

VOL. 3

NO. 28

THIRD SESSION OF THE
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, MAY 1, 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to
direct a question or two to the Minister responsible for
Energy. I notice, again, there are ten or a dozen ministers
missing today and the Premier is missing, no leadership on
the other side, she is adrift over there, Mr. Speaker.
No leadership! No wonder the House is in such a chaotic
condition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's
blustering over the past several years has been based on
a false premise and a misguided assumption that the next
federal government will be Tory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Now the latest Gallup poll
clearly shows that this is not likely to happen as the
Premier had hoped. Therefore, instead of keeping all his
offshore eggs in one basket, would it not be more sensible,
would it not make more sense, for the Premier and the admini-
stration there opposite to swallow their pride and their
ego and negotiate an agreement now with the federal
Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien)?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the
Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, after all that, the
hon. gentleman cannot voice a question, he has to read it!

MR. MARSHALL: I wonder who writes the hon. gentleman's questions? I mean, on the lead question in Question Period, he has to get up and slavishly read the question.

Mr. Speaker, we will have to wait; the only poll that counts is the election. But I will say, if that poll has any significance - and that poll has no relevance to us because we are a provincial Legislature - but if it has any significance at all, I suppose really what it means is that the people of Canada really want a change from the present administration, a

MR. MARSHALL:

change from the people who have for years come into the House of Commons with roses on, like that particular gentleman who came in with roses in his lapel. So if there is any change it can only be attributed to the fact that people think that Mr. Turner might take the leadership and that he will bring a change from the present administration. I wonder what the hon. gentlemen then are going to do? It means the death knell for Mr. Chretien, it means the death knell for Mr. Lalonde, it means the death knell for Mr. Trudeau and it means the death knell, Mr. Speaker, for all of the hon. gentlemen there opposite who have slavishly and lapdogishly supported them over the years.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now there is a statement of policy from the hon. gentleman from the administration. The hon. gentleman is not prepared to accept the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the political confrontations of the past several years by the administration, of which he is a member, have wreaked havoc on the people of this Province, have created all kinds of pain and suffering to the people of this Province. Would it not be better for the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, to stop his rude and nasty remarks and his personal affront to the members of the Opposition and act like a decent, honourable gentleman and a decent Newfoundland and take the Chretien proposal, the package that is on the table now for joint development and revenue sharing, etc., and let that form the basis of a new round of negotiations with the Government of Canada to carry out the mandate that they were given on April 6, 1982 to negotiate an offshore agreement? Would it not be better for the hon. gentleman

MR. NEARY: to stop these rude and nasty and insulting remarks, these low personal attacks on the members of the Opposition, swallow his ego and his pride, pick up the telephone, call Mr. Chretien, or call the Prime Minister for that matter, and say, 'Look, let us take the package that is on the table and use that as the basis for a new round of negotiations? Now, Mr. Speaker, would that not be a worthwhile thing for the administration there opposite to do and thereby fulfill the mandate that they

MR. NEARY:

were given on April 6, 1982 to negotiate an offshore agreement and stop the suffering and the misery and the havoc and the way that they have massacred the Newfoundland economy, stop all of that, Mr. Speaker, and get back to the bargaining table? Would that not be the honourable and sensible thing for the administration to do?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, no wonder only half of the Opposition is there when you have the Question Period led by the Leader. You know, he is asking the same questions. He wants us to take the package that is on the table. Now what does he mean? What package is on the table? Mr. Chretien's package that is on the table. What Mr. Chretien's package which is on the table? It is a Nova Scotian agreement, Mr. Speaker, which would give to Nova Scotia a small to negligible benefit. So does he want this Province to take a small or negligible benefit? Does he wish us, Mr. Speaker, to be taken in by this business of 110 per cent of fiscal capacity, which is just going to mean that our equalization payments are going to be substituted for by the revenues derived from the resources we brought into Confederation with us? Mr. Speaker, does he wish us to settle the offshore just merely for \$30 millions or \$40 millions more than we are getting this year? Is this the height of his ambition? Does he wish us, Mr. Speaker, to accept an agreement that Mr. Chretien puts on the table where there is total federal control over the development, where the federal government alone will decide whether it is concrete platforms or floating platforms, where the rules and regulations will be federal legislation,

MR. MARSHALL: where the federal minister will have the ultimate to decide?: Is this what he means by a new package? He says why do we not take the package that is on the table? I say unequivocally no, we will not take a package of that nature that is on the table. What has been put on the table and what was agreed is already known, Mr. Speaker - what was agreed, that is, before Mr. Chretien had the rug pulled out from underneath his feet by Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Trudeau.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Sir, the hon. gentleman has misrepresented what I asked. I suggested to the hon. gentleman, in the form of a question, would it not be better, instead of further inflicting pain and suffering and unemployment and high taxes, and the high cost of living and the high cost of electricity rates on the people of this Province, and lowering of health services in the Province, sick people unable to get in hospitals, would it not be better

MR. NEARY: for the hon. gentleman to pick up the phone and say to Mr. Chretien or to the Prime Minister, 'Let us take the package that is on the table as a basis for negotiation'? Mr. Speaker, that is why I asked the question I put to the hon. gentleman. I did not ask the hon. gentleman to accept the package. Stop the game playing, stop the political rhetoric, do the honourable thing that a decent, honourable Newfoundlander should do and carry out the promise they made in the April 6 general election and get back to the bargaining table, but use that package as a basis for further negotiations. Now would that not be an honourable and decent thing for the hon. gentleman to do or does he have any decency in his bones, in his viens at all?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is how are the high electricity rates, the high cost of living and the high cost of services going to alleviated at all by an agreement which brings some small to negligible benefit to the people of this Province? The hon. gentleman wants to use that as a basis of negotiation. He wants us to negotiate, Mr. Speaker, from the basis of nothing. He wants us to negotiate from a minus quantity, which we will not do.

The fact of the matter is we had negotiated with the present administration in Ottawa, we had negotiated out a package and it was a package which at the time was acceptable, and it was not the one that the hon. gentleman urges us to accept. The hon. gentleman would push us into an agreement for the sake of getting an agreement, which is not going to realize any long-lasting benefits for this Province and this government is not going to do it.

As for the pain and suffering he alleges from time to time, he is a great one, with certain

MR. MARSHALL: other people who trumpet the federal Liberal cause in this Province, to get up and attempt to say that there are no benefits that have been realized by this Province from the offshore activity that is out there. Now if the hon. gentleman wants to ask questions, why does he not ask some of substance and address himself to a report that was recently put out which showed that, even when we did not have an agreement, we had more employment here in the offshore than they did in Nova Scotia, we had more spinoff industries and we had benefits from the offshore operations.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of
the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Do I gather from the
hon. gentleman that this is what he is saying, that they
intend to continue their game playing and their political
rhetoric after the next federal election, that they are
refusing to deal with any other government in Ottawa except a Tory
government? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying?
And is the hon. gentleman also saying this, because this
is the message that I get for reading between the lines of
what the hon. gentleman is saying, that if through some
fluke there should be a Tory Government in Ottawa, that they
will sign any kind of an agreement with a Tory government
but they will not negotiate with a Liberal government,
and then they will hail the Tory government as the biggest
event to happen since Confederation? Now is that what
the hon. gentleman is saying, Mr. Speaker? And then is
the hon. gentleman saying this, that after
signing that agreement, which will be
hailed as the biggest event since Confederation, it will
be the same deal as they could have gotten ten years
ago? Now that is what I am reading into what the hon.
gentleman is saying.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the
Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I could not care
less what the hon. gentleman reads into what I am saying.
I did not know the hon. gentleman was able to read any-
thing other than that which was prepared for him to ask
questions.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, look, we made it plain and we make it plain now that we are prepared to deal with any government - Tory Government Liberal government, NDP government, Social Credit government, New Labrador Party, you name it; we would even be prepared to deal with the hon. gentleman there opposite and that is really saying something - any group, Mr. Speaker, that is prepared to give justice and equity to the people of Newfoundland and the Province of Newfoundland from that resource; any group that is prepared to recognize the fact that this resource was brought into Confederation by the people of Newfoundland and they are entitled to a measure of justice and equity for it and prepared to see that resource developed for Newfoundland and for Canada as a whole. The only way that we can perceive that the present government in Ottawa wishes to proceed is to proceed on the basis of the federal government deriving all of the benefits and taking all the controls, and that we will never accept, Mr. Speaker. And if the hon. gentleman thinks that he is playing a game, well that is a game we are proud to play.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Justice. He may recall that before Easter I asked him some questions about the Chief of Police. I wonder if he could bring us up-to-date? Is there anything new that he can report to the House with respect to the situation with Chief Roche of the Constabulary?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will recall, when he did ask the question previously, I indicated at the time that Chief or Police Roche was then on sick leave, and that one of the two deputy chiefs - Deputy Chief Coady and Deputy Chief Randell - Mr. Randell, the senior deputy chief, the one who has been with the constabulary the longer period of time, was the officer in charge during this period. I believe I indicated at the time also that I would certainly be in a position no later than May 15 to give a reply in terms of the Chief's health and his ability to return, etc. And the position is essentially the same, certainly by no later than May 15, conceivably before, but certainly no later than the middle of this month I would be in that position.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister and, of course, we will await the statement. I wonder if he would confirm for us that the Cabinet have agreed upon the retirement package to be offered to Chief Roche?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, if the Chief were unable to return to work for reasons of illness, obviously there would be an entitlement to retirement. But at the present time that is a possibility, obviously, but it is not a definitive matter because we do not know definitively what the Chief's health position is and when that is known as a fact, which I would certainly expect to know by no later than the middle of May, then I will inform the House.

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

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the minister, as with all of us, does not know and I would not expect him to know. He did not answer my question but I will let that stand on the record. I wonder if the minister could assure the House that any arrangements that are made for the retirement of the Chief will be those to which he is entitled under statute or under the policy that existed, shall we say, as of January 1, 1984? In other words, can he assure that there will be no special arrangements made either detrimental to the Chief or beneficial to him? I mean, I want to be neutral, down the middle. Can the minister assure us that, if it becomes necessary for the Chief of Police to retire, that whatever arrangements are made will be those to which he is entitled either under statute, which is straightforward, or under the policy that was in effect on, say, January 1, 1984?

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon.the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, any agreement or any entitlement to pensions certainly would obviously have to be fair to the Chief and fair in general, fair to the recipient, and would have to be consistent with statutes and policy. Certainly, if there is an early retirement, I will certainly inform the House of the conditions of the retirement and any pension rights and other things which accrue from it.

MR. ROBERTS: I will answer the question. Do you want to try it again? No? Let it stand.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are so many urgent and pressing matters involving the fishery, and the Premier's office, could the hon. gentleman tell us when we are going to get some of the ministers back in the House -

MR. ROBERTS: Some of the important ones.

MR. NEARY: - some of the important ministers, so we can ask some questions? Who is the acting Minister of Health? Who is the acting Minister of Fisheries?

Well, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of these ministers and the Premier, I will have to direct a question to the Minister of Development(Mr. Windsor) in connection with the Convention Centre for Newfoundland. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House if the Convention Centre will form a part of the ARDA agreement that will be signed in the next day or so, as soon as the fog lifts and the ministers can get into Newfoundland, Mr. Johnson can arrive, and Mr. Rompkey, to pour literally millions of federal dollars into this Province, compared to a paltry sum by the provincial government? Could the hon. gentleman tell us the status now of the Convention Centre?

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):

Development.

The hon. the Minister of

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that the hon. gentlemen opposite, since they are sporting flowers here indicating their great connection with the federal Liberals in Ottawa, would have known the answer to that question. Because I have been trying to find out from the federal government in Ottawa exactly what they propose to do with the Convention Centre.

A proposal have been on the table, before them now for many months, we have not had as much as a courtesy of a formal response from them, there is total inaction. We have some indications that perhaps the federal government is not interested in funding the Convention Centre, but we cannot get a 'yes' or a 'no'. Perhaps the hon. gentlemen would send some flowers up to Ottawa and they will get a response.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Opposition.

The hon. the Leader of the

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give us, if he has put forward a proposal, a few details of that proposal that they have put forward. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House

MR. NEARY:

if the Convention Centre is to be built in St. John's or are other areas of the Province, such as Corner Brook, being considered for a Convention Centre?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, some eight months ago I tabled the results of our study in this House as to exactly what was proposed and what was recommended for a Convention Centre and we have been pursuing that avenue ever since then. I am amazed that the hon. gentleman, in eight months, has not bothered to read that and find out that our proposal is indeed to build a Convention Centre in St. John's and that the proposal which the developer had put forward is in Ottawa, and is being considered, hopefully, by Ottawa. We are awaiting that response.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Could the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what proposal has been put forward to the Government of Canada? Which one has gotten the preferential treatment from the Province? Would the hon. gentleman indicate that? Is it the one opposite City Hall, a hotel convention centre, or is it the proposal down at the Newfoundland Hotel, or is it the Battery Motel? What is the proposal? Could the hon. gentleman pinpoint it and tell the House, for instance, is it the Ryan/Dobbin proposal that is being put forward to the Government of Canada? What proposal is it?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, neither proposal has been given preferential treatment. There has been one proposal which was deemed by both the Province and the City to be the most favourable proposal that had been put forward of four very excellent proposals, which were considered in detail. That proposal has been supported by the Province. We have been negotiating with the developer, and the developer, in turn, has been talking with the federal government and, as already indicated in response to an earlier question, has submitted a formal proposal to Ottawa, with our support. We are hopeful that we will get an answer on that.

Once we have finalized negotiations with the developer, and if this developer is not successful, then we may well have to look at one of the other proposals and try to negotiate an agreement there. Once all that is in place, I will be only too happy to give full details, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), if I could engage his attention briefly. Whenever the minister is ready, the House is waiting.

DR. COLLINS: Go ahead.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for interrupting the minister, but it is Question Period and I do not feel that I am entirely out of place in asking him a question, I am sure he will want to answer it. It grows out of the Ministerial Statement which he made in the House late in March in which he announced that the government, in response to the recommendation of the Orsborn Commission, had exempted from - what is it called now? - had exempted from RST - the retail sales tax, the Tory 12 per cent - had exempted a number of items used by people who need continuing care and he listed them and that is a welcome move indeed. I wonder if the minister could tell us whether he proposes, or whether the government propose, to exempt as well the hospitals who use this and other equipment, because, of course, hospitals are charged SSA on any purchases they make in connection with their operations?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, that question has arisen quite a number of times and, on the face of it, on the surface it would seem to be a logical and sensible thing to do and there probably would not be any particular problem if one was limiting the exemption to, shall we say, rather exotic or esoteric equipment like a CAT Scanner or whatever. but as members know, of course, the hospitals use all sorts of things; they use dish mops and they use buckets and they use cleaning soap and they use linen and they use trolleys

DR. COLLINS: . . . and they use spoons and knives and forks and so on and so forth, a whole host of things which are in common use by the general population and accordingly it is very difficult to frame an exemption in a regulatory or a statutory way that would make it possible to administer the thing without a tremendous amount of leakage. In other words, if you exempted, say, cleaning mops for hospitals, how does one limit that to hospitals in an efficient and ongoing and administratively affective way? So for that very reason we have elected not, up to now, to give a blanket exemption in hospitals. Now that is not to say that if groups wish to give a particular piece of equipment to a hospital that there is not a way

DR. COLLINS: that can be found so that group, that group of citizens, or whatever, that they are not as well as being landed with the task of raising the amount of money to buy the equipment that they are not also landed with the task of raising the amounts of the retail sales tax on that equipment. But there are ways around that and we have used that route in the past rather than writing some sort of exemption into the regulations attached to the Retail Sales Tax Act.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the minister a couple of supplementary questions which grew out of his answer? But let me deal first with the point which he made at the end of his answer which, as I understood it, was this; that if a group, a ladies' auxiliary, perhaps, is going to make a donation to one of the hospitals in the Province, and raises money publicly for this, that there is some process whereby they can be exempted from the necessity of having to pay sales tax on the item which they are proposing to purchase to give to the hospital. The minister is nodding yes, but I want to be sure. Do I understand him correctly? Could the minister tell us how to go about this? Because I know of a number of these groups. Is this to be an ad hoc exemption process? Is application to be made to the minister? What are the guidelines? Who is to decide? Could he perhaps expand on that because I am sure that there are many groups who will be most interested in it. It is a new departure, as I think he will agree.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, no, it is not really a new departure, this mechanism has been used many times before. And in very brief outline, what would happen would be supposing a group wanted to donate, say, an electrocardiographic machine to one of the hospitals, and they would come to us and say, 'Can we give this to the hospital and not be saddled with retail sales tax?' Well, I would discuss that with the Minister of Health (Mr. House). And what we would then advise the group is to raise the money, whatever it is, say it is \$3,000 or \$4,000, donate it to the hospital with the specific request that that donation be used to buy that piece of equipment, and then the Minister of Health in the budget for the hospital will make

DR. COLLINS: an arrangement whereby the hospital will get, in addition to its normal budget, the normal amount that would be allocated to the hospital's budgetary purposes, it would be given an extra amount to cover the retail sales tax on that piece of equipment. So it is an arrangement that is worked out between the Department of Finance and the Department of Health. It has worked very well, it has been in place for quite a number of years, we have looked at it in detail and it does get us around the great difficulty of exempting, say, electrical equipment to hospitals, because then, inevitably, after a period of time, one is going to get leakage from that and you find that things that one did not intend to be exempted were being exempted for hospitals. And also one would find that in our estimation, not only would hospitals be getting things, shall we say, in an exempted way other than what was intended, but other people quite unconnected with hospitals would likely get in on the same sort of deal.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, because the minister gets curiouser and curiouser, this policy may be well known, I can only say I have never heard of it referred to in the House, which may simply show I have not heard of it, but I think it is fair to say the minister is making news as he goes. Let me now ask him, Sir, whether a similar policy, a similar consideration, will be extended to groups raising money, say, for old folks' homes, senior citizens' homes -

MR. NEARY: Recreational facilities.

MR. ROBERTS: - or recreation? Where does this end? We now have, it appears, a policy which may very

MR. ROBERTS: well have a great deal of merit. I am not quarrelling at this stage. What I am asking is where does this end? We now have a policy whereby if you give something to a body corporate, and all our hospitals are not bodies corporate - they are not the Crown - you give it to a body corporate and you can then, in effect, get the sales tax paid by the government. And it is only robbing Peter to pay Paul, or, if you wish, robbing Wallace to pay John, to say that the Health Department pays the Finance Department. I mean, will this apply to a gift, for example, to St. Luke's Home or to the Agnes Pratt Home? I think that is a matter that the House should know about, Mr. Speaker, if the minister would care to enlighten us.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member in his questions is bringing up the very point that I made at the beginning, that one has to try to limit this sort of thing. Once you try to do it on a very broad basis you get into a lot of difficulties and this is what we anticipated. So to reiterate; firstly, it would have to be a donation by a disinterested-or shall we say interested, I suppose-but people who are not connected with the institution. In other words, it could not be the administrator of the institution doing it. It would be a group of citizens who elected themselves to do this worthwhile act. Secondly, it would have to be something that the Department of Health, and we are talking about hospitals here, that the Department of Health would feel is a very desirable thing to do. And there is discretion there. There is discretion on the part of the Minister of Health (Mr. House), on the one hand, and I suppose on ourselves, on my score as a Minister of Finance on the other hand as to whether this was a desirable thing to do. And this is an area of discretion that any number of ministers have in administering their departments and their responsibilities. That is what they are put in that position for. They are put in the position to make judgements and they are trusted to make judgements in the best interests of the people they serve. Now that is what the Minister of Health, and in this particular case, as it deals with a tax matter, that the Minister of Finance makes in coming to a conclusion and this is done on an item by item basis.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
the Strait of Belle Isle.

The hon. member for

MR. ROBERTS:
to know where to begin because the more the minister says the more confused it becomes. We are getting near the end of Question Period but there is tomorrow, fortunately.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister, is this beneficence now, this robbing 'Wallace' to pay 'John', is this restricted only to donations to institutions that are funded through the Department of Health? Because I may say, Mr. Speaker, I have never heard - and, I mean, that only means what it means, but I think I know as much as some and perhaps more than some others even - I have never heard of a system whereby if you give something to an institution the government in effect pays the tax.

MR. ROBERTS: I suspect there are going to be hundreds of citizens groups throughout this Island and throughout the Labrador part of this Province tonight who are going to want to know about this. So can the minister tell us, first of all, is this only confined to institutions funded through the Department of Health?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, up to the present time, it has only occurred in regard to hospitals. And I think that is probably not very strange because I think that hospitals have a certain attraction for groups who wish to do generous things, to buy equipment and that type of thing. To my knowledge it has not come forward in regard to people who want to buy books for schools or buying tractors for the Department of Transportation or to buy airplanes for the Department of Development or to buy courthouses for the Department of Justice or to buy certain buildings for the Department of Public Works and Services or to buy plots of land with trees on them for the Department of Forestry. To my knowledge these things have not occurred, but they have occurred in regard to equipment for hospitals. And, as I say, this is dealt with on an item by item basis, it is dealt with at the level of ministerial discretion, and ministerial discretion is exercised where it is right and proper and to the benefit of the public good.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for the Question Period has expired.

MR. ROBERTS: Tomorrow, 'John', be brief.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the bill entitled, "An Act To Repeal The Gander Development Corporation Act, 1975," and also, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation Act."

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

MR.OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the bill entitled, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law."

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR.COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the advancing or guaranteeing of certain loans made under the Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957. And I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the raising of loans by the Province . And I ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act," and that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the guaranteeing of certain loans made under the Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957. And, on behalf of the Minister of Health (Mr. House), Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Registered Nurses Act."

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Motion No. 1, the Budget Debate, adjourned last day by the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a moment about the provisions in the budget concerning dental health.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that members opposite can appreciate the hardship that the provisions which were announced in the last budget and were announced in the budget of 1982 can cause for low-income families in this Province. Now, the recent increase in the charge levied on patients for non-preventive dental service, which are fillings and extractions, make patients now responsible, as of this budget, for \$5 per unit instead of the \$2 per unit, which was imposed two years ago. And with the number of large families across the Province, the imposition of this increase is the second major step in the destruction of the preventive dental programme. It is the second step in the destruction of the preventive dental service which was brought in some years ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the programme was first introduced, it covered preventive services semi-annually and restorative services without a co-pay charge. So there was a preventive dental fluoride treatment and then restorative services had no co-pay charge, in other words, there was no charge to the patient. This gave all Newfoundland children an equal opportunity to develop healthy dentition, in the words the dentists use.

Two years ago, the present administration imposed a co-pay charge of \$2 per unit

MR. HODDER: and, not only did they impose the co-pay charge but, as well, they reduced the frequency of fluoride treatments, which we call the preventive service, to a once a year basis. Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been estimated by the dentists and the Dental Association that this has caused a decrease in the number of children who seek dental services by somewhere between 20 per cent and 30 per cent, which means that the programme of dental service, which was a good programme which meant that the children of this Province would have less problems in the future, has been further eroded by this year's budget. With the imposition of the fee, further increased to \$5, and with a drop of about 20 per cent in participation by the children of this Province who have been seeing dentists, we have no doubt that there will be less children seen.

I would like to talk about that for a second just to explain what can happen in a family, let us say, of four children. It is not unlikely that a family of four children, if the mother were to bring the

MR. HODDER:

children from a rural area into see a dentist that there might be as many as ten cavities. Now, at the present time this would cost fifty dollars, whereas prior to this budgetary provision of this year it would have only cost twenty dollars. Now, in six months, if she has to come back for the cleanings and the fluoride treatment, which the budget of two years ago did away with, this mother of four children could be then expected to have to pay \$100.00. So, Mr. Speaker, although the amounts may seem modest to perhaps gentlemen opposite, it is clear that the provisions of this budget is the second step in the destruction of the health care programme which was instituted some years ago. And with the numbers of families with the type of unemployment that we see in the rural areas of this Province, and in this city, and the number of people who are below the poverty line in the Province of Newfoundland, I think that this is one of the dastardly acts of the government in this budget.

The fact is they have hit home at the children of the Province, in the budget of two years ago and in this budget, they have used the children of the Province to better their own financial ends and to try to make up for the mismanagement which has led the economy into the situation that we are in at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a moment on the fishery. I suppose that if there is anything which is the basis of Newfoundland society it is the fishing industry. The fishing industry is the reason that we came here in the first place, and the fishing industry is the reason that we stayed for such a long time.

MR. NEARY:

The backbone of the Newfoundland economy.

MR. HODDER: Yes. As my friend, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says, who represents a fishing district where they fish all year round, they have a Winter fishery down there, a very prosperous area of the Province, it is the backbone of the economy.

MR. NEARY: It is a unique fishery.

MR. HODDER: Yes, a unique fishery. I grew up there myself and I remember the big boats, there used to be big schooners there, and we now see big long-liners down there on the Southwest coast and they fish all year round, and they are not afraid to leave their own areas to go and pursue the fish and stay out for weeks and weeks at a time. It is the mainstay, the backbone of Newfoundland. It is more important to this Province than the offshore, because if it is managed properly it will last forever, it will be here after oil has been forgotten. We should never forget that.

Mr. Speaker, the fishery is so important it reaches across every aspect of our society, even in communities which are not bounded by the seashore. And I do not think anybody in this House can disagree with that. At least the members opposite have paid lip service to it. Yet, in the this provincial budget the amount spent on the fishery was 1 per cent of the total budget. The dollar amount of the total budget being about \$1.8 billion or \$1.9 billion, the fishery budget was about \$18 million -

MR. NEARY: No wonder they are trucking fish from Trepassey up to Catalina.

MR. HODDER: - \$18 million in a budget of almost \$2 billion, approaching the \$2 billion mark. Yet we hear the government opposite, and we hear the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and we hear the Premier proclaiming the importance of

MR. HODDER:

the fishery, how important the fishery is to this Province. Now, the budget is the document which shows what the government is planning to do for this Province. It is the most important document that the government brings in. It shows the plans that the government has for this Province. And if we are to look at the budget and see the percentage of the budget that is spent on the most important part of our economy, we find that 1 per cent of the whole budget is spent on the fishery.

MR. NEARY: Is that not something? 1 per cent.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it is time that this Province put their money where their mouth is. You cannot go out and try and arouse the emotions of Newfoundlanders on the Northern cod and on the importance of the fishery and then ignore the fishermen of this Province. Mr. Speaker, you know the situation which this Province found itself in this year, which led to the restructuring by the federal government of the deep-sea fishery, was an immediate result of the fact that this government over the past twelve years did not develop the fishery in the way that it should be developed.

Licences were given out where licences should not have been given out, and I talk about processing licences. We went through a period between 1971 and 1975, and then after the 200 mile limit was declared we went from 1975 to 1978, when anybody who wanted a longliner - nobody ever worried about the fishing capacity, nobody ever worried whether the Gulf stocks were bad or they were good; the 200 mile limit was declared—and anybody who wanted could get a longliner. Fifteen of them came into my district. There was never a check done to see if the person

MR. HODDER: was able to handle the long-liner.

MR. NEARY: Walter Carter carried on a leadership campaign for two and a half years, the then Minister of Fisheries.

MR. HODDER: Two and a half years and gave out longliners hand over fist. Do you know how many longliners, Mr. Speaker, that are now in that particular district, that were brought in in that particular three or four year period? Not one. The longliners that are fishing out of that particular area now are longliners that were there before and people knew how to handle them. There were people who built them themselves, there were people who went over to Nova Scotia and bought them. There was one example, Mr. Speaker, where government gave a longliner, I suppose it was worth somewhere around \$350,000 to \$400,000 - to a man who had no more ability to fish than the man in the moon. He had been a paper worker, he went after the provincial government, he received a longliner, a Fiberglas longliner with radar, net haulers, every kind of equipment -

MR. NEARY: Automatic baiters.

MR. HODDER: - automatic baiters, everything that you could think of. It is down in my hon. friend's district now.

MR. NEARY: That is right. So it is.

MR. HODDER: And this Winter it was sitting there I think somewhere in either Isle aux Morts or Burnt Islands.

MR. NEARY: It was on the slipway in Isle aux Morts.

May 1, 1984

Tape No. 1154

NM - 3

MR. HODDER: It was on the slipway, the frost came; somehow or other the motor, which is worth something like \$30,000 or \$40,000 has been split apart and everything else like that. The government could not even take care of it - if it is repossessed

MR. NEARY: He is trying to walk away from it.

MR. HODDER: And the gentleman can walk away from it. And that is the kind of a fisheries policy that we have seen. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to point out as well that I wish the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) were here. I once had a group of fishermen come to me. I live in an area where there is a good smelt fishery -

AN HON. MEMBER: You want to give the fish to the Russians. He will stop that.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I am sure he will.

MR. HODDER: - and one of them had six smelt traps. Now six smelt traps are quite a few smelt traps.

MR. NEARY: Who gave the Russians the storage tanks in Gander? I did not hear you objecting to that, letting them get in here, and the synchrolift, to encourage them to get inside of the 200 mile management zone.

MR. HODDER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Who gave them all of these things?

MR. HODDER: That is right. The Minister of Fisheries will get up and scream and shout about the Russians fishing off our shores and how many metric tons they get. But when it came to this synchrolift and the Russians business it was okay then, bring the Russians in.

MR. NEARY: Hypocrisy!

MR. HODDER: Hypocrisy! When it comes to building oil tanks in Central Newfoundland to bring the Russians in, fine, let us do it.

MR. NEARY: You did not hear him object to that.

MR. HODDER: Now these were the two levers that we had. We had some leverage.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. HODDER: We had some leverage to keep the Russians off the Grand Banks. The fisheries policy of the

MR. HODDER: members opposite would make one want to throw up. I have always lived, all my life, in fishing areas. And to see the number of licences that have been given to fish plants! When one fish plant could not survive in a particular area, ten licences were given out, and they are still doing it, Mr. Speaker. In an area where one fish plant can survive, you will find that the government have established three fish plants. If you are a good supporter of the government and you want a fish plant, you can get it.

Mr. Speaker, the fact about the longliners is the Fisheries Loan Board went crazy for three or four years. Then, to top all of that off, we had the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) found himself in a position where he had to have the federal government bail them out. Mr. Speaker, when I think of the mismanagement on the Southwest Coast and the lack of a sound developmental philosophy on the fishery! Mr. Speaker, I was going to mention about the smelt fishery. Now we have a good smelt fishery and four traps can do what perhaps fifty lobster traps can do for a lobster fisherman if there is a market for lobsters. These people had four traps, and one trap would supply Corner Brook - Stephenville - Port aux Basques area, so I went to the Minister of Fisheries and I went to his deputy minister and I said, 'where can we find markets for those smelt? The fishermen have the licence' - this was about four years ago - 'they have the equipment, I would like to talk to your marketing people.' 'We will get back to you.' Sometime afterwards I had a call from someone down in the Department of Fisheries - I do not know who he was, he was not a very senior person - saying, "We do not have a marketing department, we do not have anybody in charge of marketing. Would you try Fishery Products up on the Northern Peninsula?" I went to the provincial government figuring that the

May 1, 1984

Tape 1155

PK - 3

MR. HODDER: provincial government would be responsible for marketing fish. I got a letter back saying would you try UMF somewhere else, would you try this or that? They were asking me to do the marketing.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, the fishery is the primary producer in our economy and it has to receive adequate rewards, and the fishermen, who is the primary producer -

MR. TULK: He has to be rewarded.

MR. HODDER: - has to receive an adequate reward for his efforts. These are the people who are on the first level of production, namely the producer of the raw material. He is the same as the person who extracts the iron from the mines in Labrador City, he is the same as the man who works in Baie Verte, he is the same as a person who works in any primary industry in this Province, the paper worker in Grand Falls or Corner Brook or Stephenville, but how do we compare the wages of the paper worker, Mr. Speaker, and the miner with the wages of the fisherman? Mr. Speaker, in 1978 the fishermen were receiving 19.25 cents per pound, in 1981 he was receiving 20 cents per pound and in 1982 - 83 it is unchanged, and we wonder why the fishermen are asking for more? And what did the Premier say to the fishermen of the Province? 'You must hold back.' In his famous speech that was part of this budget, 'Hang tough.' And he mentioned the social compact, this talk of a social compact between the fishermen and the super company. But the fishermen know what this social compact is, Mr. Speaker. This social compact is wage restraint, the social compact is the same type of relationship the fishermen have had with their employers down throughout history. We are not very much farther than we were in the days of the barter system, Mr. Speaker. At least in the days when the fishermen brought in his catch and settled up for his salt pork and his flour, at least in those days he probably did not have any debts, But when we look at the difference between 1978 to 1983 and see that the fishermen is receiving 1 cent more than he did in

MR. HODDER: 1978, now what has happened to the economy since 1978? What has happened to the fishermen? We have all sat here, we have seen increases in every other primary industry in this Province, we have seen increases throughout the public service, the cost of living, Mr. Speaker, has risen by about three times since 1978: What about the fishermen? He is making 1 cent a pound more than he did before but his real disposable income has decreased. How has it decreased?

MR. HODDER: How does he maintain his standard of living? The cost of nets and gear has tripled. Does anybody know what it costs to buy a herring net now and what it used to cost to buy a herring net back in 1978? It has tripled. In 1978 I suppose you could get a herring net for \$40.

MR. MATTHEWS: You would not get a hair net for that now, boy.

MR. NEARY: That is right, you would not get a hair net for it, right.

MR. TULK: When? In 1978? Thirty-nine dollars.

MR. HODDER: Yes, \$39, that is what I thought, about \$40. And today if you want a herring net I suppose it would cost you close to \$100. I have seen them go for \$120 or \$125.

MR. NEARY: Three times as much.

MR. HODDER: So three times as much, the cost of nets and gear.

MR. TULK: And gasoline has tripled.

MR. HODDER: The gasoline has tripled or quadrupled. And these are costs which the fishermen must have. To give an example of the costs: Insurance at the present time for fishermen can cost him as much as \$9,000 for a large boat. The cost of living has tripled. The cost of fuel from 1978 to 1983 has gone from eight-five cents to \$1.85 per gallon. And not only that, the cost of licences has risen. And, with that kind of a situation, the fishermen are only receiving one cent a pound more per pound of fish than they did in 1978.

MR. PATTERSON: It would be a good time to burn your boat!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, that might have been attributed to having been said one time, but there are people who may not be burning their boats but they are getting out of them. So the hon. member can use that phrase all he wants,

MR. HODDER: but he cannot use it with pride.
I do not know the hon. member's district, I do not know how big a fishing district it is -

MR. NEARY: Where?

MR. HODDER: Out in Placentia there.

MR. PATTERSON: Come out and run against me and learn about it.

MR. HODDER: Run against you! We will send out a child to run against you the next time.

MR. NEARY: Is it true you are going to run as a Liberal the next time?

MR. TULK: He in not running.

MR. HODDER: We would not have you.

MR. NEARY: You would rather not run or run as a Liberal.

MR. PATTERSON: I am keeping my powder dry. .

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, in light of all of this, in light of the cost of living, in light of the cost of nets and gear, we are now talking about quality for the fishermen without compensation. And, Mr. Speaker, I attended a meeting of small boat fishermen - twenty to twenty-five foot boat fishermen - people who make a pretty good living, not a great living. They should make a better living for the work they put into it, but it is a short fishing season. They only go out about three or four miles, since they live right on the fishing grounds. They go out the four or five miles and they have to take the ice out with them; they have to gut the fish at sea and they have to have extra help; it takes them a longer period of time and then they have to bleed them and bring them in and they cannot get out the second time that day, so they cannot land the same volume of fish in as before. And yet, Mr. Speaker, they are so close to the fishing grounds that when they bring the fish in they are still alive. So, Mr. Speaker, now they introduce this type

MR. HODDER: of quality control.
Now there is no one in the fishery , there are no fishermen who do not believe in quality control. But, Mr. Speaker, when you realize that the increase for fishermen has been one cent a pound, when you look at the cost that he is now trying to meet, when you look at the fact that now quality control will encourage him to lose more , it is no wonder that we have 'Unity '84.' It is no wonder that the Fishermen's Union are out attacking the government left, right and center, that they have become political;

MR. HODDER: it is no wonder they are holding meetings all over the Province. Mr. Speaker, it is a surprise that they are not marching in the streets. If this sort of a situation had taken place in the 1960s they would have been marching in the streets.

But, Mr. Speaker, the government should be warned that the fishermen are not going to continue like this. If the economy were any good at all in any other sector of the economy you would find more fishermen getting out than ever before. The hon. member can get over there and attribute old sayings like 'Burn your boats', but, Mr. Speaker, all of the fears that we had in the 1960s are now coming to pass.

Mr. Speaker, this government has a moral responsibility, they have an obligation to the inshore and offshore fishermen, and what does the Premier offer? What has he offered? What did he offer of the eve of this budget? Mr. Speaker, I feel quite comfortable in speaking about the Premier's speech because the Premier came on television a few nights before to warn us of what he would do in the budget. And what did he offer with his high-sounding rhetoric? He said, wage restraint! What kind of wage restraint can the fishermen suffer? And he calls it a social compact. That is a social compact. Well, I suppose that the fish merchants of old would have called it a social compact as well. Yes, it was a social compact, the merchant was in charge and they were the slaves. And there is not much difference now.

A good fisherman can only make in some areas of this Province \$6,000, or \$7,000, or \$8,000 a year, and that is only if he has, perhaps, a lobster licence. That is what he makes and then he has to go on UIC for the rest of the year, and he has a period in between when he cannot get his unemployment insurance and sometimes his family is hungry, and then the Premier calls

MR. HODDER: for wage restraint in the fishery. The Premier, I think, has proven to us now that he is not what we thought he was, he is not capable of handling the job. He is not even political anymore. I mentioned yesterday how he called for restraints for the paper workers while they were in negotiations and monetary funds were not an issue.

MR. NEARY: He will soon be a relic of the past.

MR. HODDER: That is right. And what a relic.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the budget and we see that 1 per cent of the budget, for all the talking that we have heard of the Northern cod, and all the fighting we have heard about the Northern cod, and all the fighting we have heard about the fishery and the way the fishery should go -

MR. TULK: Good question! What are they doing with the Northern cod now?

MR. NEARY: They are attacking the Russians now about the fishery.

MR. HODDER: Oh, that one has died. You might ask what are they doing about the church/school issue, or what are they doing about the Labrador boundary that the Premier came on television one time and told us about? We were going to lose our boundary, we were going to lose our church/school system on the constitutional debate. Why was that an issue at that particular time? Because he wanted to rouse the feelings of Newfoundlanders and he had to pick the issue. He was an expert, but people have learned. He saw a flash in the pan, he is gone.

MR. NEARY: A shooting star.

MR. HODDER: A shooting star, yes.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, his trademark has been grand gestures. Frighten them to death, 'They will take our church schools.' 'They will change our Labrador boundary.'

MR. HODDER: 'The Northern cod are in jeopardy,' The Northern cod must be ours!' He did not stop to think that the fishermen from my hon. Friend's district have been fishing in Nova Scotia waters for hundreds of years. When I grew up in the community of Rose Blanche on the Southwest Coast, the fishermen there fished off the coast of Nova Scotia traditionally and historically. They caught swordfish off the coast of Nova Scotia and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. There was no thought, 'It is ours', The greedy, greedy feeling, no thought of negotiations -

MR. NEARY: Lazy and greedy.

MR. HODDER: Lazy, greedy and then whining and sniveling and trying to blame all of these problems on someone else.

But, Mr. Speaker, what has the union been asking for? The union has been asking for a very simple thing. They would like to have some increases and they have also offered some solutions. They have offered some solutions so that fishermen can live better, Mr. Speaker, what sort of proposals have the Fishermen's Union made that this government cannot condone? They have asked that there be consolidated efforts in the fishery similar to those in the Saltfish Corporation; they have asked that there be an established line of credit so that we can ride out the fluctuations in the marketplace. These are very simple things, they are trying to protect the fishermen they represent and they thereby want to establish an income stabilization for our processors, our fishplant workers and our fishermen. Now, Mr. Speaker, what can be wrong with that? What is unreasonable about that? I would say, Mr. Speaker, that now that the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) and the Premier are all in bed

MR. HODDER: together in the great super company, that there are going to be very serious problems if this government do not address themselves to the problems of the fishermen and the plant workers.

Mr. Speaker, you know there used to be a psychology, and this government still has it, that if you are a fishermen you not worth much. Mr. Speaker, the fisherman is worth just as much as your paper worker, your plant worker, your miner or anybody else with their union wages, but, Mr. Speaker, this is not happening in this Province. And the more and more we see of the restructuring and of the super company, the more and more we see the problems which the fishermen are facing. Mr. Speaker, it is not acceptable. It is not acceptable to the fishermen, it is not acceptable to the people of the Province and it is another aspect of the decline of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I had the good fortune to visit the Northwest Territories back a couple of years ago, and some hon. members on the other side were there with me. I was quite amazed by the type of tourism promotions that they had in the Northwest Territories and the kind of services that you received. I went to Baffin Island and I went to Frobisher Bay. When you arrived in Frobisher Bay you were given all sorts of very accurate information as to where you could go. If you want to get to Lake Harbour, which was an hour's flight by small aircraft, if you wanted to get to Parmaton, which is a National Park on Baffin Island, if you wanted to get to Igloolik - which was where I first saw the midnight sun inside the Arctic Circle - if you wanted to get to Igloolik there are ways to do it, there are charter groups, there are people and planes there that will take you. I was down at the Newfoundland Hotel the other day and I was in a room and I was looking at what was left in that particular

May 1, 1984

Tape No. 1159

MJ - 3

MR. HODDER: room and all was left was a Board
of Trade pamphlet - good for the Board of Trade! - but what
about

MR. HODDER:

the Department of Tourism? What sort of a tourism promotion do we have? Do you know what we have done in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, as far as tourism is concerned? We have given up. Someone on the government side told me the other day that our water was too cold for swimming. Well, we do not want to compete with Nova Scotia -

MR. NEARY:

Or Florida.

MR. HODDER:

- or Florida. That is not what people are going to come into Newfoundland for. Someone has to start thinking positively about this Province. People come for a variety of different reasons. People like to snowshoe, people like to cross-country ski; we have ski resorts here that we can develop. People like to go out and jig a codfish, people like to take pictures these days.

I walked into a park in my district and I met and talked with a doctor from New York. He said, 'I come back to this Province every year.' I asked, 'How did you first become acquainted with the Province?' And he said, 'I was one time a doctor with the Grenfell Mission in St. Anthony. And,' he said, 'I come back every year and I come to this park.' He said, 'You know, this is the most beautiful place on God's earth,' this being Piccadilly Park in my district. And you come across all sorts of people from here and there. But, Mr. Speaker, we have given up the thought of promoting tourism. We print this little book every year that most of the time is inaccurate; most of the time it leaves out half the festivals that are going on in the Province; it leaves out some of the more quaint festivals in the Province. And that is the extent of our tourism promotion.

MR. HODDER: We have a few entrepreneurs, some people in tourism in a small way, who may take you out here or there, but there is nothing consistent. You cannot walk into the Newfoundland Hotel or into Holiday Inn and see 'These are the tours.' But you can do it in the Northwest Territories where everybody has to fly, where every community is 150 miles away from another.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: We went from Frobisher Bay over to Yellowknife.

MR. STEWART: Does not the member notify the minister about what is going on in his district?

MR. HODDER: The member notifies the minister- but how far does it get transmitted? Does the French Folk Festival in Port au Port or the Handshore Festival on the West Coast? Or the Scottish Fiddlers Festival over there, does that get down into the United States?

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. HODDER: Do the people in New York City and Boston and these places know about these? No, Mr. Speaker, they do not. But do they know about Prince Edward Island? Yes, they do.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: We have a lot to sell here in this Province and we have a lot to give to other people. When I see pictures of those picturesque little communities in Maine - and I know Maine very well; I have been right along the seacoast of Maine on hundreds - not hundreds of occasions, but at least twenty or thirty times, I have travelled the seacoast of Maine. I lived in New Brunswick for some time. And I think of Peggy's Cove and all of those places in Nova Scotia. And we can go almost anywhere,

MR. HODDER: we can wander around the Southern Shore, around the bay or in any part of Newfoundland and can find any community that is as good as those. I spent last weekend in a community in my hon. friend's district, the community of Petites. It has no roads, but it has a tremendous community spirit, it is a very picturesque little community with wonderful, warm people. You know, there are people in this country who would give a right arm to be able to spend a few days in a community like that.

MR. HODDER: And, Mr. Speaker, do we try to sell this aspect of our Newfoundland culture? We had a Premier who, when he first came in was interested in the art scene. I wish the Premier would go and talk to some of the arts community now. He did the wonderful thing, he set up the great Arts Council. Well he should talk to some of the artists in this Province now. I met one artist in this Province, and a true artist he was, at the Festival of the Arts in Stephenville. And he said, you know, I am not going to get enough stamps as an actor this year in this Province to be able to get my unemployment insurance. Now here is a gifted Newfoundland actor, whom I have seen on a number of occasions, who told me that he was working for his stamps.

MR. TOBIN: I can show you hundreds who are working for their stamps.

MR. HODDER: Now that is the great Newfoundland cultural revival that the Premier was suppose to lead. It is dying around us.

MR. NEARY: Forced to go on the dole.

MR. TULK: What was that? I did not hear what the ignoramus from Burin-Placentia (Mr. Tobin) said.

MR. HODDER: If it was a comment from the member for Burin-Placentia West it does not count for anything anyhow. He does not talk sense and he does not talk English.

MR. NEARY: He is the most uncouth and low we have ever seen in this House.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if hon members ever go anymore to the LSPU Hall. I do not know if hon. members ever take in some of the drama that our Newfoundlanders are doing in the Province. I have talked to them about the struggles which they have in order to perform. We have some of the greatest music,

MR.HODDER: some of the greatest actors and for awhile they were being developed.

MR.NEARY: Kelly Russell and Rufus Ginchard.

MR.HODDER: Kelly Russell and Emil Benoit.

MR.TULK: The 'Jim Hodder Reel'.

MR.HODDER: I mean 'The Jim Hodder Reel' now has become very famous. It is known by all.

AN HON.MEMBER: And the singing of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.Morgan).

MR.HODDER: No, the provincial Minister of Fisherie's song will never be as good as 'The Jim Hodder Reel.' It was composed by Emil Benoit and it has been played by all the Newfoundland musicians.And as well, Mr. Speaker, it has been recorded. It is on record.and if you would like to buy the last record by Emil Benoit's record you will hear, 'The Jim Hodder Reel' on there. But, Mr. Speaker, if the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) will let me get on with my speech, my erstwhile colleague.

MR.TOBIN: Is it anything like the Jim Hodder speech we are listening to?

MR.HODDER: I should tell the member that I have a number of things to say and the more he interrupts the longer I will be.

MR.NEARY: That is right.

MR.HODDER: The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) wants to speak and I am sure someone on the other side would like to speak.

MR.TULK: No, they do not. They are not allowed.

MR.HODDER: Well,you can see what has happened to the Cabinet over there.

MR.NEARY: They have been silenced.

MR. HODDER:

MR. Speaker, what is the blind spot in this government? Yesterday I talked about the fact that we are not creating new business, we are not making any attempt to create new business. But why is it that we are not attempting to do anything with Tourism? You know, the last idea the government had that was novel on Tourism was to send the Norma and Gladys around the world. Now I know that the Norma and Gladys must have brought some people to this Province.

MR. NEARY:

And now they have her up on tender,

MR. HODDER:

The Norma and Gladys was the last idea the government had except for printing a brochure every year. They print a new brochure every year. But, Mr. Speaker, the Norma and Gladys is better on land than she ever would have been on sea, because at least if she were on land I could take my son, who has never seen a sailing ship, and say, 'That is the type of boat that I used to have to go on from an isolated community to see the doctor at one time. That is the type of boat that your grandfather was in.'

MR. NEARY:

You have to be careful. Remember what they did with the Annie Coady? They turned her into a love nest.

MR. HODDER: The problem with the Annie Coady is that again the government did not have any interest in her and they did not provide the proper security for her and they did not provide the proper protection for her. And that is the difference. And this is the last of our banking schooners, we do not see that type of ship around again and that ship should be preserved, but not in the way the government did it. That was just a method of getting all the Cabinet ministers and the backbenchers around, whenever she landed, when she landed in Dublin the people were there, when she landed in Sweden they were there, when they landed in Bristol there was somebody who fell off the wharf, I believe.

MR. TOBIN: Did you get a trip?

MR. HODDER: No, I did not get a trip, Mr. Speaker. I am the same on the Norma and Gladys - Yes, I did get a trip on the Norma and Gladys. No, I went aboard of her, I was offered a trip on her, but I did not take it. But I will tell you where the trip was, the trip would have been from Stephenville to Corner Brook and I did not take it. But I was very interested in taking it.

MR. TOBIN: I heard that you got onboard and you got seasick and you had to go ashore. Is that true?

MR. HODDER: I was very interested in taking the trip.

MR. NEARY: He got stomach sick when he looked at the cost.

MR. HODDER: I was very interested in taking it

MR. HODDER: because it was a part of my childhood, part of the days when I used to be on that type of ship. I think that ship should be preserved. But that is the best thing that could happen to it and I think it should be protected and secured so that the generations in the future can see the last banker, or a replica of the type of boat that used to sail these coasts in the old days, which my grandfather used to sail from Pussthrough in Hermitage Bay to Cadiz and Lisbon in Spain on boats like that. I am talking about my grandfather on my mother's side. They were small boat fishermen. But that was the type of boat that was used.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to talk about the Norma and Gladys any longer, but I am baffled by the fact that this government has no concept of trying to promote tourism in this Province.

I live on the West Coast where there are many salmon rivers, I travel the Northern Peninsula where there are many salmon rivers, and Mr. Speaker, the accommodations are not adequate. We have Marble Mountain which could be a ski resort, which can be developed. We have the scenic and the picturesque communities around our shores. We are trying to compete with the type of things that Prince Edward Island is offering. Well, we can in many cases, but we have not got the confidence to do it. There is a blind spot. There is no thinking in

MR. HODDER: the government. They are just sitting there waiting for the oil to come ashore, a caretaker government. What are you doing with tourism? When the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) who is responsible - well, it is not even a department here. It is not even a department of government. It is like Consumer Affairs. But when the minister responsible for tourism stands up, and I hope he will stand up in this budget debate, I hope he will tell us what wonderful new marks he is making this year in tourism that is going to bring the people in, particularly from the Northern United States and from the rest of Canada.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if you get a French folk festival, as it takes place in my riding, they do not have the resources to be able to get that message into Quebec from where we would receive all sorts of tourists. We do not have the resources to be able to -

MR. BAIRD: Chretien will bring it up to Quebec for you.

MR. HODDER: No, I am talking about tourism potential and the hon. member over there with his buttoned down, closed mind and silly humour has to throw something that is so inane and stupid across the floor as that. If he cannot be funny, do not say anything at all, I would say.

MR. TULK: You make your speech, I will take care of him.

MR. TULK: If he keeps on going, I am going to support him for the Leadership of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland, he has been that good for the last two days.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if I ran for the leadership of the Liberal Party that -

MR. TOBIN: I would support you.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in a general way I spoke about youth unemployment in this Province and the fact that the budget did not in any way address itself to youth unemployment. It did not address itself in any way to employment or unemployment in any way except, you know, when the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) got up and said that we are putting this much into roads and bridges. We do not consider that to be an attack on employment, we consider that to be an absolute necessary thing which, if it were not done, people would not be able to move from one community to another and the roads would disappear. So anything that is being done, the pittance that is being thrown around for education with ten school boards in debt, and the pittance that is being thrown around for

MR. HODDER: highways cannot be considered job creation. And, you know, maybe the Confederation Building Extension out there will give some people some jobs for a very short time, but that is not what I consider job creation. Nowhere was there an attempt at job creation. But there are two different aspects of job creation that we should look at in this Province. I mentioned yesterday the fact that other provinces, including Nova Scotia and New Brunswick - and I will not go through all that again - are successfully bringing in new business, not encouraging businesses that are already there to expand but bringing in new business in to the communities.

Mr. Speaker,
just to give the hon. members some idea of the type of thing that this budget neglects, details were released recently in Saskatchewan of two major job creation programmes. These are not federal programmes, they were announced by the Advanced Education and Manpower Minister, and that is a very good idea.

MR. HODDER: It was not announced by the federal government. It was not federal government money. It was announced by the Minister for Advanced Education and Manpower, which I think, by the way, is not a bad title. Because in this Province we have a Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) who is still introducing courses that are geared to the 1960s and maintaining courses that are geared to the 1960s and we have a Manpower Minister (Mr. Dinn) who does nothing, but perhaps if we had a Minister of Education and Manpower we might be able to have the right type of thinking that I was talking about yesterday in trying to educate people for jobs in the future.

MR. TULK: You have to change both ministers.

MR. HODDER: If you put the two ministers together that you have there now you would not have a good one.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: But anyhow, Mr. Speaker, the programmes, one was called Saskatchewan Opportunities '84 and the other one was called Access Youth Employment. This was the Saskatchewan's government commitment to creating jobs for the youth in Saskatchewan. How much money did they put in it, Mr. Speaker? Saskatchewan Opportunities '84, they put \$2.7 million into the programme. How much did we put into our Venture Capital Fund? \$500,000.

MR. TULK: Big deal! They had that gone before the Budget was read.

MR. HODDER: Now this may be short-term employment but it will at least get youth employed for the first time because we have thousands of youth who have never had work. I would like to show hon. members a study that was done by Canada Manpower in my district where 90 per cent of the young people were unemployed. You know, Mr. Speaker, some 45 per cent of these people had never held a job in their life and cannot find one, and they are looking.

MR. HODDER: But anyhow that particular programme is expected to create 2,600 jobs in a variety of sectors in the provincial economy. It has the same broad employer base as a programme which they had last year, Opportunities '83, which was considered a major success in Saskatchewan.

The three month maximum employer subsidy of \$350 per month for each job created will be available to farmers, business people, non-profit organizations, municipalities and other local governments. Now that is a programme where the provincial government has put money into the hands of a sector of the economy in order to hire the youth of the Province.

MR. TULK: That is called 'Put your money where your mouth is.'

MR. HODDER: Eligible students include permanent residents of Saskatchewan who are at least sixteen years of age who are enrolled in a post-secondary education institution for the next academic year. That was \$2.7 million which they put into that programme.

Then the next programme, the Access Youth Employment programme, they put \$3 million and that is aimed at putting young people into jobs over the longer term for twenty-four to thirty weeks. And it is aimed at creating jobs for young Saskatchewan adults between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four. Now, Mr. Speaker, there were two programmes by the provincial government who were concerned about the young people. You know, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that Saskatchewan probably has a better economy than we do, but what I am really concerned about is the fact that this particular government did not even give lip service to the unemployed youth in this Province. They did nothing to show that they had any care or concern about unemployment with youth. And whether it had been \$1 million or \$1.5 million for Newfoundland it would have been a commitment to the youth of this Province.

MR. HODDER: But there we have it, Mr. Speaker, a government that thought that the unemployed youth was a great danger, and it is a great danger, as I pointed out yesterday, that young people who are going into the labour force, who never had jobs before, that is the worst time; they are growing up learning what social assistance is about in some cases before they learn about the work ethic is about, and then, if they do get a job for a short while, they go on UIC. It is not good, and members there opposite know it is not good and we know it is not good, but what did the government do about it in this budget?

MR. TULK: That crowd? Nothing!

MR. HODDER: But I point out this about Saskatchewan where they target two great groups of youth,

MR. HODDER: one group were those who wanted to further their academic education, they put \$2.7 million there, and the other group was the group that were without jobs, who were in the other category, young adults. And the first programme last year, the Saskatchewan Youth Opportunities '83, was a major success and they have continued with Saskatchewan Youth Opportunities '84.

But in the Access Youth Employment, a wage subsidy of \$2.50 per hour, 'employers will be encouraged to create incremental positions for unemployed youth'. And they anticipate the creation of 1,000 positions for youth between fifteen and twenty-four. Now, Mr. Speaker, could we not use that in this Province? Could we not use that in this Province where we are in a position at the present time where we have the highest unemployment in the country and the highest youth unemployment in the country?

Mr. Speaker, if members opposite think I feel bitter about the budget, I am bitter about the budget. I think that the budget was one of the most disastrous documents. Newfoundlanders have become used to the fact, they do not expect very much anymore. For a while the government almost persuaded Newfoundlanders that they had no responsibilities, that all the responsibilities were the federal government's responsibilities; the federal government should be the employer, the federal government should be the people to put the money in. But Newfoundlanders are now starting to realize that the federal government does do its share, and they are starting to realize that the provincial government has a responsibility as well. And this is the type of responsibility they have: They are responsible for unemployment.

MR. TOBIN: And the feds as well.

MR. HODDER: Yes, the federal government

MR. HODDER: is responsible for unemployment too, but so is the provincial government. They are responsible for our youth and, if they are a caring government, then they will care about what happens. They do have a role to play. They are responsible for tourism, it is a provincial responsibility. Yes, we sign agreements with the federal government, but that is not the only responsibility we have. It reminds me of something. Some Development Associations across this Province have come to the point where their only - I am not saying all Development Associations - only job in life is to be able to extract federal government programmes. They cannot extract provincial government programmes because there are none. But that is their main focus in life, to extract money out of the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, this government reminds me of that in that their main task is to extract from the federal government, and anything that goes wrong, blame it on the federal government, but they have no ideas themselves. You know, Mr. Speaker, sometimes good ideas do not cost that much money, and sometimes we waste more money when we do not have those good ideas. And we lose money when we do not have tourists coming into the Province.

MR. BUTT: Are you almost finished?

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker. I may be here for some time.

MR. PATTERSON: You will be here until the next election and then you are gone. Speak on the positive aspects of the budget.

MR. BAIRD: He will not be here after the next election, I will tell you that.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, he asked me to speak on the positive aspects of the budget. I spoke on the positive aspects of the budget yesterday. The positive

MR. HODDER: aspects of the budget were the decrease in small business tax and the venture capital, but they did not do anything to stimulate the economy. So the good things were the bad things. There were a few goodies thrown out; I am glad for the people of Marystown, I am glad for the people of Fogo, but the fact is that again it was crisis management; in order to keep that shipyard going down there they had to do something, and something certainly had to be

MR. HODDER:

done on Fogo Island and it is something that should have been done a long time ago. Mr. Speaker, you know, that is a positive aspect of the budget, but ask me what else is a positive aspect of the budget and I cannot tell you.

MR. BUTT:

Twenty-five million dollars

worth of water and sewer work.

MR. HODDER:

Twenty-five million dollars

worth of water and sewer. Does the member actually believe that the government is spending twenty-five million dollars on water and sewer?

MR. BUTT:

Of course.

MR. HODDER:

Yes, but the municipalities will

pay it back afterwards. That is not money from the government, that is guaranteed loans. And now they have put up the rate at which the capital must be paid back by 5 per cent. So what they have done now is they get the municipalities to tax even more so that the municipalities are on the firing line rather than the government. It is just a way of weaseling from one to the other.

I will be interested to hear what hon. members have to say when they get up about all those positive aspects of the budget, what was good in this budget.

MR. BUTT:

We are still subsidizing about

\$30 million every year.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, every year the noose

is growing tighter and tighter, taxation goes up in the municipalities more and more every year, property tax is coming in. It is at the point now where the government will recoup its money and more. Mr. Speaker, do not talk about guaranteed loans, do not talk about money for highway construction when every road in the Province is deteriorating.

MR. HODDER: The only road we have in the Province that is worth driving over, and that is not the best, is the Trans-Canada Highway. And now the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) tells me that he is going to try to get the federal government to get into secondary roads. We have now this year, as a Province, given away a lot of our rights in the fisheries through the super company, and now we are going to try to get the federal government into secondary roads. The next thing, we will be asking them to come in and build our schools. Do you know what the next step is after that, Mr. Speaker? We may as well dissolve the House of Assembly and let the country be run centrally if this government is not going to take responsibility and do its job.

MR. BAIRD: If we listened to the hon. member that is what we would be doing now.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if we were to listen to the government, we would be out as an independent nation. The separatist feeling over there comes across every day and you cannot talk one way when you are thinking the other way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this budget has also done something else. Make no mistake, when the Premier came on T.V. to warn us of what was in the budget, the aim of the Premier was to destroy the unions in this Province. I read in the paper today that there was some dispute in the unions. If hon. members on the government side of this House can gloat over the fact that they are beating the unions, that the unions are at bay, which I have heard members say and I have heard said in the press, if members feel that that is a good thing, then they are in for a rude awakening. Because a strong union movement in this Province is needed. And the Premier is attempting

MR. HODDER: to destroy the unions. That was the main thrust of the budget and that was the main thrust of the Premier's speech a few nights before they brought down the budget, to destroy the unions. And, Mr. Speaker, the union movement in this Province is certainly needed.

I should tell hon. members, Do not go to one of the hospitals. I had a conversation last night, as a matter of fact, with some people who work in the hospitals.

MR. PATTERSON: Tell us something that was interesting that was not cut.

MR. HODDER: Why do you not go to the Health Sciences Complex and see what this budget has done there, where you get one nurse on a ward with sixteen patients and unable to handle one at times, when nurses give medication that is prescribed by someone else.

MR. PATTERSON: (Inaudible).

MR. HODDER: No, in the Health Sciences Complex where you have nurses who work thirty-six hour shifts, that is what is going on over there now, where there are nurses who call downstairs and say, 'We want bandages and medication' and they are told 'Well, you cannot have it, you have used up your quota.' And then they try to get it off another floor and sometimes it takes ten or fifteen minutes before they can get the proper medication.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, tell us about things like that, if these things are happening.

MR. HODDER: I just told you. What is wrong with you you cannot go down and find out yourself.

MR. PATTERSON: You are talking to yourself. No one is listening. Sit down.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the hon. the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) will always be the party whip, and he will walk behind the Premier. He will never get to be a parliamentary assistant and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in the next election he will not even bother to run because the Liberals are about to clean his clock down there. And, Mr. Speaker, he never speaks, but he can always get there and natter. That is the one thing he is good for.

MR. PATTERSON: I described Smallwood in 1971 and that was the beginning of the end.

MR. HODDER: Now, if the hon. member wants to go down to the Health Sciences Complex and talk to some of the staff down there he will find out that he will get an earful about what is going on there. I do not know if I would put anybody in hospital in this Province any more with the type of -

MR. PATTERSON: Where would you send them, Bangladesh?

MR. HODDER: With the type of health care

MR. HODDER: programmes and the type of restraints that have been put on this Province I might send them to Bangladesh, yes.

MR. PATTERSON: Tell us about those things.

MR. HODDER: Well, I did.

MR. PATTERSON: Now you are making sense.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, what the government has done, to get back to the unions, is try to destroy the unions. Mr. Speaker, the thrust of this government and the thrust of any government in Newfoundland should be to have good labour relations in this Province. Not a union person in this Province has one bit of use for this government. And, you know, Mr. Speaker, what is so sad is that the people, the public servants who run the business of this Province and to whom we have to look for information and guidance, are the people who have been slashed time and time again and that is not good, Mr. Speaker, for the running of this Province. It is not good for the running of the Province, and it augers ill for the future. Because while the government may have won a temporary battle, I can tell the government opposite that the nurses, that NAPE, that CUPE, that all of the unions that this government has to deal with are getting ready and it would be far better if this government were committed to good labour relations rather than confrontation, rather than lack of consultation, and that has been the byword. The government has not negotiated in good faith with any union in this Province. They did not negotiate in good faith with the teachers, they did not negotiate in good faith with the vocational school workers over here, where the Minister of

MR. HODDER: Labour and Manpower's (Mr. Dinn) uncle was on the picketline, they did not negotiate in good faith with the union in this case, where they called the union leaders in fifteen minutes before to tell them their legs were chopped out from under them. There is no such thing as collective bargaining in this Province any more and that is a principle of democracy.

MR. TULK: What is that?

MR. HODDER: Collective bargaining. And that is not something that is happening in this Province and the Minister of Labour and Manpower can get up and say what he wants. He can rant and

MR. HODDER: rave and do all he wants, but if I were the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) I would have a bodyguard, I would take, perhaps, two bodyguards wherever I went.

MR. DINN: I can handle myself.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, you know, the other problem, and this is the last time I will talk about the wage freeze, the other problem is the fact that we have probably lost the last real chance of coming to grips with the real and pressing problems of inefficiency in government that we have now with the freeze and the type of attitude that exists in the civil service. Maybe the minister's deputy minister speaks well to him, but I can tell you that the people in the lower echelons of his department do not think well of him. And we have lost the type of co-operative -

MR. DINN: Are you talking about my department?

MR. HODDER: Any minister's department. The type of co-operation that one time existed, when there were good labour relations amongst ministers and amongst the employees of the civil service, has disappeared. And you cannot get clear of inefficiencies in government by arbitrarily doing it, it must be done in a co-operative manner. And the wage freeze in this budget has probably cost us the last real chance of coming to grips with this pressing problem of inefficiency in government. Because the only way it will ever be overcome is through a co-operative effort between the civil service and the government of this Province. And certainly this government will never be able to sit down and try to overcome the inefficiencies of government.

Mr. Speaker, the story of the 1984 provincial budget, as I pointed out yesterday at 5:50 p.m. and I will not repeat myself, is that they have apologized for what they have done, there is an apology in there, and

MR. HODDER: they have asked that they be given an even chance. You know, this government has ruled this Province for the past twelve years and it is approximately about one half the time that the Liberal administration were in power. Mr. Speaker, twelve years in any man's estimation and by any standard you choose to apply certainly must constitute an even chance. This government, past and present, who were all basically members of the same administration, have had a full dozen years, 144 long months in which to exercise an even chance to develop our people and our resources. Now, Mr. Speaker, you would think that since the Tories had half as much time as the Liberals in office that they would be able to accomplish at least half as much. The fact that you have had half as much time in power you should be able to accomplish half as much, but, Mr. Speaker, let us look at what this government has accomplished in half the time and see if the accomplishments of this government are geometrically proportionate to the accomplishments of the Liberal administration..

Mr. Speaker, the truth is not only did they not accomplish anything but, in fact, destroyed half as much of the economy and more than the Liberals had established.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the Liberals built Memorial University, they built 1,200 new schools, they introduced the school bus system, they started eighteen trade schools, they started the College of Trades and Technology, the School for the Deaf, the College of Fisheries, the College of Engineering, the College of Medicine, the School of Nursing, the Arts and Culture Centres throughout the Province, most of them, 90 per cent of them. They started Public Libraries, the Archives, the Fishermen's Loan Board, they introduced community stages and marine service centers and longliners. And while they were doing this, Mr. Speaker, they were electrifying the Province and they were doing all the things that needed to be done after we came into Confederation. They introduced the hydraulic haul outs for boats, the electronic fish finders, the mid-water trawls, the Danish seiner. They built and financed over sixty fish processing plants while they were in power. And in those plants they increased the number of people working from 1500 to 10,000 persons. They introduced the Labrador Fishery Development Commission, The Canadian Saltfish Corporation, mining developments all over the Province. The Marystown Shipyard was introduced under a Liberal government. They implemented the local preference policy of 20 per cent on purchases of local products. They instituted the formation of district development councils, the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, the Industrial Development Loan Board. Mr. Speaker, blueberry development, poultry farms, beef farms, mink farms, Farm Loans Board. I can tell the former Speaker, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) they were the people

MR. HODDER: to first bring in a caribou management programme. They built hundreds of miles of forest access roads. They built the road from Happy Valley to Churchill Falls, and the Strait of Belle Isle road was built. They put up public buildings in Wabush and Labrador City. I mean, I do not have to go on, Mr. Speaker, they paved 2000 miles of road and rebuilt. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, they built the Trans-Labrador Highway.

MR. YOUNG: Do not forget the chocolate factory.

MR. HODDER: You do not have to talk about the bridges that they built but I will tell you what they did do: They established the growth of Eastern Provincial Airways. They built and improved twenty-eight hospitals while they were here. They introduced free education for people at university which was taken away by this government. They built old age homes. Mr. Speaker, they built this Confederation Building in which we stand. They built the Sir Richard Squires Building in Corner Brook. They were the first to bring Hansard into this House of Assembly.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, all at cost plus to Smallwood's friends. The king of cost plus.

MR. HODDER: Oh, yes, King of cost plus. What about the rent in the Murray Premises? I was down there again the other day where your buddy down there, the bagman, is still taking money off the government.

MR. HODDER: Do you know what this government have done? I must say one thing for this government, they refined patronage. Tell us about all of the people all over the Province that you have put on boards and paid. Tell us about the Tenancies Boards. Tell us which party they represent. There are more boards around this Province now than were ever seen before. Do not tell me about corruption. The Province had never seen corruption at the level that this government have seen it.

MR. PATTERSON: Tell us about Doyle House and Shaheen.

MR. HODDER: Yes, what is wrong with Doyle House and Shaheen?

Mr. Speaker, I only refer the accomplishments of the past, there were failures in the past certainly, but when you look at the accomplishments of the past it goes back to my remarks that I made before that people have forgotten that a provincial government is an important government, they have a role to fulfil. And, Mr. Speaker, this government have, by its actions and by its attacking of the federal government, has lost its credibility with the citizens of this Province, and it has even come to the point that people have forgotten what a government is capable of doing, what a government has the capability of doing.

But what a shocking legacy, Mr. Speaker, we have seen in the past two years. What a legacy of betrayal. You mention the growth of this Province in the first twenty years, and then you start to look at what has been happening in this Province; the Come By Chance refinery was too much for the government to handle so they pushed it over on Petro Canada so it would not be blamed on them. They knew what was going to happen from the very beginning. When we look at the closures of the plants and the mills and the mines and everything else, and the government sits there and twiddles their thumbs lets it go. I mean, I do not have to remind members

MR. HODDER: opposite what is happening in their districts, about the closures that have been going on throughout the past Summer and during the past Winter.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a change, it is time for new ideas. It is time for this government to either give up, to call an election, to call a leadership convention, to do something. It is time for new ideas. There are no new ideas. There is nothing but sad, sick policies. The document says, 'Given an even chance the administration will develop our resources and people.' Well, Mr. Speaker, they have had twelve years to do it, and it has been a twelve year drought for our economy, not because the people in resources were not there but simply because the administration knew nothing about development, they knew only how to close things down, how to increase taxes, how to tax the people, how to waste the taxpayers' money. Twelve years they have had now, Mr. Speaker, and, you know, I wonder how much longer do they need? Another week? Another month? How many years do you need? You have had twelve and we see the Province collapsing around our ears. How many more years do you need? Let us know. Perhaps it will be next week, but I doubt it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, when they have received their large mandate in the last election, they received their mandate to negotiate on the offshore and they have let the people down. It was only yesterday that I warned hon. members opposite, I warned the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), that when they played the game of trying to wait for the right government to come into being in Ottawa that they were playing a dangerous game. And this morning, lo and behold,

MR. HODDER:

the poll shows that if an election were called today the Liberals could beat the Tories-leaderless. That is what it said, that the federal Liberals without a leader could beat Brian Mulroney today-even without a leader. That is what the polls really said. And even if it was 4 per cent off we would still have an even chance of winning the government.

And what I told the House Leader opposite (Mr. Marshall), and hon. members opposite yesterday, what I told them was that it was dangerous, it is a dangerous precedent to hang the hopes of the people of this Province on the fact that a government will change in Ottawa because, number one, the government may not change, and, number two, if it does change you have no better chance that you did before. And maybe now is the best time. This might be the best time in which you could ever negotiate. And if you knew what your bottom line was and you knew what you wanted, you should be negotiating continually. And, lo and behold, what happened this morning? The poll comes out, the Federal Liberal Party has swept up - I do not know how many points, 46 per cent, the Tories are down to 40 per cent, Mulroney is walking around with his ample chin on the ground and the Liberal Party of Canada does not even have a leader.

And, Mr. Speaker, I, as well as members opposite, would like to see a good offshore deal. But I do not believe that you should wait and fool around because what you are doing is you are trying to save your

MR. HODDER: own political necks, you will not be able to get a better deal with a new government, but you will be able to look better, so that the game plan is to save your own political necks.

I would say that this morning the Premier, wherever he is, the Government House Leader opposite (Mr. Marshall), did not have a great smile on his face. They know that the jig is up, that their strategy has been wrong. Their strategy, to get the best deal for Newfoundland, is a correct strategy, but it is the way that the government has gone about that. And I warned hon. members yesterday that anything could happen. Is this poll that we saw today an aberration or not? I would say that it is not, because the federal Liberal Party has not reached their peak. They are on their way up. They have not even picked a leader yet. And this government is hanging its offshore oil policy on the fortunes of what happens up there. And that means that they are hanging the people of Newfoundland, who gave them a mandate to negotiate, out to dry. And that is what this government is doing. But the Premier must have had a twisting in his bowels this morning when he saw that result, as did members opposite. It must be a great day for the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) when he saw the polls this morning and he realized that his seat is in jeopardy. And, Mr. Speaker, we have not even got into the provincial polls as of yet.

Mr. Speaker, you know, this government has been a failure. It is a large resounding failure. I mean, I have done some reading of Newfoundland history, but I would say that this government has been the biggest failure, I suppose, since the Conservative Government that signed away our

MR. HODDER: He has had it now, Mr. Speaker!
The Premier's cross-country speaking engagements -
he has a speaking engagement, you look at the editorial
in the local paper and he is just a dismal flop as he goes
across the country. He cannot change his spots, he is still
the arrogant, stunned, inane Premier, who is -

MR. NEARY: Greedy, lazy.

MR. HODDER: - greedy, Mr. Speaker, I do not
know if the Premier is lazy, but I have met many people who
do a lot of work but accomplish nothing. I think that is
how it is with the Premier, he does a lot of work but he
accomplishes nothing.

MR. NEARY: That is right, any excuse to get
out of his office.

MR. HODDER: You know, he has been very good
at giving former colleagues monstrous salaries and looking
after his friends. He has been great at putting supporters
on boards and things like that.

MR. NEARY: Now he is going to look after
'Frankie Baby' with his new Convention Centre. Every hotel
in Newfoundland is practically bankrupt and now they want
to build another.

MR. HODDER: That is right. Mr. Speaker,
I think the Province would be better off if the Premier
went back to the Super Bowl and stayed there. I know he
would not come back from the Super Bowl last year when the
town of Gander was in trouble. He could not even make that
gesture to come back from the Super Bowl. I think he should
go down there and stay. I do not think if the Premier left
the Province we would miss him. You know, we do not miss
him here. I have noticed this session, whether the Premier
is sitting there or not, it does not matter, he does not
say anything anymore. He does not speak. He just gets up

MR. HODDER: every once in a while. He just does not count for anything. The government is leaderless. And one of these days the members opposite will wake up and I suppose they will elect the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) as their leader; that is the only salvation that I can see they would have. They are certainly not going to elect the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) as their leader. He is just a great big lump who has done nothing since he has been Minister of Development. He has developed nothing in this Province only making promises and studies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: It would certainly not be the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I like the Minister of Finance. He is a good fellow and all that, but he does not have the charisma.

MR. HODDER: The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is the only hope that is left over there at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Well, I do not know, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: Do not stop now.

MR. HODDER: I have a great curiosity, Mr. Speaker. I am very curious as to how the government is going to defend this budget. I want to hear it. I have read the budget, I have looked at the good parts of it, and I want to hear how the government is going to defend this budget.

MR. NEARY: You know what you are going to hear. Put on the record over there and play the same old record over and over again.

MR. SIMMS: We know what we are going to hear, too.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, just let me say that perhaps the most elemental economic weapon that this Province has at its disposal at the moment is a political one; the unions have realized it, and I suggest it is one which this Province will soon use, will use shortly. And this is an economic weapon which will bring around the recovery of the economy of this Province in such a way as has never been recorded in history before. And, Mr. Speaker, that economic weapon which the people of Newfoundland have in their hands to change the economy of this Province, that economic weapon is the surgical removal of the cancer that has crippled our economy for the past twelve years, the physical booting out into the streets of this crowd opposite which I stand and speak before at the present time, this crowd of political thugs -

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, that is unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not.

MR. HODDER: - and the restoration of political decency, sanity and morality once again to this Province and its beleaguered people. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the weapon that the people of this Province have to turn the economy of this Province around, to remove the hon. members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here at a time when the fishery is in a state of collapse, the fishermen are hungry, there is chaos in the mining industry, there are severe problems in the business community, and there are problems in the construction industry, most of them have gone bankrupt. There is a desperate lack of housing development, and Newfoundlanders are leaving the Province in droves, people are leaving their fishing boats in droves. And what, I ask, does this budget do for the situation we face?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nothing.

MR. HODDER: Not a thing. We were hoping that after the vicious exercises of past budgets that this budget would do something. There was even a hint, there was a leak that they were going to do something to improve the economy of this Province.

MR. TULK: They have that venture fund, you know, 'Jim'.

MR. HODDER: The venture fund of \$500,000, yes. Venture capital, \$500,000; Now which company did they have that earmarked for? That is the question I would like to ask.

MR. TULK: Metal Craft. They have taken over Metal Craft.

MR. HODDER: Oh, I see. That is what the venture capital is for. Because I knew they could not

May 1, 1984, Tape 1173, Page 3 -- apb

MR. HODDER:

do anything straight.

We knew that that \$500,000 was so woefully inadequate
that they could not do anything straight.

MR. HODDER: Obviously, you know, \$500,000 for venture capital and nothing to stimulate new business.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) bankrupt and another one called Metal Craft (inaudible)

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker, I am waiting for the day when the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) comes into this House with a plan for the educational future of our Province. Education: If you look at the way the Western democracies are going now, education for a little while was sort of downhill but suddenly the computer revolution has hit us. We have computers in some of our schools and do you know how we are using them? We are not using them in the way that they are supposed to be used. We are learning how to use them, but in some countries now they are using them to solve problems, they are teaching people how to use them in a useful way. All we are doing so far is just learning to use them, which anybody can do.

MR. TOBIN: The new hospitals being constructed, how come you have not talked about them.

MR. HODDER: New hospitals being constructed, Mr. Speaker, I told the hon. member just a minute ago that the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) when he stands to speak, I am sure can tell you as well as I can the situations that are in the hospitals in St. John's at the present time. You do not have to talk to very many people to find out what is going on in the hospitals in St. John's right now. And one of the members opposite - the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was not in the House - said, 'I suppose you would go to Bangladesh', and I said, 'Yes, I might go to Bangladesh after hearing from professional people, doctors and nurses, what is happening in hospitals right across this Province, people working thirty-six hour shifts, short supplies. You know, they are spending more money promoting restraint in some hospitals than if they did not promote restraint.'

MR. HODDER: A patient is bleeding and you do not have a bandage, you have a quota of bandages on your floor, so you have to go downstairs.

MR. TULK: Do you know a twenty-five cent comb, I just figured it out, the administrative cost is \$5.25 to get it out of a locked cupboard at the Health Sciences Complex.

MR. HODDER: That is right, because you have to send a paid nurse who takes half an hour to get downstairs.

MR. TULK: And then she has to sign invoices and papers and all the rest of it.

MR. HODDER: yes. But to go downstairs and bring back that twenty-five cent comb they worked it out to be \$5.25.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: They have the service vessel in Marystown thanks to the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) who suggested to Ottawa that they buy that boat they have down there.

MR. TOBIN: What boat? She was announced before ever Ottawa did anything.

MR. NEARY: You are not fooling the people down there, boy.

MR. TOBIN: And I will tell you something else, it was a fellow from Burin who bought (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: You are not fooling anybody, the people down there know the difference. All they have to do is read Roger's brochure and they know the difference.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, we were hoping that -

MR. TOBIN: Down there they burn Roger's brochure.

MR. HODDER: You know, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), when I first met him I thought he knew something but, you know, the member for Burin - Placentia West has no political couth and he has no political

MR. HODDER: savvy. Because if he had any political savvy he would not even be in the House now he would be down running from door to door, from now until the next election -

MR. NEARY: Trying to get elected.

MR. HODDER: - trying to get elected. Because the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is in the same boat as 90 per cent of the members over there.

MR. NEARY: He has a bad image on the Burin Peninsula and a bad reputation.

MR. HODDER: That is right, Mr. Speaker, especially since last year.

MR. NEARY: They do not like rudeness. One thing about the people on the Southwest Coast the hon. gentleman should know -

MR. HODDER: They like gentlemen down there.

MR. NEARY: - they like gentlemen, they do not like rudeness.

MR. TOBIN: They must have some hatred for you, in that case.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if I could.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: He is not in his seat, he is very irritating, Mr. Speaker. I mean, he is not funny and he has no sense of humour whatsoever, and these inanities that he throws across the House, it is just ignorance.

MR. WINDSOR: I do not know about rudeness, I am talking about the stupidity contained in your speech.

MR. HODDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister may not like what I say in my speech but the people of this Province believe what I say in my speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Whistle past the graveyard.
But, Mr. Speaker, we were hoping that after the vicious exercise that was put through in past budgets that this budget would do something that would give us some opportunity. I was hoping, Mr. Speaker, that I could stand up and praise the administration. I could have praised the administration, I suppose, on behalf of my friend from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) -

MR. TULK: No.

MR. HODDER: - and on behalf of the people from Marystown, but Mr. Speaker, I know why it was done.

MR. TOBIN: You gave an ideal answer.

MR. HODDER: We told them how to do it, how to keep the Marystown plant going and the boat yard going and how to satisfy the great need, that need. I heard a person on the radio the other morning from Fogo and she was talking about her son who was in Intensive Care in the Janeway and she was stuck over there and she could not get over and it tugged at my heartstrings, Mr. Speaker. And I know what the member for Fogo has to put up with and it is coming one of those days -

MR. NEARY: But they are more interested in a convention centre, a new hotel, when all the hotels are bankrupt.

MR. HODDER: I drove in town the other day and I said now there is the new Confederation Building extension. And the person with me said, "Well, make no wonder everybody outside of St. John's is mad when they see that kind of construction going up when there is no need for it whatsoever.

MR. NEARY: A new House of Assembly.

MR. HODDER: And I said, "Well there is a need for it." "Yes, but there is no need now." And there is no need for it at this present time. Now we are going to have a new convention centre and an Arts and Culture Centre up in Labrador City and I am sure the people of Labrador City if they had a choice between arts and culture centres and jobs and employment they would take the jobs and employment. I have nothing against arts and culture centres, but they come in their place.

MR. TOBIN: You have nothing to talk about, you are a disaster, boy. Sit down, you are wasting your time.

MR. TULK: And then they talk about resource development over there.

MR. HODDER: And they talk about resource development. Do you know what this budget was made up of? A few little goodies given here, and a few little goodies given there, with no plans; there was no plan behind this budget for the economy. I mean, I have stood here for the past three or four hours and talked about it. I mean, there was nothing for the youth. They do not even follow the other provinces. They steal legislation from the other provinces, that is all this government does, steal little bits of legislation, so they have these little tiddly bits of legislation that come in and then they switch them so that they have their hands on the purse strings.

DR. COLLINS: You have not said much since I have been here.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the minister was not here yesterday, and I wish he had been here yesterday, because I gave the House a lecture on how business is being created in other areas of Canada and in other areas of the world and I hope the minister reads Hansard on that particular part alone. Since the minister is here, if he would listen to me for a second - I mentioned

May 1, 1984

Tape 1175

NM - 3

MR. HODDER:

yesterday about the civil

servants who will retire in the next two years who will be affected for the rest of their lives by those cutbacks. I do hope that the minister takes that into consideration because these people are not being hurt for two years, since the top three years are the years in which they receive their basic amount, and these people are being hurt for the rest of their lives because of the incompetence of the minister and the government. So I hope that the minister will remember that. I just bring that up again.

But, Mr. Speaker, what do we have in the budget? What do I have to say about the budget? Well, we thought there would be something in there to praise. But what we have is a document that lacks imagination and initiative and juggles the books and does nothing to stimulate the economy and again hurts the middle and lower income classes in this Province. There is no indication of a recovery plan for the Province's industrial sector. There is no indication of a recovery plan for the mining sector.

MR. HODDER: There is no indication of a recovery plan for the pulp and paper industry. There is nothing that would lead us to believe that anything will be done about the sealing industry. There is no plan whatsoever for growth in any of the social economic sectors. And anything that has happened as far as growth is concerned in this Province is anywhere between 85 per cent and 95 per cent funded by the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, there are no plans to help cope with our number one problem unemployment, not even lip service. And certainly, as I pointed out today, there are no plans, not even a modest attempt to help us with the record unemployment amongst our young people. And there is not even a simple, modest attempt to try and rebuild our economy.

Mr. Speaker, where is the help in this budget for the unemployed in the Province? Where is the help for the Bay d'Espoir area where there is high unemployment? Where is the help for the poor of this city? Where is the help for the high unemployment areas, such as the West Coast and the Roddickton area? Where is the plan for recovery?

I said in the House last year, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier had tried by public relations to portray himself and his government as a vigorous provincial government full of splendid sound ideas without the money to carry them out. He is now portraying the government as a group of men who care nothing whatsoever for the Province. The main aim of this Premier is to perpetuate himself in power and to perpetuate his government in power. And lately, Mr. Speaker, lo and behold, they are portrayed as a group of people who are misunderstood. They are now misunderstood. After twelve years in power the Premier is

MR. HODDER: misunderstood, the minister is misunderstood, the members are misunderstood. That is what we read in the Premier's letters to the papers. Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland understand.

Mr. Speaker, the government has taken a hands-off approach to the economy. The Premier is taking a hands-off approach to the economy and is presiding over the collapse of the Province.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the government are sitting idly by while towns die, companies go bankrupt. They are presiding over the collapse of the Province. We are watching the highest unemployment in the Province in history, the largest number of bankruptcies, both personal and business, and, Mr. Speaker, while the government presides over that they take no blame for it. Mr. Speaker, we see other Premiers in other provinces wrestling with the problems

MR. HODDER: wrestling with the problems that they have. And, Mr. Speaker, you wonder if the Premier can walk and chew gum at the same time because his mind is on the oil, it is his only salvation. But he cannot walk and chew gum at the same time. He can only do one thing. He cannot pay attention to the provincial economy. And again I say, and again I say, and again I say, supposing we had never had a discovery of offshore oil where would we be? Mr. Speaker, with the attitude that this government has we would be nowhere. But this Province can survive, that is what the government does not realize. In our Tourism, in our job creation, we can survive, we cannot survive without it. I am not saying Mr. Speaker, we do not appreciate that we have it, but let us not give everything up for it. So the Premier sits back and twiddles his thumbs and shakes his head and makes his fanatic speeches and waves his arms around and froths at the mouth and taps his feet. Mr. Speaker, the Premier does that and he waits and he waits for the offshore oil to come. And he waits for events to unfold, as they should, in Ottawa. Well, Mr. Speaker, things are not unfolding as they should. Mr. Speaker, the budget is deceptive, this budget is deceptive, you see, there were little phrases, little catch phrases in this budget which said, 'Other fees will be put up' - they were not mentioned - 'to bring them in line with the cost.'

MR. NEARY: Did you see the ad in the paper today about the birth certificates and the marriage licenses? They are \$10 now.

MR. HODDER: Everything has been doubled or tripled and everything else.

MR. NEARY: Gone up 100 per cent.

MR.HODDER: But there was a little phrase in the budget, 'We will bring government services up to an acceptable cost.' Now, can we trust this government to really bring them up to an acceptable cost? No, that is their form of taxation, that is where they get their short-fall money, that is where they get their short-fall. That is how they are going to do it, on the backs of the poor. They are not even honest. It is a deceptive budget, and the full impact will not be felt by this Province for some time to come. You know, it is not a fair budget, it is not a fair budget for Newfoundlanders. It hurts the low and middle-income earners, it has no ideas. The number one problem in this Province is unemployment and in that problem we have a very serious youth unemployment problem which is even worse, and it was not addressed. There is nothing in this budget that showed that this government has any idea about managing or manipulating the economy. The only provisions that were put into that particular document were provisions to make them look good. There was nothing there that was substantial, 2 per cent off existing business tax, how does that create new business in this Province? Sure, it helps. There is a positive aspect to it. But how do we create new business? How do we create new jobs? There is nothing there to do it with. They are creating new jobs in other countries in the world, they are creating new jobs in other provinces of Canada, they are creating new jobs in Sydney, and they are creating new jobs in New Brunswick.

MR.NEARY: In Halifax.

MR.HODDER: Well, in Halifax they are

MR. HODDER: creating new jobs at our expense. Our businessmen are going to Halifax.

MR. NEARY: We have the best Premier that Nova Scotia ever had.

MR. HODDER: That is right. Buchanan must love our Premier.

MR. TULK: Sure, he said that.

MR. HODDER: Yes, I believe he did. I believe I did read something somewhere where it was said.

MR. NEARY: 'The best thing', he said, 'that ever happened to Nova Scotia was to get Peckford elected in Newfoundland'.

MR. HODDER: And, Mr. Speaker, with 100,000 people out of work in this Province at this time. And, Mr. Speaker, you know every year

MR. HODDER: for three years running the government has said, 'We have held this tax on building materials down to 8 per cent,' as if that were a great thing. And, you know, Mr. Speaker, as far as stimulating construction and stimulating the economy of this Province and the spinoff effects it would have - and I revert to the Board of Trade who asked for this - that 8 per cent on building supplies should be dropped.

MR. TULK: I do not think they will try it on building supplies.

MR. HODDER: Well, do you not think the 8 per cent should be dropped?

MR. TULK: Of course.

MR. HODDER: Of course it should.

MR. TULK: I thought you were saying it was it just went up.

MR. HODDER: Oh, no, absolutely not.
But, you know, the government has decided it will do this - I am not even sure about the rationalization of the hospital programmes in this Province, where hospitals are being constructed. I would certainly be very worried if I had a cottage hospital in my area, and I say to my friend from Exploits (Dr. Twomey), in case he did not hear me yesterday, that I would watch it because the hon. gentleman thinks a lot of that hospital, I know. But, you know, when the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) had his hospital cut out from under him, they did not even tell him. So that should be a lesson to anyone who has a cottage hospital in his district.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that the budget tries to do, I suppose it attempts to hopefully protect the government's financial flank in the world money markets. That is what it is doing, it is trying to protect the government's financial flank in the money markets and it is trying to maintain the Province's precarious credit rating. And, at the same time, the Peckford Government will continue its drill tactics of attacking the federal government at every possible opportunity, at every single opportunity. The Province's rate is the lowest in Canada. They will sit still, hope for the best - Do not do anything to stimulate the economy, do not do anything to improve the education system.

MR. NEARY: Do not overheat the economy.

MR. HODDER: Do not overheat the economy. Leave our children who are coming out of school in abject ignorance with courses that were brought in in the 1960s and that were useful for the 1950s and 1960s. Do not do anything that might encourage our young people to prosper in today's society. Do not do anything that might bring high tech industry or micro industry into Newfoundland. Do not do anything like that. Do not do anything to encourage anybody on our unemployment rolls to get into useful or gainful employment. That is the attitude of this government.

MR. NEARY: The answer to all that is to reshuffle the Cabinet. That is the answer to it all.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I go back to what I said before and I will conclude by saying that the

MR. HODDER: Newfoundland people have a weapon. That weapon is an economic weapon, it is a very political one but it will improve the economy of this Province and that is to remove this government from the Province and replace it with another. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. BUTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT: Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully for the last almost two full sitting days to the hon. gentleman, the little man from Port au Port who just took his seat. He said very little of substance. He certainly did not address a lot of the very positive things in this budget, a budget, I might add, that has been dubbed as an election budget. There are so many positive things in it that it was considered to be an election budget when it was brought down by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) back a couple of months ago.

MR. BUTT: The member who just took his seat, he went on at great length about the present Liberal leadership that is ongoing right now. Really it does not have too much to do with the budget. He even got into talking about the Jim Hodder Reel. I do not know really how that will impact on the provincial budget, or if it will in any way at all.

He did make some reference to unemployment. I would like to have a few words to say about that because it is obviously a very serious problem that we are faced with here in this Province. It is a real big problem, one that is very distressing, I think, to members on this side of the House as well. I believe that one way of addressing this very serious problem is to renegotiate some very bad contracts that have been put in place and any new ones that are coming on, to get a fair and equitable deal for Newfoundland.

Now, the hon. gentleman as well spoke about the government having a separatist image. Well, I really do not think that there is any one on this side of the House that you could classify as separatist. But let me say this, that the policies of this Central Government that is now in power in Ottawa is certainly not making it any easier to be, you know, less than good Canadians, because the people in Eastern Canada as well as in Western Canada are being alienated by the present government in Ottawa. And the gentleman who right now is about to step down has done more to drive a wedge into this country than any of his predecessors.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT: For sixteen years the Prime Minister of today has done more to separate Canada than any Prime Minister who preceded him. He came on stream in 1968 and he spoke of the just society, and, yet, through his policies and mismanagement he has caused more injustices to this country

MR. BUTT:

than any one who preceded him.

He also spoke in another campaign that followed, about 'The land is strong'. Well, Mr. Speaker, this land is not strong. There are strong areas in it and there are weak areas and the policies of the federal government should reflect that. We are faced with this very serious unemployment problem. There is no question about it, it is more pronounced and bigger here in this Province than in any other province in Canada. Just one way for us to get around some of it, it will not cure all the ills and I am not saying that it will, but certainly one way to address the unemployment problem in this Province right now is to get a reasonable, a fair and reasonable, and equitable deal on the offshore,

MR. BUTT: the hydro carbons off our Coast on the Continental Shelf.

If we are going to improve the unemployment figures that is essential. Although there would not be all that many people working on the offshore industry itself, there would be, I would think, a fairly long time span in putting all the necessary infrastructure in place on land and that would create a lot of jobs. It would create a lot of jobs for trades people, professionals and young people, jobs that are badly needed, jobs that can improve the unemployment picture here today.

I was rather surprised as well that the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) took exception to our local preference policy. Just after he talked about the high unemployment here, he took exception to our local preference policy. Well, one of the cornerstones certainly of this government, and one that I am very proud of, is our local preference policy, because, you see, one way of improving the unemployment picture is through local preference hiring. Now the hon. gentleman, I do not know if he did it deliberately, contradicted himself when he spoke against the local preference policy, and he went on to say that it is keeping people out of the Province and so on. Well, I really do not see that, because there are good, qualified people here in this Province right now who can take meaningful jobs within the industry and reduce unemployment figures. So the local preference policy, in my mind, it is all one and the same, it matches the unemployment figures as well.

The leadership trip that the hon. member for Port au Port took us on was skimpy, although I understand that the gentleman is working on the Turner

MR. BUTT: campaign, but perhaps he should be putting his efforts now, since he has a fairly influential position I believe as the campaign manager here in the Province, perhaps he should be using his influence on the heir apparent to the Liberal throne, in making this gentleman aware of the gross inequities that have been perpetrated on this Province by the government and by the Prime Minister whom he wishes to succeed.

There are also a couple of other points I wish to touch on that the gentleman spoke about that certainly did not go right with me. One was the \$500,000 that the government gave as a grant to Metal Craft. Indeed that was welcomed by the people in Conception Bay South in particular,

MR. BUTT: because it allowed Metal Craft to continue business at Octagon Pond, in Paradise. And in continuing business out there, well, they did not improve the unemployment figures but they certainly did not make them any worse, because, you see, in doing so it gave some 125 people out there an opportunity to continue working. So I see that as a real positive thing, Mr. Speaker, and I really do not think that the people in Conception Bay South would be very happy with the hon. member's comments on that. As well, he was very negative to arts and culture centres and, in particular, the one in Labrador City. Now as somebody who lived in Labrador for some fifteen years I can tell you that that is a pretty welcome announcement in Labrador. Labrador has a fair degree of isolation and there are a lot of gifted people there in the area. Well, to have an Arts and Culture Centre, a place where they can go and meet and perform is very welcome news to the people of Labrador City. And I can assure you, Your Honour, that while it does not set right with the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), it is a big plus for the people in Labrador City.

Just one other point to the hon. member for Port au Port on his two day tirade. He spoke of Premier Buchanan in Nova Scotia, pointing out that our Premier was his greatest ally. Indeed he may be, they are both Conservative Premiers. But let me say this, Sandy Cameron, the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for LaPoile's (Mr. Nearv) counterpart in Nova Scotia, I can tell you the hon. Mr. Cameron in Nova Scotia is certainly not cheek to cheek with Premier Buchanan on the deal that they signed with Ottawa on the offshore in Nova Scotia. He is very much of the same mind as the Premier and the government of this Province, in that Nova Scotia entered into a bad deal. And they will do very little to improve their unemployment

MR. BUTT: situation in Nova Scotia because of the bad deal they entered into. They will do very little, indeed. The hon. member, as well, made some reference to the unions in this Province and I would like to take a couple of minutes now and speak about unions in this Province. I used to be a straw boss in a union myself one time. I believe the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was as well. Well, the unions in this Province are highly politically motivated people. Most of them, I think, would like to run for public office. I do not think they feel they have the support of the people or the determination or the will to do it, so they do it in their own -

MR. NEARY: That is not fair game.

MR. BUTT: Well, that is correct, you see. Most of those people are politically motivated, yes, oh, yes, absolutely left-wingers, socialists.

MR. NEARY: They are very dedicated people.

MR. BUTT: I said most of them, not all of them. And I want to address one union in particular because really, that is what the NEA is turning into, it is going from a professional association to a union.

MR. TULK: You are wrong.

MR. BUTT: Well, you know, I have a position on this as well. There is a political action group in the

MR. BUTT: NTA right now, whose members, in my humble opinion, are doing a great disservice to that noble profession.

MR. NEARY: They will remember that.

MR. BUTT: I speak from the heart. I am deeply involved in it, because my wife is a former school teacher, at least she just gave up a year or so ago, and, of course, I still have three children in school. But I believe this politically motivated action wing of the NTA is doing very serious damage to that noble profession.

And, you see, when I look around the Province and I find out who is involved in those groups, those little small groups who get together and plot and plan -

MR. NEARY: They are all Liberals, are they?

MR. BUTT: Well, there are a lot of Liberals there, yes. Granted there are. And there are people, once again, who aspire to be politicians but do not have - I do not know what it is, but whatever it takes to sign on the dotted line, or they are people who have bowed out of politics for one reason or another but yet have an axe to grind, those are the people who are spearheading what I call an anti-government movement. If this government changed tomorrow - heaven forbid, I do not think it will - but if it did, I think they would still feel the same way against another government. It is anti-government movement that is doing absolutely nothing for that profession. What they should be doing is promoting all of the very positive aspects of that great teaching profession, but right now their reputation is being damaged, it is being seriously eroded around this Province. And the NTA, rather than being a professional association, is taking on the character of a militant union, and I do not think that does anything at all for the teacher of this Province.

MR. BUTT: I do not think it does one single thing for the teachers of this Province, not one single thing.

MR. NEARY: You will find out when the next election is called. They will put the boots to you.

MR. BUTT: Now, Mr. Speaker, one final thing that the gentleman there opposite who just took his seat spoke on was the great projects that were undertaken by a former administration, a Liberal administration, and he went on to name a lot of them. There are a couple that I would like to single out as well because they have impacted on us more today than anything that administration did that was positive. They made the monumental blunders that we are living with today which have caused us all kinds of problem and economic woes, and I will just briefly touch on the Churchill Falls and Come By Chance, these two great Liberal undertakings. Indeed, the Churchill Falls development could have been a very positive one, could have been one that

MR. BUTT:

this Province could derive hundreds of millions of dollars from, but instead we get a mere pittance because of the short-sightedness of the administration of the day which got us bound into long-term contracts . And we are doing everything that is humanly possible right now to try to re-negotiate it , to try to turn it around, to try to bring some meaningful and fair revenue back to this Province.

I would now like to have a few words to say about some of the very positive things in this budget? And very briefly go through them and talk about , once again, the unemployment situation. Well, this year we have increased the amount for the Community Development Programme from \$9 million to \$16 million And I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this programme has worked tremendously well around the Province. I have availed of it, I know, on many occasions and had numerous grants approved out in Conception Bay South, did all kinds of good, useful work, got people off unemployment and got them on the employment rolls again. And this is one of the things that I see as a very positive aspect of this budget, to create many, many new jobs by increasing the funding to the Community Development Programme from \$9 million to \$16 million.

There is also in the budget a \$25 million provision for water and sewer and road work. And, of course, once again, when I think of water and sewer and road works, I immediately think of Conception Bay South. That is certainly in dire need of it and

MR. BUTT: while we got a fair share of the revenue to go out to undertake and do those projects there is still a great necessity to carry on. And , of course, I am very pleased that there is an additional \$25 million there to address that. I am looking forward to installing these very basic and essential services in many areas of Conception Bay South as well as addressing some very serious road problems.

An amount of \$2.5 million was included for the continuation of the Ocean Industries Capital Assistance Fund. A financial contribution of \$1 million has been provided for for a proposed new convention center. Now the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) pointed out today that he put forward a package to the federal government quite some time ago now. I am not sure of the exact date, but for quite some time it has been up there and all we are looking for is something that has been done in other parts of this country that

MR. BUTT: certainly do not have the unemployment problems that we have down here and do not have the need that we have right now for a convention centre. So there has been \$1 million put forward, and I would hope that the federal government will come forward with a reasonable share so this project can get underway. It is going to be, of course, built here in the capital city right on the outskirts of Conception Bay South.

There is an additional \$15 million provided as well for highways and bridges. I will not go into that in any big way because I want to get on to the very serious one that certainly affects Conception Bay South and that is the amount of capital funding provided for school construction. There was \$13,500,000 plus an additional \$1.5 million provided in the budget for school construction and, of course, I am most interested in that because of the very, very serious overcrowding problem in Conception Bay South, particularly with the Integrated School Board. And if there was ever a need for additional funding to be forwarded to that school district it is now. The population increase has been much more than expected and as a result there is very, very serious overcrowding there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as well I want to point out -

MR. NEARY: Your time is up.

MR. BUTT: No, my time is not up yet, Mr. Speaker, I still have about seven or eight minutes to go.

MR. NEARY: You certainly do not have seven or eight minutes to go.

MR. BUTT: I certainly do have seven or eight minutes to go.

MR. BAIRD: Do not waste your time talking to him. Carry on.

MR. BUTT: Now, Mr. Speaker, the little man who just took his seat before I got into this is leaving the House now, Mr. Speaker, and interrupting me. I am just trying to get a couple of notes here together.

I want to as well, Mr. Speaker, point out some of the things in this budget that are certainly relevant to the district of Conception Bay South and in particular I want to draw your attention to the Octagon Pond Offshore Park, a place that has great potential out there for heavy industry, a place that could certainly improve the unemployment picture of the Province, a place where there could be numerous jobs provided if we get a reasonable proposal, a reasonable deal on the offshore. I have all the confidence in the world that this park will be developed and in doing so, Mr. Speaker, will provide numerous jobs for the people of Conception Bay South and, of course, in the surrounding area.

As well, Mr. Speaker, when you go out over Kenmount Road and go down over Topsail Hill, you will notice a very beautiful area there on the South Shore of Conception Bay.

MR. BUTT: It is quickly taking over from St. John's Centre as being the Tory heart of this Province.

MR. NEARY: Yes?

MR. BUTT: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, Conception Bay South has a tremendous amount of potential in tourism. I have to agree with the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), who spoke before me, that there is a great need, I think, for more tourist development in the Province. There is a great need, and the area of Conception Bay South certainly has a lot to offer. I might add, as well, Mr. Speaker, that some of the best municipal parks in the Province are there, absolutely beautiful parks in little glens nestled among the hills. You break out into a clearing and suddenly you see a beautiful municipal park sitting there.

Conception Bay South also has a fish plant there that really has not reached its potential at all. The plant in Foxtrap has some potential for middle-distance trawling. I do not think Conception Bay South will ever be a big district for fisheries, there are only perhaps about fifty or sixty full-time and about fifty or sixty part-time fishermen out there, but, nevertheless, the potential is there. The existing plant there requires some freezing equipment and I would hope that there will be provisions in the fisheries budget to provide freezing equipment for that very important industry in Conception Bay South.

I want to make some mention, as well, Mr. Speaker, of the major arteries in and out of Conception Bay South, because I take some satisfaction in getting some of that in place since 1979.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) money there?

MR. BUTT: Well, there is \$3 million there

MR. BUTT: right on the bottom from the provincial government which was provided for in the budget to pay our share.

MR. NEARY: Your time is up.

MR. BUTT: It was a good deal that we worked out. It just showed that we can work out a good deal, 75/25. As a matter of fact, the extension of the arterial road -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I am not sure if we need a new clock or a new timekeeper, but I sat here and watched the clock. It was 5:15 p.m. when the hon. gentleman started and it is now 5:46 p.m. I believe the hon. gentleman's is up.

MR. PATTERSON: It was 5:20 p.m. when he started.

MR. NEARY: No, it was 5:15 p.m., I was watching the clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The table is looking after the time and the hon. member has approximately three minutes left.

MR. BUTT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was just getting into the goodies, the major arteries going into Conception Bay South and the negotiated deal that was signed on the roads agreement by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), my good friend and colleague, a deal that will see the road building of a major highway completed, I would think, this year.

MR. BUTT: That in itself is going to do a tremendous amount of good for the people of Conception Bay South. Not only that, but for the new people who will be coming into this area, it will be much easier for them to commute back and forth now as a result of that. As well, Mr. Speaker, in 1979 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. BUTT: - I also pressed for a four lane highway to the Foxtrap Access Road, which is the other major artery into the town of Conception Bay South, and I am pleased to say as well that that too will become a reality this year. So having made some reference to that, Mr. Speaker, I commend the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on bringing forth this budget. I think it was well thought out, it was well planned, it is a masterful document. It has been said to me many times in Conception Bay South that there is obviously going to be a provincial election after the Minister of Finance brought in this budget. I think it is very good. It deals with major problems within the Province and I have no problem supporting it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

AN HON. MEMBER: One and one.

MR. CALLAN: One and one! I think it is about five to one on that side in members.

MR. PATTERSON: Get prepared again.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak this afternoon.

MR. CARTER: Then shut up and sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, that does not make for very good decorum in the House, 'Shut up and sit down.'

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak this afternoon but I guess I could carry on for ten minutes or so unless hon. members on this side and opposite feel that it would be nice to adjourn the debate until Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate until Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): It is noted that the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) has adjourned the debate.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 2, 1984, at 3:00 p.m.