

VOL. 3

NO. 27

THIRD SESSION OF THE  
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
MONDAY, APRIL 30, 1984

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

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

MR.MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before we get into the ordinary routine of business today, I would like to rise to express an expression of sympathy on behalf of the House to the family of the late Irving Fogwill who passed away over the Easter break. Mr. Fogwill is a well know Newfoundlander. He had been connected with the Workers' Compensation Board originally and I believe had been the original architect of that legislation. He had also been very prominent in the labour movement in this Province and many other provincial and community affairs. So on behalf of the government I would like to propose that a vote of sympathy be extended to the bereaved family.

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

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I join with the Government House Leader (Mr.Marshall) in paying tribute to a distinguished Newfoundlander, Mr. Irving Fogwill who passed away during the Easter recess of the House. I believe he was 82 years of age. My hon. friend there opposite rightly pointed out that Fogwill, the late Mr. Fogwill was a prominent labour organizer and labour leader in the 1930s and in the 1940s who helped form, by the way, the Newfoundland Federation of Labour in 1937. In 1946 the late Mr.

MR. NEARY: Fogwill was very active in the Confederation issue and helped in two referendums which eventually saw Newfoundlanders and Labradorians freely choose to join the Canadian Confederation. After 1949, when we did become a Province of Canada, I suppose you could say that the late Mr. Fogwill was the architect of the Workers' Compensation legislation, the Workers' Compensation Board in this Province and he was Chairman of that Board for seventeen years.

The late Mr. Fogwill will well known in the literary world and published several books of poetry. So I would like to join with my friend there opposite in having a message of sympathy and condolences go out to the bereaved family from this House.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you would expect after the Easter recess that the Premier and the ministers would be gung-ho, would be back in their seats, shirt sleeves rolled up, coats off, ready to tackle the problems of this Province. And here today we come into this House with questions to the Premier and to the ministers and, lo and behold,

MR. NEARY: we find they are not in their seats, they are absent from the House, and we do not know now whom to direct these important questions to that we have to put to the ministers.

MR. HODDER: Twelve ministers missing.

MR. NEARY: Twelve ministers are missing, Mr. Speaker, and this is shameful!

MR. ROBERTS: You should ask where they all are.

MR. NEARY: No, under the rules, I suppose, we cannot ask that, we cannot go down through the individual ministers. But I would like to start out, and, you know, I regret to have to do this, but I suppose I could bounce a few questions off the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

MR. ROBERTS: You are starting with the bottom, are you?

MR. TULK: They are all down South, I suppose, boy.

MR. NEARY: I do not know if they are down South or not.

The number one problem that we have in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is high unemployment and job creation. It is the number one problem facing the people of this Province, it is the number one issue in this Province today.

I would like for the hon. gentleman to tell the House, over the Easter recess, what plans did the administration formulate to deal with the horrendous state of the Newfoundland economy, created by the mismanagement of gentlemen there opposite; and what extraordinary plans does the administration have to create jobs in this Province and to stimulate the Newfoundland and Labrador economy?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I refuse to be motivated to anger by the hon. gentleman. The fact of the matter is, after hearing that long harangue for about three or four minutes, make no wonder that certain people are not here in the House, make no wonder that any of us would not be here in the House if that is the same type of question, generalisms, that the hon. gentleman is going to ask.

I can tell the hon. gentleman that most of the ministers are off on business of the government and most of them have not been able to get in. There are a lot of Newfoundlanders who have not been able to get in, those who have been outside St. John's, because of the weather conditions.

I will respond to the hon. gentleman's question. Does he want me to go on for about an hour and tell the hon. gentlemen what this Province is doing? Shall I motivate the hon. gentleman to his feet again?

MR. NEARY: You could get it on the head of a pin.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, policies are well-known, our resource policies are well-known; there is the offshore. I would ask the hon. gentleman what the hon. gentleman is doing with respect to securing a fair deal on the offshore for the people of the Province of Newfoundland. I hope, Mr. Speaker, he is doing a little bit better than the hon. gentleman's reported activity. He visited Ottawa, we are told, over the Easter holidays and what did he go up to do? He is now going up to beg them to secure the Terms of Union. I heard reported on CBC today, the announcer was almost in triumphant terms, that Mr. Neary, lo and behold, is the saviour of the Newfoundland railway. He was up, Mr. Speaker, and there was good news CBC told us today, that Mr. Neary had it assured that the Newfoundland railway was going to continue in Newfoundland. Now, is that not great stuff. Mr. Speaker? The hon. gentleman has the consummate gall to go up to the people who took the passenger service away from us, who attempted to downgrade the railway here, who forced this Province to put money into the synchrolift. Never before has any province of Canada had to finance a federal Crown Corporation. Now we are told that now he is delighted because Ottawa is not going to make the final act of savagery on this Province by completely tearing up the Terms of Union, because, as everyone knows, the railway is a part of the Terms of Union. But the hon. gentleman there opposite is delighted and glad. His contribution after the Easter holidays is to come back and tell us, 'No, the railway is not going to be closed.' And we are supposed to be grateful, Mr. Speaker. That is what he does for economic development.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing, we are doing the same things as we have been doing since 1979; we have been asserting the rights of the people of this Province to their resources, We have not gone cap in hand to

MR. MARSHALL: Ottawa as the hon. gentleman always has and obviously is still doing as a result of his sojourn to Ottawa over the Easter holidays. We have been attempting to get the enjoyment of the resources of this Province to the same degree as other provinces have; we have taken actions with respect to the deep-sea fishery that he is aware of; we have taken actions on the West Coast, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) is very active in the situation in Corner Brook with Bowater; we have taken action in the

MR. MARSHALL:

Burin Peninsula, where Grand Bank now would be closed but for the actions of this government, where Burin would be closed but for the actions of this government, where St. Lawrence, we hope, is going to be opened again by the actions of this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: We have taken actions, we are monitoring very carefully what has occurred in the Western portion of the Province, in Labrador City, the fishery, the offshore, and hydro development. We are attempting to regain what the hon. gentlemen there opposite gave away in hydro development. So, Mr. Speaker, it goes on and on and on. What we are doing, we are asserting the rights of the Province of Newfoundland. We are not going up like little lapdogs, like the hon. gentleman does, begging Ottawa not to take away vested rights under the constitution; what we are is calmly asserting the rights of the people of this Province to the resources. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the Premier is engaged in that action right now; he is enroute to Gander, he is to speak tomorrow in Halifax. I have to report to the hon. gentlemen there opposite, I know it will be to their great disappointment, that his first address given with respect to the offshore in Moncton was greeted very positively and had very positive results, got a lot of people talking about the rights of the Province of Newfoundland, got a very distinguished member of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on!

MR. MARSHALL: - the Economic Council of Canada coming out and saying, 'I do not see why Newfoundland should not be given the same rights as the rest of Canada.' Now, Mr. Speaker, if a member of the Economic Council of Canada can make statement like that, why cannot the Leader of the



MR. MARSHALL: Opposition (Mr. Neary)? Why must the Leader of the Opposition disgrace us all of the time by going up, crawling on his knees to Ottawa and asking them to save the railway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman obviously has given up on attacking me on the Senate appointment, now he is using different strategy today since that one did not work. Now he is going to attack me for trying to save the Newfoundland railway. Well, I hope the hon. gentleman now will come along behind me, like a little cracky yapping at my heels, and support my crusade to try to save the Newfoundland railway and get a commitment from the Government of Canada that the railway is here to stay because, as hon. members know, it was only a five year plan to revitalize the railway and that five years will be up next March. We should lobby now to save the railway.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the hon. gentleman failed to put forward any plans or suggestions or recommendations or ideas in his answer to improve economic conditions in this Province and to create jobs. Hon. members are aware that we have the highest unemployment in Canada, we have record unemployment, high taxes, vandalism and violent crime, rising abortion rates, breakdowns in the family unit and an ever-increasing cost of living and electricity rates. Now would the hon. gentleman get up man-fashion and tell the House what plans, what extraordinary plans -

MR. SIMMS: Do you expect to ask a question like that and get a short answer?

MR. NEARY: No. - Mr. Speaker, what extraordinary plans does the government have to create employment this Summer, badly needed employment? Would the hon. gentleman also tell us, when he is on his feet, what has happened to the 40,000 jobs that the Premier promised to the people of this Province? The people believed him when he made that promise. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what has happened to the five year plan to create 40,000 new jobs in this Province?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman talks about me attacking him on the Senate. I thought I was complimenting him, you know, I thought this was his ambition. I mean, I will repeat it again, the fact of the matter is that a distinguished Senator, Senator Cook, is retiring in June and I fully expect this to be the last sitting for the hon. gentleman in this House. He only says it because I am the only one, you see, in this House who is promoting him for a position in the Senate, because I understand that other members in the Opposition are trying to get it from him anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So I hope, Mr. Speaker, yes, I hope the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) gets to the Senate. And he better get there quickly, because the Liberal Leadership is in June and I know that they are thinking of other things other than the Senate appointment, but if they think a little bit further to the East, which they never think, one of the leadership candidates might just make it a plank in his platform to appoint the hon. Leader of the Opposition to the Senate. And I am sure that would have reverberations not only in Newfoundland, everyone would love to see the hon. gentleman go to the Senate -

MR. SIMMS: No, that is not true.

MR. MARSHALL: - I am sure, through all of Canada itself.

MR. MARSHALL:

So what was the hon. gentleman's question, Mr. Speaker? What was his question? His question was what are we going to do? Mr. Speaker, I suggest the hon. gentleman look at the budget given by the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Here we have a Province which has the greatest amount of resources perhaps of any Province of Canada but yet it does not enjoy these resources, it enjoys them less than any other Province of Canada. It has the highest per capita debt, the lowest per capita income, yet it has the highest taxes, it has the lowest revenue base in all of Canada. Yet, Mr. Speaker, if he looks at that budget he will find plenty of actions taken by this government for the purpose of employment. For example, what about the roads programme? There is a very substantial roads programme that has been budgeted this year which is going to employ a considerable number of people. The fisheries is underway, The new company is underway, and we are doing everything we can with respect to the fishing industry apart from the new super company. If the hon. gentleman wants to look at the budget he will find many instances there where we have guaranteed independent processors and doing everything to foster the fishing industry, so there are going to be jobs there. If the hon. gentleman wants to look at this budget, he will see that the government of this Province, with minimal resources, have done a more than credible job in providing jobs to the people of this Province. I remind the hon. gentleman that we could do a lot more if we had control of our resources, which is what the whole question is about, and is what distinguishes the government from the Opposition, is the reason why the government had some

MR. MARSHALL: forty-five members-it had;  
it has forty-four now that the unelected Liberal  
crossed over the House, but we had forty-five elected  
on this side, and only seven on the other side  
and that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why we will continue  
in power in the future.

MR. SIMMS: A good answer. A good answer.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the first part of  
the hon. gentleman's remarks had to do again with the  
Senate appointment, I would say that is wishful thinking.  
The fact that hon. gentlemen would like to see this my  
last sitting of the House is wishful thinking and Tory  
propaganda. They would love that, Mr. Speaker. If there  
is any member they would be glad to get rid of in this  
House it is me.

Now, Mr. Speaker, instead of hon.  
gentlemen talking about controlling resources, they should  
talk about controlling

MR. NEARY: their senses and their tempers if we want to get anything done. They have spent the last ten or twelve years in opposition. They could control their thinking first, Mr. Speaker, before they start about controlling anything else.

Let me ask the hon. gentleman a couple of specific questions about projects. What about the Trans-Labrador Highway? How much work and how many jobs will be created this Summer as a result of a continuation of the Trans-Labrador Highway? We know the people in Labrador West are pretty angry with the Premier for the letter he sent down saying that it would take two years to do an environmental impact study from Ross Point, I believe it is, down to Goose Bay. There will be a delay of two years and that makes the people of Labrador pretty angry.

MR. TULK: Even the minister from Labrador (Mr. Goudie) is pretty upset about it.

MR. NEARY: And the minister from Labrador is probably upset about that, too.

What about the Trans-Labrador Highway? And, Mr. Speaker, what about the transmission lines down toward the Strait of Belle Isle from Labrador? What about that? Will that be started this year? And could the hon. gentleman be a little more specific on the road building this year? Are there any agreements in place with the Government of Canada to carry out any of these road projects that the hon. gentleman is talking about? And what about new business and industry? What about the aluminum smelter that we heard so much about? And when the hon. gentleman is on his feet let him also tell this House, while we have the time and there are no ministers in their seats to answer any other questions, how many young people will be employed by the government, Summer employment, this coming

MR. NEARY: Summer? And how will they be hired? Will it be done in the same old way as it has been done in the past, it is not what you know but whom you know? Is that the way people will be hired this coming Summer, Mr. Speaker, under the government's Summer employment programmes? Will the hon. gentleman answer some of these questions?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Is he finished? I was not looking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, to get back to his first topic, the Senate, he loves talking about the Senate because that advertises, you see -

MR. NEARY: No, you do.

MR. MARSHALL: - it will get reported in the press and somebody will pick it up. Now, the hon. gentleman loves it, and we love hearing it, but there is one person who obviously does not; we drove the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) out of the House when we spoke of him getting the Senate seat.

The trans-Labrador

Highway: He asked about -

MR. YOUNG: Tell him Mel Woodward is going to build it.

MR. MARSHALL: - the Trans-Labrador Highway.

I tell the hon. gentleman there would not have been any start on the Trans-Labrador Highway but for the insistence of this government in its negotiations of agreements with Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: This government is determined that the Trans-Labrador Highway will become a reality and will continue to do everything it possibly can to see that that comes about.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman having the consummate gall to get up and ask about a transmission line! Here is the hon. gentleman who participated in the give-away in Labrador -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - which would have provided the very wherewithal to provide for not only transmission lines, but roads and industries and everything else to develop Labrador as it should and will be developed in the future. What does the hon. gentleman expect, to build a transmission line through Labrador when you do not have a secure source of power? Why does not the hon. gentleman, when he gets up and talks about the transmission line, address and express the indignation that all Newfoundlanders should feel at the decision of the National Energy Board, which denied us the right to get power from the Province of Quebec because we did not have the transmission line built? I ask the National Energy Board and the member for LaPoile, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), how does anyone expect a transmission line to be built if you do not have a source of power guaranteed? How possibly, Mr. Speaker, could anyone contemplate building



MR. MARSHALL: a transmission line without having a source of power? And, of course, that source of power is there, the only problem is that it has been given away. It is the power of the Upper Churchill.

MR. SIMMS: Tell us about the give-away.

MR. MARSHALL: And, you know, instead of asking questions like that, why does not the hon. gentleman, like a Newfoundlander and a Labradorian, get up and face the issues as they are? If we did not have creatures, Mr. Speaker, like the hon. gentleman, crawling around the landscape in this Province, we would probably be further ahead. He just asks questions of this particular nature, no depth to them, no substance whatsoever! Imagine the gall to get up in the people's House and ask about the building of a transmission line! Now, why would he build a transmission line? What does he want it for, to hang dirty clothes out on?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Because that is the only use he could have for a transmission line, as a result of the policies of the hon. gentlemen and their friends in Ottawa and the National Energy Board, the whole bunch of them. So imagine the hon. gentleman getting up and talking about a transmission line!

MR. MARSHALL: As to road building, look, it is there in the Budget. The Budget provides for a very, very substantial road building programme for the ensuing year. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) appeared down at his estimates and was examined at it, I am sure if the hon. gentlemen wants to ask question of the minister from time to time he can give them information with respect to it. But the fact of the matter is the road building programme in this Province is substantial. It would be substantial if we were an affluent Province. But, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing the road building programme in this Province when you consider the small resources that we have.

What was the other question he asked? the aluminum smelter. The aluminum smelter, Mr. Speaker, is ongoing, as the hon. gentleman knows. The Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) is working quite hard with respect to the aluminum smelter. But that aluminum smelter, Mr. Speaker, also has exactly the same basis as the transmission line itself. For an aluminum smelter to come into existence, to make it attractive in Labrador we have got to have a cheap source of power. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say again we have a cheap source of power, the only problem is the hon. gentleman who is now urging us to build aluminum smelter unfortunately was a party to giving it away a few years ago. When we get the situation rationalized we will be able to meet all of these considerations. In the meantime, the Minister of Development is working valiantly with respect to that to see what we can fashion together from the resources that we have, and he is doing a good job and making a good fist of it.

MR. MARSHALL: Now the other thing he asked about was hiring. Look, there is an accepted hiring practice in this government and it is reasonable and it is a fair hiring practice and that will be adopted and implemented with respect to all hiring.

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

MR. NEARY: The only thing that should be hung on the transmission line is the hon. gentleman's snakelike tongue so he would not be squirting poison and venom across the floor of this House, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman gets up and makes wild irresponsible statements about an hon. gentleman is responsible for this and responsible for that. Well, we are as much responsible for that now as the hon. gentleman is. But, Mr. Speaker, that is a great bluff the hon. gentleman runs.

Now let me ask the hon. gentleman this when he is talking about the availability

MR. NEARY: of electricity , of power to justify the construction of a transmission line. Did Quebec offer this Province 800 megawatts of power that would justify the construction of a transmission line? In the current round of negotiations that are taking place with the province of Quebec, did Quebec offer to give the Province 800 megawatts , return to the Province 800 megawatts of power as a part of the package that is currently on the table? And would the hon. gentleman tell the House what the counterproposal was from the administration that he is a member of, what the counter proposal was?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say, and the hon. gentleman need not think that I am going to say what was discussed in the course of those negotiations for one very good reason, the conclusions to date of those negotiations that we hope that those negotiations will continue. We desire on all fronts to arrive at an amiable settlement of all of these outstanding issues, and we are not going to reveal what went on in those negotiations at the present time while there is any possibility of those negotiations continuing one for this reason. Once you get it out in public and you start negotiations in public it is not a satisfactory form and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it will probably result in the negotiations not foundering. So we are just not going to do it. All I can say to the hon. gentleman there opposite is we will stick our record up against theirs at any time from the point of view of protecting the interests of

MR.MARSHALL: the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. And when he asks questions like that,my only response to him is I hope we do not appear as green to him as he appears gray to us.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: I have a question for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Dawe) and it concerns a problem that has been ongoing for some time in this Province , namely, the signing of a Rural Development agreement for Newfoundland between the Province and the federal government. I would like to ask the minister just when he hopes to have the agreement signed and just what areas of this agreement he now has with the federal minister, Mr. Lumley?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, last week signaled to this Province the first time in the negotiations or discussions, which have been taking place following our submission of a proposal two years ago to Ottawa, in which the Ottawa position was made in writing. We finally have that in writing now in which Mr. Lumley suggests certain conditions to be met in order to have an agreement in place. The only thing I can tell the hon. member and the House at this time is that government is addressing itself to the proposal made. It is somewhat different than the submission that we sent Ottawa two years ago in that initially we asked for a cost-shared agreement based on the same principles as the two preceding agreements of approximately \$39 million; The offer which has come back is substantially less than that in terms of dollars and in terms of some the programmes to be offered, so we as a government are analysing the proposal made and will be deciding whether or not it can be acceptable and certainly as soon as that decision is reached, which it will be in the very near future, I would hope, we will communicate that to Mr. Lumley and see how it goes from there.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. TULK: I would like to ask the minister, since he is aware without any doubt of the letter that was sent to the Premier, about one of the things that was mentioned in that letter to the Premier by the minister, Mr. Lumley, that project decisions under the development fund will be designated to a rural development board comprised of individuals drawn from private sector representatives and government officials selected by the two governments according to how much they are putting into the programme itself. I would

MR. TULK:

like to tell the minister

I find that to be somewhat attractive because I believe that rural development should perhaps be, and one of the contentions has been in the signing of that rural development agreement that the rural development movement should be separated from political influence and political interference, and it seems to me that that rural development board will certainly go a long ways to stop having the provincial politician or the federal politician interfere or intervene in any of the decisions that affect rural development in the Province. I would like to ask the minister if then he agrees with that type of structure that the minister, Mr. Lumley, has put forward, and if he finds that perhaps one of the most attractive parts of the proposal that has been put forward by Mr. Lumley?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, as I said in my earlier answer, government is addressing itself to that overall letter and the component which the hon. gentleman just mentioned is one of them that we are concerned about. I do not think government would have any difficulty with a board administering this cost-shared agreement and deciding upon certain programmes to be implemented under an agreement if and when it is signed. The difficulty I would have, and this is just an initial reaction, Mr. Speaker, we have to bear in mind that government has not made a decision on the matter yet, but if we were to implement a board to administer this agreement or any other whereby the membership is made up based on the cost sharing formula, let us just say it is a 90/10 cost-shared agreement and there are ten members on the board, the federal government appoints nine, the Province appoints one. That would give us some difficulty. But, Mr. Speaker, as I suggested, we are analyzing the proposal. The idea of a management board is fine, I have no difficulty with that whatsoever. It is how the board is made up and who appoints the members to the board that is one of the concerns we have and one upon which we will be making our decision very shortly.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary on the thing. I find it strange that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) has problems with setting up a board. And it is not the administration of the programme that we are talking about, we are talking about a Rural Development Board for project funding that he has some difficulty; and yet the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) can very well go along and sign a fisheries



MR. TULK: agreement which is in proportion to what he is contributing and to his shares in that company. But let me ask him this question. I have picked up over the weekend and over the past week the idea that indeed the Province itself may be going to fund rural development associations themselves, that the Premier has indicated to some people in the Province that the Province is prepared to fund rural development associations themselves. I would like to ask the minister if he has been in consultation with the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Council, as far as that goes, as to whether they share the view that the Province should fund the rural development movement itself or whether indeed it should be a joint agreement between the Province and the federal government and what they are pressing for exactly, the Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Council?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, in the short preamble given by the hon. gentleman, I think he may have misunderstood my answer. I have no difficulty with a board which would administer project funding under an agreement, if and when it is to be signed, but it is the make up of that board and the number of people nominated by either of the two governments involved. However, that is one of the points that we are addressing.

On the matter of meeting with the Rural Development Council on their reaction to proposals made, the Premier and I, I know, have met on a couple of occasions with the outgoing Newfoundland and Labrador Rural Development Council

MR. GOUDIE: and the incoming new president who was just recently elected in Gander. We presented our position to that group and to development associations throughout the Province. The position that they adopted, hon. gentlemen may recall, several months ago was the Rural Development Council supported the idea put forth by the government of this Province that it should be a cost shared agreement between the two governments so that no association or the council would feel dependent on either one, and that is my understanding of what their position is. That is why we have been pushing so hard to get a cost shared agreement in place as opposed to one or the other government picking up the whole bill. And to ensure, Mr. Speaker, that we have adequate time to deal with the proposal on the table now from Mr. Lumley and other concerns we have, the Province has provided something in the vicinity of \$420,000 of interim financing over the first three months of this fiscal year for the development associations, the Development Council and to craft development associations as well. So our interest is there, In signing an agreement, the council supported and still supports the proposal put forth by the Province, and hopefully if we can agree to a new agreement being in place they will agree to that as well.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion the House  
resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means  
to consider the raising of supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Budget Debate.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Will we ever get back to the  
Throne Speech?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I listened with some  
interest to the answers which were given by the House Leader  
opposite (Mr. Marshall) today concerning the job creation  
that this government has embarked upon. He mentioned  
specifically the road building programme throughout the  
Province where the Province has put an extra amount of  
money into roads. Now, Mr. Speaker, the truth of the

MR. HODDER:

matter is for the past three or four years the roads budget in this Province has been very, very low. And across this Province from one end of the Province to the other, and I have had the opportunity of driving most of this Province throughout the Summer with the Food Prices Committee and even throughout the Easter break I was in some remote parts of the Province, the fact of the matter is that the money spent on road building in this Province this year will not even go close to the needs for roads. I often wonder, Mr. Speaker, when a road is no longer a road; we see a line on a map, a dotted line or a solid line to denote the classification of the road, but in some areas of this Province at the present time I think the lines should be erased from all of the maps because the roads have now become cowpaths and should have a long broken line.

Mr. Speaker, so the government brags about the money that was spent on bridges and roads, but to get to the matter of bridges I am told by people in the Department of Transportation that we have large numbers of bridges in this Province which must be replaced. It is not a matter of the government trying to create capital works throughout the Province, it is a matter of the safety of the citizens. And even with the large amount of money for roads and bridges that will be spent throughout the Province this year, we still have bridges which must be replaced and must be repaired. So any government that consider that to be their job creation programme, then I think, Mr. Speaker, that is very, very weak indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here at a time in the Province when unemployment is higher than it has ever been before. The worst group in the Province, the highest unemployment, is amongst our young people. They are without

MR. HODDER: work. I suggest to members opposite that they should perhaps meet with some of the young people around this Province and find out the desperation with which they face the future. The unemployment in some areas of the Province amongst the youth reaches as high as 90 per cent, and there are studies and documentations which have shown that. This has given rise to social conditions which are readily apparent; any time you look at the papers you see a rise in crime and violence, we have desperation, we have people who are trying to scrape to keep their families fed, We have now started a system where when a person goes on social assistance, he is given ten weeks work and then goes on UIC, and then the government has decided they have created jobs. They actually bragged about it in the Budget, the number of jobs that would be created through money in Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, what we are not doing is trying to create the type of business climate in this Province that will give rise to permanent jobs.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HODDER: We are

MR. HODDER: on a treadmill, which, if we continue, this Province will lag behind the rest of the country for years, and years, and years to come.

Now, let us look at what was in the budget, because the one thing that the administration was praised for in this particular budget was the fact that they lowered the corporate income tax from 12 per cent to 10 per cent, and the retail sales tax was removed from all manufacturing and capital equipment, and there was a venture capital programme of \$500,000.

Now, I want to talk about that for a little while because some people, or at least one or two people in the Province thought that that was a good thing, and, I suppose, all small businessmen would like to see less tax. But I think in the next few minutes I might point out to the government where they should have been going and where they missed the boat in trying to stimulate small business in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, Canada's future it seems at the moment, when we look at industrial countries in this world, Japan and the United States, is with high technology. In order to compete in this world today it is a global oriented economy. We in Newfoundland for a long time missed the opportunities to be able to partake in the global world economy because Newfoundland's markets are farther away than ever before. But most important, in the 1960s we did try to form industries in this Province and we found - because the perception when this Province went into Confederation was that we would be like Ontario and, therefore, sometimes politicians responsive to the people try to do what they can - that many of these smaller industries failed.

MR. HODDER:

We are now in a world economy where small countries like Formosa, Hong Kong, Korea are leaders. I remember when a Japanese product was considered to be an inferior product, if it came from Japan it was inferior, but we find now that Japanese products have become superior. We always had a problem within the Canadian Confederation because of the global area in which we live to try and sell manufactured products to other parts of the world. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s we lost our appreciation of the global economy, in particular in terms of our small business.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age there is a growing sophistication of small scale technology and geographically we can compete.

The problems which plagued the Newfoundland economy in the past are not necessarily the same problems of today. But one of the things that we have developed in this Province is an anti-business feeling. We have no training for entrepreneurs. We have very few people who are taking the chance to get into small business.

Now, I believe I read somewhere that the top 500 companies, Fortune's top 500 companies, did not produce one job in the United States last year, as a matter of fact jobs have been declining, but small business is growing and flourishing and has been creating jobs at a great rate.

There was a study done by MIT which said that small business fails at a consistent rate throughout the whole of the United States; there is a consistency in rate of failure, but it is consistent throughout the whole of the United States, the figures do not change. You can actually predict what chance small business has to flourish.

The Canadian Federation of Independent Business says that between 1970 and 1979, small firms created 500,000 new jobs in Canada, which was 50 per cent or 60 per cent of all new jobs. The U.S. National Science Foundation estimated that a dollar invested in small enterprise is twenty times more likely to produce a significant gain than a dollar invested in a larger enterprise. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that there is a feeling throughout the United States and throughout Canada that small business is where we will create the



MR. HODDER: jobs - and I am talking about jobs in Newfoundland - more quickly, they respond to changing conditions more quickly and they are more responsive to the communities in which they are located.

Where are we in Newfoundland as far as job creation is concerned? The courses which we have in our vocational schools in this Province are courses that were developed in the 1960s, they were good for the 1960s: heavy equipment operators, linesmen, etc. A lot of the courses, developed when the vocational schools and the College of Trades and Technology were built, were progressive at the time, but we have not changed our courses quickly enough and we have no type of entrepreneurial spirit within the Province.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere in the budget does the government commit itself to the development of opportunities for self-employment, even though we have the largest, highest unemployment rate the Province has ever seen. Now, Mr. Speaker, where did we go wrong in the budget? It is now common thinking that in order to develop small business incentives to existing business is not enough; that is what we did in the budget, except for the \$500,000 Venture Capital. It is the thinking of economists and others - and there has been some proof, and I will come to that in a little while - that in order to develop small business, you must be able to involve people and set up a climate

MR. HODDER: where people want to get in business. More and more we hear in this Province, 'I would like to do this but the climate is not right,' It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that the government with its doom and gloom, which I will get to a little bit later, and the statement the Premier made on television before the budget came down and then the budget have only heightened this particular awareness. Mr. Speaker, what is needed in this Province is not money infusion into existing business. What we need in this Province and what I would like to see the government do, which has been done in other provinces and other parts of the world which I will get to, is that companies need to be assisted to find markets. There has to be attention given to encourage formation of companies, to encourage people to get into small business. It is a proven fact that tax incentives and loan guarantees are of little use or no help in business formation, and that is where we stand in this Province. The problem is business formation. Many of the companies which will receive those grants, those tax breaks, will probably survive anyway. I do not know if people realize that we are going at the present time into an age of new technology in a province where there is no feeling of entrepreneurialship, where there is no business climate, there is no feeling of private enterprise, where our young people are without jobs, where many of our older residents are without jobs, where UIC has become a way of life and it is very, very difficult. And most important, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in our school system, even with the extended high school system, there is nothing in Newfoundland which would lead people to want to become businessmen in the Province. There are no courses, no information disseminated. We are still training

MR. HODDER: people throughout our high schools in the main to attend university, perhaps to attend vocational schools. We are not motivating the business environment, the people who are growing up, to be self-starters. I have often thought, Mr. Speaker, that if you brought a number of highly trained people from Formosa or from Taiwan or from the Pacific rim countries and dropped them in the middle of Labrador, because of this business spirit which they have within a short time that that particular remote part of Labrador will be manufacturing, materials would be coming in, goods would be manufactured and the place would be prosperous, because it is a matter of the people believing they can do it, that spirit must be there and we in this Province are falling farther and farther and farther behind. Our economy we know, it has been said by the government, lags behind the Canadian economy by a couple of years, the Canadian economy lags behind the American economy, and here we are in this Province with a new revolution. The oil will not help. You can have all the Hibernias you want, it may last for forty years, it may last for fifty years and perhaps the Province will be on an even keel, but unless you encourage that particular spirit then we are lost in the long run because it is our people

MR. HODDER:

who must be able to develop this Province. And perhaps, as I have often said, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we would have been better off. What would this government have done if they did not have the promise of oil? But, Mr. Speaker, what is it that this government can be doing to encourage, because that is where jobs come from. If you sit and you ask yourself how do we create jobs, it is not enough for the government to say, 'We put \$1 million in social assistance and we put all these people to work and now they are on unemployment insurance.' Unemployment insurance is just as destructive as social assistance. It is not enough to say that. How do we create permanent jobs? Where do we put our money? We have to put our money into developing and we have to start somewhere. We have to start in the schools and we have to start in other ways. In a couple of minutes I will talk about some of the experiments that have been done in other parts of the world and in Canada which have been successful. But, Mr. Speaker, the one thing, and I have mentioned this before, is entrepreneurial training training people to be able to get into the business world themselves. Secondly, one of the problems that we have here in this Province is that we have people who are able to run businesses but we need market research. People must be able to take part and be able to tap into market research. We need product development in the Province. We need the expenses and financing to be able to get people involved and we need follow-up consultation.

Mr. Speaker, in

MR.HODDER: England, in Wales, Central Wales is much like Newfoundland in that they had a very, very rural economy based mostly on agriculture. If you look at agriculture, 40 per cent of Americans, for instance, back in the early part of this century were on the land working and now only 2 or 3 per cent are on the land working, and the economy of Wales was much the same. Now in the past five years the Wales Development Board, which is held as being a very, very good organization, has assisted in the creation of 1000 jobs. And they have done it by, first of all, something that we rarely ever do - we are on a reverse trend in Newfoundland - they encourage outsiders to come in and set up business there. The board has a free rein as to what it does. It is not controlled by the government. Everything that has ever existed in this Province has strings on it from government. It is close to the communities. They have worked out methods and have done their market research and development and the financing by working in close harmony with the communities. They have distributed booklets in primary schools and they have put computer-based business games into all the schools so that children in the schools can use the computers to play business games. It is a matter of trying to arrange this type of entrepreneurial spirit but, at the same time try, to foster within the community businesses that will work with the available resources that are there or bring outsiders in. And that is the sort of direction that this Province must go in. That is the direction that we have to go. We have to try and develop. It is not enough to throw money at businesses. I gave an example here in the House

MR. HODDER:

of Assembly the other day of a fish business in my district where the problem was that any sensible person in this world ever looked at it, and I am not a business man by any stature and have never been, but I could look at the books of that company and see that they were bankrupt. The Province gave them \$90,000 and bragged about it. Every time I see the list of the Fisheries Department, they gave them \$90,000, which was just enough to be able to put the fellow into business for the last fishing year, and the upshot was at the end of the year he had no assets, he was in a rented building, he just had one or two fish processing tables which belonged to the manufacturer, which he had not paid for, a couple of old trucks, and he owed \$50,000 to the fishermen which the fishermen have never gotten. Now that is not the way you develop small business in this Province. You do not throw money at business. It has to be carefully nurtured and developed.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps it is not wrong to say anymore that there is nothing wrong to encourage people to become millionaires, because if we do not develop that kind of spirit, if we do not develop that kind of thinking, we are never going to create the jobs, we are just always going to be dependent on Ottawa, we will be dependent on the offshore. The offshore will come, there will be fast money around, business will start and finish, but we still will not have developed business leaders. Outsiders will come in, and we encourage that, but we ourselves need that type of motivation which will allow us to get involved. And the government has not addressed itself to that in this budget, it did not address itself to it in the 1983 budget and it has not addressed itself to it in any budget that we have had. So for the ten years that this

MR. HODDER: government has been in power  
we are slipping behind.

MR. NEARY: Twelve years.

MR. HODDER: The twelve years that the  
government has been in power we have slipped behind. You know,  
twelve years ago our vocational schools were offering  
courses which were in line with the 1960s, now we are still  
offering courses which are in line with the 1960s. We have  
not progressed one little bit. As a matter of fact, we have  
fallen back.

MR. NEARY: We have a bad Minister of  
Education (Ms. Verge).

MR. HODDER: Not only the Minister of Education, but  
the Minister of Education has no idea whatsoever as to what  
should be done. She has no idea whatsoever, she has no  
vision, of where we are going in 1990s, no vision whatsoever  
where we will be going in the 1990s, but she is not alone.  
The problem is that the Premier has no vision. The problem  
with the government is that the Premier has decided not to  
make the mistakes of the past, but he has forgotten, his  
vision has been clouded politically, that there were many  
successes in the past. He is motivated more by a dislike  
of the Canadian mainland than for his like of the Canadian  
mainland. He has built himself this platform: "I will

MR. HODDER:

not give in. I will not allow this Province to go down the drain. I will not do this, I will not make the mistakes of the past." I sincerely believe, with everything in me, that in ten years time he will be looked at as the worst premier that we have ever seen and this will be looked at as the worst administration that has ever governed in this Province.

MR. NEARY:

The laziest and the greediest Premier. Any excuse to get out of the House, out of the Province.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, this government has forgotten everything about the people. The government - and the charge has been made before - the government thinks in terms of, first, their own salvation, and their own salvation is tied up with first preserving their hides in an election and using whatever issue comes before them to work it to their own advantage. And I think I would like to talk about that for a second. I am a little bit off the track but it still hinges on the thinking of the government, that the government in terms of trying to get itself elected has left itself vulnerable to the terms of history, what history will say of them, and as far as the offshore oil agreement is concerned, I hear the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall), for which we have no constitutional authority at the moment, I hear the House Leader opposite talk about the problems, and about how we cannot get along with Ottawa and how they have done this to us and that to us, One thing I have never been able to understand, and I make no pretence, that I know everything about the offshore



MR. HODDER: oil agreements, -

I have read them, I have looked at them - but I do not understand that in any negotiation why, if a person has a bottom line and he knows what he wants, if the minister knows what he wants, he goes into the negotiations - if he went into negotiations without knowing what his objectives were he was going to fail - but if you do have a bottom line and you know where you are going, why would you break off negotiations, why would you make statements such as have been made recently that we will not negotiate until there is a change - there seems to be a door left open, if somebody new comes - why would a government that was given a mandate by the people to negotiate, why would they not sit down and continue to negotiate? Whether the minister is right, whether the federal government is right, whether one side broke off or the other side broke off, whether the government who are trying to negotiate by letter, whether they are right and that is the right thing or whether that is the wrong thing, why would you ever break off negotiations? As long as people talk there is always a chance for compromise. And why is it that this government is not talking on the offshore at the present time? If you know your bottom line, if you know what you want, why are we not still negotiating and negotiating and negotiating?

MR. PEACH: That is what your boss would do, give it away.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, we were not elected to govern.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, in this House of Assembly the government very often tries to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: The hon. members opposite obviously do not like what is being said. And one of the tactics in this House of Assembly, and people should realize that, is the Opposition is elected to oppose, the government is elected to govern. And backbenchers like the hon. member governs no more than I do, he is just a pawn in the government's hands, the Cabinet makes the decision.

MR. PEACH: When are you going into the Cabinet?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I expect that after the next election the hon. member will be retired, so will most of the hon. members over there, and we will form the next government. I have no doubt about that whatsoever, I see the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) there and I have had some association with his district over the past few weeks, and I watched the television programmes, and I told the hon. member last Summer that it was the only chance he had, the only possible chance that he had would be to come over here. And I said I am not sure we would take him, that is another matter, but I said that would be the only chance he had come the next election, I told him that last Summer. Now the hon. member knows I tell the truth. He knows what I say is true.

MR. TOBIN: Do you know in Marystown we cannot get a place to hold a meeting, a political rally, the arena only holds 1,700?

MR. HODDER: Oh, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker!  
Just to continue on, Mr. Speaker, to give some idea what other areas, what other provinces and what other countries are doing in New Brunswick they have

MR. HODDER:

a programme, and in Sydney, Nova Scotia, the new DAWN programme have been quite successful in creating new business. In Hawaii, oddly enough, and there is no reason why we in Newfoundland cannot look at examples elsewhere in the world, in Hawaii oddly enough they find unemployed people, bring them in - I believe it is called the Hawaii Development Institute - they actually bring unemployed people in, interview them, and then if they feel that they have the social skills and the mental skills, they then put them through a course which stresses business skills and the success rate has been two to one. We have never done that. There has been no thrust. I mentioned what was happening in Wales, but in Hawaii they take them to workshops, they go through a business development courses. They just take the unemployed from the street and try to train them.

In Sydney, Nova Scotia, which is very close to home, they have received government funds to encourage economic development. They as well train people and help people to set up companies and corporations and apparently at the present time they have a cashflow in the millions of dollars and they have several successful enterprises. And hon. members know that Sydney was a coal mining town and the mines closed down, but they have been very successful. And we have

MR. HODDER: never seen in this Province any attempt of that nature.

In New Brunswick we find the same sort of operation. I forget the name of the group they had in New Brunswick, but they have the same type of corporation which is classed as being very successful. When in this Province are we going to try and pay attention? And the minister gets up and talks about the fact that there was some money for roads and bridges to create employment. That is what they are doing for the youth of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the government realized that, unless we start to try and work on our young people, the tragedies we are seeing around this Province at the present time, and there are tragedies, the marital break-ups, the trouble that people are having to send their children to school, the crime which we see on the increase, this will continue and intensify. We are in a very bad situation in this Province, even for the offshore oil to come ashore. Because with the desperation of our people at the present time, the desperation which you see, and I am sure hon. gentlemen on the other side know what I say, because some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have high unemployment districts, or they have areas in their districts where there is high unemployment. And if hon. members are visiting their constituencies and visiting the people there then they will realize that what I say is so, that there are some areas of this Province which are in total desperation.

I wanted to talk about one other thing, as far as the budget was concerned. The Board of Trade, of course, can come out and say that the budget was wonderful, they gave us a 2 per cent reduction

MR. HODDER: in taxes. By the way, the \$500,000 venture capital, I would say that might be good for one industry, if it were a viable industry. What kind of money is that for a Province, in the situation that we are in, for venture capital? That was just a pittance thrown in. The 2 per cent reduction in the corporate tax to small business, no one has defined what small business is yet - I think on the mainland of Canada they define small business as businesses turning over less than \$1 million a year - but there are all sorts of interpretations of small business and we certainly have not found out what small business is yet.

Certainly, if people were to think a little farther they would realize the hopeless environment in which business has to survive in this Province, the hopeless, totally barren environment in which business has to survive! We have a government who by its very nature and by its pronouncements have driven people away, by our local preference policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no! Oh, no!

MR. HODDER: Oh, yes! Oh, yes!

We even got to a point in this Province at one time where we had communities setting up local preference policies and the Minister of Municipal (Mrs. Newhook) was strong enough, in one particular case in this Province, to go out and say, 'no, you cannot have a local preference policy.' Because the same thing can work provincially as well as federally. But we have set up barriers, we have set

MR. HODDER:

up a climate here which is anti-investment. We even get people who try to get into this Province, who write letters to the paper trying to get hold of the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) and cannot do it. We just are not encouraging people in. And any chance we had of trying to be a world leader in ocean research development or anything like that, while we have the expertise, the university has the people there, we are not seeing the spinoff, we are not seeing research and development.

Mr. Speaker, there was a conference here in the Province on the role of research and development in the Province. I will just give a summary of a report which was done by a professor at Memorial University. He said, "Research and development is the key to achievement of economic progress for Canada in the difficult years ahead. This is particularly true for Newfoundland with its resource base being faced with strong competition and new technologies being applied offshore. One answer is to give research and development some role in most economic development and commercial activity. R and D should be accepted as a natural cost of production for the purpose of keeping the product or service competitive. Concentration of effort, such as Cold Ocean Research in St. John's, accentuates the achievement of economic benefit. The application of advanced technologies through applied research and development could lead to new products, new manufacturing opportunities and economic advantages. Research must have long-range plans and goals, with a degree of sustained funding in order to fulfil its role. Government should measure research by net cost rather than gross cost, as a large part of the expenditure is returned through taxes,

MR. HODDER: employment and purchases."

MR. CARTER: You were reading that.

MR. HODDER: Oh, yes, I was reading that from a book. It was a summary done by Professor Snyder at Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress enough, in the environment which we are in, when you have to go out and face people and you have a government that says, 'Oh, yes, we are creating jobs: We are building roads, we are building the Confederation Building extension, we did this, or we did that,' that is not where our money, Mr. Speaker, should be going. That is not where it should be going. It should be going into trying to make sure that the next generation of Newfoundlanders are capable of competing and coping in this world. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that they certainly are not. Even the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), who is a businessman himself, knows. Every pronouncement of the government has been doom and gloom, the cutbacks with the Civil Service, the cutbacks at the hospitals. While we have in this government on the one hand gross waste and mismanagement, on the other hand they make it up by just slashing and cutting across the board and the doom and gloom forecasts which they are daily bringing to us.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that has kept people out, and you will hear it on the mainland all the time, there is an anti-business climate in Newfoundland. Why is there an anti-business climate in Newfoundland? It is not done by the Opposition. We have not been telling business

MR. HODDER:

not to come into Newfoundland, but they feel that there is an anti-business climate in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, we find companies who might stay here, running off. Like a friend of mine who tests drilling mud, a former student of mine, who went to petroleum school in Alberta; he came back, for a while his head office was here, just three or four people who were checking some sort of business that they did out on the oil rigs, but they were with a firm here in St. John's. I used to see him quite often, he would drop up here once in a while and have a look in at the House, a former student, I am very proud of him, and suddenly I got a call the other day, "I am not going to be here any more, all moved to Halifax." There were only three or four, perhaps with a secretary, perhaps with two secretaries, but they have gone to Halifax.

MR. DINN: A mud engineer?

MR. HODDER: I did not say he was an engineer, I said he had gone to college and he was working with a company, I do not know the name of the company, but I know that they have transferred him, and now he works out of Halifax to go to the rigs rather than working out of St. John's.

MR. DINN: That is what he is, a mud engineer.

He tests mud.

MR. NEARY: Mud, yes mud.

MR. HODDER: As far as I know that is the sort of thing that he was doing out there. But now that little office is gone. And how many more little offices are gone?

MR. NEARY: Hundreds of them.



MR. HODDER:                    Hundreds and hundreds and hundreds. We do not even hear about them. And perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the worst thing that this government could do, I believe, and every day we see more and more of it, there was a time when a community went flat, when an industry left a community, that the government of the day, regardless of which day, if we have to go back fifty, sixty or seventy years, or even back twenty years, the government of the day would move in and they would do everything in their power. We see now a hands-off approach to the economy. This government has been accused so often of having a hands-off approach to the economy that now they make little gestures when something happens.

                                  You know, there are people in this Province who tell me that they did not realize that there were so many industries failing, because they did not see the list of bankruptcies and people moving out, and businesses closing down because that happens nightly. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when the population of Newfoundland was growing, people were coming back. Now there is that outward migration again, so that the finest and the best and the brightest of our Newfoundlanders, the most ambitious of them, of our young people -

MR. DINN:                    That is not true.

MR. NEARY:                  It is true.

MR. DINN:                    There are more moving in.

MR. HODDER:                 - many of them are leaving.

Those who are here, some will stay. You will always have some that will stay and some that will go, but we are losing many of them. In my district, in the district

MR. HODDER: of Port au Port where we have 75 per cent unemployment, what is happening to the young people there? I know the statistics, Up to age eighteen years is a very high birth rate; from ages zero to eighteen I think is about 5 per cent above the provincial average. And then suddenly from ages twenty to thirty-five it drops about 10 per cent below the provincial average. What has happened to all these people? It is very simple, it is a high unemployment area but they can find no work there and they are leaving and their skills and talents are being contributed to other parts of Canada and to other parts of the world.

MR. HODDER: So there we are, Mr. Speaker, that is what is happening to us, and we have a government that sits back and waits for the oil to come in. I say again, what would happen if we never did find the oil? What would you be doing then? Of course, I know what would have happened. If there had never been an oil strike, this government would not be here, there would be a new bunch of Newfoundlanders over there. Certainly some of us on this side would be over there, perhaps all of us. That is all that this government is waiting for, it is all you are waiting for, waiting for the oil to come ashore and then you are going to try to fix all the ills. Well, if you fix all the ills when the oil comes ashore the same way to tried to run the economy before it came ashore, then God help us.

MR. NEARY: Do you know what they are planning on doing? They are planning on another snap election.

MR. HODDER: Oh, yes, that is the game plan. You know, this is the strangest government that has ever governed this Province. Not only that, they are throw-backs from Confederation. I mean, you know, the ministers are smart enough, the ministers like the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) he is smart enough to be able never to tell you anything. I do not think he is a separatist, and he will not say it.

MR. NEARY: He knows when he is well off.

MR. HODDER: But the backbenchers, when you talk to the backbenchers like the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) -

MR. NEARY: Rejects.

MR. HODDER: - you know, you can talk to these members behind the curtain and, you know, they let the cat out of the bag. They are actual separatists.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. HODDER: Yes, they are actual separatists. I have talked to many, many of the backbenchers, met them here and there, and this comes out, the separatism. Of course, not so very long ago the Premier - we know what a trial balloon is! - on the eve of the referendum when Canada won, when Quebec wanted to separate, the Premier was wandering around Ottawa floating his trial balloon and saying -

MR. NEARY: He liked Rene Levesque's Canada.

MR. HODDER: Yes, he liked Rene Levesque's Canada, Rene Levesque's view of Canada was his rather than Trudeau's.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: Then there was an interview in The Toronto Sun or in one of the Toronto papers where the Premier floating the trial balloon again. At that time the Premier was the darling of the media, he was seen as being invincible and everything else, but that was the first tarnish, when he floated that trial balloon. He actually thought, his ego was so great, he floated this trial balloon, and all of us who are politicians heard it across the Province, that was the first time his image was ever tarnished, when he floated it. Now I often wonder if there had not been such a revulsion by Newfoundlanders about that trial balloon? I think there were three or four times actually when he did it, but he suddenly realized that this was a no-no. But then he picked up the ball again because he realized he had the offshore oil issue, that it was an issue that had been played around with for a long time, and he promised the people of the Province he wanted a strong hand in negotiating and the people of the Province, rightfully so, gave him the strong hand.

MR. NEARY: And then he threw it away.

MR. HODDER: Then he threw it away. He



MR. HODDER: about the Seafarers' International case. The Seafarers' International case could have been decided and nothing would have happened. And the parrots over there talk about the Seafarers' International case as being the first blow, and that had nothing to do with it whatsoever. He made the gigantic blunder. He thought that because during the constitutional debates that the Supreme Court of Newfoundland had ruled in favour of Newfoundland, he thought that they would do it again. He forgot that the judges obey the law and even for someone who has done as little law as I did it was quite evident that every country on the face of this earth - I do not understand Newfoundlanders even. I listened to Open Line and he said what a terrible blow we have been dealt by Ottawa. Well, there was already a case, the BC offshore resources case, there was already a case that said that the minerals off the shore of Canada belong to us. We follow British common law. If you live in Britain the Central government owns the offshore oil, if you live in Australia the Central government owns their offshore oil or minerals offshore, if you live in the United States the Central government owns the minerals offshore.

MR. TOBIN: What about Alberta and Saskatchewan?

MR. HODDER: Alberta does not have minerals offshore, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if my colleague would allow me a second?

MR. HODDER: Sure.

MR. NEARY: I do not see a quorum in the House, Mr. Speaker. My hon. colleague is making

MR. NEARY: such a wonderful speech  
I would like to have an audience.

QUORUM

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please! Call in the  
members. A quorum is present.  
The hon. member for Port  
au Port.

MR. HODDER: I did wonder, Mr. Speaker,  
where -

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

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

MR. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr.  
Speaker. It is quite true that the Leader of the Opposition  
does not count and presumably from that he cannot count.  
At the time that he called a quorum in this House there  
was a quorum. There are so many of us on this side that  
there can be very large gaps in the seating and still be a quorum  
here. And at the time that he called a quorum there was  
a quorum and I think the hon. member has forfeited his  
right to speak.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour  
is well aware of course that what the hon. gentleman is  
doing is challenging Your Honour's ruling. He is  
accusing Your Honour of having made a mistake. Now I  
believe the hon. gentleman should have gotten scolded  
enough in the last two weeks in this hon. House with his





MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had enough rudeness, we have had enough of lowering of the decorum of this hon. House by the hon. gentleman, we have had enough insults and sarcasm and ice cubes being flicked across the House by hon. gentlemen there opposite. Now they are going to challenge the Chair and accuse Your Honour of making a mistake. Mr. Speaker, I would submit that there is no point of order, that the hon. gentleman is just being mischievous, as he ususally is in this hon. House, and I would submit that my hon. colleague be allowed to carry on uninterrupted, in silence.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: It is true that I am accusing the Speaker of something: What I am accusing the Speaker of is excessive courtesy. When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) suggested that there was not a quorum in this House, the hon. Mr. Speaker was so courteous enough to listen to him, and unfortunately I must point out that that is a danger.

MR. NEARY: Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I must admit I did not count the members myself, I did take the word of the Leader of the Opposition. There is a quorum present now.

The hon. the member for Port au Port has the floor.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, in actual fact what happened was that the members opposite came scurrying in through the door, and you can rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that the count over here was correct.

Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me while I was sitting there, I just wonder where all the ministers are. I think we will probably find out perhaps in two or three

MR. HODDER: days when they all return from the sunny South, their suntans will give them away.

MR. NEARY: Reshuffled.

MR. HODDER: Oh, yes. There is a rumour that the government might be reshuffled and perhaps they are all upset. Maybe they just do not have face enough to come into the House. but, Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has no worries, he will not get in the Cabinet, there is no doubt about that. But the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) I would say has a very, very good chance to get in the Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: Suntan and all.

MR. HODDER: But the rumour is the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) is gone, he is finished, There is so much jealousy over there and so many people trying to get ahead! The member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) has been panting and chomping at the bit, he wants to get in. The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has given up, he does not want to be in the Cabinet anymore. He is just hoping that before the election they appoint him for a couple of days and that he will go back out again.

MR. TOBIN: Is he a separatist?

MR. HODDER: Yes, the member for Stephenville is a separatist, there is no doubt about that.

MR. YOUNG: How many of us are going to be defeated next time? That will be a start.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there will not be enough over there to make it up, we will have to appoint an Opposition.

MR. TOBIN: I thought you were going to work for Turner?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin - Placentia West contributes nothing to the debate, he is not

MR. HODDER: humorous.

MR. SIMMS: He did a good job organizing the Memorial University young Liberals.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, to get back to more serious matters, the hon. members opposite can laugh and joke all they want, but what hon. members opposite should realize is that I have unlimited time and that I can speak for perhaps five days, six days or seven days. I can stand here and I can repeat myself. Now I have some things that I want to say. In the next three or four days perhaps I will get them out at my own pace. I was proceeding very quickly.

MR. DINN: I have got all these notes.

MR. HODDER: I am sorry that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is in the sunny South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: He is not.

MR. HODDER: He has not been in the House. I notice that his selected documents from 1949 have been removed from his desk. I would say that he is basking in the sun somewhere in the South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. HODDER: If he is not in the South, he is on one of the Caribbean Islands then.

MR. NEARY: No, he is in Europe.

MR. HODDER: Oh, he is in Europe. I see.

MR. NEARY: He is over getting our Eurodollars.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, before I go on, I want to re-emphasize for members opposite - because I think I have said something that has not been said before in this House - that you cannot develop small business unless you make the effort to do it, and that small business is not created by putting money in the hands of the friends of the members opposite. That is what has been happening.

MR. NEARY: Pork barrelling.

MR. HODDER: We on this side of the House have asked for the rural development list. We see when any other government in Canada gives a grant it is public knowledge, it is advertised, it is made public in the newspapers. They are proud of it: 'The Government of Canada has awarded this number of projects, DRIE or DREE when they were here', you know, they announce the projects. But up to this time, we have never been able to find out. Rural Development grants and loans could have been useful. When we talk about the types of things that they are doing in other parts of the world, where they are trying to develop -

MR. YOUNG: The minister gives the breakdown.

MR. HODDER: Oh, yes, the minister sometimes gives us categories but we have never received the lists of Rural Development loans and grants. We never see them, they are kept secret.

MR. DINN: You want the names.

MR. HODDER: Well, sure. Why should we not get the names? But, you know, whether I brought this up, this is not a matter that I want to talk about. I mean, everybody in the Province knows that whatever the government tries to do in job creation and whatever aid they give to small business, it is done in secret. And we know why it is done in secret because they will not give out the names. In my own area of the Province, I know who gets them, the word gets around; I do not know about other areas in the Province. I know whose friends they are. I know why they get them.

MR. SIMMS: You are out of touch, boy.

MR. HODDER: I gave one example today of where a great friend of the Tory Party was given enough money to bankrupt himself and then bankrupt the fishermen with him.

MR. TOBIN: Who was that?

MR. HODDER: If the member had been in his seat, he would have heard.

But what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that that is not the way we are going to stimulate small business in this Province, and we are behind, in the mainstream we are falling behind. We are like a backwater of civilization in this Province. Have you ever stopped to think about that? Has the member for Burin - Placentia

MR. HODDER: West (Mr. Tobin) ever stopped to think how far we are falling behind in the development of new technology? Do you see many microchip companies here? You see them in Nova Scotia. Do you see any microchip companies being established here? Is there any encouragement to get any type of small micro industry into this Province? And what I have been talking about since I started, Mr. Speaker, is not the bad part of the budget, not the bad part! We can get around to criticize, but I am talking about what was good in the budget! The 2 per cent which was flung at small business, yes, they can use it, no doubt, but that is for existing small business. Where in the budget is there anything that will help develop new business in this Province?

MR. SIMMS: What about removing the 12 per cent sales tax on manufacturing?

MR. HODDER: The 12 per cent sales tax on manufacturing items: there is not enough manufacturing going on in the Province; I doubt when we see the figures -

MR. DINN: What about Bowater?

MR. SIMMS: You are against that too?

MR. HODDER: Well, I should tell the hon. member that whenever Bowaters or Abitibi-Price came to the government, at least in the old days, and they were bringing in new equipment, the government gave them a sales tax grant anyhow, and in many cases that was done by decision in Cabinet. So, actually, it meant very little. Now, there are a couple of manufacturing firms in the Province that it will help, but it will not help very much, because it is helping existing business. But the minister must realize that it is the people, it is the development of the entrepreneurial spirit that will bring prosperity to this Province and create new business.

MR. HODDER: This government is doing nothing to develop that. The courses in our vocational schools, the courses in our day schools, the courses in the College of Trades and Technology are poor. Perhaps the only places where there are advanced courses going on are in our university and our Fisheries College with the development, thanks to the federal government

MR. HODDER:

of the new facility, the new Fishery College. I mean the Fishery College, before the federal government decided that they would build a new Fishery College, they were down using equipment that had tubes in it, and tubes have gone out for the past ten years. As I said, the courses that we have been teaching were developed in the 1960s, they were good for the 1960s, but they are no longer good for today.

MR. DINN: Plenty of electronic equipment still has tubes.

MR. HODDER: Oh, I am sure there is electronic equipment with tubes but not of the type they had at the Fisheries College. And with the new Fisheries College and new equipment in that college it is possible that we may be moving ahead a small bit. But for the average person who comes out of the schools, the hundreds of thousands of children who will be coming out of Grade XII or coming out of the senior level of high school in the next five or six years, they have very few places to turn. And the entrance requirements in the College of Trades and Technology and in the University and here and there are such that very few of them will be able to get a chance to be able to get into the main stream, and that is no good. One time if you had Grade XI in this Province you could always be sure of a job. When the members opposite graduated from university, those who went to university, they were sure of a job. When I came out of the university there was no thought in my mind that I would never be able to get a job. But that has changed. The world has gone past us faster than ever before. There was a period from 1949 to 1965-1966 when we were keeping up, when we were progressing by leaps and bounds and trying to catch up with the rest of Canada, but now we are



MR. HODDER: falling behind. And it is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that we are ten years behind.

MR. PATTERSON: That was done under the Liberals.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, under the Liberals we were advancing. Mr. Speaker, we went into Confederation with a Province that was rampant with disease, with poor roads, with little transportation. There were leaps and bounds and things were being done. I will get to that later, Mr. Speaker, that is for another part at a later date.

The next thing I want to talk about to hon. members, and I wish the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) were here, is the budget process itself in this Province, the way that the budget is crafted, the way that the budget is presented to this Province. Now I believe that there should be budget secrecy. Obviously any person who does not believe in the secrecy of budget just does not know what he is talking about because what the budget says can make a person a millionaire overnight; if you knew three days before what the budget was going to tell you then of course you could make yourself a pile of money. So budget secrecy is a principle of democratic governments around the world, it is the same in Britain as it is in the United States or in Canada or in Australia or in any of the Commonwealth countries.

MR. PATTERSON: John Doyle used to write them for Joey.

MR. HODDER: Well, perhaps Craig Dobbin writes them for this government, I do not know. If you want to throw stuff around like that, I mean, go ahead.

MR. PATTERSON : I am sorry.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make a valid point here and I was making a point that budget secrecy is important. But there should be a procedure to make the

MR. HODDER: budget more acceptable and relevant to Newfoundlanders. There should be a political consensus about the budget, there should be a chance for input into the budget before the budget is presented. And we know that every year responsible groups in this Province, like the Federation of Municipalities, the Federation of Labour, the St. John's Board of Trade, and various others present to government before budget time their feelings as to what should be in the budget. But it is a one-way stream, it is a brief that we all receive and very often it is very good. There are things in the Board of Trade brief this year that I agreed with and there were things that I did not agree with, but I would agree as a business community that

MR. HODDER:

that was the type of thing they would like to see. I do not know if the government reads this or not, but it is one way. And when you read the Federation of Labour brief you see that many of the concerns of the Federation of Labour are expressed to government in the budgetary process. Municipalities have their own axes to grind as do every other group.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in this Legislature there should be a process of consultation. This is not a large Province in terms of population, it is not a large Province in terms of interest groups. It is not like the whole of Canada even though, I must say, that the latest Minister of Finance in Canada (Mr. Lalonde) did make some attempts to try to get a consensus before the last budget came down. And I believe the last budget was a good one even though it was criticized by members there opposite. Generally, across the country it was well received.

I think our budgetary process in this Province should be changed, and I think we should have a chance, before the budget comes down, to debate the budget -

MR. POWER:

Debate it before it comes down? How are you going to do that?

MR. HODDER:

Yes. If the hon. member would listen he would hear what I am saying. I said that there are groups in this Province who now already make available to government and to Cabinet, of which the hon. gentleman is a member, their interests and concerns. I believe that we should encourage that from all groups. For instance, the consumer groups should have an input into the Provincial government. I believe that there should be two-way communication. Before a budget comes down there should be two-way communication between the interest groups

MR. HODDER: in this Province and the government. And I think there should be a period in this House of Assembly before the budget comes down when we can talk about aims and aspirations. If hon. gentlemen would let me make a suggestion, and it has been made before, it is not a new one, a committee could travel this Province and could talk to consumer groups, could talk to the Board of Trade, could talk to the various Chambers of Commerce, could talk to the various communities and community councillors and the Rural Development Associations and the Rural Development Authorities, and there could be some predebate in this House as to where the budget should go.

I know that there will always be budget security, and there will always be budget secrecy, but there should be a debate amongst the conflicting interests in this Province before a budget comes down. Now, does that make sense to the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) over there? He is not listening. I prefer he would not make any comments if he is not listening to what is being said.

Mr. Speaker, briefs from the outside should be distributed before the budget. There should be consultation back and forth. There should be public hearings within the Province. We get the government's forecast for the next year when we get the budget and the basis of some of those debates should be the government's forecast of the economy. Because the government is very wrong sometimes and that is normal.

MR. YOUNG: Never wrong. Never wrong.

MR. HODDER: Oh, the government is never wrong. And the Opposition is right sometimes. And sometimes the people are right.

MR. SIMMS:

wrong sometimes.

The federal government is

MR. HODDER:

I would like to have the ability in this House of Assembly to look at it. Why is it that when we get the budget we also get the projections of government on the economy? The Outlook for the Economy, that should be the central document. And if hon. members were to go through that type of exercise it might keep the House open a little longer, but I think it would be a very, very useful debate, with that as the working paper for the debate, the document, the government's forecast of the economy.

I am not saying that people would have total input. I have been in this House much longer than the hon. member and I know that there are times when the Opposition has an issue on which the government

MR. HODDER: is wrong, and I have seen the government shift itself on a number of occasions because of debate in this House of Assembly, but not so much in these last two years. I saw the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) reverse herself twice. I have seen the government reverse itself. This House of Assembly is here for a purpose and it is a sounding board and there are moves made sometimes by the government which, when they are brought to the light of day, hon. members opposite, and I am talking about democracy and that is what it is all about, hon. members realize that they may have made a mistake and they shift or slide sideways or backwards or whatever on particular issues. And hon. members over there know that as well. The budget is the most important document which the government brings down, it is the document which affects more of the lives of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, and it should be a topic of discussion before it comes down. And if hon. members do not like staying in the House of Assembly, there is always another month, we can always sit for another month throughout the year and we can talk about it and we could have, you know, a debate because there are people throughout the Province, there are conflicting interests all over this Province, and the government may sometimes fall into a trap as they very often do. One of the things that I have noticed about this particular government is that most of the taxation that this government has brought in under the Peckford administration has been regressive taxation and the time must come to stop it. And the type of regressive taxation is not really taxation, it is fees, but it is a taxation. And the ordinary wage earner in this Province, the low and middle income wage earner, is being hurt by each successive increase.

MR. SIMMS: All progressive taxation.

MR. HODDER: In the minister's department he puts up the moose licence. Who does he hurt? Does that hurt

MR. HODDER: the millionaire down on Water Street?

MR. SIMMS: We did not put up moose licences.

MR. HODDER: The moose licence has gone up. You do not even get your initial fee back now. There is a certain amount that the minister grabs up when you -

MR. SIMMS: There has not been an increase in moose licence fees for years.

MR. HODDER: What about the extra five dollars that the person does not get back? You know, it is still something that hurts the low and middle income taxpayers more than anybody else. You know, we saw in last year's budget the thing on pick-up trucks went up. We had a petition here when the pick-up truck fee went up and the rates and one thing and another, we had a petition in here which came from Central Newfoundland and I think there was something like 9,000 names on it. People were very upset.

MR. SIMMS: The member refers to regressive taxation. What are the examples of progressive taxation?

MR. HODDER: Progressive taxation is a taxation which affects low income earners and high income earners as well.

MR. SIMMS: Would income tax be progressive taxation?

MR. HODDER: I would consider a raise in income tax to be more fair than to year after year after year be raising fees and services; even marriage licences, everything, every little thing that can possibly go up, Crown land fees. I have a list of them here which I will get to in a little while. But all these little fees that are increasing daily, they put a little licence on a snowmobile, well, what does that do? You have to pay \$5 to have a licence on a snowmobile and it has not done one bit of good in keeping track of snowmobiles, where they should be or anything else in this Province and probably costs as much to administer. The rabbit

MR. HODDER: licence goes up, the bird licence goes up, this goes up and that goes up, and every kind of a little fee that the government can -

MR. SIMMS: When did this happen?

MR. HODDER: I am talking about over the last three or four years. The rabbit licence did not go up a couple of years ago?

MR. SIMMS: Not in the last twenty years.  
Of course not!

MR. HODDER: But this is the way that the government operates. You say in the budget we will save \$100,000 on this and \$50,000 on this and \$60,000 on that, you know, the minister knows what I am talking about. It is no good for the minister to try to tell me that that is the way that they recoup their money. But there comes a time, and I realize it, I understand, that you have to charge certain amounts for certain services for which you give people, but if you



MR. HODDER: continue to use that type of indirect taxation, that is hurting year by year and more and more a certain segment of society. And there comes a time when you have to stop because it hurts the person who is on social assistance, much of that, who needs a marriage certificate, or the ambulance fees which went up this time, the air ambulance fee and the road ambulance fee. That hurts the people who are in the more remote areas who do have transportation, I mean usually air ambulances are not used in St. John's, but in areas down in my friend's district, down in Burin-Placentia West, in isolated communities along the South Coast where they have no doctors, where they have very often, when there is an emergency, to fly. When you put up that type of taxation that is regressive, it is hurting the people who have the least medical services, and yet they are penalized the most. And that is the type of thing that I am talking about that this government has been going on with forever and ever and ever, and has been going on with for the last four years. You know, certain fees. There is a statement in this budget, it says, "Certain fees for services will be brought up to cost," etc., etc., etc, and Mr. Speaker, very often it hurts most.

I want to talk about something else that this government has done this time. I would like for hon. members to listen to this.

MR. PATTERSON: Yes, boy. I am listening.

MR. HODDER: No, because I believe that the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) will understand what I am saying. I believe he will agree with me. I believe that the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) will agree with what I am going to say now, and the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power). I do not see how they cannot. And it is something that a lot of people have not thought about yet, and it has not been brought up in this House of Assembly yet.

Do you know when the wage freeze came on the public servants in this Province for two years, there is a wage freeze for two years - I had hoped that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would be here today - do you realize that in the next two years many public servants in this Province will be retiring, will be leaving the public service and retiring? And the top three years in which they were working, their pension will be based on those top three years. Now that particular wage freeze will not affect those that will be retiring in five years time, but those that will retire in two years time it will affect them for the rest of their lives. I believe that this government should take that particular item into account because I think that a special case should be made for those retiring public servants who have served this Province and who have served ministers, and who have served the people of this Province, who are retiring in the next two years, whose incomes for the rest of their lives - until they die - their pensions will be affected

MR. HODDER: . . . because of this wage freeze. And I believe the government should do something about that. I think the government should make some compensation. I do not think that the government should have slashed across the board, that is another point. But when they slashed across the board for public servants in this Province, they did not take into account that some people will be affected for the rest of their lives. And you know the public service pension does not go up by very much. Every year we see a bill go by us here in the House of Assembly which says we will raise public servants' pensions by one or two per cent, something like that. They never go up according to the cost of living.

How many people will be retiring from the public service in the next two years? Perhaps 500 or 400 people will be retiring from the civil service, who spent their lives in the service of this Province

MR. HODDER:

and they will be penalized for the rest of their lives. If hon. members find that to be fair and just and acceptable, then I would say to hon. members that they should stop and reconsider and I will continue to bring this up. I know a lot of public servants, some of whom are retiring this year, are finding that for the rest of their lives, because of their top three years, they will not have that advantage that others will have that come after them, because they were unfortunate enough, Mr. Speaker, to be there while the wage freeze was on. The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is listening and the member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) and I would suggest that they bring it up to their colleagues in Cabinet.

MR. SIMMS: How many would you say will be retiring?  
I mean, what would you say is the number?

MR. HODDER: Well, in the next two or three years, 300 or 400 possibly could retire from the public service.

MR. SIMMS: In the next three years?

MR. HODDER: In the next three years, yes.

I asked the member but there are quite a few. What if there is only one? Is it fair because of this wage restraint that he suffer the rest of life? The minister knows there will be more than one.

MR. SIMMS: The pension is funded now.

MR. DINN: There are pension increases every year.

MR. HODDER: Yes, he will get pension increases every year, but still they take their top three years as the base, so there we go.

Mr. Speaker, so I believe that the budget process should be changed and I believe that there should be - it might mean changes in the procedures of this

MR. HODDER: House - but there should be debate on the budget, on the contents of the budget not only in the public, Mr. Speaker, but in this House before the budget comes down. Because it is my feeling that the last two budgets that have been brought down by this government have not taken into full account all of the groups in this Province and, while some groups have been helped, some communities have been helped, they have not taken everything into account.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one other thing is what happens after the budget comes down. Once the budget has come down in this Province and the monies are allocated, I believe that the list, the priorities which are given to roads in municipalities should be prioritized. The Sullivan Commission Report on Transportation in Newfoundland, there were things in that particular report which I did not like, there were things in the report which I did like, but there are many things in that report which were very revealing; it was a very, very good report. There were things there that the government liked and I did not like. But one thing that they did point out that there were priorities in this Province. They had travelled the Province and, as far as transportation, particularly in roads in this Province, there were priorities. Mr. Speaker, when the road work starts to be done in the Spring, we see that the priorities that were laid down - and some of them were laid down in the Sullivan Transportation Report - that the priorities are not met. The monies are spent depending on which government member needs it worse, whether it was promised in the last election.

MR. DINN: No, it is not.

MR. HODDER: Yes, it is, Mr. Speaker, I have travelled just about every single road in this Province.

MR. DINN: You may have travelled the road, that may be true, but it is on a priority basis that they are done.

MR. HODDER: Oh, on a priority basis they are done? The hon. member should come over to Port au Port.

MR. SIMMS: He should go over to see the French festival.

MR. HODDER: Yes, if the hon. member would come over to the French festival I will take him and show him some roads. They are the roads which I say now should be taken off the map. I think I should

MR.HODDER: write Esso and Irving and all these people who publish maps and say, 'there are some roads in the district of Port au Port at the present time which no longer should be called secondary roads. They now should be called cow paths or trails. You put a dotted line there now.'

MR.DAWE: That is what we are getting for \$15 million this year.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.HODDER: The member for the past years has been tormenting and cajoling and begging the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to try and get something done. But the member realizes that some of the hon. members opposite are doing the same thing and it is not done on a priority basis. And you know the unfairness of this process will bring this government down. Do you know that you can only get away with things like that for so long? If you are going to pork barrel your own ridings, the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Minister -

MR.DAWE: You will just have to represent your district better.

MR.HODDER: That has nothing to do with representing districts. Nobody represents their district more than I do. I work at it twenty-four hours a day. It has nothing to do with representing districts. That is an old red herring that you guys like to throw over this way. What it really means is that the pork barrelling is done. But, you know, Newfoundlanders are basically fair people and that is going to be an issue in the next election campaign. And eventually

MR. HODDER: Newfoundlanders will rise up and decide that - well, they already have, they are on the way.

MR. POWER: Your district rejected the government, did not want our programme.

MR. HODDER: My district rejected the government. I see. So if a district happens to vote for a member and he does not happen to be a Conservative, then my district has rejected government programmes. But I would warn members opposite that while they sit there pretty now with forty-four of them over there, they can be wiped out pretty quick. Remember what happened to Mr. Levesque in Quebec. They formed the official opposition of seven and Mr. Bourassa had the largest government ever seen. And what happened in the next election, Mr. Speaker? Not one of them were left and Mr. Levesque was in power. And the same thing happened here in 1966 with a large majority - there were only three in opposition, I believe, in this House - and the results were opposite. So do not sit there and feel secure that you can coast along on the Premier's coattails forever because the people of this Province now realize that the Premier is not the man they thought when they gave him that mandate to go and negotiate the offshore oil. So do not think you can sit over there. If people start to realize that you are not being fair, you know, if you run a fair and honest government you can be in forever, but that is not what is happening. You are not running a fair and honest government. You are running a government which puts its own priorities first. The Premier's game plan is now very clear. He went on the offshore issue



MR. HODDER: the last time and asked for a mandate, and now his game plan is to wait until there is a change of administration in Ottawa. And that is a very risky game for the people of this Province, I might add, a very risky game. And then he hopes that he will sign an agreement. It does not matter what the agreement is because, as I said earlier, if you have your bottom line and you know what you want, and obviously a government that has spent so much money on legal fees and who have hassled over this particular problem and won an election on it for so long, must have a bottom line, they must know what they want when they go in to negotiate, why did they stop negotiating? I will tell hon. members opposite why, as they know: They stopped negotiating because they are sitting there waiting.

MR. SIMMS: Chretien, your buddy, could not deliver. I forgot: He is not your buddy. You are with Turner.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Turner's policy, I might say, on the offshore was praised by the Premier, so perhaps the hon. member should keep quiet. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a very, very dangerous game that hon. members are playing

MR. HODDER:

with the people of the Province. And what do I get back from members opposite? No denial! Now, again I say if you have a bottom line why not talk forever? Why not keep talking? We do not need the Minister without Portfolio, the House Leader here in the House every day, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) can take his place easily enough. Why is he not up there negotiating all the time if he knows his bottom line? As long as we have stopped talking nothing can happen. So let us keep talking. But no, that is not the game plan. That would be the sensible thing to do, that is what Newfoundlanders want to do, but that is not the game plan. The game plan is the same as it was before, let us wait, maybe we will get a change of government. The thing about the change of government is that you have the same problem you had before. I have talked to people in Mr. Mulroney's office -

MR. SIMMS:

What?

MR. HODDER:

I have talked to people in

Mr. Mulroney's office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

As a matter of fact, I have

a very good friend in his office.

MR. SIMMS:

Name him and we will get rid

of him.

MR. HODDER:

I certainly will not name him.

MR. SIMMS:

Give us his name.

MR. HODDER:

I certainly will not name him, but I spent two weeks with him a couple of years ago, and I met him in Ottawa not more than a little while ago, and the attitude in Mr. Mulroney's office is no different than it was two years ago when Mr. Clark was there. And we have all heard what Mr. Mulroney has had to say. Do you think

MR. HODDER: you are going to get anything from Mr. Mulroney with the pressures that the Canadian Confederation puts on a federal government? Do you think you are going to get anything from Mr. Mulroney with the pressures that the Canadian Confederation puts on a federal government? All Canadian governments have been centralist. All Canadian governments have been centralist and it may be that you have lost the best deal. Think of that. But no, the plan is to wait.s And I make a prediction that one of two things will happen; if a Liberal government is in power the deal will be signed immediately; if it is not, it will be signed and it will be rosy and the Premier will go to the people. That is what he is waiting for. But going to the people is the important thing. To preserve his government, to preserve his neck, that is the important thing.

MR. SIMMS: Your colleague asked us to go to the people last week.

MR. HODDER: Yes, we would like you to go to the people now. You know the old maxim, I should say to the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time, well, this government has come to the end of its rope.

MR. TOBIN: You sound awfully nervous.

MR. SIMMS: Wise men speake because they have something to say, fools speake because they have to say something.

MR. HODDER: I am not nervous, Mr. Speaker. I have been in this House in Opposition for ten years and I have never felt better about being in this House, because I know that in a very short time we will be over there. So, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing nervous about this gentleman.

MR. TOBIN: What about the job you asked Turner for? Tell us about that.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I will

tell the hon. member that at least I will not make the kind of a fool of myself on the National Convention floor that the Premier made of himself when he rushed over to Joe Clark, on television, with his T-shirt on, he was not even able to negotiate in private, he did not have the couth to do it in private, and he was a disgrace and a shame to all Newfoundlanders. At least we will do it with good grace, and we will do it with honour. If hon. members want to look at the type of shenanigans that went on in Quebec between Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Clark, you do not see that sort of thing happening amongst the Liberals.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, yes you do.

MR. HODDER:

It is a far better party,

Mr. Speaker, a far better Liberal Party.

And, Mr. Speaker, once the shouting has died and the ballots are cast, then

MR. HODDER: whoever wins the federal election, there will be no bad feelings, like are presently existing on the Prairies between the Mulroney forces and the Clark forces. There will be no bad feelings, we will go into an election and we will win it because the people will have realized, they would have compared the way that the Liberal Party can conduct their affairs internally and conduct their affairs properly. I mean, the disgrace of the Federal Tory Party, and now we have Mr. Crosbie up there destroying himself. I had a person from the Canadian press, the Ottawa press the other day told me, he said, he is not even funny any more. He is disgracing himself up there. He cannot put up with his defeat. He is bullying ahead. And, of course, he comes out and he says one thing and Mr. Mulroney says another thing. And when Mr. Mulroney turns his back and goes to Europe, he is like a bull in a china shop. By the time it is all over, he will be discredited and gone. That is what hon. gentlemen were supporting, that is the type of person that the hon. gentlemen were supporting, and the Premier up there running back and forth. So do not talk about our leadership convention. We have already proved up to this point that we can do it better than the Federal Conservatives. We went through Quebec without a hitch, not a hitch.

Gentlemen, gentlemen working against each other -

MR. TOBIN: What was the newscast today about the underhanded deals of two of his colleagues?

MR. HODDER: There is nothing as bad as the Tories. Mr. Speaker, hon. members, you know, really like punishment.

MR. POWER: The hon. gentlemen had three meetings - two delegates in three meetings, and registering people without their consent.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have not even started my notes yet.

SOME HON . MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, hon. members realize that those who follow me have a half an hour or an hour or whatever to speak, some of them, but Mr. Speaker, the longer that I am interrupted by members opposite the longer I am here, the longer they are here. So I have my things to say and I am going to say them whether it takes me two hours or three hours. I could have done it in two hours, I expected to speak for two hours -

MR. NEARY: Take four or five days now.

MR. HODDER: - but I might be tempted to take four or five days.

MR. TOBIN: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) will handle you.

MR. HODDER: The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), I cannot wait for the next election so I will never have to set my eyes on him again except, perhaps, downtown. He will be back as a social worker again.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing which I touched on earlier about this particular budget is the pessimism

MR. HODDER:

in the budget. I sometimes wonder what the Premier's tactics are. The Premier made an announcement

that he would be going on province-wide

television. And earlier, I spoke about the mood of pessimism in the business community.

I talked on many aspects of it. The mood of pessimism has been fostered by this government.

~~performance~~ I often wondered why it was that the Premier of the Province made that particular appeal on television, because basically, it again had the effect of dampening the spirits of Newfoundlanders. Why is it when we are trying to develop our industries, develop our business, to have an optimistic business environment - the budget was bad enough, but why this gloom and doom? Why was it spread out? Why is it that the government has constantly and continually given the poor mouth, every tactic, days of mourning, days of fighting with the federal government -

MR. NEARY: Flags half-mast.

MR. HODDER: - flags half-mast.

MR. NEARY: They identify themselves with death.

MR. HODDER: That is right, with death, the death of the Province. And, you know, hon. members do not realize that the ordinary people on the street always see a fight against the federal government on agreements, but they see no fight to save what we have, to save the business we have, to save the industry.

I will never forget what happened in the community of Stephenville. I do not represent Stephenville, but I will never forget what happened there,

MR. HODDER: when Labatt's Brewery who had made their fortune, a profitable brewery which had expanded, suddenly decided to close.

MR. RIDEOUT: I thought you were going to talk about the Labrador Linerboard.

MR. HODDER: I can talk about that too, if the hon. member wants me to talk about Labrador Linerboard.

MR. NEARY: Be patient, he has four or five days.

MR. HODDER: Is the hon. member trying to tell me that Labatt's Brewery was built on government subsidies? It was run by a reputable company by the name of Labatt.

MR. POWER: (Inaudible) Labrador Linerboard.

MR. HODDER: I will get to Labrador Linerboard if the hon. member wants me to. I know more about it than anybody else in this House of Assembly because I lived through the closure of it and I know about the waste and extravagance in Labrador Linerboard Limited and I know about the stupidity of the government of the day. If the Labrador Linerboard had to be taken over - and that was before my time - but if it had to be taken over in 1971, then it should have been taken over as we have suggested Bowater be taken over, that it should have been taken over to sell. But that ego maniac, John Crosbie, thought he could run it and make a profit.

MR. NEARY: He wanted to get the contract for his company.

MR. HODDER: Do not tell me about Labrador Linerboard.

MR. NEARY: He wanted to get the contract for the Crosbie empire.

MR. HODDER: Yes. The first boat that ever came in to get paper for the Labrador Linerboard was



MR. HODDER: the Chesley A. Crosbie.

MR. NEARY: That is right, and the first bills that were paid were paid to Crosbie and Company.

MR. HODDER: Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: If the hon. member wants me to talk about Labrador Linerboard and what happened at Labrador Linerboard, I can tell him. The government decided to run it. 'Mr. Ego', Mr. Crosbie, was going to make a profit and instead of taking over the mill with the intention of selling it, they took it over with the intention of running it.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: And their first mistake was in their hiring practices. Instead of hiring the 500 or 600 people that were needed, they hired double the number they needed to run the mill and people were wandering around with their hands in their pockets down there. They used to bring the wood down from Labrador and drop it in the harbour and then people had to go and muck around in little boats and pick up the wood and get it ashore. And you tell me about how Labrador Linerboard was run once the government took it over! If it had been left in the hands of private enterprise it would have been run twice as well.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: I do not know whether it had to be taken over or not, but if it were taken over, it should have been immediately put on sale to a company that knew how to run it. And now we have a company there

MR. HODDER: and what has happened? What has happened since Abitibi-Price came in? And that deal, by the way, was not made by anybody in this administration or anybody who sits in this House, it was made by some people who did sit in the House. That deal was made by the hon. Frank Moores and the hon. Don Jamieson, and that deal was made with the hon. William Doody. There is no man on that side of the House these days who can match that particular gentleman. If there were only some men like that left. When I first entered this House of Assembly there were people on the other side of the House that I would trust to run a bull's-eye shop, there is not a soul over there who I would trust to run a bull's-eye shop at this particular time.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not nice.

MR. HODDER: It is nice. So nobody on that side of the House, who sits in this House at the present time, can ever open their mouth about the Labrador Linerboard, because you had no more to do with it than the man in the moon.

Mismanagement, did you know that they found out that to bring in the wood they used to have these slings which cost about \$150 a piece, and instead of reusing the slings they chose to dump the slings. I mean, you know, drop the wood in the water and then having people out picking it up. And then, as will happen in a town, the then mayor of the town started the hiring. The pressure came from the town for more hiring.

MR. HODDER: You could not blame the town, they had been out of work. So the government responded. I would not want to see this government giving out fishing licences. If they got any pressure they would give them out to everybody.

MR. NEARY: What do you think is going to happen to the super company?

MR. HODDER: Yes, let us see what happens to the super company when it comes in. And I would like to ask the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) why it was that after that wonderful takeover of Labrador Limerboard, after all of that, the government was running it, and Mr. Crosbie was doing such a great job with it, that the whole of Bay St. George elected three Liberals? Why was that? Would the minister tell me that? Was that an indication that -

MR. POWER: And where are they now? When the people of Bay St. George wanted a long term policy with a long term government, who did they elect? They elected the chosen few, and once they learned the difference (inaudible).

MR. HODDER: Oh, Mr. Speaker, the only problem with this side of the House is the Premier asked the people of this Province for a mandate to go out and solve the offshore and the people gave it to him. That is what happened to the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg).

Let us see what has happened. But I will tell the hon. member that you fool the people some of the time, but the hon. member is not going to be -

MR. DINN: All of the people sometimes, and some of the people all the time.

MR. HODDER: Well, this government has been trying to fool all of the people all the time. And you are in such a position now you will never recover. Newfoundlanders are not that slow.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of the pessimism in the budget, I looked at The Evening Telegram back perhaps three weeks ago to a month ago and they had the industrial review and forecast, and I read through it. The other day I just jotted down the headlines as I went through, "Good Year For Photo Copier Sales" was a headline.

MR. HODDER: "P and R Auto Glass Expansion";  
"1983 NTV's Best Year", "St. John's City of Opportunity",  
"University Developing Super Human Resources", "Brisk Activity  
in Lot Sales", "Year of Progress for Newfoundland Telephone".  
I mean, this was just running through the articles in that  
industrial forecast. Then again we saw little change in  
the unemployment picture, but generally it was an optimistic  
forecast, that businessmen in this Province can be optimistic  
and these were articles which were written by businessmen or  
reports of what businessmen had said in this Province and  
it was optimism and it struck me as so funny, because it  
came on the heels of the Premier's doom and gloom announcement.  
We know, Newfoundlanders know that when we have problems that  
we have to sometimes cut here or cut there, but this overall  
mood of pessimism which we see in this Province is one that  
is detrimental and one - to go back to what I was saying before -  
one that mitigates against ever anybody trying to start a  
new business in this Province, because the thing you hear in  
this Province every day is, 'This is not the time, boy. I would  
like to go into business, or I would like to start this or I  
would like to start that, but this is not the time.' And who  
is fostering that? This is the time if hon. members only knew  
it.

MR. POWER: (Inaudible).

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister  
of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) would only stop,  
Mr. Speaker, while I am trying to speak I would tell him  
about Labatt Brewery.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Well, if the minister wants to have  
a conference with my colleague here I am sure my colleague  
will see him outside and have a chat outside. But I wanted  
to tell him about Labatt Brewery because he happened to bring

MR. HODDER: it up and he made some little comments under his breath. But I want to tell you that that was the first time I noticed the hands-off approach of this government. Now, what happened with Labatt Brewery? Labatt decided that they would pull out, that they were in a building which was leased from the Harmon Corporation. And the equipment that they took over was never put in there by Labatt Brewery. It was one of the most modern breweries in the world. And at a time when American brewers were starting to move into Canada and were looking for brewing equipment and were looking for breweries, at a time when they had started to diversify into Canada and had targeted Canada, the government said, 'Labatt go ahead.' And Labatt decided that they would take the machinery out. Now, Mr. Speaker, I happened to get a hold of a report which showed identical circumstances in Timmins, and when Canadian Breweries tried to take over there the government said, 'No, because under the Liquor Act - no, the minister does not want to hear, he can not listen to the truth - but under identical circumstances they said, 'No, you cannot do it. No, the workers in this area will run this plant. No, you cannot close those plants!', because they were buying them in order to close them.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is not a quorum present.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There is a quorum present.

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, at a time when the

MR. HODDER: economy of the West Coast was in the worse kind of circumstances why was it, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this Province when asked to do so responded with a , 'No'? Was it because the Labatt people gave contributions to him? I do not know, I am only surmizing. Was it contributions to the party coffers? Was it that the coffers of the Tory party were being filled? I am just asking. Why was it that in Ontario Premier Bill Davis, a few years before in identical circumstances, said, 'No, you cannot do it' ? Their Liquor Act and our Liquor Act is the same, it is the most restrictive piece of legislation that we have, which it has to be and we have more powers under that, but the government said, 'No', and the Premier just shrugged it off, and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe),

MR. HODDER: who is supposed to be the Bay St. George's community Cabinet minister, would not turn up to a meeting. And the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), what did he do? He said we are going to boycott Labatt, never going to drink Labatts again, and two weeks later someone took a picture of him drinking a bottle of Labatts. That was the government's official response. And, Mr. Speaker, that particular industry could still be going in that particular area. You know, if that is not a hands-off policy to the economy. So if hon. members want to bring up the Labrador linerboard mill and they want to bring up the Labatt brewery or if they want to bring up the Abitibi-Price operation, I can tell them what happened.

MR. NEARY: \$500 million on the linerboard.

MR. PATTERSON: Tell us what happened to the hockey stick plant.

MR. NEARY: Your buddy, Howie Meeker, took off with the resources. And the mattress factory, your buddy Howie, the big Tory.

MR. HODDER: At least, Mr. Speaker, there were attempts made. What the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) says now is what is starting to come true, that they are so afraid. Twelve years ago they were elected on an anti-basis, the '60s had come to an end, and they are so afraid of making a mistake that they do nothing. And that is the very problem. But history will record that they did nothing, Mr. Speaker. And in my speech today I outlined where they could do something to encourage business in this Province.

MR. TOBIN: What speech?

MR. HODDER: What speech? If the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) would only stand in his place and say something that was understandable and intelligible, he would have a right to say that.



MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, to get into the sales tax, you know, just about every group in this Province has asked that the sales tax be rolled back.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HODDER: Now, Mr. Speaker, the government has not the courage nor the fortitude to do it. You know, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that we have in this Province is that our sales taxes and our general taxes are so far above our neighbouring provinces and you cannot go beyond a certain level. We have done it with cigarettes, we have done it with alcohol. I understand that for all of the cigarettes that are being smuggled into this Province in suitcases and in trucks and under fish and under everything else that for all the cigarettes that are being smuggled into this Province we only have one conviction to date. Mr. Speaker, there are people who have made hundreds of thousands of dollars in this Province smuggling in cigarettes.

MR. TOBIN: You do not know that.

MR. HODDER: The hon. member can play all he wants, he can wander down around his district and the word is out that cigarettes are coming into the Province, everybody knows that cigarettes are coming into the Province.

MR. NEARY: Do not forget, down in the hon. gentleman's district, what is coming in from St. Pierre.

MR. HODDER: Yes, do not forget what is coming in from St. Pierre. Has the member not turned a blind eye to that? You do not have to go very far in this Province - the member could go out and visit his constituents, people talk about it openly. One time a person went to the mainland and he brought back a carton of cigarettes, now he comes back from the mainland and he brings back twenty cartons. People take an extra suitcase to the mainland now to bring back cigarettes.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) does.

MR. HODDER: I do not know if the hon. member does.

MR. TOBIN: I have never been on the mainland in my life.

MR. NEARY: No, you go over to Scotland at the expense of the shipyard.

MR. TOBIN: Scotland and England and Norway.

MR. NEARY: Norway, that is right.

MR. HODDER: But it is common knowledge, it is joked about openly and, Mr. Speaker, one conviction. Do hon. members know that if you brought a truck load, a tractor trailer load of cigarettes from Ontario at

MR. HODDER: Ontario prices that a person would make themselves \$200,000 profit, pure profit? That is what I am talking about when we tax ourselves beyond our neighbouring provinces. We cannot go farther. Now, I noticed that the government has reduced the ad valorem tax or taken it off cigarettes. That is a good thing but the same thing is still happening. Now we are pricing ourselves with alcoholic beverages in the same way. It is against the law to bring alcohol across provincial borders but it is happening. It happens all of the time and hon. members know that is happening all the time, particularly the hon. member who sits opposite of me.

But, Mr. Speaker, at what point do we realize this? Now, Mr. Speaker, how many members opposite have heard a woman say I am going to go to Toronto, or I am going to be in Halifax, or I am going to be here or there, I am going to buy my clothing there. It is not come to St. John's any more. If there is a chance that you will be on the Mainland of Canada, or in Florida, or in the United States in the next two or three months, the purchases of clothing, the purchases of appliances will be made elsewhere and this Province is losing revenue hand over fist. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the gloom and doom attitude and the cost to the government of the high tax, and it is a cost to the government because people are no longer spending. They may spend, they may still go out on a Saturday night but they are not buying consumer goods in the same quantities that they were before. If the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) were here, the Minister of Finance would tell you that. But that is what is happening in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, what I would advocate to members opposite, to those members who have any influence

MR. HODDER: over there, and there are very few members who have any influence on the Premier, I am sure -

MR. NEARY: They are all on their knees trying to get into the Cabinet.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have never in my life seen such a group of sheep -

AN HON. MEMBER: What happened to Turner?

MR. NEARY: Down on their knees trying to get into the Cabinet when the reshuffle takes place.

MR. HODDER: That is right.

And, you know, I predict, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier will not have the intestinal fortitude to make a Cabinet shuffle. He is too afraid.

MR. NEARY: 'Luke' is getting in the Cabinet. Luke,

MR. HODDER: He cannot do it.

MR. TULK: I know one person who is going.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) is going. He is kicking her out, and Social Services (Mr. Hickey).

MR. HODDER: Well, I certainly would not kick her out, she is one of the best ministers over there. I would certainly get rid of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). I would certainly get rid of these. I certainly would. There are only three of you over there I could see.

MR. NEARY: I would keep her in because of her new hairdo if nothing else.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the proposal that I would make and it has been made before, that the government should roll back the sales tax on a trial basis. If you are

MR. HODDER:                   afraid to do it, roll back the  
sale tax to 7 per cent or 6 per cent or 5 per cent, do it  
on a trial basis for a number of months and let us see what  
happens. Let us see if what the St. John's Board of Trade  
and what the economists are saying at the University is right. And  
have the members opposite noticed that the economists at the  
University did not like this budget? That was a first.

MR. TULK:                    There was one there.

MR. HODDER:                Oh, yes there was one. We know about  
him. But, for once, even some of their friends at the University, -

MR. NEARY:                Their Tory friends.

MR. HODDER:                - their Tory friends at the University  
did not like the budget. And I found it so strange, Mr. Speaker,  
and I felt so proud, because

MR. HODDER: a year ago I suggested that the government roll back the sales tax and it was hardly picked up by the media. I do not even know if it was. And lo and behold, when the last budget came down the two professors at the university were advocating rolling back the sales tax and the Board of Trade was advocating rolling it back. I was the first to say it and I thought, well, Jim, you are not so bad after all. You must be pretty good. But, Mr. Speaker, sometimes members opposite should listen instead of being too partisan, like the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), instead of being too partisan, like the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power), to listen. When I told the minister today about the public servants who are retiring this year who will, for the rest of their lives be suffering because of this particular budget, the member should listen. Because we know what we are saying, we are not always wrong over here. Mr. Speaker, I must say I find it very difficult, when I look at the calibre of this government, to be able to have any confidence in it.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible).

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) would sort of quite down. My voice is going. I might tell hon. members that when the budget was brought down the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) had the flu, and a month later, I, in responding to the Minister of Finance, have the flu as well and if my voice is somewhat scratchy, it is because my throat is very sore.

MR. NEARY: Take your time, boy, you have four or five days ahead of you.

MR.HODDER: Mr. Speaker, another point I would like to raise about the budget is that the budget was one of restraint. It savaged the hospitals, particularly the bigger hospitals. Of course, I happen to know that it has not done the government much good, they did not win many friends amongst the hospital workers or the nurses. And lo and behold watch out for the next election, because they are on the move. But I would say they savaged the hospitals.

MR.TOBIN: What about the capital for hospitals?

MR.NEARY: Build two and close down ten, that is the capital you are talking about. Open a couple and close down eight or ten.

MR.HODDER: They cut down on the civil servants' salaries, but not only that, Mr. Speaker.

MR.NEARY: Every hospital on the Burin peninsula has been closed. Come By Chance, Markland, every one of them closed.

MR.TOBIN: How long is it since they closed Port aux Basques?

MR.NEARY: They closed the old one. We have a hospital to close now.

MR.TOBIN: Oh, he wants that left open too now.

MR.HODDER: Why not?

MR.NEARY: They got a good member out there now and that is why we got a brand new one. But we did not close anything down except the old buildings. But down on your peninsula they are closing down three hospitals.

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR.HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would say

MR. HODDER: to hon. members who have cottage hospitals in their districts to watch out because the trend is coming. I would say to my friend from Exploits (Mr. Twomey) district, the man who is credited with saving the hospital, now he is going to lose it. Because as sure as anything - and the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) - is it?

MR. TULK: The one who almost resigned last week?

MR. HODDER: Yes, he knows how the government can bring down the axe without much regard.

MR. NEARY: Look out Bonavista, look out Burin, look out St. Lawrence, look out Grand Falls.

MR. HODDER: That is right. Because the axe is on its way, it is moving. Mr. Speaker, I keep losing my trend because of the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms)• Mr. Speaker, one of the things I noticed was that after all of those savage cuts,



MR. HODDER: after the savagery that the hospital workers got, and the savagery that the public servants got, that there was not one symbol of the Premier making any kind of a move to show that he should tighten his belt first. He made no move whatsoever. And the people of the Province have been looking for a symbol. You know, people feel fair is fair. "If you are going to cut back my salary for two years, if you going to freeze my salary for two years," which is actually cutting back - you know, I am talking as a civil servant would talk who is in the middle income, you know, or the secretary down below us or above us. "If you are going to cut back my salary," which is only probably \$12,000 or \$13,000 anyhow, and it is an actual cutback because the inflation rate is somewhere around 7 per cent or 8 per cent at the present time, and maybe, God knows, 10 per cent next year -

MR. MARSHALL: 4 per cent.

MR. HODDER: 4 per cent next year. Oh, the prophet.

MR. MARSHALL: 4 per cent now.

MR. HODDER: 4 per cent now. The prophet tells us it may not be 7 per cent or 8 per cent next year, and he says 4 or 5 per cent now. The prophet tells me it will not be -

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the 40,000 jobs they have lost.

MR. HODDER: That is right. That is like the 40,000 jobs. That is like Come By Chance being opened in ninety days.

MR. TOBIN: You did not think much about inflation when you signed the agreement on Churchill Falls.

MR. HODDER: When hon. members finally get a chance to speak I would like them to point to the glowing achievements this government has had since 1970-71. I would like for, I believe, the Minister of Manpower and Labour (Mr. Dinn) to point to the glowing achievements that we have achieved in the twelve years that you were in power. We would like you to tell us the plans that you have. It is crisis management. That is what we are seeing, Mr. Speaker, crisis management, lurching from one particular crisis to another with no vision. And I will come back again to the fact that new businesses are just not being formed and they can be. Government can give the lead. And I spent an hour today telling members how it could be done, that government can assist in market development, assist in research and development, improve the business climate, and institute courses which will help people in business.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not where this government is putting its money. It is putting its money in taking people off social assistance and putting them on UIC, that is where this government is putting its money. There has not been one original idea that has emanated from this government since I have been here. Not even your seat belt legislation; the legislation that has been passed through this House, 99 per cent of it has been done in other provinces before. I suspect that everybody takes a run up to Ontario occasionally. Even the Election Expenses Act which the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is bringing in, is nothing but a farce and a sham. I sat on that Committee

MR. HODDER: and there were things that I thought were going to happen, but lo and behold, when it came out, all they did was steal legislation from other jurisdictions. The Economic Council of Newfoundland, the Status of Women, not only do they take it from other provinces, but then they very cleverly figure ways in which they can then keep their fingers on the reins. So when members opposite stand to speak I would like to hear about their glowing achievements and about the great legislation that has come in. There is always a great piece of legislation. I have yet to see anything that has worked.

What about your five year plan?

I would like some hon. member, particularly the member for Grand Falls when he stands to speak, to tell me about the five year plan which the Premier brought in four years ago and where we stand with that five year plan.

MR. NEARY: Jobs in Halifax.

MR. HODDER: Jobs in Halifax, that is right, Mr. Speaker.

And I would like the Minister of Rural Agricultural and Northern Development

(Mr. Goudie) when he stands, to tell us where

MR. HODDER:

we have come in farming in this Province in the last years and why it is we do not have an agreement? I would like for him to point out to me the strides that have been made in agriculture since he has been in. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, in the 1930s when the Depression was on, the people in the Codroy Valley used to have people come looking for work. That is where people went to look for work, it was prosperous. But the people in the Codroy Valley - what a sin, Mr. Speaker, when you go into the Codroy Valley and you go into the Robinsons area of this Province which used to be in the '30s, when everybody else was in a depression, used to be where people went to get work. And you go into those areas now and you see houses. I remember the Codroy Valley in the 1950s and I remember the way the economy was humming along even in the '50s and early '60s, when I, as a boy in Port aux Basques, used to go up to Robinsons. And I went through it last Summer, I believe with the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) -

MR. NEARY: Did you say you were fed up with the government, the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid)?

MR. HODDER: Well, I think that the member for Twillingate should be fed up with government. If I had to sit with that crowd over there - I mean, if she has any sense, if she has any brains at all or insight, she knows that she is on a sinking ship, blind faith, that

MR. BARRETT: Ha, ha!

MR. HODDER: Ha, ha, says the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, you know, what really bothers me about the member for Humber West (Mr. Barrett) is that, you know, he has this can do it forever, you know, and that the Premier can do it

MR. HODDER: for him. And, you know, when it collapses he is going to be the first to go but he cannot see it.

MR. TULK: He will not be the first to go, will he?

MR. HODDER: No, no. Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) oddly enough is a nice guy and people see him as that. But, you know, Mr. Speaker, when it comes, when the slide comes, he will go sliding down the slope as well.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, to get back to what I was saying, back to my speech from which I was led astray, the Premier is ultimately responsible for the budget. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is, I suppose, nominally responsible for it but the Premier is responsible for his administration. And the savage, savage, savage cuts that we saw on civil servants in this Province, on workers in this Province, on the nurses in this Province, and not only that, Mr. Speaker, that was not far enough, he had to alienate the paper workers in Stephenville with Abitibi-Price and in Grand Falls. He came out and he called for restraint in the paper industry. The Premier called for restraint in the paper industry. They were signing the contract and were not talking about monetary matters, and here the Premier of the Province, with the pulp and paper union in negotiations with management and money.

MR. HODDER: items at that particular point were not a problem, and the Premier comes out and urges restraint. Now what do you think the Premier was doing? Why was he doing it? Is the man crazy, out of his mind?

MR. NEARY: Can you imagine the fish plant down in Trepassey only working one shift and they are trucking the fish up to Catalina?

MR. TOBIN: Is that right? That is not true.

MR. NEARY: That is true.

MR. TOBIN: It is not true.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon, it is true. They are transporting fish to Catalina from Trepassey with the fish plant working part time in Trepassey.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the best I have ever seen with a fish plant - I mentioned to hon. members earlier about how the government gave out its money to encourage business and how a fish plant was given enough money to drive it into bankruptcy and the fishermen owed \$50,000. Do you know what the government has done now? They have given the licences of the plant to another person and did not bother to pay back the fishermen - a real caring government! They really care about the fishermen! And this is a government, as well, Mr. Speaker, who agreed to pay the workers, the top men in the fish company who went along with the - what is it, \$300,000 he is making?

MR. TULK: What?

MR. HODDER: In the super company?

MR. NEARY: It was \$250,000 they offered him.

MR. HODDER: They offered him \$250,000, and yet they are holding stiff on the fishermen, the primary processors in this Province. So make no wonder the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) would sell a fish plant

MR. HODDER: to a buyer who was completely willing to pay off the fishermen - and it has been brought up on the floor of this House of Assembly. The minister knew that the fishermen were owed \$50,000. It was his fault that he drove them into bankruptcy -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: - it happened to be a political friend.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: The fish plant, the building, was owned by the Harmon Corporation, a Crown corporation of this government - the biggest scandal that ever happened, and now the plant is in operation again and the fishermen are out their \$50,000, poor fishermen who last year made less than \$8,000; some of them made less than \$6,000 to \$7,000 because it was a bad fishery last year.

MR. TULK: Let me tell you something. Do you know there are people in this Province still pulling fish processing licences out of their pockets they could not use in the last year.

MR. HODDER: Yes?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: We saw how this government operates down in Terra Nova, did we not?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: We saw how this government operates down in Terra Nova.

MR. NEARY: You know, one operator going around with two crab licences in his back pocket for the last three or four years.

MR. HODDER: Yes, we know how they operate. We saw it in technicolor in Terra Nova how this government operates, and everybody else saw how they operate too.

MR. TULK: Pure blackmail.

MR. HODDER: Pure blackmail. And again, you can fool the people once but you cannot fool them forever. And I will tell you something, the people of Terra Nova will remember. They will remember.

MR. NEARY: They do not have their one-forty-fifth of the budget yet.

MR. HODDER: Yes, when they get their one-forty-fifth of the budget they will remember the promises that were made, direct promises right from this government of what was going to be done. And if you spent the whole budget that you had for this year on roads and bridges, you could not do the work that was promised in Terra Nova, with the little odds and ends that everybody was carrying around in their back pockets. The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) was down there promising councils this and promising recreation grants.

MR. SIMMS: Not true.

MR. HODDER: Yes, he was, Mr. Speaker. Yes, he was. And he said, 'The promises will be kept.' Now, that is the measure of this government - political thugs, that is what they are, Mr. Speaker, thugs.

MR. SIMMS: Thugs?

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, going down there and promising them everything.

MR. BARRETT: Thugs? That is unparliamentary.

MR. HODDER: Political thugs, I call the government.

MR. NEARY: Let us get the book out.

MR. HODDER: Yes, get the book out.

MR. NEARY: Carry on.

MR. HODDER: To get back to what I was saying, with all of the restraints that came down, the Premier



MR. HODDER: showed the people of this Province no sign that he would make any personal sacrifice himself.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: The budget before last there was an announcement that the government aircraft was going to be cut out. This was supposed to be the big sacrifice. How many times are people going to continue to believe that? Now, we find that Cabinet ministers are travelling - the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) when he travels over to the West Coast, he does not spend his own money. He does not spend his own money as I do when I travel to the West Coast for something. He charges his flight to his department. The Minister of Tourism (Mr. Windsor) comes to the West Coast and he charters a flight. The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) travels and his flight is paid for. And we had a

MR. HODDER: government aircraft which was being serviced anyhow, which was an air ambulance as well, and it is still there, so the Premier made this great sacrifice. And what has the government done, Mr. Speaker? The helicopters and the private planes and Aztec airways, and Labrador Airways are making a bonanza and we are spending more money now than we did on the government aircraft. But I should tell the members opposite, we got through to someone. I wondered all of this year why the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) was never on EPA, on the regular commercial flight when I travelled back and forth, but he always seemed to get home. I wondered why it was. And do you know, Mr. Speaker, lo and behold, since the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) brought that little matter up in the House of Assembly, two weeks running he has been on the plane going in and the plane coming back.

MR. NEARY: The Navajo is grounded.

MR. HODDER: Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition had done something to save a few dollars for the taxpayers of this Province.

MR. SIMMS: Were you ever on that?

MR. NEARY: No, not on the Navajo.

MR. HODDER: Never, never, never.

MR. SIMMS: You never had a ride on the government plane?

MR. HODDER: Oh, when the government plane was being used for transportation, the Leader of the Opposition had a right to use the government plane and sometimes members used it. I would say I was on there at least three times in ten years.

MR. NEARY: But never on the Navajo.

MR. HODDER: Never on the Navajo, never on the Fly, never on a helicopter unless I was on a Select Committee or something like that, and had to be moved from one spot to another. Never! As a matter of fact, I should tell the hon. member that twice I was offered a chartered flight and refused.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HODDER: And I would not take the taxpayers money of this Province. I am not that type of person and I have not been on the Navajo. But if the government plane was going with eight officials and there was a ninth seat on it, I did not feel that I would be taking taxpayers' money. But I would certainly never, never consent to go on a chartered flight for the purposes of getting a minister home or a minister here and a minister there as often happens. And you know, Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge in the airline industry that flights take off just prior to commercial flights and sometimes flights land just after commercial flights. You cannot hide those things. And hon. members may look at me, but I know of which I speak. The only thing is I have to keep my sources confidential.

MR. NEARY: Never divulge your source.

MR. HODDER: But certainly I can tell hon. members opposite that flights -

MR. TULK: I wonder if the Speaker is going to get that road done to Boyd's Cove?

MR. HODDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that was one of the Premier's tactics, that was the big sacrifice last year, the government plane. Now, where was the sacrifice this year, this year when they really savaged the public service and savaged the people of this Province?

MR. NEARY: Did he give up his apartment?

MR. HODDER: Did he give up his free cars?  
Did he give up his apartment? Did he give us his free helicopter rides?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. HODDER: Did he give up the dining room?

MR. NEARY: No.

MR. HODDER: Down there eating pheasant under glass with his private cook. It does not matter, Mr. Speaker, if it was there since Sir Richard Squires' day, it does not matter if it was there since Sir Robert Bond, but there was never restraint in this Province to the point that there is in this Province now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. REID: What about the ranch on Roaches Line?

MR. NEARY: The people own it. He gave it to the people for \$1 after he built it.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, surely -

MR. SIMMS: Listen here, did you not grab your brief case and slam out of the Premier's office?

MR. NEARY: Go down and look after the hole you put in the wharf over there.

MR. REID: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Overloading your truck.

MR. REID: I got a hole for you as well.

MR. HODDER: That was the hon. member who was going to resign the other day, when they took his hospital away. But, you know, I should tell hon. members that I have been travelling in some of their districts recently and if I were hon. members opposite I would be very scared, even the member for Grand Falls. Things are changing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would say if I were the member for Grand Falls that I would be very very nervous. The member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has a problem. He cannot come

MR. HODDER: over here and if he stays there he is not going to be elected but the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), he is okay.

MR. NEARY: He is one of the few we will take.

MR. HODDER: He is one of the few we will take. We will take the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) and we might even take the Minister of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: But the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) and the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), we have no interest.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you want him?

MR. NEARY: We would take you but we would not take him.

MR. HODDER: We would take you.  
Mr. Speaker, if I could adjourn the debate.

MR. NEARY: Move the adjournment.

MR. HODDER: I moved the adjournment, it was not agreed.

Mr. Speaker, the story of the 1984 provincial budget was a story of an apology. The theme, the core, the central purpose of the document -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who wrote that?

MR. HODDER: Do you want me to go on? I said I would adjourn the debate - is contained on page 22 of the budget. On page 22 of that document in the Minister of Finance's (Dr. Collins) own words, it clearly articulates, "Government holds firmly to the view that the economic outlook for this Province is bright indeed, given an even chance to develop and realize the abundant opportunities." "Given an even chance". You have had twelve years, what do you mean by, "an even chance"? What is the Minister of Finance

MR. HODDER: saying, "given an even chance"?  
I think the people of Newfoundland have given this government  
"an even chance", I think the people of the Province would  
realize that the -

MR. HEARN: Come on, let us call it 6:00 p.m..

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if hon. members are  
agreed I will call it 6:00 p.m. I may lose my voice and I  
move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): It is noted that the hon. the  
member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has adjourned the  
debate.

The hon. the President of the  
Council.

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

On motion, the House at its rising  
adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 1, 1984, at 3:00 p.m..