

VOL. 2

NO. 36

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.  
MONDAY, MAY 9, 1983

May 9, 1983

Tape No. 1899

MJ - 1

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

Friday, when the House was in session, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) made some unparliamentary remarks. I have searched Hansard to note them, I do not think it is necessary to read them out, but I would ask the hon. the Minister of Fisheries if he would withdraw these remarks.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw any unparliamentary remarks made in this House.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). The minister is quoted as saying, over the weekend, that some 60 per cent of Newfoundlanders were opposed to the church school system. I wonder where the minister got those figures?

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the article to which the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) refers is, I believe, one appearing in Saturday's edition of The Daily News, a copy of which I have with me. The article was written by a Daily News reporter, Mr. David Benson, who asked me leading questions about the Denominational Education System and in particular my views and government's position on the system. For

MS. VERGE: the most part, the article accurately reports my answers in saying, 'The Newfoundland Government is not aware of any organized opposition to the Denominational Education System but Education Minister Lynn Verge says that government would respond to any in the same way it responds to public input on other issues. She told The Daily News Friday that the government believes the people of Newfoundland want to keep the system as it is.' And then it goes on to say something which I think creates the wrong impression, 'But polls in recent years indicate that the majority of the people want the system abolished and then later- although she admitted that the number of Newfoundlanders opposed to the system is somewhere around 60 per cent.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reporter prefaced a number of his questions by saying, a majority of the people of the Province want the system changed, a majority of the people of the Province prefer a public education system. I said to that, 'All I am aware of are public opinion polls conducted by the Political Science Department of Memorial University which,

MS. VERGE: I thought, showed about 60 per cent of the people whose opinions were sought indicated favouring a change.' Mr. Speaker, I checked the source to which I referred, a public opinion poll conducted by the Department of Political Science, Memorial University of Newfoundland, following the 1979-1980 election, a summary of the results dated October 1980. Mr. Speaker, the results indicate that people's opinions on social and moral issues were sought and in particular the following question was posed, 'Should Newfoundland keep its present denominational school system or change to one overall system without church control? Keep denominational system, 36 per cent. Change to public system, 48 per cent, Do not know, 16 per cent.' -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that this administration, particularly the Premier on a public broadcast across the Province, tried to frighten Newfoundlanders during the constitutional debate by the fact that our church school system might be injured because of the new constitution, could the minister explain her remarks when she said she could not argue with the logic that a public system would be more expensive? And does not the minister think that her remarks were a little bit out of line and that she should have her mouth washed out with soap?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite actually misquoted The Daily News. The Daily News actually said in its Saturday article what she said was she could not "argue with the logic" that a public system would be less expensive to maintain. And, Mr. Speaker, I stand by that statement. The real question that people concerned about education in Newfoundland and Labrador need to address is;

MS. VERGE: What are the benefits of a denominational education system, and, therefore, what price should our people and should our taxpayers pay for a denominational system?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary question.

MR. HODDER: In listening to the minister's remarks, it seems that she is talking about what price the Newfoundland people should pay for a denominational system.

MR. HODDER: It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the church/school system is enshrined in law. Have we now come to a system where the minister is questioning the law? Has the government become so dictatorial that they question the law? And the other question I would like to ask the minister is whether this is a trial balloon to see what the public opinion of Newfoundlanders might be?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, if there is a trial balloon it has been inflated by Mr. David Benson and his employer, The Daily News. I simply answered a number of leading questions which were initiated by The Daily News reporter. As for my questioning the law, Mr. Speaker, my remarks stand for themselves. People who can read can interpret. I was simply making the point, response to leading questions, that there is a price to pay for denominational education, on the other hand there are benefits to be derived from denominational education, and presumably the government and the people of the Province have weighed the respective costs and benefits, and in my judgment, and this is what it says in The Daily News, the majority of the Newfoundland people like the system the way it is. There is certainly no evidence that the people across our Province are trying to change the system.

MR. WARREN: You would like to change it, though.

MS. VERGE: I have had no people approach me lobbying for any change in the denominational education system. If there is any disagreement with the denominational educational system among the populace it is passive disagreement.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member  
for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: A new question, Mr. Speaker. But before I say that, I would say that the minister should watch her statements and try to conduct herself so as not to inflame the hierarchy of the denominational system in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, a new question; I would like to ask the minister who is responsible for the design of the new Fisheries College?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the design of the new Fisheries College, meaning, I presume, the new building for the old Fisheries College, which will be renamed the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology, has been handled by consultants for government and perhaps through architects, sub-contracted. The main contractor,

MS. VERGE: as I recall, my colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) can confirm this, is the BAE group.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Port au Port, a supplementary.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, will the students and faculty have any input into the design for the college?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the design of a new building for the Fisheries College has been worked on over a period of years, and actually the new building would be standing today if it had not been for the stalling tactics and mistreatment inflicted on the provincial government and the people at the Fisheries College by the federal government.

The design has been worked on for a period of years and through all that time the administration and the faculty at the Fisheries College were actively involved and contributed to the final design. At the moment the Department of Public Works and the Fisheries College, with their consultants, are proceeding to begin construction on the new building.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: I noticed some hon. members opposite laughed when I mentioned the word 'students', but I would like to tell hon. members that a lot of the schools in this Province were designed with the help of the staff and the students and I was principal of one of those schools, which won a design award right across Canada. So I might tell you it is not a laughing matter when we say that students can have something to do with it.



MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, my question for the minister is is the minister aware that there is no provision in the design of the Fisheries College for access to the roof for the purpose of celestial navigation?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

No, I am not aware. Actually I did not catch exactly what the member opposite said-for celestial navigation?

MR. HODDER: Yes.

MS. VERGE: No, I am not aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

I can take the question under advisement and provide a thorough answer later.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask if the hon. minister is aware that those persons who are responsible for the numbers and types of technology to be used as aids in teaching have not made provisions for a modern bridge simulator, radar simulators and

MR.HODDER:

navigational aids designed to meet the needs of this most important industry? Those particular technological advances are being used in all such institutes right across Europe. Could the minister tell me why it is that there will be at that Fisheries College no teaching aids along those lines and in particular the bridge simulator, which is a very, very important component - that is like a simulated 737 they learn on first, a bridge simulator is the same thing for a ship - and why there will be no radar simulators at that facility?

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Educations.

MS.VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the new facility for our College of Fisheries, for the proposed Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology, comprises a building and flume tank valued at over \$40 million with the provincial government pledged to contribute \$14 million. The complex will be a first-class facility and will complement other structures and equipment presently occupied and used by the Fisheries College. I will be able to provide more details about the proposed facility, but I will simply say now that I find it strange that the member for Port au Port (Mr.Hodder) is showing a sudden interest in the Fisheries College. All during the months and years the provincial government was struggling with the federal government in trying to finalize an agreement for cost sharing, last Summer when we were all detracted from the main point of the exercise by a silly political charade putting the location of the college up for grabs, I did not hear the member for Port au Port expressing his concern about the programming and equipment for the students at the college.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), I want to ask the Premier if he would explain why forty-eight watchmen are being laid off in the various depots across the Province? Why? What is the purpose for it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, over the last number of years the Department of Transportation has been able to erect fences and take other security precautions which therefore make the jobs of the security people that we had on redundant. That is the main reason, I think.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, in this year's budget estimates there is an allocation for fifty-three watchmen, a budget allocation of \$748,289, almost three-quarters of a million dollars. Is the Premier then saying that this figure here shows a lack of planning or no planning at all? I mean, if government intended to do away with forty-eight jobs, forty-eight watchmen positions, then why was this provision for three-quarters of a million dollars placed in this year's budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am not sure if the money allocation that the hon. member refers to is actually applicable to the ones that we are laying off. Undoubtedly, the Department of Transportation has other security people or watchmen still on. I do not think it eliminated every single last watchman. So I am not sure that the comparison is valid at this point in time, but I will take the matter under advisement for the hon. member and get the answer to see whether in fact the money is for those same forty or forty-five watchmen. But I would just indicate to the hon. member that, obviously, there may be ongoing watchmen's services still being provided by different aspects of the Department of Transportation and it does not necessarily mean that this blob of money that the hon. member talks about is money that was used to pay the watchmen. I will get the information for the hon. member.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, getting back to the first answer that the Premier gave, he talked about the

MR. CALLAN: erection of fences and so on, similar to the one, I guess, that we have at Mount Scio House. Is the Premier then suggesting that since fences and locks and so on have been erected around various highway depots, does this mean that the government are not contemplating contracting out to private contractors the security of these depots?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is exactly right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: A lot of the men who work at the various highway depots, mechanics and so on, are required to provide their own tools, some of which are valued at, for example, up to \$8,000. I am wondering, in the answer that the Premier gave earlier, is the Premier suggesting that not only the equipment belonging to these individuals who have to provide their own, but is the Premier also suggesting that fences and so on are sufficient to make sure that vandalism will not increase in these various highway depots once the watchmen are laid off?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, over the last two or three years there has been extensive work done by the Department of Transportation on this very issue, as it relates to watchmen and security, and we have found that in the depot where we have had these fences and so on, and where in another depot there has not been a fence but watchmen, that the pilferage at the depot where there were fences and no watchmen was less than at the depots where we still had watchmen and no fences. So there is no question there has been less pilferage and theft or whatever in those areas where we have gone with the high fences and taken the other precautions, So I do not think that there is any chance, for example, that workers who continue to work with the Department of Transportation will have valuable tools and so on I am sure that if their tools were lost - the same thing would apply in the past, no doubt some workers lost tools - and I sure that if that happened and it was on the Department of Transportation's property, there would be some reimbursement, I would imagine, for them, But I can only reiterate what I said first, and that is that there have been a number of experiments undertaken and we have found that the pilferage was greater where there had not been any fence and a watchman than there was where we had a fence and no watchman.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Bellevue, a final supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier, then, these forty-eight watchmen who will lose their jobs, will other employment be found for them or will they just be laid off and that is the end of it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I did not get the question. I am sorry, I was not listening.

MR. CALLAN: Will other employment be found for these forty-eight people?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, the same policy will apply to those forty-eight people as applies to all people who are laid off by government. There is a redundancy policy and if they qualify under the redundancy policy then obviously it will apply to those people the same as it does to anybody else who is laid off by government. So there is a standardized redundancy policy that applies straight across the board and will be applied to the watchmen.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). In a short time now we will have what we call the caplin fishery upon our Newfoundland fishermen. I understand many of the fish plants presently buying cod and other species, once we have the influx of caplin, some fish plant owners are

MR. WARREN: planning to not buy other species but are going to concentrate on caplin. This will leave many fishermen who are prosecuting the cod fishery with no place to sell their catches. Is the minister going to allow those fish plant owners who have processor licences from the Province to just purchase caplin in season and not purchase the cod?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a good question and I thank him for asking the question because the inshore season is about to start and, of course, the caplin fishery is about to start. Many of the plants, in the Eastern part of the Province in particular, do get involved in a big way in the processing of caplin because it is a very lucrative species and they see a chance of making a good dollar in a short period of time. Last year some of the plants, on the Avalon Peninsula in particular, were involved in buying only caplin for the short period, a number of weeks, that the caplin fishery was on and not buying cod, and fishermen found difficulty in finding markets. Based on that we had to have an over-the-side sale operation in a couple of places on the Avalon last year during the inshore season.

I have held meetings with some of the companies and most of them have agreed they will attempt to accomodate the fishermen on both species. But there is no doubt in my mind that the processors will be leaning more in the direction of caplin than cod because, as I say, it is a better dollar return.

So because of that we have arranged to appoint a federal/provincial committee of officials, with the Fishermen's Union involved in that committee, to deal with the so-called glut situation. They have been holding meetings on a regular basis, almost on a weekly basis for the



MR. MORGAN: past month or month and a half. Senior officials from the federal Department of Fisheries here in the Province, my Deputy Minister, Mr. Ray Andrews, in particular, and officials from the Fishermen's Union are all now part of a committee to deal with as quickly as possible if a situation arises where fishermen will not have a market for their cod. We do not want them to have to dump their cod anywhere in the Province, we want to stop that if at all possible, so by working together we are hoping to have a situation whereby instantly, as soon as there is a problem in selling cod, there will be some action taken.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: The minister said that he was assured by the companies that they would make an attempt to purchase the cod. I do not think that is a satisfactory answer, not only to me but to the many hundreds of fishermen who do not prosecute the caplin fishery. I think the minister of this government of which he is a part, which gives out the processing licences to those companies should make it mandatory.

that those fish buyers will not only purchase caplin -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question! Question!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: - but also will purchase cod. So would the minister undertake to advise those fish plant operators that they must purchase X number of pounds of cod from the fishermen even during the caplin season?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if I got involved in dictating to the companies what species they must process based on the licences they now hold, that would be totally irresponsible on my part because I am of the firm opinion that the more the fishery is market-led the better it is going to be. We have to count on a market-led fishing industry, in other words, we have to supply what the market is demanding, what the market needs. If the market is good for caplin, well, we want to see the processors buying caplin from fishermen, fishermen making a dollar from the caplin and so will the companies concerned. In other words, the greater the demand for any species, processors and the fishermen must be able to supply that certain species; in other words, be market-driven or market-led. And the more of that in the industry the better it is going

MR. MORGAN: to be in the future. But, as I say again, these companies hold a number of licences to process a number of species, not just cod, not just caplin but a number of species, and they will buy these species from the fishermen if they have a good market for that species. And again I will say that in most cases, with the exception of one or two last year, they did indeed buy both species at the time of the caplin fishery. But, I will repeat again, there is no way that I am going to get involved in dictating or telling a company they must only buy a certain species, especially if there is a good market for it, the fishermen can make a dollar and so can the companies concerned.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Alyward): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a new question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). Knowing that the inshore fishery is coming upon us, could the minister advise what is the status of the two fish plants at Nain and Makkovik for this year? Will the Torngat Co-op be running those fish plants or will the provincial Department of Fisheries be operating them?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Labrador portion of the Province is indeed a concern every year at the beginning of the season, this time of the year in particular. As for the two plants mentioned, at Nain and Makkovik, and, in fact, the feeder plants in Hopedale and Davis Inlet and Postville, they will again this year be operated by the

MR. MORGAN:

Newfoundland Government. We had a proposal in from the Torngat Co-op. It was given every consideration, thoroughly assessed; however, because of a major recommendation in Mr. Kirby's task force report, talking about the Northern fisheries concept and the idea of a Northern fisheries corporation or company taking over Northern plants, including some on the Great Northern Peninsula, based on that we felt that we would not divest ourselves of these plants this year until we saw what was going to happen to that recommendation still not dealt with to date by the federal level of government.

So this year again, we are going in to operate as government and we will do everything possible to satisfy the needs of the fishermen and supply jobs to the people on that part of the coast again this year.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains,

MR. WARREN: Considering that this year CN Marine will be transporting roughly fifty or sixty fishermen and their families approximately 150 miles North of Nain, have the minister and his officials given any consideration to having some kind of a facility, whether it is a large trawler or something, North of Nain to accommodate the fifty or sixty fishermen who will be fishing there or will he just rely on a collector system as in previous years?

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

MR. MORGAN: Again, Mr. Speaker, it is a very pertinent question because last year, as the hon. gentleman who asked the question is aware, the Torngat Co-op. group arranged to have a freezer vessel go North of Nain to fish

MR. MORGAN: a very good stock of Arctic char and he arranged to charter a vessel and to have the actual processing on deck and the freezing take place aboard the vessel. And it worked quite well, although I understand the overall operation of Torngat Co-operative last year was not profitable, they lost on the overall operation. We have not been advised by the Co-op whether they are going to proceed with the same kind of operation again this year or not. We are not sure. However, it is a thought that we are considering in conjunction with the plant at Nain. And if the Co-op is making no effort to have an operation to tie into the Nain plant, or to have a separate freezing operation, there is a possibility we may have to look at it ourselves. But we will do everything we can to accommodate those fishermen moving North and fishing a very good stock of char and having it tie into the Nain plant to make it more profitable.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: I know it may be fairly early in the game, but has the minister made any decision on the price per pound that his department will be paying for salmon and char this year? I think, if my memory is correct, for the last two years in fact, the people between Rigolet and Nain received the lowest price per pound for salmon anywhere in the Province.

I am just wondering is the minister considering -  
I know expenses are higher than on the Island portion of the Province -

MR. WARREN:

is the minister considering his department paying prices equivalent to prices paid per pound for salmon and char anywhere else in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, a very difficult part of our overall fishing industry is the Labrador coast. Unfortunately the private sector is not too interested in going in there. Fishery Products, for example, just turned their backs on Labrador. People wonder sometimes why I am upset with that company and why I condemn them and criticize them, and here is an example: They turned their backs on the Labrador fishermen, they turned their backs on the Labrador people and they walked away. Why? Because they had no dedication to do anything in Labrador and we were left to try to do something about the Labrador fishery as it pertains to salmon in particular. This year Fishery Products will not be buying any salmon down there, they are not going there at all, they are not going to be involved in any operations at all in Labrador. They have foresaken the Labrador coast, yet they are one of the largest companies we have in the whole Province. So, Mr. Speaker, we will do everything possible to insure that the fishermen get a fair price for their salmon. Now a fair price, of course, will be determined primarily by the marketplace. I met recently with the Labrador Shrimp Company, a section of the union, and they are going to be pretty big in Labrador this year and I am quite pleased with that. They have taken some good initiatives. They are the only ones so far who have taken initiatives on the Labrador

MR.MORGAN: coast except the Newfoundland government, and we are doing everything we possibly can with limited dollars. Every year we are subsidizing the operations. We have to cover the losses of the plants in Nain and Makkovik and the collector stations, we have to cover the losses involved in the boats sent out to collect fish from fishermen, and it is at a loss to the Newfoundland government and a cost to the taxpayers of the Province. But we will endeavour again this year to pay the fishermen a fair price. Hopefully we will have better markets than last year. There is some positive reaction for possible markets in Scandinavia this year, above all places. Although they are farming salmon over there, there is a possibility of a market and tying in and co-operating with the Labrador union company, call it that, in Labrador and ourselves working together, we are hoping to have a good price for the fishermen. And I am hoping to be in a position, for the hon. gentlemen's information, to be able to announce, just prior to the commencement of the season, what prices they will get this year.

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!  
The time for Question Period  
has elapsed.

NOTICES OF MOTION

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

DR.COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of Supplementary Supply to Her Majesty.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

DR. COLLINS:                   Mr. Speaker, I have  
answers to Questions 47 and 64 asked by the hon. member  
for Port au Port (Mr.Hodder) a little while ago.

PREMIER PECKFORD:           Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER:                   The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:           I have an answer to question  
106 on the Order Paper of April 18th. and I table it.



ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 1, Budget Debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Motion 1, Budget Debate, When we last adjourned our debate the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) was speaking, and he has approximately nine minutes remaining.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had a few more minutes than that, but Mr. Speaker knows better and is correct, I guess. In my few remarks on Friday I refuted some of the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), when he said that the years of the PC administrations in Newfoundland had seen very little progress. I used enough examples in my own district to show that he was wrong and I think it behooves every member here to show that he was not telling it as it is but as he sees it from his own biased and slanted viewpoint.

Mr. Speaker, I did not exhaust my supply of evidence on Friday as to the good things that have come to the district of Bonavista North in the past eleven years, I would like to add just a few more: In that eleven years a community stage has been upgraded in Newtown and a second one built and that is being fully utilized. One million dollars and more, Mr. Speaker, have been spent through Rural Development projects. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent on blueberry development over the past eleven years. And although I have not seen the figures for last year, I would say there were as many and more blueberries collected in Bonavista North last year than in any other area of the Province.

MR. CROSS: We have had a new forestry building built, equipped, and opened in Gambo. We have had forest access roads built, Mr. Speaker, and the list goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke of the Bonavista North Loop Road that was paved. The work started in earnest in 1974 and was completed in 1979. The old road that was built in 1957, from Valleyfield to Indian Bay was some twenty-six miles long. The road that replaced it is only fourteen, a little more than half the distance. The old road meandered through the country, and the money spent on it, removing the dangerous curves, in the seventeen years it was used, could have built a complete new road from Indian Bay to Valleyfield.

I believe the attitude of the then Liberal Government was, "That is good enough for them. We are going to move them all tomorrow or the next day." This seemed to be the case. The line was drawn, Mr. Speaker, South of Hare Bay during resettlement days, and all communities to the North were slated for resettlement.

MR. CROSS: . . . . . Mr. Speaker, Silver Island, Fair Island and Bragg's Island were resettled and the people scattered but, Mr. Speaker, where are most of them now, especially in the Summer months? Back on the Islands fishing during the fishing season. The island of Fair Island is vibrant again during the Summer months; there are many Summer cabins there that are being put to good use; they are the homes of the fishermen as they gain their livelihood from the waters of Bonavista North.

Mr. Speaker, I want to change the subject for a moment. My mind, at this moment, wanders back to Bonavista North and the year was 1961, when the most devastating forest fire in the history of Newfoundland occurred. If you lived in Bonavista North that year, Mr. Speaker, you would have thought that the world was on fire. The fire started in Hare Bay and burned right through the district, on into the adjoining district of Fogo, and when it was over the livelihood of hundreds of people was gone, Bonavista North was truly a disaster area. Mr. Speaker, after the damage was done the then Liberal government of the day called in the Canadian Army. Mr. Speaker, they were locking the barn door after the horse was stolen. Mr. Speaker, after that disastrous fire, did the then government of the day do anything to help the people? The answer is precious little.

Mr. Speaker, I like to tell the story as it is. I know, and the people of my district know, that we have made great progress in the district of Bonavista North in the past eleven years. There have been three times as many homes, Mr. Speaker,

MR. CROSS:                   built in the last eleven years  
in the district that I represent than were built in the  
whole twenty-three years before. Greenspond, as I said  
Friday, is a glowing example, where last year many new  
homes were being built and the carpenters of Greenspond  
were employed in their own home town of Greenspond all  
the Summer. Mr. Speaker, I can well remember the by-  
election in Twillingate in December of 1977.

MR. CROSS: I went into that district to campaign for the PC party and the first door I knocked on I was handed a letter written by the former, former, former leader of the Liberal Party, who was then the Liberal candidate for Twillingate. In that letter he was using my district and me as an example of the do-nothing PCs. He told deliberate lies in that letter. He said anyone who would vote PC should look at Bonavista North, where nothing was going on and where the member was seldom heard let alone seen. Mr. Speaker, at that time I went on the open line show to refute these statements and when I finished the brother of the then former, former, former leader came on the show and said I was a frustrated man, a frustrated individual, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, time has shown who was the frustrated individual, The man who accused me of being frustrated is no longer with us in this hon. House, nor is his brother the former, former, former leader.

Then we can look at the former, former leader. Mr. Speaker, he came home to conquer and must have been frustrated when he failed. Then came the former leader, Mr. Speaker, I call him the Macbeth of the Liberal Party who was flown into Bonavista North to defeat the local man. He arrived, Mr. Speaker, not knowing anyone but he won. Then, Mr. Speaker, no sooner had he won when he had vaulting ambitions to become leader of the Liberal Party. He succeeded, he took his people for granted, almost forgot that they existed thinking that because they were good Liberals they would vote for him anyway. But, Mr. Speaker, who was the frustrated and disappointed man on April 6, 1982? The former leader of the Liberals. And, Mr. Speaker, who is going to be the frustrated and disappointed individual if he does not change his tactics?

I was going to say, Mr. Speaker,

May 9, 1983

Tape No. 1912

MJ - 2

MR. CROSS:                   that you could whistle and I  
would point, but the hon. leader is not in his seat today.

                                  Mr. Speaker, I have said that I  
am the person who tells it as it is; I speak the truth,  
I put nothing

MR. CROSS:

on, I take nothing away. I do not think it behooves anyone of us elected members to do more or less. I do not think we should tell it as we would like to see it just to lead the people astray. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that that should be the case. We should speak the truth and the truth will never hurt, Mr. Speaker, if we speak in fairness.

Mr. Speaker, in closing

I will say that we know we are living in a period of restraint, but, Mr. Speaker, we are not alone. All you have to do is look across our nation to other provinces that are finding it hard in these harsh times and having their deficits.

We are no worse. Our Province is, in my opinion, well run fiscally and financially. I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that we will weather the economic storm and be in a better financial position than many of our neighbours when the storm is over.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the first part of the member's speech but I listened intently to the last part. And I think that at least the first speaker to lead off the debate should have had some constructive points to deal with the economy. After all, this is the Budget Speech, and this the Speech where we can put forward our concerns and the government can tell us what they intend to do about the massive unemployment and the chaotic business climate and the problems that are facing Newfoundlanders on every side.

No, Mr. Speaker, what we heard was a speech, or at least a portion of a speech, where old political scores were talked about.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is what we should be about here in the House. I think, Mr. Speaker, the economy dictates -

MR. STEWART: I bet if you had listened for the past seven days to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary)-

MR. HODDER: I listened to the Leader of the Opposition and I admire the Leader of the Opposition for the fine speech which he made. One who speaks now after the Leader of the Opposition has spoken for six days, has very little to say -

MR. STAGG: Unfortunately, I was six days on the road.

MR. HODDER: - since the Leader of the Opposition made a marathon but excellent speech which showed to all Newfoundlanders the problems that we face here in this Province and the lack of action and the lack of answers which we get from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget was brought down over a month ago and last week was the first time in which we could reply to that Budget Speech. And I am wondering if this is a new tactic, because normally governments who are not afraid of Oppositions, or who are not afraid of public opinion in the Province -

MR. STEWART: Tell us about the young Liberals in Gander?

MR. HODDER: Oh, certainly.

MR. WARREN: Yes, it would be enjoyable.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, many times over this weekend I would have loved to have seen gentlemen opposite just come in. I would have brought them into our policy meetings, brought them into our general assemblies, to watch some 500 young Newfoundlanders-because there were,



MR. HODDER: I believe, some 479 registered delegates there committed to a new Newfoundland. And it would have been very nice, I would have been very proud to bring gentlemen opposite and ladies opposite through to observe what was happening at that convention. Because I have attended many conventions in my life - 1969 was my first political convention and that was one where a lot of money was spent and there was a lot of enthusiasm. And I have attended just about every convention that has since been called but I have yet to see the enthusiasm and the emotion and the commitment that was shown by those 400 young delegates in Gander this weekend.

MR. WARREN: Was anybody there from Baie Verte - White Bay?

MR. HODDER: Baie Verte - White Bay? Yes, there were sixty-six delegates.

MR. WARREN: What?

MR. HODDER: Sixty-six -

MR. WARREN: Sixty-six!

MR. HODDER: - committed delegates from Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. WARREN: From Baie Verte - White Bay? You mean to say that there were sixty-six from Baie Verte - White Bay?

MR. HODDER: Sixty-six committed delegates, registered delegates. There were other young people there from Baie Verte - White Bay -

MR. RIDEOUT: You mean that was all that was there?

MR. HODDER: Sixty-six.

MR. WARREN: Yes, sixty-six from one district.

MR. STEWART: How many were there from Fortune-Hermitage?

MR. HODDER: Fortune - Hermitage? I believe there were one or two people there from Fortune - Hermitage, yes. But from almost every district in this Province, the second convention of young Liberals. And hon. gentlemen opposite would actually be pleased with some of the recommendations, would be pleased with some of the resolutions which were passed at that convention

MR. HODDER: and some of the policy which was discussed. They were the brightest, most articulate, group of people I have ever seen. They put the older members to shame in the way they campaigned and conducted themselves.

MR. WARREN: Gentlemen and ladies all the way.

MR. HODDER: But the members would have been very interested and very pleased. But at one point one of the Youth speakers said, 'Would all the people unemployed in this room please stand up?' And, Mr. Speaker, close to 75 per cent of them stood up. But, I can tell you their commitment was strong. They did not come to look at us, they came to join us. I know that makes the knees of hon. members opposite tremble beneath their desks but it shows that there is a revival in the Liberal Party.

MR. WARREN: That is right, the time has come.

MR. HODDER: And that is a start. For the next Youth convention we will have 2,000 and by the time the election rolls around we will roll right over you.

Mr. Speaker, I must start my speech by saying it is very strange to me that I should be speaking at this late date. I would like to ask the administration why it was that they did not hold the Budget Speech immediately after the budget, and why it was they waited until the provisions of the budget had gone away - five or six weeks have passed - why they did that? That may have been a very smart tactic and they have the power to do it in this House of Assembly but it is not a smart tactic politically, because the people of Newfoundland can smell when a government is on the run or when a government is afraid, when they start, changing around the order of business of the House.

Mr. Speaker, we will try to keep the government here in this House as long as possible -

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. HODDER: - to make them account to the House and to the people for the mismanagement of the Province, and we will continue to wait to hear their plans. Because, Mr. Speaker, we have already had a Throne Speech this year and we have had a Budget Speech and in those two documents we should be able to find what the plans of the government are and particularly in the Budget Speech, what they plan to do in the coming year to overcome the economic problems in this Province.

MR. WARREN: I would say we will be here until July 12th.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there was nothing in either one of those documents, so we have to keep you here until someone decides to let us know exactly what the government is contemplating to turn around the economy of this Province.

I would have to ask as well, Mr. Speaker, why it is that the House Leader opposite and the government are going for such a short session this time? We have been here about thirty-four - I believe this is the thirty-fifth day and even by the statistics that were sent over across the House by the House Leader opposite (Mr. Marshall), we have not served a quarter of our time this year.

I remember when I first came to this House, Mr. Speaker. It was under the same administration opposite. But I remember that when chaotic things happened in the Province such as the closure of the Linerboard mill, the Premier then graciously allowed a one week debate where all members of the Opposition who were concerned could speak and lay out a case for the mill.

I remember, too, when we sat here

MR. HODDER: from 10:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M.  
and then came back at 3:00 P.M. through to 6:00 P.M. and  
back again from 8:00 P.M. to 11:00 P.M. So I remember  
when we sat for many hours in this House of Assembly and,  
if my memory serves me correctly, they might have been only  
classed as so many days, but an awful lot of work was done  
in those days and a lot of questions answered.

MR. WARREN: I would say they want to get out  
because they want to go campaigning for Mr. Crosbie, across  
Canada.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the other -

MR. CARTER: You are not prepared. Why did you not prepare?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, could the peanut gallery confine their remarks to their fellows opposite or go outside and carry on their conversations?

Mr. Speaker, I am also concerned about the lack of information which is coming from this government; there has always been a lack of information. I could refer hon. members, and I am sure they have all read it, to an article in Saturday's edition of The Evening Telegram which is entitled 'Answer the Question Mr. Peckford'. I am sure all hon. members of the House have read that. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned as well by the fact that we cannot get the names of those people who receive rural development grants and loans, why we cannot receive the names of the people who get these. This has been going on for a great number of years. I have said before, Mr. Speaker, that you can pick up the Dun Report and you can find out just about everything that is happening in the Province; you can find out where the lawsuits were, assignment of book debts in corporations, you can find out all sorts of information, assignment of book accounts, cancelled business, bills of sale, mortgages, release of mortgages and the companies are named, Mr. Speaker. As well, any grants which come from the federal government, and I think in terms of DREE grants now, one of the conditions of those grants is that the grant be made public and every once in a while in the public press you will see a little statement saying such and such a company received a loan through DREE, through the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, and the name of the company or the name of the individual is placed there. But for years, Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to get the

MR. HODDER: list of names of those who receive rural development grants and loans. Now, anyone who borrows money from this Province, the people have a right to know who they are. Now, the minister has recently put a new part in the policy which says, if you ask the person indirectly and you know who you are asking for, So if I feel that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has a rural development grant, just as an example, and I ask if the member for Stephenville has a grant and how much, then they will go to the member for Stephenville and say, 'Do you mind giving the information?' But if we want to know who is getting the grants, where they are going, are they going for political means or are they going for political purposes - I am not saying they are - the fact that the government has not once given us this list of who is receiving government grants and loans through the rural development authority is questionable and, I think, would make anyone suspicious in this Province.

MR. CARTER: Are you nearly finished?

MR. HODDER: Not for a long time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we find it difficult sometimes to lay aside our political differences, especially when the rhetoric becomes emotional. But, Mr. Speaker, sometimes we have to lay aside our political differences. We must sometimes go back into our heads and recall why we became involved in the political process in the first place. Most of us, I would think, Mr. Speaker, became involved in the political process because things could be better than they are.

MR. HODDER: As well, there were certain political ideals that caught our fancy and moved us. These we sifted through and weighed, the various political ideologies, and then chose that political ideology which best suited us. Perhaps I should say which best suited our individual weights and measures. But, basically, it was a desire to make the Province of Newfoundland a better place to live in that made us enter this political arena. We were tired of bitching at the sidelines like many do and decided to take matters into our own hands. Mr. Speaker, for that reason I admire and I respect each and every member in this Legislature, each and every member, whether they be on the hon. gentleman's side opposite, or on this side, whether they be Tory or Liberal, who had the courage to just not stand idly by and mouth about the way things were, but each man, I suppose, in this House of Assembly came here to try to make things better. They decided to do something about it. And for that reason I would take my hat off to every member on both sides of this House. Mr. Speaker, I seriously considered coming here today and trying to get out of each one of my colleagues opposite - to get them aside and to explain to each one of them individually just how seriously the economy of this Province is today and the lack of response to it by the Premier.

MR. STAGG: What about your federal colleagues? You have not commented on that.

MR. HODDER: I thought I might persuade some of my colleagues opposite to at least try to exert some pressure on the Premier to start responding to the problems in the Province today, instead of spending all his time -

MR. STAGG: That is a non-partisan remark.

MR. HODDER: - Basking at Tiffany Towers, and bashing at Ottawa.



MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if any one opposite has been listening to the ever-increasing and growing opposition to this administration.

MR. YOUNG: Let us call an election. and prove it.

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we on this side could think of nothing better than to have an election called at this moment.

Mr. Speaker, there are many points of economic consideration I would like to address. For example, I would like for each one in the House of Assembly to read the report by the Economic Conference Board of Canada, issued in March and entitled Atlantic Business Outlook. It is about the Atlantic governments, Mr. Speaker, and what their financial and fiscal reforms and fiscal positions mean. And the report was presented by Mrs. Freda Ackerman of Moody's Investors Service. It is a very interesting document, Mr. Speaker. The report is startling in its content.

MR. STAGG: What one is that?

MR. HODDER: It is the Conference Board of Canada and the article was entitled Atlantic Business Outlook and the speaker was Mrs. Ackerman who is an employee of Moody's who are the people who rate this Province.

It examines the principal economic sectors of these Provinces in depth to attempt to predict their prospects. The report says that there seems to be long-term uncertainties in all economic sections at present.

Mr. Speaker, this current administration under the current Premier was elected last April on one issue, the offshore. The Premier promised to negotiate. He said he had the most important issue facing

MR. HODDER: Newfoundland today and he promised to negotiate, He said, "In this Province our history had worked against us and he pummelled the emotions of Newfoundlanders into so much pulp, and those who spoke against him he labled as traitors, and asked for their support to help him negotiate with Ottawa."

In that light, Mr. Speaker,

MR. BAIRD: No more giveaways, boy. No more giveaways.

MR. HODDER: If the hon. member will dig into what is happening at Come By Chance he might be looking a big giveaway right in the face. We gave the Come By Chance oil refinery away a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, the report says this of the offshore: " the declining price of oil may cause a deferential in exploration plans in Eastern and Western Canada. In the West the effects are likely to be short-term. In the Eastern part of Canada, however, it is likely to be more serious over the long-term. The apparent inability to reach an agreement over ownership and mineral offshore resources", the report says,

MR. HODDER: "may defer potential benefits of Hibernia, both direct and indirect." Mr. Speaker, these are frightening statements and these statements are not coming from just anybody; they are coming from the people who rate this Province, who give us our credit rating and they are afraid. Mr. Speaker, it may become one of the most cruelly, tragic ironies of our history that the one and only time we had an administration that could not negotiate with anyone, that period was the time when the ability to negotiate was the most crucial, more crucial than any other time in our history. It may very well be, Mr. Speaker, that for some reason beyond the knowledge of our Premier - the Premier was sent to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to test for us some future challenge or perhaps as a punishment for our past sins. In any case, Mr. Speaker, his stature as a sound, ethical manager and stimulator of the economy is negligible and his policies are cancerous, they are already eating away at what we have left of our apparently frail and weakened economy.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is reading his speech.

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, history will not be pleasant to the Premier of today. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe that history will be bitter against Mr. Peckford because his attempts to pull the Province's economy out of the mud failed. They will not be bitter about that but what they will be bitter about, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: Is that bitter or better?

MR. HODDER: Bitter - B-I-T-T-E-R.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, what history will be sad about is that the Premier has made no attempt to do anything about the economy. He will not have the Province's most blackened name for what he did do because, Mr. Speaker, he did nothing, but he will have a blackened name throughout history because he did not try to do anything.

Mr. Speaker, we are concerned at the moment about the future viability of the steel industry as it would affect Newfoundland's mining industry, the mining of iron ore, Competition between the States and the Canadian Provinces to attract new manufacturing facilities will probably continue to increase in the future. Mr. Speaker, some Atlantic Provinces, small though they may be,

MR. HODDER: are doing something to fight the problems that they have with Eastern Canadian industries being hurt because of slumps in the world markets. Our Premier says he can do nothing, he said it publicly, because he has no control and he has laid his weapons down until the winds of fortune blow the other way. But, Mr. Speaker, Nova Scotia is not laying down their tools. Mr. Speaker, according to the report what Nova Scotia is doing about the iron ore slump - it says, 'Nova Scotia's success at attracting Michelin and the modernization of dockyards should assist the province in the future'.

Mr. Speaker, the image of our Premier throwing stones at everyone across Canada, at everyone and everything that is not a Newfoundlander is well-known in Canada and, indeed, perhaps in all of North America. So how can that image ever attract industry to this Province when Mr. Peckford is against everything, including outside interests? I have spoken, Mr. Speaker, to people who are in the Province, working in the Province, who come from away and they feel that they should not be here. I have talked to people who are married to people who come from other parts of the Country. This administration has created a reflection around itself that makes people who come from other provinces to this Province feel that they are not wanted.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is known as a man who has refused to put aside his political aspirations in favour of creating a favoured economic climate for growth. It was an administration of which he was the key figure that nationalized BRINCO. And what do we have to show for that? The Lower Churchill is not now developed, we have instead two \$60 million holes on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. HODDER: Well, let us talk about debt levels. The report which I referred to, a report which was read at an Atlantic Provinces seminar in Halifax, says that the level of debt as a percentage of Gross Domestic Productivity shows wide variance among the provinces, and I would like hon. members to listen to this.

The report says the level of debt as a percentage of Gross Domestic Productivity shows wide variance among the provinces. New Brunswick's is 26 per cent; Nova Scotia's is 33 per cent; and Mr. Speaker, just guess who is the highest? Newfoundland's percentage is a staggering and obscene 60 per cent. You may very well be asking yourself if this is as serious and as damning as it sounds. Well, the report says that a level above 20 per cent normally causes concern. Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland is 60 per cent. If 20 per cent normally causes investors concern -

MR. STAGG: Run it by again. What are you talking about?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. member if when I was speaking, he would listen. Because this is very important, I would again go over the figures.

The report which was given by Moody's says that the level of debt as a percentage of Gross Domestic Productivity shows wide variance among the Provinces. New Brunswick is 26 per cent, Nova Scotia is 33 per cent, Newfoundland is 60 per cent. They consider 20 per cent to be grave, we are three times over that mark.

I would like to ask how much time I have left, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Two minutes.

MR. HODDER: Two minutes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would now move a vote of non-confidence in the government.

MR. BAIRD: Surprise! Surprise!

MR. HODDER: I should say, Mr. Speaker, that it gives me great pleasure -

MR. STAGG: Pleasure?

MR. HODDER: Yes, pleasure - perhaps some sadness but with this government pleasure. After listening and not hearing the policies of this government I would now move the traditional motion:

I move, seconded by my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) the following amendment to the 1982/83 Budget, that all of the words after "that" be deleted and replaced with the following, "This House regrets the inability of the government to develop and present positive programmes to cope adequately with the problems which concern the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the House regrets further that instead of the Province having control over the public debt, the public debt has control over the Province."

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member mind reading the thing again?

MR. HODDER: Would you like to have a copy?

MR. MARSHALL: I would like to have a copy, yes, if I could.

MR. WARREN: Two people cannot have the floor at the same time.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the point of order I have is as follows: You know, we hear from time to time it being mentioned in this House about the small number of members in the House, They are not all that small, but I keep emphasizing quality is what matters. I will give you an indication that this amendment has to be out of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has moved the following amendment to the 1982/83 budget. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the 1983/84 budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: Hold on now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can respond. Look, this is a very serious forum that we are in now. The hon. gentleman has moved an amendment to a budget of this Province that entails over \$2 billion in public expenditure and he comes in and he wants to move the amendment to the 1982/83 budget. That budget, Mr. Speaker, was the budget which was passed last year for the hon. gentleman, not this year. Now I do not know, you know, As to the substance, you know, the other part of the non-confidence motion one would have no objection with if it were on this budget. I mean, it does not make sense but it is perfectly in order. But for the 1982/83 budget, Mr. Speaker, it is out of order



MR. MARSHALL: and I think the hon. gentleman's motion is out of order. And I think you will find, too, as well, that he can only propose one motion, at one time, of non-confidence in the Budget Speech.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, that was merely a typographical error. Mr. Speaker, the motion is the main substance and it would be ludicrous to think that I was trying to amend last year's budget. It was a typographical error.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member read it into the record.

MR. HODDER: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, had the motion read that I was to move the following amendment to the budget it would still have been in order. Unfortunately, the wrong numbers were typed in. And I will say, Mr. Speaker, that if justice -

MR. BAIRD: I would say you do not know the war is over yet.

MR. HODDER: - and rationality were to precede here, this motion is in order, first of all, Mr. Speaker, because it was placed to Your Honour on this budget during the Budget Speech, secondly,

MR. HODDER: Your Honour, the two numbers could have been left off - and I assume, Your Honour, that the motion itself is in order - but these two numbers could have been left off and it would be still in order. Mr. Speaker, furthermore, it was merely a typographical error and I do not think that anyone can disallow a motion for that reason.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Before ruling that point of order we will recess the House for a couple of minutes in order to research this.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
Call in the members.  
To the point of order raised by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) concerning the non-confidence motion, there does appear to be an error in the preamble, yet it could be considered a slip of the tongue. The motion itself does not include the dates 1982 - 1983, so I would have to rule that it is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Well, you can be certainly pleased that got a liberal interpretation of that.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) have to swear on the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!  
The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, when I finished I was talking about the Premier as being a man who refused to put aside his political aspirations in favour of creating a favourable economic climate in this Province. And the report which was read by Moodys at the Atlantic Provinces

May 9, 1983

Tape 1923

EC - 2

MR. HODDER:

Council is frightening.

Mr. Speaker, the report said  
that the debt, as a percentage of the gross domestic product  
showed wide variances amongst provinces,

MR. HODDER: New Brunswick's being 26 per cent, Nova Scotia's 33 per cent and in Newfoundland we had the highest in Canada which was 60 per cent. The report also said that a level above 20 per cent causes concern. So, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlanders have 60 per cent and it must be setting off air raid sirens in the offices of the people who rate this Province and whose ratings will tell us how much we will pay in interest.

Mr. Speaker, the point I conclude on is that we are three times over what is considered by the firm of Moody's to be a cause for concern. Mr. Speaker, that is a concern to all of us. Mr. Speaker, it is not enough to sit and attack the federal government, to blame all the problems of this Province on Ottawa, we must do something that will stimulate the economy of this Province. Mr. Speaker, everywhere we look in the Province we see signs of economic inactivity, every report that we look at we are told by people who are knowledgeable about such things that we are in desperate financial shape and Mr. Speaker, here in this House we have been standing since the House began asking the government basically one question, 'What are you planning to do to overcome the financial problems, the social problems that have been caused by the financial problems, what are you going to do?'

MR. HODDER: And the answer, Mr. Speaker, has been to cut back. There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, in this budget that shows stimulation. I stand here at a time when the Province is in a state of collapse, there is chaos in the mining industry and severe problems in the business community. There are problems in the construction industry, a desperate lack of housing development and Newfoundlanders are leaving the Province in droves. And I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, what the budget does to help us in the situation we face? We have a budget which does not give any detail where money will be cut back. There will be cutbacks but the details are not there. There is nothing which attacks the problem of trying to stimulate the economy, of trying to get the Province going, nothing which attacks that problem in the face. We have a document full of excuses. We were hoping that after the exercise of the mini-budget of last Fall, on November 18, 1982, that this budget would do something which would give us opportunity to praise the administration. However, we have a document which lacks initiative and imagination and merely juggles the books and does nothing to stimulate the economy which again merely hurts the low-income and the poor people of this Province. There is no indication of a recovery programme. The five year plan has gone out the window. We have not heard of the five year plan for some years now. I do not think it has been referred to in this session. And there is no indication of a recovery plan for the province's industrial sector, the mining sector, the pulp and paper sector and the sealing industry. I have to ask where is the plan for the growth in any of the social economic sectors?

MR. HODDER: Where are the plans to help cope with our number one problem, unemployment? I represent a district and I find that members do not believe me when I tell them that the Canada Manpower Office in Stephenville told me and told the person in charge of the Department of Social Services, that at one point this Winter unemployment had reached a 95 per cent level. I had trouble believing it myself until they told me. Those are figures from the office and any member can phone the office and speak to the manager and ask him how he derived at these figures and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that he will tell you how he arrived at those figures, 95 per cent, yet Mr. Speaker, I see no direction from the provincial government, not even in the NEED programmes, to try and overcome that horrendous, terrible unemployment figure and to try to cope with what is happening to people who are now first time social assistance recipients, who are finding it very difficult. We have had a number of raises for social assistance recipients over the past years but none of them can come up to the cost of living. And this year the same thing happened, so that year by year they have been falling behind and people are desperate. I have people who call me and they are crying, they say, "My mind is not good. I do not know what I am going to do." And coupled with that we have in the Department of Social Services some of the most vicious restraints and methods. It seems that Social Services is geared more towards catching the offender than to helping the person who needs help. And all of us, Mr. Speaker, all of us on this side of the House and I am sure if that happens in our districts it must be happening to people on that side of the House, all of us are finding those problems and we have to do something. But what we must do first is to try to roll up our sleeves and say, "How are we going to get that high rate of unemployment down?" Even if it means bowing down and getting

MR. HODDER: together with our federal counterparts, we must overcome. This is our Province and high unemployment figures are not just the - I mean, members opposite cannot get up and say, "Well, we do not have the tools, the fiscal tools and the fiscal policy." I saw the federal budget and I heard the government's response to the federal budget. But I will tell hon. gentlemen that this government cannot lift its head in pride over its own budget, particularly if you compare it with the federal budget, at least there were efforts to overcome unemployment and to stimulate the economy of areas such as this. In the budget which was brought down in this House this year there were none.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, when I speak of unemployment I speak in terms of not only the record unemployment throughout this Province but especially I ask the government to try to bring down the unemployment figure amongst young people. Young people are people who are going into the work force for the first time and if they cannot find jobs in this early part of their lives - you know, most of the people who are here are of my age group; the Premier is, and the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross), the member for Humber Valley (Mr. House), the member for Baie Verte-White (Mr. Rideout), and there are a number of people who sit in benches opposite who attended university when I did, and we were saying the other day - I was not talking to you fellows, but a group of us were talking and we were saying, When we came out of university there was no thought of not being able to get a job. And now we have coming out of the university with their doctorate degrees and they cannot find a job.

Mr. Speaker, education is in the hands of the provincial government and we should be taking some direction to make sure that the students who are being turned out of our vocational schools and turned out of our community colleges will be able to take advantage in the coming electronic revolution which we see upon us already, that they will be able to take advantage. I know it is very difficult to move out of a heavy equipment school - I am not saying that heavy equipment is a waste or anything like that, but I take it because it has a lot of infrastructures, if it were found that people were not getting jobs who graduated from those courses, it is very difficult to change that infrastructure and change it into a computer operation instead of heavy equipment or scale it down and bring in another. I know it is not easy, but it is something that must be done,



May 9, 1983

Tape 1927

PK - 2

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker. Because most of the people whom I find unemployed over on the West Coast and on the East, and I attended a convention of young people from all over this Province, from Labrador, from St. John's,

MR. HODDER:

from St. Mary's, from Terra Nova, from Gander, from Grand Falls, from Port au Basques, from Port au Port, from Stephenville, all of those young people were people who had qualifications, they had job skills but they could not find a job and it is on that basis that we have to -the Federal Government is doing its share, Just the other day they announced a \$1.25 million programme to put computers in the Bay St. George Community College and that will mean, Mr. Speaker, that the Bay St. George Community College will, in a couple of years, become the place to go in Newfoundland for computer training. It could not have been done without a large amount of money. Mr. Speaker, I think, we in this Province have to decide where we are going and the courses are under our control. We have to decide which ones are no longer of use and it is not hard to tell when they do a review of people who came out of Vocational School last year and find that there are only three people working out of a class of twenty in a trade, and yet the next year the same amount of people, in that particular trade, are being trained and the year after, and the year after, and the year after, and that some of those people of whom I am speaking have gone into the Armed Services and many of them are still out scratching for a job, so we have to do something about unemployment and we can do something about unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, we have not seen a plan here, there is not even a modest attempt to simply try to rebuild our economy. We do not know yet where the help for Burin, Buchans, Corner Brook,

MR. HODDER: Baie Verte and the Northwest Region, where that help is coming from, or what is going to happen, or what the plans are to help the economy of those areas.

Mr. Speaker, I said in this House last year that the Premier had tried by Public Relations to portray himself and his Government as a vigorous, political 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 for the Province, the poor of the Province, but whose main concern is to stay in power. A group of men who are misunderstood, that is what the Premier says, he is misunderstood. But he is not misunderstood, Mr. Speaker, because Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are starting to understand all about him. We saw that last weekend in Gander. Mr. Speaker, we here do understand what is happening and soon the people of the Province will understand what is happening. You know, if the job is too big for you and if you are too tired and lazy to do it, and when you are led by a Public Relations expert who has taken a hands-off approach to the economy and who is presiding over the collapse of a Province, who is standing idly by while towns and companies die and go bankrupt,

MR. HODDER: watching the highest unemployment in the Province's history, the largest number of bankruptcies, both personal and business in the Province's history, and you take no blame for it, when the Premier takes no blame for it while other premiers have wrestled with those problems and in many cases succeeded - I believe Bill Bennett won his election in British Columbia on his plans to turn around the economy, on jobs and what the government was going to do to fight for the economy. You know, Mr. Speaker, the Premier took over the Province while it was in relatively good shape, but his main concern was oil, and I have to say to the Premier that his mind was set on the oil and he could not look after the economy. He puts me in mind of person who cannot walk and chew gum at the same time because, Mr. Speaker, the government - and it is not only the Premier, the Cabinet Ministers and the backbenchers -

MR. STAGG: I thought the hon. member never chewed gum

MR. HODDER: In the first couple of sessions of this House after the last election that is all we heard, 'Oil, oil, oil', but the other thing was that the other ministers sat back and the only minister who was involved and who said anything at all was the Minister Without Portfolio responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, formerly the Minister of Energy and now demoted, (Mr. Marshall) he was the only one who was saying anything, and the Premier, and they were talking about oil and gas and the rest of the ministers sat back and did nothing. They sat back day after day in their seats and there was no force in that government that said, 'You run your departments, great, if you are the Minister of Municipal Affairs, or you are the Minister of Public Works, or you are the Minister of Finance, or you are the Minister of Justice, be creative, do things new, let us

MR. HODDER: creative, do things new, let us gear our thinking to providing jobs for Newfoundlanders. With what bit of money and what bit of fiscal power that we have, let us stimulate the economy of Newfoundland.

The question I often wonder about, Mr. Speaker, is what would this administration have done if they did not have the oil issue to hold over the heads of Newfoundlanders? What would we have done even if there were no oil, if none had been discovered? Now, we know it is there and, you know, we have to be realistic and we have to deal with it, but what if there had not been a discovery? What then would this government be doing? I mean, we have a Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) who, to my knowledge, has developed nothing in this Province yet, in two or three years. He has been fooling around with an aluminum smelter and we have heard nothing about that. That is the only project he has had. He has shown no leadership as far as the Tourism part of his portfolio is concerned, the budget shows that, but yet he wanders around New York and Toronto promoting Sir Humphrey Gilbert Day which is going to be mostly paid for by the federal government. Oh, Mr. Speaker, there are many things that we could do. I wish the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) had been in Stephenville on the day, and I realize he could not be there - and I say this with no rancour - but I wish he could have been there to hear my speech to the Chamber of Commerce that day because I certainly laid out where I thought the priorities should go in Bay St. George and I certainly laid out what I thought Tourism should be. And I will send the member a copy of what I said.

MR. STAGG: You already had a copy of my notes.

MR. HODDER: Yes, I was there and I already had a copy of yours. It was very hastily done. There were a

MR. HODDER: few good ideas there. It was very short.

MR. BAIRD: Short? I will rank mine with yours character for character.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if we had an impartial judge, he would not be even in the running, neither did the people of Bay St. George think so.

MR. BAIRD: Was that the same day the President of the Party was out cutting ribbons, opening up town halls?

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker, it was not the same day. And she was not opening town halls. The people graciously asked her if she would like to put her hand on the scissors and the headline writer said that she opened the building. In actual fact, myself and the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) were the two people who opened that building.

MR. BAIRD: It was Marvin Youden who runs that, your buddy.

MR. HODDER: No, it is not Marvin Youden who runs that, who is my buddy. As a matter of fact, I am not sure if Marvin Youden is my buddy.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot take a hands-off approach to the budget. You know, even the predecessor to this government, when the Stephenville Linerboard went down, rolled up his sleeves and said, 'This cannot happen.' And then he went up and saw Don Jamieson and he said, 'Mr. Jamieson, we cannot let this happen.' And between the two of them they opened the mill. But that was a time when even though we were in a better fight - and the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) was involved as well, and we were all trying to do the thing we thought was right. But those two gentlemen, the then Premier Moores -

MR. STAGG: I was in here trying to straighten up the thing and you were in here trying to put the screws to it.

MR. HODDER: Yes. And that would be only the -

MR. STAGG: You are dealing in stolen information.

MR. HODDER: That would be only the hon. member for Stephenville's (Mr. Stagg) interpretation and his interpretation does not stand for much.

MR. STAGG: And meanwhile 50 per cent of our people were out of jobs thanks to the hon. members. Thank you very much for your contribution.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would say if we pulled it the way they did in Goose Bay, where the -

MR. STAGG: The hon. gentleman was dealing in stolen information in 1977.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, that charge is not true. Would the hon. member stand and make that public? I believe there is a little provision where, if a charge is made by a member and denied by another member then it must be proved, and if it is proved then one of the members must resign. I believe there is a little something in the rule book somewhere and I would ask the member to make that charge and I will put my seat on the line if he is alleging that I was stealing information.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not stealing, dealing.

MR. HODDER: - or even dealing -

MR. STAGG: I did not say you stole it but you had stolen information.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if I had stolen information I had no knowledge of it. Mr. Speaker, I did have some information which was horrendous as to what was happening in that mill. And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would have liked me to sit down and not criticize the government which owned the mill and keep my mouth shut. But if we had not, at that particular time, shown the people of Newfoundland how important that resource was to all of Newfoundland - if the hon. member remembers, we

MR. HODDER: even had the Board of Trade and just about every association across this Province in support of what we were doing. And that was what was said but the time was given us to say it and the people of that day said, 'Yes, we are going to do the best we can to get you that mill back', and they did. I give them praise.

MR. ANDREWS: The hon. member knows that Linerboard would not work, it was useless.

MR. HODDER: I am giving praise to your former Premier but I have not seen anything of that nature from the present Premier, where he has rolled up his sleeves and said, 'This cannot happen'. And I can go into a lot more but the hon. member obviously wants to pull me away from my speech and I do not intend to be pulled away. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the protection of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is deceptive.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) obtain a copy.

MR. HODDER: I will send you a copy of it.

The full impact of this budget will not be felt by Newfoundlanders before some four or five months have passed. We are starting to see the impact of it on the hospitals of the Province at the present time, we saw the impact of it on the teaching profession. But the impact of the budget has just only now started to be felt by Newfoundlanders. It is not a fair budget to Newfoundlanders in that it has hurt the low and middle income earners most. Fees are being raised again and they are always being raised whether they are in the budget or not. The raising of fees for every conceivable thing in the Province over the past years, penalize people with small incomes in exactly the same way that it hits the millionaire. We presently have some 400,000 people unemployed in this Province, with unemployment



MR. HODDER: among our youth, between sixteen and twenty-one years of age, at the high rate of 42.1 per cent of those in the labour force. Fifteen per cent of those working are classed as under employed and 25 per cent have dropped out - we do not know where they went, they have just given up.

Housing starts in 1981 were  
1,504; in

MR. HODDER: 1982 - 935. And that is a very good indicator of the economy. I am pleased to say, and I understand, although there are no figures available yet, that housing starts this year are a little higher than last year. But with those housing starts being down in 1982, from 1,504 in 1981 to 935 in 1982, we have a government who did not see fit to take the building tax away altogether. Now, there was one area where the government could have stimulated the economy. They could have removed the tax on building materials. And they were told, because I read the brief from the St. John's Board of Trade, the pre-budgetary submission from the St. John's Board of Trade, they were told by the St. John's Board of Trade that they should remove that building tax and it would stimulate the economy. It would have been the only stimulative provision in the budget. But the government chose not to lower the 8 per cent. I would say, Mr. Speaker, you would see an awful lot of building going on in this Province this Summer if people realized that the 8 per cent - even if we just did it for one year the values that would have come back to the government through increased sales for the building of homes would -

MR. BAIRD: Very boring.

MR. HODDER: Well, perhaps the member should listen to it. It might be boring but the member should listen to it. But the fact that the government did not have one stimulative provision in the Budget is shocking, and that is the one way that they could have shown that they were interested, in having that removed. And it would have stimulated the economy and they would have received back in the financial coffers, because of the amount of construction activity that would have been going on, the amount of salaries and everything else that would have been generated through a provision like this, they would have received their money back.

MR. HODDER:

No, Mr. Speaker, they held it

as it was.

MR. DINN:

- it is only going to

drive it up more.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, in looking through

the Budget, tourism is not now even a department, but the tourism budget has been cut to the bone. It was cut last year and it is cut this year. If you leave the Sir Humphrey Gilbert celebrations aside, which will hopefully stimulate it right across the Province, the rest of the budget has its provisions cut to the bone.

MR. HODDER: And I do not understand why it is the Northwest Territories can attract more tourists than they can handle, because of their tourism promotion, and we can not. It is not, Mr. Speaker, because people have to arrive here by boat, that is a cop out. In the Northwest Territories which I visited last Summer, a great part of it, I was amazed by the handicraft displays, by the local artistry of the inhabitants - and we have all of that here - and I was amazed by the tourist promotion in the Northwest Territories. And to say because we live on an Island how much harder - the people in Newfoundland can fly from Nova Scotia for a small amount of money but to the Northwest Territories the price is horrendous, yet they have developed a very good tourism industry.

I do not know how long, Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue to downgrade expenditures for roads. I wonder at what point, Mr. Speaker - and I would like, Mr. Speaker, to think about this as I would all members of the House - I wonder how long it is before a road becomes not a road? What period of time before a road becomes a cow path? Is there any set guideline? Because I would say, Mr. Speaker, that some of the roads across the Province, in rural areas of this Province, were roads and then they became snowmobile trails and now they are down to cow paths, and communities in this Province have been isolated from each other because of nonpavement of roads. And the member asked what about the fishery. Well, if you can have an area where you have a six month fishery and at the height of the season people have to ride with half load limits to try to get that fish to market, or cannot get there at all, then, Mr. Speaker, I would say to him that he should build roads where there are

MR. HODDER: resources which, I believe, at one time was a slogan of this administration.

Mr. Speaker, there was nothing in the budget to stimulate small business in any way, shape or form. There has been no development plan in this Province and our services have been cut to the bone.

Mr. Speaker, all the budget has done is attempt to hopefully protect the government's financial flank in the world money markets and maintain the Province's precarious credit rating and at the same time enable the Peckford administration to continue its gorilla attacks on the federal government at every possible opportunity. Indeed, the Province's credit rating is still the lowest in all of Canada. Now, the Premier may make funny little statements like our credit rating has not fallen this year, but it is still the lowest in all Canada and it is so weak that even the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) a few weeks ago acknowledged that any downgrading of the rate would have drastic consequences.

MR. HODDER: And on the back of that statement we get a statement from Moody's saying that we are in a precarious situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to continue its borrowing programme for 1983 - 1984 the government is now continuing the austere restraint programme it brought in last November to cover the, approximately, \$60 million deficit. Thus there is more belt tightening and increased taxes from an administration that professes it has no more money. It somehow can find the necessary funding for its own political Trojan horse, the Shoe Cove Satellite Station.

Mr. Speaker, there is a basic premise of this administration their strong belief that the people of the Province will accept the austerity embodied in the budget because they have been historically conditioned to do so. While times are tough in Canada they are always tougher in Newfoundland and our people are better prepared and ready to accept hard times. That is the price, the Premier likes to tell us, we must be willing to pay for living on the rock. There is nobody on this side of the House who would dispute the fact that the Province must be able to provide a viable and prosperous future for our children and that if necessary we must be prepared. The Premier, the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) have asked us to wait out those tough economic times no matter what they may be, what they may present, and what they may cost in social, economic and human cost to the people of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, that is the motherhood issue the future will bring to our children. We have heard it over and over again. We even had a debate one time about what the future will bring to children, but while we were having

MR. HODDER: that debate these future children were being rustled off to Edmonton and Fort McMurray. We have a strong moral responsibility to those residents whose future is now - especially our young people who are in that category I mentioned, the 43 per cent unemployment rate, those people who are in the job market for the first time, who must have jobs. It is the worst way to start a young person off in life, on unemployment insurance or on social welfare and it is happening in too many areas of the Province. Mr. Speaker, these young people must have their day in the sun too, and we were elected to this House of Assembly to try to overcome the disparities which exist in this Province. And there are many disparities in this Province, Mr. Speaker, there are disparities of roads, there are disparities of income, there are disparities of areas where people are on social assistance, and there are great disparities of unemployment throughout this Province. Even though our unemployment rate is large, the disparities are horrendous. You know, if you live in

MR. HODDER: a certain part of this Province you are going to have to keep your car up. It will cost an awful lot more because the road is never fixed, yet year by year the maintenance grants are less. Nobody ever plans to build a new road these days. There was only \$50,000 in the budget for new roads in unincorporated communities. The maintenance budget goes down so you have to try to keep your car in better shape than you would in other areas. And because of the cost of getting over those roads your food costs more, and on top of that you are in a high unemployment area.

I always shudder when I hear my friend for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) talk about the prices in Labrador. But the farther you travel in this Province, in the more rural the area, the more cost a person incurs, and the higher the unemployment, and the higher the social costs. So we have areas within that general 19 per cent unemployment figure, we have areas where it is not so bad -it is bad everywhere, but it is not so bad- but we have other areas where it is horrendous.

I am sorry the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is not here, because when the NEED programme came down I could not see any indication at all that the NEED programme is going to try in any way, shape, of form to look at areas where they have high unemployment, because if it were then my district would to received it- I have the highest unemployment district in this Province, bar none. Well, if anybody has a district that has higher than 95 per cent unemployment stand up. If you want to check them out you phone the Manpower Office in Stephenville and ask for the manager and he will tell you how he arrived at them. I am talking about the Port au Port Peninsula, I am talking about a period this year. Now, employment is gone up somewhat right now, the men are fishing. They almost did not get fishing for



MR. HODDER: a while, they almost did not have a buyer, they almost did not have a processor. But that is in place now but there are not as many people working there as there were before. So the employment figures may have dropped by 5 per cent or 7 per cent, maybe it is 87 per cent unemployed now. I would have hoped it had dropped further than that. But that is so. And I would hope to see that that NEED programme would benefit that district much more than it would benefit a district where there was only 50 per cent unemployment or where there was only 18 per cent or 19 per cent unemployment. I would certainly like to see that happen.

MR. RIDEOUT: Did they apply for a project?

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there were more applications for projects. And I might say something else about the NEED programme, I understand that since the NEED programme came in that the provincial government decided that the NEED programme would be resource based only. So, of course, an awful lot of people put in their NEED programme for, say, an extension to a water system. And my understanding now is that that will be scrapped, that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) has a veto.

MR. RIDEOUT: No, that is not right.

MR. HODDER: Well, he told me that anything that was not resource oriented he was going to scrap, and I do not see a water system as not being resource oriented. If a person wants to put up a cottage, wants a cottage industry, or wants to develop crafts for their homes I think that a good water system could be classed as a development project.

MR. TOBIN: How come your colleagues all left? You bored them to death.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are within listening distance, they know that everything is in hand. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is very sick today, and is uncharacteristically not in the House.

MR. TOBIN: What was wrong with your (inaudible)?

MR. HODDER: Oh, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HODDER: I sent in ten delegates - I will tell the hon. member while I try to find some of my notes - I sent in ten delegates and -

MR. TOBIN: I heard you were making phone calls asking people about a free weekend in Gander.

MR. HODDER: The District Association paid an amount towards the Young Liberals going in and they had a registration fee of \$20, and they went out and in one week raised the money, by themselves. They frightened me to death. They raised it I think in about three days.

MR. DOYLE: How many delegates are in Harbour Main?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I could not tell the hon. member that, but, Mr. Speaker, I would think that there would have been delegates from Harbour Main-Bell Island. I know hon. members are all worried about where these young delegates came from, and I am sorry that I cannot give you all the information, but when I see the list I will let the hon. member know privately how many were in there. I will not give him the names because I would not want him to be insulted if he were to try to win them back to his side. And I am quite aware that he is just itching to win those young people back again but the feeling that I received while I was in there certainly was that these young people are committed.

Mr. Speaker, I had something to say, I had the notes here and I had them all in order and now I cannot find them. Mr. Speaker, there was certainly something I wanted to say on this Budget Speech and I hate very much not to say it at this time, because there may not be a chance to speak in this Budget Speech again. I thought it was important to say it and in saying it I wanted to say it as carefully as possible.

May 9, 1983

Tape No. 1936

NM - 2

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I guess that is that.

It is not here.

MR. TOBIN:

Do not be wasting time. Let someone

else take over.

MR. HODDER:

No, Mr. Speaker, I have lots to say,

it is just a matter of saying the right things.

Mr. Speaker, debating this budget is going to be one of the most difficult tasks for members opposite and I cannot wait. I have heard one member opposite already. It is going to be one of the most difficult tasks that members opposite will have in this session. Now, the first member who spoke, I admit I did not hear the first part of his speech, I heard the last ten minutes, and it did not tell me what the government was going to do about the problems that arise from the Budget and the massive unemployment in the Province.

MR. HODDER: There is another way to raise revenue and that is by stimulating the economy. And I want to hear each member stand and speak to this. If he stands as the member did for that last ten minutes, and I am sure from the last ten minutes the first part of his speech must have been okay, but I am sure that if members are going to stand and throw political, partisan cracks back and forth across the House, then I would say that they should give up now, resign and go home in shame. If this administration, which has been in power since 1972, cannot at this point in time stand up in the House and show the House at this time just how they are going to deal with the financial crisis in the House, then I think they should resign. And I think every member should stand to speak on that side of the House, and I certainly hope that every member will speak. I could not think that they would not speak. My understanding is that in this House every member speaks on the Throne Speech and every member speaks on the Budget Speech. And it is very important that each member speaks. It is a tradition of this House that each member speaks because it is noted afterwards whether you spoke or not, and to not speak to the Budget Speech would show something about the member, and his constituents, in time, might be quite amazed to find out that a member did not speak on the Budget Speech. And, of course, if you speak on the Budget Speech, then you must say something, then you must tell the people of this Province how you plan to get this economy over the next few years. What are you going to do?

It will be a difficult task for members and it should be one that will be preceded by a lot of hard work and a lot of thought to let us know, as each member stands, what the administration is doing about the Province. And I know some of the people in the back benches, like the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), may

MR. HODDER: not be in on what is happening in Cabinet, but he should still tell us when he stands up what the government is planning to do for the economy of this Province. He should do it from his perceptions. He should tell us what they are going to do. He should not only defend his government but give us positive information as to what we can see. What can the last lone fisherman out on the bell of Cape St. George, who is nearly as badly off now as he was in the time of the National Convention, what is he going to see from this government to help him? And the small businessman who is nearing bankruptcy in downtown St. John's, what can he expect from this government? And what can we all expect? What can we all expect from the government?

Now, I realize that the provincial government does not have all the fiscal and financial tools to change around the Province's history overnight but I would like to see the government try. Because this government can only survive now, and I will tell you with certainty - I would like for the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) opposite to listen because I know he has the ear of the Premier -

MR. HODDER: there is only one way now for this government to survive - it can still survive, it can still possibly win a new election - but the only way that the administration that the hon. gentleman represents can survive is if it rolls up its sleeves and goes to work on the economy. If you fail people may forgive you, but at least you will have to roll up your sleeves and go to work on the economy. But as long as the sit-back, forget-it attitude prevails, then there is not a chance in the world that the forty-four members opposite will come back here, the next time we will be over there. That is a warning that you have to do something with the economy.

MR. MORGAN: We have four years to go yet.

MR. HODDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) says, 'We have four years to go yet'. But, Mr. Speaker, the problem is now and we still have not seen any move whatsoever from members of the government -

MR. MORGAN: Over the weekend, two fish plants were opened that were closed last year. That is 200 jobs more than last year.

MR. HODDER: You opened two plants? I congratulate you. When the minister stands up he can tell us about the two plants that he opened. My challenge is to all of you to stand up -

MR. MORGAN: Everybody in the Province knows about those plants now.

MR. HODDER: What about the plants that are closed? Are you going to be able to open all of those? If you can say yes, we will applaud the minister when he sits down. What we have not received yet from the Cabinet ministers are the plans -

DR. COLLINS: The opening of the syncrolift next year will provide another 170 jobs.

MR. STAGG: Tell us about the mining industry in Port au Port. Where do you stand on that? Where do you stand on the concrete platforms?

MR. HODDER: Oh, Mr. Speaker, where do I stand on concrete platforms? I will send the brief over quickly to the hon. member, as quickly as I can get it to him, because I will tell him exactly how I stand on the concrete platforms and on the limestone -

MR. STAGG: You are in favour of it, right?

MR. HODDER: Yes, absolutely. I told people they should support the government on the building of concrete platforms rather than semi-submersible platforms and I said that I think we in Bay St. George should stand with the government on that issue. So the member might even like the speech that I made except for comments relating to him.

MR. TOBIN: What about the seventeen points of the agreement? Want us to sign that?

MR. HODDER: If the member wants to look at the offshore situation, I will talk about the offshore situation for him. He wants to talk about the offshore situation? On the offshore situation, nothing has happened. If you want to look at it as it exists, first there are six rigs off the shores of Nova Scotia, while there are three at the present time about to drill on the Grand Banks. Now that is offshore. Drilling activity on the Nova Scotia Shelf has been increasing steadily with no apparent sign of letup.



MR. HODDER: The Nova Scotia agreement has stimulated exploration on the Scotia Shelf. The fact that we could not reach an agreement has dampened exploration off the Coast of Newfoundland.

MR. TOBIN: Where do you stand on the agreement that has been reached?

MR. HODDER: Where do I stand on the agreement that has been reached? I would say, Mr. Speaker, where I stand is that this government should get together with the Government of Canada and iron out their differences. We must remember who walked away.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Chretien.

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: All it needs is his signature.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, in Nova Scotia most of the drilling effort is directed towards gas, but Shell Oil expects to recover oil at the Shubenacadie well, and the drilling on the Scotia Shelf has increased in tempo while drilling on the Grand Banks has come to a dismal halt, a virtual standstill. And it is not expected, whether we had an agreement this year or not, that the drilling picture will change off the Grand Banks or off Labrador.

The hon. member asked me the question and I will tell him where I stand on the offshore negotiations. In Nova Scotia, Mobil has three rigs, Petro-Canada two rigs, Shell Oil one rig and has announced another, and then Husky Oil and Bow Valley Resources of Calgary announced a \$225 million deal on January 17 which gives them the right to four wells on an exploration block on Stable Island. There are a lot of people in this

MR. HODDER: Province, Mr. Speaker, familiar with the agreements, who think that the Nova Scotia deal is a very good one.

MR. STAGG: Are you among those?

MR. HODDER: No, I am not among those. But what I would say to the member is that this side broke off negotiates and all Newfoundlanders know it. Go back to the negotiating table.

MR. TOBIN: Would you sign the Nova Scotia agreement?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there was another \$130 million agreement for the Sable Island area, and there was another since then of those that I listed there was a \$15 million drilling programme on the Prince Edward Island - Northumberland shore.

MR. STAGG: The taxpayer of Canada is paying for all of that.

MR. HODDER: And, the taxpayer of Canada was also paying for all of this we had here and do not forget that. Because when hon. members here in this House are slamming at the federal government, they must remember that those holes would not have been drilled out there on the Grand Banks or on the Labrador Shelf without the help of the federal government. The tax write-offs on those wells at one point was such that if they drilled a dry hole they still made money. And these And these were tax advantages which were given by the federal government, that terrible, terrible federal government. Mr. Speaker, I would love to be on the negotiating team, I really would, for nothing else but to see how this has been negotiated. But I do not intend to negotiate a deal across this floor, I can only tell you what is and what has been. And what is is that there is

May 9, 1983

Tape No. 1939

MR. HODDER:                    increased activity on the Scotia Shelf and what has been has been enough fighting and squabbling with Ottawa, a start of negotiations and then lately the Province walked away from the negotiations. And I

MR. HODDER: say to the Province, "Stay at the negotiation. Stay there until you get what you want. And make sure what you want is not so great that we may get nothing."

MR. TOBIN: We will get it under a Tory Government.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in silence because I want to say something that I think is important. Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we are playing a very risky game here in Newfoundland.

MR. STAGG: We always have.

MR. HODDER: And we have always lost.

The longer we hold up the oil deal, the longer we see no exploration on the Grand Banks; and the longer we hold up the oil deal the more exploration we see off Nova Scotia and off Prince Edward Island.

MR. STAGG: The oil will go bad?

MR. HODDER: No, the oil will not go bad but the oil is needed by this generation, not the next generation. We need it in this generation. Those young people, 43 per cent of whom who are out of jobs, need some oil related activity at this present time. But I want to ask a question, If members would just close their mouths for a second I would -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: I want to ask a question, I want to ask what then -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, do I have to put up with that?

MR. HODDER: Yes.

MR. HODDER: Well, if I do then this is not much of a House of Assembly. Generally when someone asks for the Speaker's protection he gets it, and especially from idiots who do nothing else but heckle in this House. I have some things to say. Hon. gentlemen may not believe them. Hon. gentlemen have things to say on the other side of the House. I may not believe them but I certainly let them say them in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I have never in my life made a display of myself like the member sitting over there in his wrong seat has been making. But the question, Mr. Speaker, is the longer we hold off the oil deal, the longer we wait, the more exploration takes place on the Scotia Shelf. And I said we were running a risk again and I am about to tell you why we are running a risk again. We are running a risk again because what happens, and it could happen - I know hon. gentleman said, 'No, it cannot happen' but it happened at Hibernia - what happens then if we find that Nova Scotia makes a major find? What happens? If that major find, that major oil strike, is more accessible to develop and it is not in iceberg valley, it is not 200 miles offshore, where will the oil companies be going then and how long in the future before they go to the Hibernia oil fields? Because that is much more expensive. Now that is something that hon. members should take to sleep with them and chew on for a little while: How long can you wait?

MR. STAGG: There are certain genetic possibilities that your Aunt would be your Uncle as well, you know.

MR. HODDER: Boy, that is the kind of a thought that I thought I would get from the hon. member.

MR. HODDER: The hon. member has a closed mind. You see, when you get an administration that is totally committed to one idea, they tend to have closed minds. And the hon. member could not really understand that, with increased exploration on the Grand Banks or on the Scotia Shelf and around Sable Island and off Prince Edward Island, that these have been designated as oil bearing areas, that there is a chance, a very large chance that they can strike a major oil field.

MR. TOBIN: More power to them!

MR. HODDER: More power to them? There may be more power to them, but there will be less power to us, Mr. Speaker, if they go after an oil field closer to land and out of iceberg alley.

MR. TOBIN: Do you realize that the only national party that will not give it to us is the Liberal Party?

MR. HODDER: It was my understanding of the Liberal Party that they were willing to continue negotiations and called for hon. members to come back.

Mr. Speaker, the government knew that they had an uncertain case, or at least, the government should have known. The Premier should have known he had an uncertain case. It was said here in the House of Assembly a number of times back in 1975 that we would not put the case in court. Individual members have gotten up and said we would not put the case in court, that would be the last thing we would ever do.

MR. TOBIN: Did you say we ought to?

MR. HODDER: On this side of the House - and I have been here long enough, longer than many of you - it has been said over and over and over again that the Supreme Court case was a thing of last resort. That case

MR. HODDER: should not have been used until such time as we had lost the negotiations and been beaten into the ground. That time had not arrived. We have been hardly doing any negotiations because as soon as the two groups get together, away they go again. And there was no reason to stop negotiating. The government did not like what was happening at those negotiations when the officials got together, Mr. Chretien said, 'Mr. Marshall, we will sit down and we can still talk.' And Mr. Marshall said, 'No, we will start doing it by telex.' How stupid! How stupid, Mr. Speaker!

AN HON. MEMBER: Go on! You do not know anything about it.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I know what has happened and so do the people of Newfoundland know what has happened. The Premier decided that he would put the case in court and as soon as he had done that, we had lost it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you support the federal government against Newfoundlanders?

MR. HODDER: No, I do not, Mr. Speaker. I do not think anybody in Newfoundland, and I think the Board of Trade said something like that a very short time ago, if you read between the lines, would take sides one way or the other. Now, perhaps some people have on the basis of their arguments and their letters, but I have been here long enough to know that you cannot really get a story from that. The only thing I would say, and what Newfoundlanders are saying is get back and negotiate. That is what they are saying, 'You left the bargaining table. Get back there and negotiate.'

And then we had this stupid thing of putting the case in court, placing it in the court first on the mistaken idea that a court in this Province, whatever

May 9, 1983

Tape 1941

EC - 3

MR. HODDER: the rule of law was, would rule  
for Newfoundland. I mean, that had to be the mistaken  
assumption. But courts rule by the rule of



MR. HODDER:

law and always have, and there were certainly no precedents in the rule of law which stated that a federal state would give up its coastal waters. Now we did have some extra reasons but it was a very, very risky game when we took that case to the Supreme Court.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I had so much more to say. Would hon. gentlemen consider leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman lost his notes about fifteen or twenty minutes ago and he lost his speech. I congratulate the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and others who kept him alive by interjections. Otherwise I feel quite sure that the hon. gentleman would have disappeared below his bench looking for his notes, because he lost them and he was reading entirely by notes, He is still looking for them over there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has proposed a vote of nonconfidence, I will get on to his lack of appreciation with respect to negotiations, his lack of understanding of the offshore, his foolish little comments with respect to the drilling off Nova Scotia and what have you, but I want to dwell a little bit first of all on the nonconfidence motion that we are addressing ourselves to. It is the budget of this year, that

MR. MARSHALL: has been clarified, Mr. Speaker, to edification of the hon. gentleman there opposite, and he wants the House to regret the inability of the government to develop and present positive programmes to cope adequately with problems and that the House regrets that we do not have control over our public debt and he talks about various things and various shortcomings of this government. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the hon. gentleman, and he knows full well we know his stand with respect to offshore resources, marine resources and the fishery, to hydro power in Labrador and many other things. I would also liken his resolution to that of a hangman objecting because the neck of his subject is being twisted and stretched, because, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we have come down to here with the hon. gentlemen there opposite. Their stands are constantly against Newfoundland, and when Newfoundland or the government has not got the money that it may like to have to be able to cope with the varied needs of this Province, they get up and they bring in resolutions of this nature. If the hon. gentlemen would stand fast as Newfoundlanders and forget their petty little political stands and their constant support of the present government in Ottawa, we would be much further ahead in our quest to provide adequate services for the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, on March 17 of this year the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) delivered his budget speech. This was the earliest time in recent days for the rendering of the fiscal plans of the government, and, although there was a small deficit on current account forecasted, this budget represents, no matter what the hon. gentlemen there opposite may say, or certain vested interests outside this House, it represents a real achievement by a

MR. MARSHALL: responsible government.

All one needs to do, Mr. Speaker, is look at the budgets of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and other provinces to see that the minister in this case and the government, have achieved a really monumental accomplishment to bring this responsible budget in for this Province, a province whose revenue base is the lowest in Canada. And this is the responsible way in which this government carries on the business of the Province, this is why the credit rating remains the same.

MR. MARSHALL: Now I noted that the hon. gentleman there opposite referred in his speech, and this is the way the hon. gentlemen conduct debate from time to time, to Atlantic Business Outlook, a publication of the Conference Board of Canada and an article by Freda S. Ackerman condemning the situation with respect to the Atlantic Provinces, and he equated that to Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, just harken now. Hon. members of the House will remember, those who were not asleep, the words of the hon. gentleman, his great emphasis on that particular article. He did not read it all, Mr. Speaker, either because he had not read it all - somebody had written his speech for him - or if he had read the whole article, he did not want to bring this out. But I just quote the conclusion by this lady from Moody's with respect to the credit rating of the Atlantic Province. And in the Atlantic Provinces and Eastern Canada, as we all know, the credit rating of Nova Scotia has gone down, the credit rating of Quebec has gone down, the credit rating of New Brunswick is threatened, so what do they say? The analysis went on and said at the end, "It is hoped that the Atlantic Provinces will continue their responsible approaches to current economic conditions. Nova Scotia," she noted, "was the only Province to anticipate a reduced deficit this year." But its deficit, Mr. Speaker, is still to the tune of about \$180 million, I believe.

DR. COLLINS: \$230 million.

MR. MARSHALL: \$230 million, says the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), on current account as against our paltry little \$28 million. "Nova Scotia was the only Province to anticipate a reduced deficit this year."

MR. MARSHALL: And listen to this, Mr. Speaker, just listen to this. Why did not the hon. gentleman read this? 'And Newfoundland continues to exhibit satisfactory financial operation'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now this is the very same expert that the hon. gentleman was quoting in this House as condemning this particular government. This is the kind of misinformation that we get from the hon. gentleman there opposite, despite the fact that we have provided them with a great deal of help, research help and what have you. The hon. gentleman, I know, probably know this, but did not chose to bring it out.

The fact of the matter is Moody's, which is one of the leading rating agencies in North America, has said that this Province's position continues to be satisfactory. And all of that in the face of the bleak problems that are experienced in other Atlantic Provinces, in the entire Atlantic area, and all of that when you consider the low level of our revenue base in this Province, is quite an achievement indeed, Mr. Speaker, and one that all members on this side continue to be very proud of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now the reactions that the hon. gentleman has admitted from time to time, Mr. Speaker, in this House have, and others outside, certainly with respect to certain people outside, have been harsh. The budget has of necessity, because of this management-the necessity to provide adequate management, to provide for security for the future - had had certain restraints on it, and all segments of Newfoundland have been affected by these restraints.

MR. MARSHALL: They were necessary imperatives, as I say, if the general interest and future of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians were to be protected. And notwithstanding, though, the justification of these restraints brought about by the general factors evident to all beyond this government's control, the direct application of budgetary measures to certain groups, particularly in the education and health fields were vehemently criticized. The teachers' strike was one example of the difficulty which we are experiencing in having made certain segments accept the realities of the present financial situation as it applies to them specifically. It is certainly not my intention here to go into a debate on the details of the positions taken during that strike, Mr. Speaker. The matter has been settled and through the accepted process of collective bargaining, a process, which I have to draw to attention, was a process that was conferred upon the teachers and other public service sectors of this Province by the initiatives and votes of many persons in the government itself. However, I am not able to let this opportunity pass, Mr. Speaker - perhaps somebody might advise the hon. gentlemen in our own common room that we would like to have quiet. I am not about to let this opportunity pass, Mr. Speaker, without commenting upon what I deem to be an unfortunate happening during the strike.

This relates to charges levied, particularly by certain elements in the NTA, certainly not all of them but certain ones of them, to the effect that the Premier of this Province is a dictator and from this flows allegations of arrogance and inability to negotiate and what have you, and we heard it time and time again.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, and I am sure that all members of the Cabinet and

MR. MARSHALL: and members of the caucus will agree, but I can state for myself would the Premier were more of a dictator than he was. Because then, Mr. Speaker, we would not be faced with the interminable and the continuous and the repeated meetings that we have from time to time of Planning and Priorities, the Cabinet, the caucus, the Social Policy Committees and the Resource Policy Committees. It happens to be a fact, Mr. Speaker, that in 1982 there were in the vicinity of about eighty to ninety meetings of the Planning and Priorities Committee. For the first quarter of this year there have been approximately thirty meetings, which would translate again to

MR. MARSHALL:

ninety meetings. During the teachers' strike itself, after every session of this House for one whole week there was a Cabinet meeting convened, and there were always full caucuses convened. Mr. Speaker, I know it is customary for some people who do not get their own way and cannot realize their aspirations, and certainly we would like to see everybody in this Province realize their aspirations, but it has not been unknown for individuals and groups, from time immemorial, when they cannot get what they want — shall we put it that way? — to brand the person or the group that is denying it is to them as being dictatorial. Mr. Speaker.

I have to observe that I think that was a rather unfortunate attitude or unfortunate position to be taken by certain elements, certainly not all of them, but certain elements in the NTA, because it is completely without foundation.

Mr. Speaker, does it sound like the act of a dictator to confer to the fullest possible extent and frequently with his colleagues in the Cabinet, in the caucus? I have indicated to you the number of Cabinet meetings last year, the number can be gotten, but certainly they were in the vicinity of sixty or seventy — Planning and Priorities ninety; myriad Social Policy and Resource Policy meetings — and that does not count the caucus meetings and it does not count the times when the Premier himself has conferred individually with groups of people. If you want to use another instance, Mr. Speaker, does it sound like a dictatorial attitude to confer with fishermen, the Fishermen's Union, companies, banks, the federal government,



MR. MARSHALL: municipalities and every interested party before preparing the Province's responsible replies on the fisheries, which has partially come before the people of this Province and will come forth in more detail in the future? Does it sound, once again, Mr. Speaker, like the action of one-man government to insist, as he did, that negotiations with respect to the offshore be conducted on the basis of collective involvement by all of his colleagues? And that is a matter of record as well, Mr. Speaker, as to that position. So in talking in this budget debate, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one observation, and the fact is that here we have what I think to be an energetic, intelligent but, most of all, a collective leadership in this Province. It is not the leadership of one man, Mr. Speaker, in this Province. That would not be acceptable by any persons in the caucus, least of all the Premier himself, and certainly anybody in the Cabinet.

MR. WARREN: What about the Minister of  
RAND (Mr. Goudie)?

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentlemen there opposite are not used to this, but we just do not happen to have, no matter what may be indicated by the hon. gentlemen there opposite or certain people outside whose aspirations we cannot satisfy, we do not have a government based upon personalities. We have a government, Mr. Speaker, that is based upon policy, and for the first time this Province, Mr. Speaker, is getting consistent leadership and a leadership whole basis is attempting to change the course and direction of the Province. Whenever there is any change it is based, as I say, completely on policies, and whenever there is any ingrained change there is always going to be opposition, and we are always going to get opposition from the elements in society whose vested interest, in many cases, is to maintain the status quo. That is in effect what we are seeing in many instances, Mr. Speaker, coupled with, of course, the legitimate problem of the lack of resources and the problem of being able to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of certain people and certain groups.

Now, there are many things that we are trying to do in this Province that are self-evident. One of the things is to maintain, under very difficult circumstances, a balanced budget and a firm financial basis for the Province, to protect the future of this Province and to protect the young people of this Province. That is one thing, there are many others, but if I were going to denote one of the major policies of this government, one of its major aims and aspirations, I would think it would be to see that this Province takes its rightful position and place in the Canadian Confederation as an equal province with other provinces of Canada.

MR. MARSHALL:

In the past we have tended to be very acquiescent with respect to this and this has done inestimable harm.

The idea from the people who have dealings with us outside borders of this Province is that we could be bought, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, I think sometimes in the past, in fact, we have to admit it to ourselves, that we have been bought and we have been bought by transfer payments and equalization payments and we have been satisfied to accept that. We have been content to accept what Ottawa is ultimately going to offer.- we know when we go up this is what they are ultimately going to offer- and this is what has been accepted time and time again in the past.

MR. MARSHALL: Negotiations of our rights, our real rights when successive governments used to go to Ottawa from time to time, were merely carried on as a charade. They would go up there with bluster and they would go up there with rhetoric and they were going to get their deserts, but, because of the financial conditions that we have been in since 1949, eventually what happened at every given time was they would give in and, in effect, they would accept what Ottawa had to offer. The net result of this, Mr. Speaker, has been continuous and increasing equalization and welfare payments, and I say that this is a tragedy, and it is particularly a tragedy in a Province that is endowed so greatly with the resources which we have. That is why I get so mad when I see the hon. gentlemen there opposite bringing in resolutions of this nature, regretting their perception of the government bringing in a positive programme to cope adequately with the problems and concerns of the people of Newfoundland or regretting the amount of the public debt. The reasons why we fall short in these, Mr. Speaker, is purely and simply because we are a Province that has our resources, we want to share our resources with the rest of Canada, but we want a fair share of our own resources ourselves. And you do not have to look very far, Mr. Speaker, before you can see the sorry results of our own history, this history, as I say, of acquiescence, of going up to Ottawa, telling the people of the Province that you are going to negotiate, going through the charade of negotiation and, eventually, just merely being content with a future of equalization and transfer payments. We have seen that. It is vivid before the hon. gentleman's face. You can see it once again - and I know the hon. gentleman may be tired of hearing it but it has to be said again and again - you can see it with respect to the Upper Churchill contract and that

MR. MARSHALL: translates into some \$600 million this year that are flowing not into the pockets of the people of this Province but into pockets elsewhere while we derive a paltry \$10 million to \$12 million at the very most. We see it in the fisheries, Mr. Speaker. The Premier and the government took, within the last year or two years, a very, very strong position with respect to the Northern cod stocks of this Province. And while we want to share, and we can share abundantly with other provinces, we see fish go into the Province of Nova Scotia and we are told that fish plants in this Province have to close because of lack of supply of fish.

MR. WARREN: And fish going over to Spain.

MR. MARSHALL: And fish going over to Spain - Nova Scotia and Spain and foreign allocations and what have you. But this is what I am saying, that comes completely under the control of the federal government. We get accused of confrontation when we stand up and speak for the people of Newfoundland, because this government would lose its very being in the future, and I am sure it will not - would never,

MR. MARSHALL: ever be content to go to Ottawa and take the crumbs that Ottawa gives out by way of equalization and transfer payments. Not that we are not grateful for equalization and transfer payments, it is a great concept and all the rest of it, but we have a vested right, as well as other Canadian provinces have, to contribute to the equalization and the transfer payments of other provinces which we would do ourselves gladly in the future. But the point of the matter is we become so hung up on these things that we have given away completely our independence. We have shown that we are prepared to give away the independence of being able to direct our economic activity within the Canadian Confederation and now we see more and more of our resources slipping away from us.

The same thing presents itself now with respect to the offshore. The hon. gentleman's speech there opposite before he sat down shows exactly what the Liberal government and the Liberal Party would do with respect to the offshore. Let there be no doubt about it, exactly the same psychology, he would give it away. He looks at Nova Scotia and he comes up with what is really an unintelligent position for the hon. gentleman to take. And that is the fact that Nova Scotia is now getting all of the exploration up there and he is afraid that there is going to be a find in Nova Scotia before there is a find in Newfoundland. He does not know about seismic studies. He does not mention anything about the prospects up there and what have you. But his whole way, the whole tenor of his speech, and I am afraid that this is so, is that he would give it away immediately in the interests of the short-term jobs, as the Churchill Falls, the Upper Churchill, indicated. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, he would give it away because once more he would think that Newfoundlanders

MR. MARSHALL: should know their place and accept their place in Confederation as has been dictated over the past thirty years, which is really to be given nothing more and be able to look forward to nothing more than welfare payments and equalization.

MR. HISCOCK: I would like to know where we would be without Confederation.

MR. MARSHALL: 'I would like to know where we would be without Confederation,' That is not the issue, Mr. Speaker. What I am talking about is Newfoundland taking its proper position in Confederation. And one of the reasons why it has not in the past taken its position in Confederation is the type of attitude that is emitted by the hon. gentlemen there opposite and particularly the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) who just interjected.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are determined in this government that we are going to reverse this trend, and it is a pretty hard trend to reverse because they are used, as I say, year after year after year of Newfoundlanders going up, going into the offices of the federal government, rolling up their sleeves and coming away with, as I say, their transfer payments and their welfare payments. Now, we are going to use every means we possibly can - we are not going to stop, we are not going to desist - to see that these are achieved. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, this will be achieved through negotiation and through understanding. We have attempted to do this and we shall not cease to attempt to do it. When I hear people talking about 'We should negotiate,' they just do not know the history of the situation, they do not know the fact that, for instance, in the offshore that we have negotiated.

MR. MARSHALL: We negotiated to the degree - it needs to be repeated again - that we achieved an agreement. It was an agreement that was good for Canada, it was also good for Newfoundland, but once again the elements that are up there in Ottawa, who feel that we are no different from any other government and we will ultimately accept what they are prepared to give us, had sway, and that agreement, which had been forged together very carefully and with a lot of specific details, has been denied us, but I will say it is only denied us temporarily.

Our detractors tried to say with respect to this government too, and it is all incidental to some of the statements that were made by the Executive of the NTA, it comes out from the hon. gentlemen there opposite, that we do not know how to negotiate, the government does not know how to negotiate, the Premier does not know how to negotiate. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is very curious about a government led by a Premier who managed to get the affirmative action clauses in the constitution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: How did they get in? They did not get in because of any superior power on our part. They were placed in the constitution for the benefit of the people of this Province and here we have it, Subsections 2 and 3, 'Do not preclude any law, programme or activity that has as its object the amelioration in a province of conditions of individuals in that province who are socially or economically disadvantaged, if the rate of employment in that province is below the rate of employment in Canada.'

So, Mr. Speaker, how did that get in? It did not get in because of any superior power on the part of Newfoundland. It did not get in from confrontation or what have you, but it got in through good, hard negotiation



MR. MARSHALL: conducted by the Premier of this Province. And if anything shows the capacity of this government to negotiate, certainly that clause in the constitution evidences it.

What about, Mr. Speaker, ERCO and the revision of the ERCO contract? And what about the revision of the Bowater and the Price contracts in very, very difficult times? Now for the first time in our history we took a contract and we rectified that contract so that today ERCO makes a positive contribution rather than a very negative contribution to the economy of this Province. A lot of credit goes to ERCO with respect to it, but I would say a lot of credit goes to this administration for sitting down and negotiating it. If the people in the federal government had the same attitude as the people in Albright and Wilson and the people from ERCO, we would have a deal on the offshore and we would have been able to deliver a deal that was positive.

There seems to be an impression around as well from people who do not get what they want,

MR. MARSHALL:

who think that the government is not negotiating if they do not give everything away, right up to giving everything away in order to satiate their own interests. Now you can only do that so much, Mr. Speaker, obviously. There is only so much to give. It is not the money of the government, the government has no money. Where does the money come from? It is the people's money, it is not the government's money.

Leaving the teachers aside, when I hear Mr. Burnell, probably with all sorts of good intentions, and Dr. Guy of the Medical Association, getting on the air and equating that the medical facilities in this Province need x millions of dollars more, I say to them that you just cannot equate things to need. You have got to go further and what you have got to do in order to be really responsible, you cannot just sit back and say, 'The government has got to get the money to provide it', there has got to be a realization amongst the leaders in our community that the money does not come from the government, it happens to come from the people, Mr. Speaker, and the people of this Province are giving as much money as they possibly can by way of taxes. As a matter of fact, they are giving more abundantly by way of taxes than any other citizen in Canada and there is just so much that can be squeezed out of them and there is no more to squeeze. As a matter of fact, what has got to be done as soon as possible is to give them a transfusion and give some of that money back.

Now, the only way that we are going to be able to do that, Mr. Speaker, and let there be no doubt about this as well, is to get control of our resources. Money comes from the people or it comes from royalties from our resource. And here we have a situation where we have the highest per capita debt, we have the lowest per

MR. MARSHALL: capita income, we have the highest taxes and we have proportionately the greatest resources of any province of Canada. And with the greatest resources that we have, these great resources, look, compare the revenue that we are getting today with respect to them; compare what we are getting from the great hydro resources in Labrador, compare what we will get out there in Hibernia if the federal government has its way. The hon. gentleman stand on his feet and say that he is for concrete platforms and all of this all he wants, but he knows full well that in a year or two time he may well be up here justifying the federal government building floating platforms, and you know where they will float from, they will float from the Eastern shore of Quebec or they will float in from Nova Scotia, and he will be sitting here, still with his brave words and saying, 'We need concrete platforms. Yes, boy, I am all for concrete platforms'. But where are they and where are the jobs for the Newfoundlanders? I just cannot understand.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to emphasize here, and the people talk about confrontation and they can say what they like, there are no charades for us. We go up and we stand for the interests of the people of Newfoundland. We are determined that the people of Newfoundland are going to get a fair shake out of Confederation, it becomes very, very difficult when you look at the performance in the past of people who were prepared to accept equalization and transfer payments, no matter what their brave words may be - but we are completely and absolutely dedicated to that

MR. MARSHALL:

I remember during the offshore talks

I do not think the federal government yet realized our intent with respect to the offshore, when they were dealing with us. The gentleman there opposite talks about there being no need to move away, 'He should sit down with Mr. Chretien and talk with him.' He ignores the fact that I sat down with Mr. Chretien twice after there was a reversal by the federal officials, and told him that this just was not going to fly and he would have to get his officials back on track and he would have to get into a position where he was going to deliver what he promised to deliver to me as a representative of the government. So what I think really happened there, Mr. Speaker, is during the course of one of the talks with either him or his right-hand man, the permanent person - and I was very exercised over the fact that I had to call them down from Ottawa to tell them that the thing was off the track - I said to either one or the other, 'Look, you had better just understand something, that we are not going to accept anything less than we have put on the table already. We have given you our bottom line and do not think for one moment that we are going to go back and go through a charade and try to use our own majority and our own popularity in the Province to sell an agreement that we know would not be favourable to the people of Newfoundland, would be a sell-out to the young people of Newfoundland and would not be good for us. We will sell nothing less than the bottom line that I agreed upon with you in the negotiations and do not try to get us below that bottom line.'

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the things that really happened is that they just did not believe that and you cannot blame them for not believing it.

MR. MARSHALL: Because time and time again, Mr. Speaker, Governments of Newfoundland have gone up to Ottawa with cap in hand and have accepted whatever Ottawa would put out to them. And this is not what we are about, it is not what we will accept. We insist upon the rights of the people of Newfoundland and, as such, some people might think we are confrontationalists. Well, if that makes us confrontationalists, to advance the interests of the people of Newfoundland, sobeit, we will continue to confront. We will continue to confront and ask people to negotiate in good faith, sincerely, on a reasonable basis, and then eventually we will be able to take our rightful place in Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I just wanted to make these points. It is sort of ludicrous when you see a responsible gentleman get up in this debate - now, I do not want to derogate him, I suppose everyone can make a mistake - who first of all starts off with a non-confidence motion on last year's budget. That indicates the concentration powers of the individual. They have the consummate gall to get up and bring in "regrets the inability of the government to develop positive programmes and to cope adequately with the problems of the people of Newfoundland." He tries to quote an article by Freda Ackerman in the Conference Board of Canada, but in quoting it, Mr. Speaker, he does not quote the last page of it, the conclusion,

MR. MARSHALL: which says that "Newfoundland continues to exhibit satisfactory financial operations!" So, you know, you would like to ask the hon. gentleman what is his game, why the hon. gentleman did not quote that when he was using it as a basis of condemnation. You know, the hon. gentleman there gets up - I mean, I could go on and on and on - and he talks about the offshore. In talking about the offshore he talks about the courts. He rehashes the usual old jargon of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) about taking the matter to court and the rule of law and all the rest of it. Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman there is a large body of legal opinion, a very respective legal opinion, who believe that the judgement that was rendered by the court was in error. Now, he might look aghast at that and say, 'Oh, you are not going to accept the decision of the court'. It is one thing to accept the decision of the court, Mr. Speaker, but none of us are puppets and we are all entitled at any given time to say when we believe that a decision is in error that it is in error, so we have appealed it to another court. And if, Mr. Speaker, it so happens that the other court does not, we will still say they were in error because, Mr. Speaker, we have the right, we have the vested right, to receive -

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

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): A point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, in relation to the Government House Leader's (Mr. Marshall) remarks, I also did not point out that retail sales tax is Newfoundland's principal source of revenue, accounting for 18 per cent of total revenues. Mr. Speaker, that is 18 per cent of the total source of revenue. Mr. Speaker, if anything demonstrates government on the backs of the poor, that figure is the amount that this Province, the Province which brings in a budget

MR. HODDER: whereby 18 per cent of the principal source of revenue, the highest in the country, is in retail sales tax, does not show much for the government generating revenue. What they do is take it off the backs of the people who are worse off. And, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is making a speech.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! Order, please!  
Does the hon. member have a point of order?

MR. HODDER: I do, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it clearly shows why the rating agency thought that they were doing a pretty good job, they are raising the money on the backs of the poor of the Province.

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

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, he compounds it. First of all he does not quote accurately what was in the report, he does not quote fully what was in the report; now he gets up with a great thrust at us as if we did not know that we had the highest retail sales tax in Canada. That is just the point, Mr. Speaker, that we are making. The point is we would have a much lower retail sales tax if we got a half decent break on the resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. gentleman wants to debate it, you see, I have access to my notes a little bit quicker than the hon. gentleman. But here you go, if the hon. gentleman wants to debate it, retail sales tax this year is \$340 million. The hon. gentleman's friends in Ottawa continue to allow \$600 million to escape from this Province from the Upper Churchill contract because we never got a fair deal then. Let us ask what would happen, Mr. Speaker, so we could reduce the retail sales tax theoretically to nothing and we could give a retail bonus to people rather than put on a sales tax. If the hon. gentleman wants to debate it let him debate a little bit more as well when he talks with respect to the offshore. With respect to the offshore, the agreement in principle was 75 per cent of the total government take, the total government revenues to the Province until we realize certain goals, one of which was to have a retail sales tax equal to the average of other Canadians.

So, if the hon. gentleman wants to participate in public debate, I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should get more publicly informed than he is



MR. MARSHALL: with respect to it. What a revelation, Mr. Speaker! The Province of Newfoundland has the highest retail sales tax in Canada. That is what this debate is all about, Mr. Speaker. That is why this government is trying to get a fair deal within the Canadian Confederation and will not cease until it gets that fair deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we will not do it with the support of the hon. gentlemen. If all of the hon. gentlemen there opposite were over in France in the 1940s there would be a good name for them. They would be known and they would find good company in the people who are called the quislings of this world because that is what they are right now, Mr. Speaker. He gets up and he quotes from sources like Moody's to suit himself, does not quote it fully and then gets up on that little arcane little point which is the whole thrust that this government is on.

I have other words for the hon. gentleman if he turns up tomorrow, Mr. Speaker. So I move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Well, to give the hon. gentleman time to collect himself, Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

May 9, 1983

QUESTION 47: ORDERS OF THE DAY 9/83 March 21, 1983

QUESTION: Mr. Hodder (Port au Port):

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) the number of individuals hired in the past four years on a contractual basis.
- (b) How many of these individuals are still employed on a contractual basis?
- (c) How many are now permanent employees?
- (d) What Department of Government are these people presently employed?

ANSWER:

- (a) 2
- (b) 1
- (c)- The second individual referred to in (a) acquired a permanent position in another department.
  - The contractual position was made permanent when it was vacated and was recruited through the Public Service Commission.
- (d) Department of Finance

It should be noted that the information provided only covers contractual positions hired for work in the Department of Finance.

Information on contractual positions in other departments should be referred to the Individual departments or to Treasury Board.

QUESTION #4: ORDERS OF THE DAY 13/83 - March 25, 1983

QUESTION: Mr. Hodder (Port au Port):

To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

A list of estimated expenditure for 1982-83, and 1983-84 showing actual expenditure for 1982-83, detailing what firms or individuals were contracted in that fiscal year, and what firms or individuals will be contracted for the forthcoming fiscal year, by item and expenditure.

ANSWER:

<u>FIRM/INDIVIDUAL</u>	<u>REASON</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>1983-84</u>
Royal Trust Company	To manage the Province's Pooled Pension Fund Investment.	104,000	112,000
Wm. M. Mercer Ltd.	To administer the Province's various pension plans.	98,200	120,000
Nfld. & Labrador Computer Services Ltd.	To provide professional computer services for the Province's Pension Plans.	231,600	378,200
D. F. Lunnen Ltd.	Engaged to review Federal Sales Tax paid by the Province which could be recovered. Payments to Lunnen were offset by like amount which were credited to revenue.	42,200	-
Leonard Clarke	To conduct system studies and assist in the development of the new Financial Management Information System.	38,600	38,600

It should be noted that the information provided only covers contractual arrangements for work in the Department of Finance.

Information on contractual work in other departments should be referred to the individual departments or to Treasury Board.

Answer to Question #106 on the Order Paper of  
April 18th., 1983:

Question:

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable  
the Premier to lay upon the Table of the House the  
following information:

- (a) What is the estimated out-migration of  
Newfoundlanders to other provinces of  
Canada during the calendar year 1982?
- (b) How does this estimate compare with  
that for the years 1979, 1980 and 1981?

Answer:

(a) The out-migration of Newfoundlanders to  
other provinces during 1982 was 13,600.

(b) As one can see the figures fluctuate  
slightly from year to year. 1980 showed a decrease  
in out-migration as compared to 1979. 1981 showed an  
increase as compared with 1980 and 1982 shows a  
decrease when compared with 1981.

The figures for each year are:

<u>Calendar year</u>	<u>Out-migration</u>
1979	13,200
1980	12,500
1981	14,300
1982	13,600