word that has a sexual connotation, will not use the word man or woman, will use persons - what are we seeing? Are we seeing a show by those two ministers in allowing that other minister to go on, in allowing the kinds of cuts that we have had, in allowing the kinds of statements that this minister is making? 'Stay home mothers'. He says nothing about the fathers. As sexual as you can get. As sexist a remark as you can get. Chauvinism! Complete chauvinist!

They are so far back in Charles Dickens day, as the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) said, the Leader of the Opposition, they are so far back

in time, they do not even realize that in our society today it is not unknown that a father stays home and looks after the children. No, it is the mothers. They have got to stay home.

Maybe they have cut back the thirty-five social workers to make them stay home. Maybe that is their tactic. It is not unknown that this government would try to do through the backdoor what it fails to do through the front door, not unknown at all that they will do exactly what they want to do through the backdoor when they will not do it through the front door.

I would like for the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), whom I just saw walk by the corridor there, to come in and get up in his place and either support this petition or not support it. He is out in the corridor. He should come in and either support this petition or not support it.

I have to warn him that if he supports this petition, then he speaking against the Minister of Social Services, who does not believe that you should have an increase in social workers, who do not believe that there is any place in the system for them. Rather, he believes that the mothers should stay home and try to keep down juvenile delinquency.

There comes the Minister of Career Development. I would ask him to come in, as I know he believes he should do, and get in his place and either speak in support of this petition or speak against it.

There comes the other champion of women, the Minister of Justice. There she comes. She is going to

speaking. Just as sure as I am speaking here she is going to speak. She is going to stand in her place and support this petition and she is going to stand in her place and say that, "Stay home, Moms: Brett. Juvenile delinquency increases as mothers leave home to work, says Cabinet Minister," does not follow what she herself believes and does not follow what the government believes.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TULK:
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, we have other petitions that we will want to present and we have other people who want to speak. I am going to sit down because this is a very important issue. I am going to sit down and let those two fairly intelligent people, as I believe they are, in touch with the 20th. Century and into the 21st. Century and not back where the Minister of Social Services is, I am going to sit down and give one of them at least, a chance to stand up and support the petition and therefore tell the Minister of Social Services that he is wrong.

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 support of the petition so ably presented by the member for Fogo as I have spoken in support of similar petitions presented on this issue in the past couple of days. I am also particularly pleased to be able to rise in support of the petition seeing that the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies, who is also responsible for the Status of Women in this Province, and the Minister of Justice, who is the only woman in the Cabinet, indeed, the only woman in the Legislature, are here in their seats now to participate in the debate. If not to actually intervene, they can listen to the debate on what is obviously a very critical issue of the day.

I would have to say that I found it unfortunate during the Question Period when we, being the small caucus that we are down in this corner, not getting an opportunity to raise our questions and be recognized. I thought for sure -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. LONG:
I am speaking to the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Would the hon. member please sit down for a moment? I would ask the hon. member to speak to the petition. He is now referring to question time and that has nothing to do with the particular petition that we are discussing.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

While the hon. gentleman is new to the House and may not know what he is doing, and while I support him on this issue and while he is supporting us on this issue, I have to say to him that he cannot cast aspersions on the Chair in the way that he is doing.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I have already made a comment to the hon. member. I would ask him to continue.

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

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, if I may, my reference to Question Period was only just to say that I was disappointed that the members of the official Opposition have not put any questions to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies or to the Minister of Justice. I would hope that in the coming days we will have some opportunity -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I pointed out to the hon. member that he is to speak to the petition. Now he is making comments about the official Opposition and about questions. That is not relevant to the petition that we are discussing at the present time.

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

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to speak

to the debate that has been happening around this very issue in the Legislature in the last couple of days and I am speaking to the petition in light of the debate that is happening. I am continuing to add remarks from our party in support of the petition. I am hoping that in the debate around this particular petition, there are others that have preceded it and presumably more that will follow, we will see other ministers of the government put their remarks on the record about this very critical issue.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would want to reiterate the concern about the cutbacks of the thirty-five social workers, concerns that are being brought to our attention, the lack of information as to where these cutbacks are taking place across the Province and the remarks by the minister today in which the minister says that, indeed, it will mean that social workers will have to work a little bit harder but it will -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I ask for protection.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down boy.

MR. LONG:

The comments by the Minister of Social Services today when he suggested that there will be no real impact on the degree of quality provided in his department but, at the same time, admitting that it would mean an increased work load for the social workers, just demonstrates a complete disrespect for the people who are working on the front lines of this

Province.

As presented in the petition, the members of the Foster Parents Organization out in Bay St. George, people who are dealing with the effects of abused children, people who are dealing with people who are living on social assistance and who are struggling for survival, trying to pay their bills month to month, the people who work in the minister's department deserve more respect from the minister.

I would suggest that the minister's comments, in light of the cutbacks in his own department, are consistent with what the minister presented to us today in his own reaffirmation of the position that women should stay at home. The comments that the minister made in the House yesterday and then his restatement of the position today, saying that he would not only not withdraw the comments but, in fact, took some joy in informing the House that he was receiving congratulatory phone calls and messages on his way to the Legislature, presents what might be seen as a very unscientific survey of the debate that is happening in this Province. Debate is raging in this Province right now about the disposition of this minister, not only towards women, in light of his remarks yesterday, but also in light of the cutbacks in his own department where social workers are being laid off.

The callousness that the minister continues to exhibit towards the people who are hurting in this Province, towards women who are coming forward looking for day care or towards the social workers who are working in his department, Mr. Speaker, will continue to

provoke much debate in the Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:
Mr. Speaker, I have a petition as well with respect to the cutbacks to the Department of Social Services. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is straying from this petition to link the attitudes on mothers and fathers, single mothers and single parents and day care to this particular petition because it is, after all, a question of attitude.

It is interesting to watch the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) in her seat today blushing like a Sprung tomato as the minister talked about the attitude towards single parents, about mothers in general and about the day care system throughout this Province. Mr. Speaker, I could not help sitting here thinking out widows who have young children and widowers who have young children. Where do they turn, Mr. Speaker? Should they stay home? Should they stay home too? Are they part of the problem of why our prisons are full?

Listen to this quotation, Mr. Speaker, 'I wish mothers would stay home and look after their children, if we did we would have fewer juveniles in correctional institutions.' What kind, Mr. Speaker, of a maniacal, illogical, silly, foolish, correlation is that to say that mothers not staying home are filling up our prisons with children who do not

have them at home. How ridiculous and illogical a correlation that is, Mr. Speaker. It is shameful.

No wonder the Minister of Justice and the Minister responsible for the Status of Women sat there blushing like a brace of Sprung tomatoes in their seats today, Mr. Speaker, after that kind of statement is issued forth to the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, cutting back social workers, yes, it is all in attitude. Seven hundred thousand dollars they claim they are going to save, Mr. Speaker. They could have saved it by keeping the Premier's Office the way it is instead of doing it up in pretty pinks and pastels, Mr. Speaker. That is where there is illogical expense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, where could they have saved -

MR. SIMMONS:

Guy Fawkes supports it, look.

MR. FUREY:

- thirty-five jobs and the \$700,000 concerned? Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Could I interrupt the hon. member for a moment?

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, you certainly can and could and always will.

MR. SPEAKER:

I just like to announce the questions for the Late Show. The first one is by the hon. the member for Fogo who is not

satisfied with the answer he received from the Minister of Social Services.

The second one is on a similar topic by the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

The third one, I am happy about it, but I think it is by leave. It is from the hon. member for Bonavista North. These questions are to be here by 4:30, and it was nearly 5:00 o'clock before it arrived. If that is acceptable, we will have that as a third question. It is on a similar topic, a question to the hon. the Minister of Social Services.

The hon. member has three minutes left.

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

You are asking for leave to enter a question in that came after 4:30. Is that what you are asking at that point?

MR. SPEAKER:

Yes, that is right.

MR. FENWICK:

No leave from our party, Mr. Speaker. The same request was made a week ago and the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) got up and objected to my entering a question late. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. No leave.

MR. TULK:

Fair enough, fair enough.

MR. SIMMONS:

Duly noted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FUREY:

They are feeling the heat of losing their union offices and their union support, and their extra monies and the hidden monies and all that kind of stuff.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the third question cannot be considered.

MR. FUREY:

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, I was saying that this particular government has a convoluted -

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) in Windsor.

MR. FLIGHT:

No, you will not have to worry about him anymore.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I was saying, before I was rudely interrupted by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), that priorities are twisted when we see how this government expends its money. Where could we have saved money, they say? Where should we have not chopped?

Well you should not have spent \$800,000 to make the Premier's environment prettier. It was not necessary. You did not have to spend \$3 million sending Cabinet ministers jet setting around the globe to exotic lands. That was a waste of money. It is not because we do not have to send Cabinet ministers, Mr. Speaker, but ask yourself an honest question, how many jobs did we get for these Cabinet ministers?

MR. TULK:

What about Lougheed?

MR. FUREY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, and my hon. colleague for Fogo says, what about Lougheed, \$440,000 last year for legal services, for what? Who knows? \$440,000 again this year for legal services, for what? Who knows? So if you want to save money, \$3 million saved from jet setting; \$800,000 saved on the Premier's Office; \$3 million on jet setting; \$250,000 on the cocktail circuit; \$250,000 for eight lazy ministers who refused to use the Newfoundland Information Service and hired eight press secretaries. What an orgy of laziness, Mr. Speaker! It is just ridiculous!

Mr. Speaker, this petition comes to the floor of this House because of the attitude of a government that cuts where it hurts. They are cutting social workers, Mr. Speaker, and that hurts.

But let me take you back to this attitude and here again the Minister of Social Services is speaking on the public record. He says, if they - mothers - make a conscious decision to have children, they should stay home and raise their children. Now just imagine, Mr. Speaker, saying that. What an antiquated statement! That is so foreign to modern times and modern language that it is almost imperceptible, Mr. Speaker. How can anybody in this day and age say that? Mothers, lots of them, do not want to go into the marketplace and go into the economy, Mr. Speaker, but they are forced to. They are forced into the marketplace and into the economy because, Mr. Speaker, of the various economic policies of this government.

Why are mothers working? They are working to pay off that Finance

Minister's current account deficit because he cannot pay the light bills.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Why are they working, Mr. Speaker? They are working to pay off the jet setting \$3 million from those Cabinet Ministers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Why are they working, Mr. Speaker? Because these ministers got thirsty to the tune of \$250,000 last year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Why are they working, Mr. Speaker? They are working so the Premier can have pretty pastels to sit his rear end in on the eighth floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, do not condemn mothers for working.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. FUREY:

Of course. By leave, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave is not granted.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Is the minister going to rise in support? No.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member speaking to the petition?

MR. KELLAND:

Yes, I am rising to support the petition, obviously, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much for recognizing me.

I suppose of all the members on this side of the House, when we make references to what the Minister of Social Services does or does not do or how he conducts the affairs of his department, up to yesterday I can say that I probably, on almost any occasion, could have rose in very strong support of the Minister of Social Services for what he has done and the benefits of his department and the good people he provides to my district, because it is a benefit to Naskaupi district, as it is to many others.

But I was more than just a little taken aback also yesterday, Mr. Speaker, to hear the expression of his views, his personal philosophy and his ministerial philosophy, because he was speaking as the Minister of Social Services. There is no question about that.

When he again rose today and reiterated what he had said the previous day, and it is in quite a proud manner that he holds his views, and, as my colleague said,

was applauded by his colleagues on the government side, I went into a form of shock, I would have to say. Thinking back about the other remarks and comments by my colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) district, I was impressed by one of his analogies when he referred to Charles Dickens and poor Oliver Twist, who had the nerve, the temerity, to ask for more porridge, please.

I look at the petition as so ably and eloquently presented by my colleague from St. Barbe district and I see exactly what my other colleague meant in his analogy, because we are talking about the laying off of thirty-five social services positions in the minister's department. At the same time, the petitioners are saying that in order to carry out the functions of the Department of Social Services properly, we need 150 more workers, not thirty-five less. Those people in that area of our Province, and no doubt, every other area of our Province, are simply looking at the Minister of Social Services and saying, 'More porridge, please. More porridge, minister. We need more porridge.'

If you think about the movie version of Oliver Twist, when you saw that little guy having the temerity to stand up and say, 'More porridge, please', and you think about those who had to make that decision, we can make an analogy here that the fat cats who ran that orphanage in the movie can be likened to the fat cats on the Tory side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
While they are living in the lap

of luxury, which is ever increasing, the fat cats ever increasing, the people of this Province who have social services needs are saying, 'More porridge', and all they are getting is a deaf ear and more layoffs. More layoffs, Mr. Speaker, while they ask for more porridge, a pittance compared to the lap of luxury the fat cats on the government side of this House live in. There is no question about that.

I know the minister said when he rose to support the petition that the quality of service will not suffer in his department. He did not say anything about what the current ratio is of clients to case worker. I would be interested to hear what that might be. What is the ratio and what effect will the layoff of thirty-five people have in increasing the ratio of clients to workers? I would like to know that. If indeed it is taking place because they have too many staff members in the Department of Social Services, it is only an indication that the department has been mismanaged that would allow that in the first place.

If they are saying it is for fiscal restraint reasons, that they cannot afford to pay them any more and cannot afford to keep them on, then they are saying and confirming what I have already said, that they are a bunch of Tory fat cats living off the backs of the people in this Province who need those social services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
The poor people, the ordinary people, the common people in Newfoundland and Labrador, -

MR. MORGAN:

What is Clyde Wells going to do?

MR. KELLAND:

- while the Tories on the government side get fatter and richer, obese in body and mind and spirit.

MR. DECKER:

Yes, and the poor get poorer.

MR. KELLAND:

And the poor get poorer. When they look for more porridge, they do not get more porridge. They get a cold shoulder, a Tory cold shoulder.

MR. MORGAN:

Clyde Wells, the biggest fat cat in politics in Newfoundland.

MR. KELLAND:

That is what we have, Mr. Speaker. It indeed does give me a great deal of pleasure to stand in my place and support the petition so ably presented, as I have already said, by my colleague from St. Barbe and his predecessors who also presented similar petitions.

Mr. Speaker, just a sort of a little notice, in a way. I have one too and when my turn comes to present it I will say it all over again and reiterate it one more time.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a

petition on behalf of some twenty-one residents of the Province. Mr. Speaker, I find it amazing that those petitions are being presented and the Minister of Social Services is sitting in his seat and refusing to comment on the petitions and so on.

MR. MORGAN:

Read the prayer of the petition.

MR. TULK:

Yes, I will read the prayer of the petition for the hon. gentleman.

"We, the undersigned, would like this petition presented to the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador.

"The prayer of our petition is as follows: The Department of Social Services has recently cut back thirty-five positions around the Province within its department," the member would be aware of that I presume. "The Bay St. George Foster Parents Association is very concerned about these layoffs as this will critically affect the services that are needed for our children, and all those whose lives are enriched by the services of social workers."

MR. MITCHELL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting in my seat and I have been listening to the petitions as they have been presented. I have also made a note here, because I wanted to speak to the petition. The same petition was presented by the member for Fogo just before the last two and now he is presenting

the same petition again from the Foster Children's Association in Bay St. George.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
While the prayer of the petition may be somewhat similar, let me say to the hon. gentleman that the names are not the same and therefore the petitions are not.

MR. MITCHELL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MITCHELL:
Yes, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK:
I am not finished, Mr. Speaker. What happened there?

MR. MITCHELL:
The hon. member did not read out the names that were on the petition. I am going by the prayer of the petition -

MR. TULK:
Do you want me to read them to you?

MR. MITCHELL:
- and from the association that it is from.

MR. TULK:
Sit down and do not be such a fool.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

The hon. the member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say to the man from LaPoile, who, when he opens his mouth, does not put one foot in, he puts two in, if he wants to find out the names of all the petitions it is a very simple procedure in this House for him to do it. If he sees this lady sitting down here to the table, she is the Clerk of the House. He can ask her to see if the names are the same that I am presenting. Otherwise he should stay in his seat and be quiet because, otherwise, he will have his feet and his arms in his mouth as far as he can get them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to continue, "Children who usually come to live in our homes are children who have either been abused mentally, physically or sexually. The social worker is the link between the child and the system. Their services to the children are vital to the well being of the child." The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) is leaving again.

"As a Province, we must have increases of services by approximately 150 new workers."

Is he threatening you, Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms)? God forbid if he does because we will have to take him on.

"As citizens we feel we cannot permit this reduction of services. We ask that this petition be presented to the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and

Labrador and that the Minister of Social Services act upon our concerns."

Mr. Speaker, what those people are saying to this minister, I say to the member for LaPoile, is there are children in this Province who need child care, who need social service workers to see that their mothers who are working are still allowed to work and that the children, at the same time, have child care. They are saying to the Minister of Social Services, the man from Dickens, I say to the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), please, do not cutback thirty-five social workers in the Province. We need 105 so that the children of this Province can be protected. We need 105 increased. Presumably that means they need 140, thirty-five and 105 is 140. He will understand that, Mr. Speaker, if not, we will send him a copy along with a little calculator.

Mr. Speaker, I say again to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or perhaps the President of Treasury Board, the gentleman from Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor), where I would presume there are a lot of working mothers, I say to him that he should rise today in his place and as a once powerful member of the Peckford administration - and I say once powerful because he has got, I understand, the boots a little bit lately - but I would say to him that he should stand in his place and as a private member representing working mothers in Mount Pearl, he has always said that he is the champion of them, that he would stand in his place and support this petition from twenty-one residents of the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. TULK:

Not true. By leave, Mr. Speaker. That is not true is it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before recognizing the hon. the member for LaPoile, I would like to welcome to this hon. House thirty-four Grade VI students and their teachers Mrs. Reader and Mr. Williams with four chaperones from L.R. Ash School in Lethbridge in the great district of Terra Nova, which is well represented.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to have a few words, if I may, without too much interruption from the Yahoos. I have learned that word from that side, actually, since I have been in the House of Assembly, so it gives me pleasure in using it here today.

I would like to support the petition, but I also would like to read into the record a defense for the Department of Social Services for the tremendous job that they are doing in this Province today.

I am quite aware of the petition that the hon. gentleman has presented or the two petitions that he has presented in the House

today. In fact, I was invited to a meeting only last week in my own district where all members from different associations were represented. The President of the Foster Children's Association for Bay St. George was also present at that meeting. I happened to bring along some statistics that I had gathered in relation to my own Social Services Office in the Port aux Basques region. I think it is interesting to note and it is interesting for the House to note what these statistics are.

If you look at from 1979 until 1984-85 in the Port aux Basques Office itself, there were seven social workers. That is the number of people that was working in the Port aux Basques area.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Up until when?

MR. MITCHELL:
From 1979 up until 1984-85, that is when I got the information from the Department of Social Services. At that time, which was last Thursday, we had eighteen full-time employees in the social services office in Port aux Basques looking after the needs of my region. So, if you look at that and you put it into perspective, in the last two years, we have had a 135 per cent increase in the staff in social work in the LaPoile district.

Now, the other thing I found interesting was that the gentleman, the President of the Foster Children's Association, who actually was at that meeting, did not bother to present a petition. But he also had a concern about the cut back. I asked him - I will not name him here - if he had the opportunity of making an appointment with the Minister of

Social Services and bringing his concerns, as President of that Association, to the minister or to the department. The answer was, no, he did not.

I was very happy to be able to bring good news to the residents of LaPoile, to my constituents and to be able to tell them that my lobbying on their behalf meant that there would be no cut back in the staff in LaPoile. Instead of a cut back, where we had a temporary, we were going to now have a full-time person. Everybody was pretty pleased.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:
I have got to throw some accolades today to the Department of Social Services for the wonderful job that they are doing. I do not have the information right in front of me but there are two major organizations in Canada today that have come out publicly and said that the social services programmes in Newfoundland are the best in Canada.

I am very proud to be able to stand behind the Minister of Social Services and say that he is doing a tremendous job in the field of social work and trying to address the social problems that we have in our Province today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I thought that the

interjection of the gentleman from LaPoile was one of the more significant things we have had today. It was only about five minutes before when my friend from Fogo tried to present the petition that he told the House that the petition was out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. MITCHELL:
The Opposition has a peculiar way of trying to twist words in the House and trying to make things preceived the way that they understand them. I am sure that Hansard will record that I did not rise on a point of order to say that the petition was out of order. I rose on a point of order to say that it was the same petition. I would like for the Leader of the Opposition to be correct when he gets on his feet and makes accusations.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, there is no point of order, just a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
I was being gentle with the gentleman from LaPoile. He deserves all the gentleness he can muster. I was assuming that by implication, by rising to point out that it was the same petition, that he was going to submit it was out of order. He now tells me

that he was going to submit it was therefore in order. I see. Well, Mr. Speaker, we will give him the benefit of the doubt. Mr. Speaker, doubt is not a word he would know a lot about.

Mr. Speaker, they all sit there. Nobody supports the petition and, lo and behold, some guy right in the far fetches of the backbench gets up. The question is, who lit a fire under him? Who made him get up?

He speaks, he says, for the minister. Mr. Speaker, he is no match for the minister.

MR. FUREY:
He would not ignite the House.

MR. SIMMONS:
He says, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is doing a marvellous job.

Mr. Speaker, the member may be missing the point of some of these remarks so let me be a little bit more explicit and he will have reason to be less on the defensive, less watching his back, less consulting his colleagues for explanations of what is being said and why it is being said. If he would realize that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and that if presist in this House in speaking a fairly uncoded and crude fashion, I shall insist on speaking in coded fashion, but the code will become more understandable with each passing day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the petition for a moment. I was talking very much about the petition and I just wanted to send a little coded message to a person who is not, despite his embracing the minister, as stunned as he

pretends to be at times. Now, Mr. Speaker, the member talks about getting an additional person for Port aux Basques, and that was the good news. So, again, by implication he says that cutting back these thirty-five positions is bad news. Why did he not go into the meeting in Port aux Basques, if he wants to support the minister, and convince them that the thirty-five was such a good thing that they should share in that good thing by being part of the cutback?

Now, Mr. Speaker, again he cannot have it two ways, he cannot get up and support a petition against cutbacks and, at the same time, say that the minister is doing a good job in socking it to people. And what he said very clearly today, and I expect better of him than this, because I know him for many years, he said that as long as the people in Port aux Basques are not the direct victims of that cutback, it is a good thing. I do not mind as long as it is not people in Port aux Basques. What an uncaring attitude.

MR. MITCHELL:
(Inaudible) this member.

MR. FLIGHT:
How do the rest of the members feel about losing their social workers?

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Minister of Social Services, during his limited time in that job, because he ain't there must longer, Mr. Speaker, as soon as the Premier twigs, as soon as he reads tomorrow's press, as soon as he swallows this abomination, they are going to put some distance - Mr. Speaker, they put up a brave front today, the dinosaur has

sucked him in over there today, but as soon as the progressive men, like the Minister of Education, get the calls that he is going to get tonight about this abomination right here asking him whether he agrees with that, he is going to be after the Minister of Social Services to apologize for this. Why he did not do it today, I do not know.

AN HON. MEMBER:
He wants the rest of it.

MR. SIMMONS:
He wants the rest of it? The rest is that juvenile delinquency increases as mothers leave home to work. That is what the Cabinet minister said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:
Well, he said more than that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HEARN:
Tell the truth about it.

MR. SIMMONS:
The truth is that the minister has said that there are more people in penal institutions because mothers are working. Has that not dawned on the minister? Here he is, Mr. Speaker, one of the guys we thought was the more progressive people in that Cabinet now saying that he is with the dinosaurs. He is with the people who say that all mothers should stay home. Well, I do not share that view, and shame on him for having that view.

I believe my time is up, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave! By leave!

MR. SIMMONS:

The little bits are unforgivable I say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member's time is up.

We have one minute left before we get into the Late Show. The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

What are you speaking to?

MR. SIMMS:

To the petition.

MR. TULK:

To the petition?

MR. SIMMS:

Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You already had three speakers.

MR. SIMMS:

Three on this side?

MR. TULK:

No, one on that side and three on this side.

MR. SIMMS:

His Honour recognize me, so I assumed -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is now 5:30. We will go into the Late Show.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo with the first question: I am dissatisfied with the answer given to me today by the Minister of Social Services concerning child care and I wish to debate this matter on the Late Show.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, yes, I say that I am dissatisfied with the answer given to me today by the Minister of Social Services concerning the mothers of this Province and his belief that the mothers of this Province should stay home, his belief that juvenile delinquency increases as mothers leave home to work. I say to him, yes, I am dissatisfied with that answer and I am dissatisfied with his casting a slur on every professional person in this Province regardless of whether they be male or female.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

And I say to him, yes, I am dissatisfied that we have a Minister of Social Services who stands in his place and professes to be enlightened and, at the same time, lives in the fifteenth century. Yes, I am dissatisfied and I am going to be dissatisfied until the Minister of Social Services stands in his place and apologizes and, indeed, if he does the hon. thing he will resign, because he cannot sit in his seat and he cannot stand in his place and say, "This is personal," and, at the same time, stand up and say, "As one minister responsible for social services in Canada I

say that I wish we had more conscientious mothers." He cannot be the Minister of Social Services and say that. He cannot insult my own wife who happens to be a working mother. He cannot do that, either. My children, I say to him, are not in prison, and, I say to him, they are not juvenile delinquents, and, I say to him, that he cannot stand and say because my wife works part-time, full-time or whatever, or anybody else's, that my kids are going to end up in jail, or are likely to, and that I am less of a parent than I should be -

MR. MORGAN:

He did not say that, he said the chances are greater if they are not home.

MR. FLIGHT:

No, he did not.

MR. TULK:

- or that she is. He cannot stand in his place unless he is willing to show me the studies. I say to him I have read as much social literature in this country as he has read, and perhaps more, and he cannot stand up here and give me fifteenth century philosophy and tell the people of this Province, and the women of this Province, that you have to stay home and be child bearers and child rearers. That is what he would have.

MR. MORGAN:

He did not say that.

MR. TULK:

The member for Bonavista South would not agree with it, and he should read what the member said yesterday evening. Mr. Speaker, if it was inadvertent I could be satisfied with the minister's answers this evening, but I say to him that I sat here yesterday

evening and I heard him say, "I know I am not going to make very many friends, but this is what I believe." So, I say to him, his statement was thought out and that he said exactly what he believes. Mr. Speaker, if he is an hon. person, as I believe he is, he will reach down deep and find the courage that it took yesterday evening if he believes what he said, and I say to him if he believes what he said yesterday evening he has no place in the Cabinet of a twentieth century government, because it is not reality. The minister is living in his own world, he is living in a world as he would like to see it.

MR. FLIGHT:

A fifteenth century Tory world.

MR. TULK:

But, I say to him, that world is not there. I say to him that partly thanks to his government the women who work in fish plants in this Province have to work there, and, I say to him, that the women who work in stores all over this Province have to work there, and, I say to him, that regardless of whether they have to work there or not, they have the right to choose whether they work, and who does he think he is to stand in his place and make the pronouncements that he made yesterday evening? Is he following in the steps of the master who somehow thinks that he is God of this Province, rules supreme? I say to him it is an attitude, an attitude that led to the cutback of thirty-five social workers in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. TULK:

I am dissatisfied with the answer, and unless he has something different to say, I will still be dissatisfied.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I guess it is the hon. member's prerogative to disagree with my answers in the House this afternoon. It is a free country, and we are operating in a political forum here that permits him to disagree and to get up and voice his opinions, as he has done. I also have the right to my opinions and I stand by them. I stand by my statement which I indicated today on a number of occasions. It is a philosophical belief of my mine that there is nothing on the face of this earth that can take the place of a mother's love. I, Mr. Speaker, could not care less whether the Socialists in the House, or the Liberals in the House or anybody else disagrees with that statement. I happen to believe that as an individual and I happen to believe that as the Minister of Social Services. Now, that is one issue and let us put that to one side because I have dealt with it. I happen to believe very strongly in that.

Now, the other issue, the one that was debated yesterday which hon. members, both the Socialists and the other crowd have seen fit to mix up and mangle up to their own political advantage, is whether or not there is a need for more child care in this Province, whether or not there is a need for more and better quality child care in this country of Canada. I have said over and over and over that

philosophically, from a policy point of view, I have no quarrel with anyone. That is true, and I agree with that, Mr. Speaker. I proved beyond any reasonable doubt this afternoon that we are a government that cares.

It was only a few years ago, Mr. Speaker, several years after I went into politics, in 1972, that any action was taken to provide services in the way of child care in this Province. We have increased spending, Mr. Speaker, from a mere couple of hundred thousand dollars up to \$1.5 million this year. We started off with twenty or thirty spaces in the Province, and this year we will have 1800 or 1900. So, Mr. Speaker, that does not sound like a government or a minister who does not care or who does not believe in child care.

I also indicated, Mr. Speaker, that people have a choice, and I believe in the right of choice. I know there are people who must go to work, it is necessary to have two breadwinners in the family. I indicated that government has a moral obligation to assist these people when it is necessary for them to go out to work.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of playing politics with the whole thing. They believe they are making political hay and, I suppose, it is their choice to do that. But I stand by what I said, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that I am supported by a large number of people in this Province when I say that nothing on earth can replace a mother's love.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is not the issue.

MR. BRETT:

No, but that is what you are saying. That has nothing to do with the issue of whether or not we need more child care or whether we need better child care, but they choose to put the two issues together to their own political advantage.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I led off in Question Period this afternoon and I want to emphasize very clearly in this House that I am not satisfied at all with the answer given by the Minister of Social Services to my three-part question. What the minister is doing, and my colleague from St. Barbe stated it very well, is whitewashing the issue. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the minister very clearly said, "As one minister in Canada who is responsible for child care, I want to go on record as saying that I wish we had more conscientious mothers, more people who would be willing to sacrifice their careers, stay home and raise their children."

Now, what the minister is saying is that any woman who goes out to work does not love her children as much as the woman who stays at home, and he just said that in his response to the member for Fogo, 'nothing can take the place of a mother's love.'

MR. BRETT:

What is it that can?

MR. EFFORD:

You tell me what a woman's going out to work has to do with her love for her child. Her love for

her child does not deteriorate because she is going to work. In fact, it is because she loves her child so much and she wants to make a better life for him that she goes out to work.

Now, the minister cannot say that he did not say it. It is very clearly printed in Hansard. The minister very clearly said it. What the minister has done is lay a guilt complex - this is what is happening - on every individual mother or parent who has to go out to work in this Province to provide for their families. That is what the minister has done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

And by standing up and whitewashing the issue, stepping aside and trying to play with words, there is no way he can get away from that particular subject, that particular item. The minister has very clearly made a tremendously serious accusation and he has laid a guilt complex on mothers, on all parents in this Province. Then he tries to sidestep the issue when he very clearly said, it is in Hansard and I want to read it, Mr. Speaker, "Our correctional centres in Newfoundland today are full." Now, these are the minister's words. "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 centres if these people continued on with a conscious decision to stay home."

Now, those are not somebody else's words, those are the words of the Minister of Social Services. Not

the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, the Minister of Education or the Minister of Justice, nobody else made that statement but the Minister of Social Services and the minister cannot sidestep it. What he is telling the people of this Province is that because people who go out to work, the parents, whether they be male or female - he insinuated they are mainly female - their children are more apt to commit crimes. There is no way the Minister of Social Services can sidestep or whitewash that issue. He has made it, it is in print and he has to answer for the consequences of what is about to take place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
There is only one answer, there is only end to the statements that the Minister of Social Services made yesterday in this House of Assembly, and they have gone not only across the Province but across the nation, and the only outlet for the minister is to resign his position as Minister of Social Services immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
There is no other alternative.

If the Premier of this Province has any regard for the children, for the parents, for the single parents and for the mothers of this Province, he will make sure that before Monday comes he will have that minister's resignation.

Mr. Speaker, it goes on to point out very clearly that the minister, again in the House in

answer to a question this afternoon, said, 'My personal views towards day care centers and towards the children and the parents of this Province has nothing to do with my ministerial views.' You cannot, as an individual, hold the view that mothers should stay at home, and then step into Cabinet and try to convince the Cabinet that we should allocate more money for day care centers. You cannot have it both ways.

MR. TULK:
Jekyll and Hyde.

MR. EFFORD:
Exactly. You cannot change your colours from one minute to the next and expect the people of this Province or the people in Cabinet to have confidence in you.

Mr. Speaker, there are three very clear questions that I asked the Minister of Social Services this afternoon, and they are very obviously and very clearly written in Hansard. The Minister of Social Services cannot make light of the answers and the statements that he has made. He knows that full well. Every parent in this Province knows it. It is no good apologizing. You cannot apologize and expect the people to have confidence in you.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Social Services, and I ask everybody on the other side to ask the minister, to implore him, to resign as Minister of Social Services and let somebody else do the job that is necessary for this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

I guess one thing has been established, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, and that is that both the Socialists and the Liberals are against motherhood. I guess that has been established. That is one thing that we are now all very certain of.

Another thing that has been established by the Socialists and the Liberals is that they are very much in favour of latchkey children, which is a great problem across our nation. They are very much in favour of that. It has also been established that the Liberals and the Socialists do not agree with the fact that children are products of their environment. So those are three facts that we have established from this whole thing this afternoon: One, the Socialists and the Liberals are against motherhood; number two, both the Socialists and the Liberals agree with the thousands of latchkey children we have across our great Nation, many of whom grow up to be very troubled individuals, and the third thing that we have established is that the two Socialists here and the Liberals disagree with the fact that troubled children are products of their environment. Now, we have established that.

Let me go on to say, Mr. Speaker, that at no time yesterday or today did I suggest that women should not go out to work. As a matter of fact, I indicated on a number of occasions that in this great country called Canada we all have a choice. I said both was commendable. Now, there is a great need for day care; there is

a need for day care for single mothers who find it necessary to go to work; there is a need for child care where both parents must work. There is a great need for that. There is a great need for child care for developmental reasons, and this is where this Province has been placing the emphasis over the last seven or eight years. But I question if the taxpayers really should foot the bill for professionals who decide for their own good reasons to continue their career, and it is in that context that I made the statement that I wish we had more conscientious mothers or fathers, whichever chooses, to stay home and raise their children. And I do believe there is a connection to the number of people who are in our correctional institutes who have had troubled childhoods. I do believe that. It is not necessarily because parents go out to work, but they are products of their environment and, in a good many cases, that is why they are in institutions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I repeat for the unpteenth time today that I acknowledge the need for more child care, I acknowledge the need for greater quality day care, and, as the minister responsible, I intend to work towards that end as long as I am the minister.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Just before we adjourn I want to tell hon. member's opposite that it is our intention to proceed with some legislation on Monday, when we return.

MR. J. CARTER:
Tomorrow.

MR. SIMMS:
There is an understanding, Mr. Speaker, I gather, that we adjourn to attend the coronation on the weekend, I guess, some members anyway. With that in mind I would like to move -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Tomorrow, if you like. It spells the end to you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, I really look forward to being here on Monday. Because, I suspect, when the new leader of the Liberal Party sits up in the gallery and looks down and sees what he has to work with he is going to say, 'Oh, my heavens! What have I done?'

Anyway, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave! No leave!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, if I have to, I will speak to the adjournment motion.

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

MR. TULK:
I want to extend a warm welcome to him as a member of the Legislature to come down and see the festivities and see if he calls it

a coronation. Because I can assure him that starting on Saturday he will not have to be completely concerned about Brian Blackmore from Grand Falls, he is going to have to be concerned about the Liberal Party knocking the socks off his party in the next election.

MR. SIMMS:
Just to that last comment. I recall the hon. member making that very same speech when Mr. Barry became the leader about two and a half years ago. So, we shall see.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until Monday, June 8, 1987, at 3:00 p.m.

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. P.J.McNicholas, Speaker

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C., Premier

Hon. Roger Simmons, P.C., Leader of the Opposition

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Aylward, Kevin (Lib)	Stephenville
Aylward, Hon. Robert J. (PC)	Kilbride
Baird, Raymond J. (PC)	Humber West
Baker, Winston (Lib)	Gander
Barrett, Hon. Harold (PC)	St. John's West
Barry, Leo (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Blanchard, Hon. Ted. A. (PC)	Bay of Islands
Brett, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Trinity North
Butt, Hon. John (PC)	Conception Bay South
Callan, Wilson (Lib)	Bellevue
Carter, John A. (PC)	St. John's North
Carter, Walter C. (Lib)	Twillingate
Collins, Hon. John F. (PC)	St. John's South
Dawe, Hon. Ron (PC)	St. George's
Decker, Chris (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Dinn, Jerome W. (PC)	Pleasantville
Doyle, Norman E. (PC)	Harbour Main
Efford, John (Lib)	Port de Grave
Fenwick, Peter (NDP)	Menihek
Flight, Graham (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Furey, Chuck (Lib)	St. Barbe
Gilbert, Dave (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Greening, Glenn C. (PC)	Terra Nova
Hearn, Hon. Loyola (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Hiscock, R. Eugene (Lib)	Eagle River
Hodder, James E. (PC)	Port au Port
Kelland, Jim (Lib)	Naskaupi
Long, Gene (NDP)	St. John's East
Lush, Tom (Lib)	Bonavista North

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

...2...

Member

Matthews, Hon. William (PC)
McNicholas, Hon. Dr. P.J. (PC)
Mitchell, Calvin (PC)
Morgan, James (PC)
Ottenheimer, Hon. Gerald R. (PC)
Parsons, Kevin (PC)
Patterson, William G. (PC)
Peach, Milton (PC)
Peckford, A. Brian, P.C. (PC) (Premier)
Power, Hon. Charlie (PC)
Reid, James G. (PC)
Rideout, Hon. Thomas G. (PC) ,
Russell, Hon. Maxwell James (PC)
Simms, Hon. Len (PC)
Simmons, Hon. Roger P.C. (Lib)
Tobin, Glenn (PC)
Tulk, R. Beaton (Lib)
Twomey, Hon. Dr. Hugh Matthew (PC)
Verge, Hon. Lynn (PC)
Warren, Garfield E. (PC)
Windsor, Hon. H. Neil (PC)
Woodford, Rick (PC)
Young, Hon. Haig (PC)

District

Grand Bank
St. John's Centre
LaPoile
Bonavista South
Waterford - Kenmount
St. John's East Extern
Placentia
Carbonear
Green Bay
Ferryland
Trinity - Bay de Verde
Baie Verte - White Bay
Lewisporte
Grand Falls
Fortune-Hermitage
Burin - Placentia West
Fogo
Exploits
Humber East
Torngat Mountains
Mount Pearl
Humber Valley
Harbour Grace

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C.	Premier
Hon. Robert J. Aylward	Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Hon. Harold Barrett	Development and Tourism
Hon. Ted A. Blanchard	Labour
Hon. Charlie Brett	Social Services
Hon. John Butt	Environment
Dr. The Hon. John F. Collins	Finance
Hon. Ron Dawe	Transportation
Hon. Jerome W. Dinn	Mines and Energy
Hon. Norman E. Doyle	Municipal Affairs
Hon. Loyola Hearn	Education

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Third Session - Fortieth General Assembly

-2-

Hon. William Matthews	Culture, Recreation and Youth
Hon. Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Energy President of the Council Government House Leader
Hon. Charlie Power	Career Development and Advanced Studies
Hon. Thomas G. Rideout	Fisheries
Hon. Maxwell J. Russell	Consumer Affairs and Communications
Hon. Len Simms	Forest Resources and Lands
Dr. The Hon. Hugh M. Twomey	Health
Hon. Lynn Verge	Justice
Hon. H. Neil Windsor	President of Treasury Board
Hon. Haig Young	Public Works and Services