



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 18

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

UNEDITED

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

24 May 1985

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before I call Statements by Ministers I have great pleasure in welcoming a class of students from Queen Elizabeth School, Foxtrap, with their teacher, Miss Manuel.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. HODDER:
Mr. Speaker, last night in the meeting of the Standing Committee on Elections and Privileges, a member of the Opposition, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) during questioning of the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Ray Andrews, stated that he had made up his mind as far as his conclusions were concerned. When asked by the press shortly after what he meant, he stated that as far as he was concerned the member for Bonavista South's (Mr. Morgan) privileges had been breached, that he had heard enough.

Now, Mr. Speaker, whether the member for Bonavista South's privileges had been breached or not, at this point I do not think that the Committee can clarify whether the member for Windsor Buchans was right or wrong. I think it was improper. This statement, to say the least, Mr. Speaker, was premature. Not only that, it was delivered while a major witness was being interviewed by the Committee, and Mr. Flight had just finished

questioning that witness. So I think it was very improper. I believe that this prejudiced the credibility of the member for Windsor - Buchans as a member of the Committee.

I should point as well, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee had not finished questioning the witnesses nor, most importantly, had they looked at precedents as to what creates a breach of privilege in light of facts surrounding the case, either from our own precedents, or precedents in other jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, as well it exemplifies the ongoing attempts of the Opposition to undermine the credibility of the Committee, and it underlines their attempts to use the hearings for partisan political purposes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Right! Dead on!

MR. HODDER:
The Committee was appointed by the House, and its deliberations reflect on all members.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, although I rose on a point of order, I actually believe that the privileges of the members of the House of Assembly have been breached. Further to that I believe that the hapless member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) should withdraw from the Committee, since he has indicated a bias before all the facts have been assessed -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Order, please!

MR. HODDER:
- and before the precedents have been looked at. In addition, I

feel that this member of the Committee has gone against proper procedures that would be expected under our British system of justice, by prejudging the case before all the facts had been ascertained.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right on! Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. FLIGHT:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To the point of order, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the hon. member. There is an old saying that a little knowledge is dangerous, and I suspect the member should have finished his law degrees and then he would have been able to probably make a better case than he has made. I would also let him know - he is talking about the British system of Justice, and Canadian justice - it is normal for a judge at any time in a trial to say to the public and to the lawyer that the burden of guilt shifts; 'I have seen enough, and unless you show me more evidence, I have made up my mind'. That is normal. Now, Mr. Speaker, might I take a moment to answer the silly charges of the member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

We kept quiet when that member was

making his silly point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this Committee was struck to determine whether or not there was a breach of the hon. member's privileges of this House. As I understood it, we were not instructed to determine whether it was inadvertently or deliberately, we were simply asked to indicate to the House whether or not we believed that the member's privileges were breached. Mr. Speaker, we have sworn evidence that the member's files were shredded, burnt, destroyed, his personal files. There is no evidence that can come to this Committee that will change that fact, so, Mr. Speaker, yes, the member's privileges were breached.

Now, if I have made a mistake, Mr. Speaker, it was simply in the Committee when I did indeed mumble that I believed I had heard enough. The press came up to me and asked me -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, can I have the protection of the Chair, please?

MR. YOUNG:

The hon. Mumbles.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, a member of the press overheard me saying that based on the evidence I had already heard, the member's privileges were indeed breached. Then the press

came up and asked me directly if I were prepared to say that. Now, I could have been wimpish, like the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), I could have no courage and said, No, I do not want to say that, but I said what I believed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member has asked on a number of occasions to be heard in silence. The rules equally apply to one side and the other, and I would ask that the hon. member be heard in silence.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the question is whether I should or should not have said that I thought the member's privileges were breached. Well, not only did I say to the press last night, and, by the way, in doing so I provided that member there with the only chance, and maybe the only reason he has ever deserved to be in the press in this Province, but I did say to the press, Yes, based on the evidence that we have had before this Committee the member's privilege is breached. And, Mr. Speaker, if in subsequent meetings other things come to light, so be it. Nothing can come to light that will change the fact the member's privileges have been breached. I said it to the press, I said in Committee, and now I say it to the House of Assembly, and I say it to the member. And he knows it. The only difference between him and I is that he is not prepared to say it and I am. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has raised a point of order or a point of privilege, but I guess it is a point of order. The fact that a member of the Committee has commented and given his opinion, I have been listening to the two main witnesses who have been called before the Committee, who have admitted being involved in the destruction of the files, and I understand the Committee is now going to be calling forward the RCMP to try to determine if any intentional destruction of the files was carried out. Whether it was inadvertently or intentionally, the information is quite clear and it has been put forward to the public of the Province and to the Committee members. I know I have talked to numerous people who have been listening to what is going on, and they have made up their minds, and have given their opinions, that the files have been destroyed.

Nobody has determined yet whether it was done inadvertently or intentionally, but they have been destroyed and, accordingly, I am the loser of all these files. Therefore, my privileges have been breached. That opinion has been expressed to me over and over by many, many Newfoundlanders. In this case a member of the House has commented that he feels the same way, and he has only done that after hearing from the main witnesses.

Now, I understand, the Committee the Committee is maybe going to go beyond its mandate. Its mandate is to look at whether or not my privileges were beached, but now they are going to go beyond that mandate and get the RCMP involved, call them in to determine whether or not there was any intentional activity carried out.

MR. SIMMONS:

Carter is on an ego trip.

MR. MORGAN:

Now, the RCMP investigation should do that. I talked to them at length yesterday and gave a lengthy statement.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Would the hon. member mind sitting down? The point of order, as I understand it, which was raised by the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), was about what the hon. member on my right said; 'He had made up his mind'. We are not now discussing details, or entertaining any discussion about what will take place, or what has taken place in the Committee. In due course we will get a report from that Committee. I would ask the hon. member to just confine himself strictly to that point of order that was raised, and it is in reference to the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) having already made up his mind on that matter.

MR. MORGAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. To that concise point what I am saying is the Committee's job was to determine whether or not a breach of privilege has occurred - there has been a breach of my privileges - and by calling in the main witnesses, and they have given

evidence to the effect that the files have been destroyed, that part of the Committee's work can now clearly determine that there has been a breach of privilege. So with what the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) has stated publicly, and I also listened to the evidence as a member of this House of Assembly, I can clearly state that there has been a very serious breach of my privileges. Nobody has said whether it was intentionally or inadvertently, but there has been a very serious breach of my privileges. And surely as a member of this House of Assembly the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) after listening to the evidence is free, whether a member of that Committee or not, to be able to say that, the same as I can say it.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

I had the opportunity of listening to the radio this morning, to the comments of the member for Windsor - Buchans to the media, and, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) either unintentionally or otherwise is misleading the House as to what was said when the member for Windsor Buchans stated that he, from the evidence that has been put forth so far, had formed an opinion and had arrived at a conclusion and will have to find that there is a breach of privilege - and here are the words that were put in which have been ignored by the member for Port au Port - 'unless there is evidence

to the contrary shown.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

That is what I said.

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. speaker. for the benefit of the partially learned gentleman from Port au Port, I would point out to that gentleman that the conclusion that has been formed by the member for Windsor - Buchans is the same conclusion that Your Honour has already formed when the decision was made that a prima facie case exists.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

He did not say a prima facie case exists.

MR. BARRY:

That is exactly what His Honour has said in arriving at a decision to set up this Committee.

MR. SIMMS:

You are wrong. You are totally out to lunch.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, could we control the landslide member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms)?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

That is exactly what Your Honour concluded before the Committee was set up. And it is what Your Honour had to conclude in order to set up the Committee, that the evidence establishes on a prima facie basis that there has been a breach of privilege. And what the

member for Windsor - Buchans has said is that nothing has changed since Your Honour arrived at that conclusion, there is still a prima facie case of a breach of privilege from the evidence that is now in, and there must be other evidence to the contrary before that changes.

It seems, Mr. Speaker, that members opposite are protesting too strongly, and we have to ask what is it? - do they want to arrive at a conclusion that there has been no breach of privilege? Is that what this charade is all about?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

It seems that way.

MR. MORGAN:

Yes.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of speaking to this because the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) made the point of order quite succinctly, but I have to address what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has just indicated lest there be any mistake. What the member for Port au Port is complaining about is the statement of the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). What Your Honour has ruled and what the hon. member said are not one and the same thing. All your Honour has done is indicate that there is a prima facie case, which

indicates *that Your Honour is saying, I am not saying there is a breach of privilege, but if some of the facts set forth by the hon. member for Bonavista South are borne out there may be one.

Now, if there is one there the House deals with it by striking the Committee. The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans is a member of that Committee. I know he comes from a party that is prone to have dictators in it, who speak for themselves, etc., but it is very unfortunate he would make a statement like that. When he accepted membership on that Committee he agreed that the Committee would, in an impartial manner, sit down and hear all the evidence. When the hon. gentleman halfway through, without any reference to the Committee makes a statement like that, I say it is rather unfortunante to the proceedings themselves. But it is very different from what the hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, is attempting to equate, the statement of the member for Windsor - Buchans with the decision made by Your Honour. That really is not logically sound, is not fair to Your Honour, and is not fair to the precedents by which this matter got to the Committee itself.

MR. BARRY:

Just a brief point, Mr. Speaker, to respond.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I have heard enough on the point of order to make a ruling.

I do not know what the member for Windsor - Buchans said to the press, all I know is what the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans said here today. He has indicated to this hon. House that he is

prepared to listen to further evidence, and that is quite clear to the Chair. There is no point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker, seeing that I did not get a chance to speak to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, I have to insist on my rights, and one of my rights is, as with all hon. members in this House, the right to speak to a point of order, if they want to. Now, Your Honour has ruled and that is fine. The point of order I rise to is something which runs very close to the issue, which I think has to be said, and it is this: I wonder if all of us, both sides of the House, are anxious to get to the bottom of the issue of privilege, or are we going to continue wrangling over rules and points of order and everything else? Because sooner or later, Mr. Speaker, the issue at hand here is going to be lost, and I, for one, as a member of this House, am not prepared to see the issue lost.

Mr. Speaker, to address the issue very briefly, where a member of the Committee made statement, the wisdom or otherwise of that statement is something, as far as I am concerned, that rests squarely with the member of that Committee, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). He has to answer and live with what he said with regard to the issue. I do not think it is a matter for the

member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) to worry about or the Chairman of the Committee (Mr. J. Carter) to worry about. He was not speaking for the Committee, Mr. Speaker, he was speaking for himself. I happen to agree that I would not have said what the hon. gentleman said, I do not deny his right to say it, though. It is a single statement pertaining to himself, so I really do not know what all the fuss is about unless we are interested in clouding the issue, prolonging the debate, and not getting to the root of the problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY:

So we had better wise up, Mr. Speaker. Already members of this House have been denied the right to ask questions.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is unbelievable.

MR. HICKEY:

The public out here are pretty soon going to wonder more and more what is going on on this issue. So let us get to the botton of the issue, Mr. Speaker, and let the Committee get on with its business and bring back a report.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. BARRY:

The member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) has hit the nail right on the head. The people who put us into this House are going to start wondering when

we are going to get down to the serious business that faces us. Now, we know that it is a serious matter for the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), and it could impinge upon all our privileges, but, Mr. Speaker, it is not such an issue that we should spend the entire time of this Assembly on from now until we close.

We have rampant unemployment in this province that we have to get on with, and what we are seeing from the other side, when we see points of order or privilege, if the Member can figure out what it is he was asking, when we see this type of thing raised today, when we see the actions of the Chairman of this Committee, what we are seeing is a deliberate attempt to, one, delay, and, two, confuse the issues that are involved here.

There are two very simple issues involved, Mr. Speaker. Number one, were the member's files destroyed? Number two, was that intentional or was it unintentional?

If it was intentional, then we have to find out what is being sought to be covered up. If it was unintentional, then we have to ask has a mountain been made out of a molehill?

But that is what the Committee now has to establish. It can be done expeditiously. It can be done quickly, with questioning by all members of this House, because nobody wants to prolong this, and nobody wants to extend it.

To have the member from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) get up and say that the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), doing what judges in the Supreme Court of

Newfoundland and the Supreme Court of Canada do on a regular basis, namely indicate partway through a proceeding, to a lawyer, to a defendant, to an accused, "Listen, the evidence that I have now before me indicates so-and-so. Unless there is evidence to the contrary, this is how I will have to find". That is what the Member for Windsor-Buchans has said and that is what judges in every court in this land say on a daily basis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. BARRY:

We have already had Your Honour indicate that it is the Committee that controls its own destiny in a previous ruling. Now, if it is the Committee that controls its procedure and its own destiny, what is this nonsense the Member for Port au Port is going on with this morning?

Let us get on to the business of the province. Let us get this matter cleared up as quickly as possible and get on, Mr. Speaker, to dealing with unemployment, to discussing this terrible Budget that was brought in last night, and other issues of concern to this province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, I am sure there is not a point of order, there is a difference of opinion. But I agree wholeheartedly with the comments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER::

We have spent two days and now we are on a third day discussing, or trying to discuss points of privilege. And the main point of privilege that we are veering around all the time has been sent to a Committee to deal with, and the terms under which that Committee can deal with the matter are very clear. If we want to change these terms, it is up to the House to do it. I have no competence, I cannot do anything about the matter, but I certainly would like to see the Committee dealing with it without further delay.

Before calling Statements by Ministers, I would like to welcome to the Gallery 120 students and their teachers, Edward Neil and Corbett Newman, from Ascension Collegiate in Bay Roberts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Will the Premier agree that instead of inflicting prosperity on Newfoundland, the Wilson-Mulroney budget will lead to Newfoundland being worse off than otherwise would be the case, and probably to the tune of \$400 to \$500 per family of four in this Province? And, in light of this, will the Premier reconsider his strategy, which has seen him move, or attempt to move, from mad dog to lap dog in one federal election?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes, that is a Rex Murphy special, no question! Talking about hiring defeated candidates, I understand that Mr. Murphy is now on the staff of the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Paid for by the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I issued a statement last night after the budget was brought down, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) and myself listened to the budget and received the budget documents last night. I have them here with me and we are trying to go through them.

There are certain aspects of the budget which are positive as it relates to simulating the private sector, the retention of the U.I.C., the child tax credit and so on, and we indicated that in the statement. But we also went on to indicate our concerns in a number of areas, and one of them is, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has pointed out, the reduction in the amount of disposable income that will be available to Canadians, and especially Newfoundlanders, with the tax increases. We are extremely concerned about that, and we do not think it is going to do much to stimulate the economy of Newfoundland and to put enough money in the hands of people that they can have a higher purchasing

power as we are coming out of the recession here.

Number two, I also indicated a fairly deep concern with the whole issue of regional development. If we had to choose, as we have said over the last number of years, between transfer payments per se, and a regional development philosophy, it would be to choose a proper regional development philosophy based upon regional disparities, because it is through development that you create more money and not just get the money directly to try to do things yourselves.

On Monday, I think it is, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) will be going to Vancouver to participate in a conference on Regional Development. This conference came out of the national Economic Summit that was held in Regina, where regional development was on the agenda, and we will be taking a firm and strong stand on behalf of Newfoundland at that conference. We have already, in Quebec City, a couple of months ago. I was the person who got regional development put on the national agenda in Regina, so it is not late.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes, true, thank you very much. And we built a new clinic there, as well, which is far better than the hospital.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are certain positive aspects to the budget and there are certain aspects to it which give us a lot of concern, on which the Minister of Finance here (Dr. Collins) will be discussing with the Minister of Finance in Ottawa and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) on the question of regional development on Monday in Vancouver. So we will be pursuing those areas.

The other area which concerns us a lot is, on the one hand there is the phase down of the heavy water plants in Cape Breton Island, but as an offset, there is the tax holiday in Cape Breton Island, which could have a negative impact upon Newfoundland. So we want to pursue the whole issue of regional development and where it is going in this country. We want to pursue the whole question of whether similar incentives that have been given to Cape Breton Island can also be given to Newfoundland, because there is very little difference between the economic situation in Cape Breton Island and that of Newfoundland.

So those are two areas in the budget which are of concern to us, and we are going to be pursuing them with aggressiveness and with diligence over the next couple of weeks.

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. BARRY:

We would agree with the the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that there is a terrible lack of attention to dealing with regional disparity,

* that this province is going to be worse off as a result. But in addition to that, would the Premier not agree that there are other glaring defects in the Budget, namely, Mr. Speaker, what appears to be a reduction in transfer payments which will result in a loss of probably \$2 billion to the provinces from transfer payments over the next several years?

MR. SIMMS:

To Newfoundland?

MR. BARRY:

Not just to Newfoundland.

Would the Premier agree that this is likely to result in increased pressure for direct billings by doctors and increased pressure for higher tuition for students at university?

Would the Premier also agree that there is a glaring defect in the Mulroney-Wilson Budget similar to the one in the Budget of the present Administration of this province in the lack of attention, lack of concern for job creation, Mr. Speaker?

And would the Premier agree that leaving it to the private sector is one thing if there is a stimulus for small business, but when, as the Federal Budget does, it is left to the private sector and all the incentives are for big business that this is not going to do very much for Newfoundland?

And one further glaring defect, would the Premier agree that the lack of a replacement for the PIP grants has basically seen a transfer of exploration money from offshore Newfoundland to the Western Provinces?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in my previous answer, the question of transfer payments and national economic policy are two very important points in the Budget which give us concern. I would suggest to the hon. member that of the two, the most important over the longer term is the whole question of a national economic policy. And where we find fault with the Budget as delivered last night is in the definition of a national economic policy. We have no argument with it taking the thrust it has. We have had fifteen or twenty years of \$30 billion and \$40 billion deficits and we still have 1.4 million Canadians unemployed. So obviously that did not work all that well. Otherwise we would not have 1.4 million Canadians out of work right now.

We agree with the thrust of a national economic policy which directs its attention to stimulating the private sector. But we would go on to say, and we will make our points on Monday at the Regional Economic Ministers meeting with Mr. Stevens in Vancouver, that that is a good and sound policy out of the Budget last night for parts of Canada which have a strong private sector. Unfortunately, in places like Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island we do not have the infrastructure or the base in place for a strong private sector. Newfoundland never has had that. Mr. Speaker, in the last number of years the goods producing sector as a percentage of our Gross Provincial Product has gone down and the service sector has gone up. And the only

thing that has kept private industries alive, the private sector, has been the service industry and public spending.

So we do not have a strong private sector. Every contractor or businessman in Newfoundland will tell you that the only reason most of them are alive is because of that. So we need a philosophy of a national economic policy like that pursued ten or fifteen years ago and which started to get diluted under ERDA of a DREE-type regional development policy to complement the positive parts of the private sector that are here mainly for Ontario and Quebec and other of the stronger provinces.

So, I would agree with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), insofar as you need something additional on what is in the Budget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Time! Time!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What is there is good but you need more in order to reflect the reality of economics in Newfoundland and in P.E.I. and in the other havenot provinces.

Now, the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked about PIP grants. I have indicated in my statement last night that it is the intention of the Government of Newfoundland, and I know of the Government of Nova Scotia and the other governments of Canada, to discuss this because they are going to be phased out by the end of '87. Between now and '87, it is the intention of the various governments to sit down and to

work out an incentive program to replace the PIP grants to ensure that more high risk, more expensive frontier areas to explore will still get their share of exploration under a new mechanism and not through the PIP grants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
I think I heard the Premier say that what is in the Budget is good, but it does not go far enough if I understand the Premier. What is in there is good on the economic side. For example, increasing oil prices by 15 cents a gallon, I assume that there is a little economics involved in that.

The Premier agrees with increasing oil prices - is this what he is saying? - which is going to see an increase in the cost of living in this province, and a reduction in the tourist industry because of increased costs to tourists getting into this province.

More good stuff, as the Premier indicated when Mr. Wilson brought in his mini-Budget. Is this what the Premier is saying?

And is the Premier now admitting that such statements as the one made by the Member for St. John's East about grubby little manufacturers' agents, that his administration has busted the private sector in this province. Do we now have the Premier admit

that the * policies of his administration are wiping out the private sector, Mr. Speaker?

And, finally, I would like to ask the Premier,

MR. FLIGHT:
We never had a private sector, he said.

MR. BARRY:
in light of what he said about Cape Breton, when was the last representation made by the Premier and what representation was made prior to the Budget by the Premier with respect to seeing the same program implemented for Newfoundland where we have a record rate of unemployment, the highest in Canada, similar to the program of tax exemptions that is now provided in Cape Breton?

Did the Premier, before the Budget, not at the conference that is going to come up next Monday when the Budget is in place, written in stone -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Question! Question!

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is consulation.

MR. BARRY:
That is consultation, yes, after the fact.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Did the Premier, before the Budget, ask the Prime Minister of this nation to implement a similar program as has been implemented for Cape Breton? Is this proof that the Prime Minister is paying as much attention to the Premier on this point as he obviously had

on the item of regional disparity?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Mr. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of allegations that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) made in his so-called question, which was a speech.

Number one was that somehow the provincial government has eliminated or destroyed the private sector. Now, how can the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) honestly say that? In this past Budget and in previous Budgets that is what we have been trying to do is stimulate the private sector and the members opposite here have been taking issue with us because we were trying to stimulate the private sector.

MR. BARRY:

Nothing but lip service.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Let me ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), is a \$22 million minerals agreement an attempt to destroy the private sector? Is the Burin Peninsula Development Fund of \$28 million that we negotiated, that we proposed? Is the Rural Development agreement -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That was a Liberal programme.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is going to be spent by the PCs in Ottawa who are going to honour

these agreements. Is that something that is somehow going to destroy the private sector? Is an Ocean Industries agreement somehow going to destroy the private sector?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That was Liberal.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

How about the Tourism agreement, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

How about the pulp and paper modernization? Who, Mr. Speaker, who took the sales tax off manufacturing equipment in Newfoundland? It was this government which made possible the modernization in Grand Falls and the \$50 million that is going to be spent this year by Kruger in Corner Brook. That was done by the PC government of Newfoundland and Labrador. That is destroying the private sector?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

What I am saying as it relates to the economic policy articulated last night in the Federal Budget, is that insofar as it is stimulating the private sector through various tax incentives, it is good.

But because you have a variation in the strength of private sectors across the nation, you need, in places like Newfoundland, an addendum to that policy to ensure that the regional disparities are brought up quicker through public infusion of funds, to further build a private sector which is strong. Then when it is strong and equal to the rest of Canada, then it could take advantage of this economic policy outline last night better than it can right now. That is what I am saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is a lot of sound with nothing coming out!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Mr. Speaker, could we have silence?

MR. EFFORD:

Yes, everybody, silence.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

In the provincial budget last week, there were very few specific job programmes for the 40 per cent of Newfoundland's young people who are unemployed. Now, we have - I was going to call it the Wilson budget, but a better name is the

cruel budget, which is even more neglectful of job programmes for the young, especially the young in Atlantic Canada, and most especially for the young people here in this Province.

Will the Premier, in light of - and I will not call it the Wilson budget, I will call it the cruel budget again, in its lack of programmes, now give urgent consideration to a high priority provincial job action programme for the young people in this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, that was designed to attract the attention of the hon. member's constituents who are now in the galleries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have, with the federal government, a \$7 million job creation programme this Summer for 6,000 students in Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Six thousand students are going to get jobs this Summer under the \$7 million programme. The hon. member was a a little bit too eager in his question, because, if the hon. member was listening last night, this year there is going to

be \$900 million spent by the federal government in training and youth job creation, and last night in the budget they committed another \$900 million for 1986 - 1987. So that is \$900 million and \$900 million, and we will be getting larger shares of training and job creation money under that programme, as we already have this year with 6,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So to answer the hon. member's question, yes, Mr. Speaker, we will create under one programme 6,000 jobs this Summer for students who will be going back to school in the Fall.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, yes, that question was for the young people who came in from my district today, because they are the people of the future and their relatives are certainly unemployed, so it is certainly for those young people. The 6,000 jobs that the Premier says are going to be created are certainly not going to help all the young people in this Province. Those are for students, but there are a lot of other young people out there besides students who are not employed.

So I ask the Premier, would he give urgent consideration to all the young people in this Province who are unemployed. The programme he just mentioned has nothing to do with the rest of the young people. The question I ask him is on behalf of all of the young people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

All of the young people, Mr. Speaker, and all of the other 40,000 who are unemployed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have the most generous student aid programme in this country.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, yes! I am talking about young people who do not have jobs, who do not qualify for these 6,000 jobs, and can go and get retrained. They can go to vocational school, the College of Trades or the university. We have the most generous student aid programme in all of Canada, better than Alberta's, better than Ontario's. The wealthy provinces of Canada do not have the generous student aid programme that Newfoundland has, even though we are the poorest Province.

The Minister of Social Services

(Mr. Brett) in the budget that was announced, will have \$25 million to help, and some of those helped to get jobs will be the young people the hon. gentleman is talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We created 8,500 jobs last year with \$20 million and a lot of them turned into permanent jobs, they were not just temporary jobs. A lot of them turned into permanent jobs. This coming year, it has gone to \$25 million for 10,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker. So, yes, we are trying to take care of all the people in Newfoundland and Labrador, all the young people, all the older people, and the policies that we have outlined in the budget have attempted to do that. What the hon. member should be doing is supporting those 10,000 jobs, supporting those 6,000 jobs that we are going to create this Summer and next Fall and next year.

So, yes, we are doing all we can to try to alleviate the problems that the hon. member has mentioned.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is an old ploy that if your argument is weak you shout the louder. I had a feeling as the Premier talked about all those jobs for young people that his heart was not in it, but his

solution to these people was, if you cannot get a job, go borrow some money, go get a student loan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the question -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

When you are all ready - we have lots of time.

Mr. Speaker, the budget last night, as the Premier has admitted, gave favoured tax treatment to Cape Breton. Now, we heard much during the past few months about consultation, how Governor Mulroney in Ottawa was going to consult with everybody.

My question the Premier is, Was the Premier consulted on this issue of favoured tax treatment for Cape Breton? And, if so, did he record his agreement, and I would hope, his opposition, to this idea, or did he make a special plea for Newfoundland in terms of this tax treatment? Or will he now admit to the House that he was not consulted on this issue at all?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say I find it very strange that the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) is trying to put a damper on the most generous student aid programme in Canada. As a former educator, a former teacher and a former boss of mine, for him to stand up in the House this morning and try to condemn what is the best student aid programme in Canada is a disgrace, and he knows it. He

knows in his heart and soul that it is the best student aid programme in Canada and he should be the last to condemn it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Number two, Mr. Speaker, obviously, the Premiers of the Provinces were not privy to all of the elements in the budget-making process. We were consulted on all the range of issues, and we put forward our positions. We put forward our position last September as it related to regional development and we put it forward a month or two ago, but we were not consulted about what the budget was going to do. Never, never will any national government or any provincial government tell one component of the economy, whether it is a government or somebody else, what is in the budget. The hon. member knows, although he was only in the Cabinet of Canada for ten days, that the government-making system and the budget-making system is not such that the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister go and tell everybody what is in the budget and then ask them what they think of it. They consult widely on broad policy matters, and we provide input. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) knows what I just said is valid.

Now, on the question of Cape Breton, that is a serious concern of this government and of all members of this House, I am sure. But just let me say two things on that. Let us not forget that, you know, it is all right to start talking about the tax relief in

Cape Breton now, but for the last ten or fifteen years, the Liberal Government, the national government, have been doing the same thing another way, by providing \$100 million a year to Cape Breton, while not providing us any, and keeping those heavy water plants open. So let us not suddenly think now that we have crossed over a new Rubicon.

Let me go on to say, Mr. Speaker, we will be making representation to the federal government as quickly as possible to indicate that we do not want to see a favoured treatment status to Cape Breton Island which could jeopardize development opportunities in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If they can do it for Cape Breton Island, then we are going to make a case for Newfoundland too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the Canada Student Loan programme is a good one, initiated by a federal Liberal government, but it was never meant to be a permanent solution to student job problems.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

The Premier offered the Canada Student Loan programme as an alternative to jobs, and I say to him, it is not an alternative to jobs and he must know that.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is not an alternative to jobs. If the Canada Student Loan programme (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, last night's budget is clearly disastrous for Newfoundland. You do not need to take my word for that, Mr. Speaker, take the Premier's word. He has been somewhat critical and it must have taken something out of him to be critical given the hopes he had built up about a new relationship with Ottawa.

It is a disastrous Budget for Newfoundland. It is a Budget that has had all kinds of consultation.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman, I believe, is on his third supplementary question and he is making a preamble that is really a speech.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the Point of Order, I was up first, then I was up again. Tell the minister that is twice, not three times, and I will get to the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I think it is well established in this House

that for a supplementary there is no necessity for a long preamble. I ask the hon. member to state his supplementary now.

MR. BARRY:

Short questions, short answers.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, since the Budget was clearly disastrous for Newfoundland, or will be, and since there has been no consultation, at least no evidence of that consultation, and since, in relation to Cape Breton Island, there is good reason to believe now that offshore companies will begin relocating there if this tax preference treatment works to the degree that the federal government hopes it will work I ask the Premier is he going to launch the kind of initiative--not necessarily a public barrage that he was used to in the days when the Liberal government was in Ottawa is he going to launch a full-scale initiative to get this programme, not changed in Cape Breton, but get the same treatment extended to Newfoundland? Because in the absence of that preferred tax treatment, we see our offshore development seriously jeopardized. Is he going to launch an initiative? What is he going to do to get the kind of clout that John Buchanan has in Ottawa? What is he going to do?

MR. CALLAN:

How many telexes are you sending out, Mr. Premier?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I heard this morning, by the way, that the hon. member from Fortune-Hermitage's (Mr. Simmons) colleague in the Federal

Cabinet, Mr. Johnston, said this morning it was the kind of Budget the Liberals should have brought in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So I think the hon. Member from Fortune-Hermitage better find out who his friends are in Ottawa.

MR. BARRY:

He said it was a good Budget for Ontario.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh, yes, and the Liberals will go along with that. Mr. Johnston goes along with that.

I said in my previous answer to the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) that we are going to take every means at our disposal to see that what has happened last night in the Budget as it relates to Cape Breton for development opportunities will not impinge upon the development opportunities we have, and if that means favoured tax treatment for Newfoundland to ensure the companies do not move over there then that is what we are going to go after. And we will use the Development Fund and everything else. But we will first of all go to the Federal government and say, "Now, look. We understand there is a problem in Cape Breton and we are not against Cape Breton. And the way you solve the problem up to now is just to pump subsidies into two heavy water plants for a product that could not be sold, and that was wrong. But now what you have done is you have changed course, and you are doing it a different way, but in so doing you have a disadvantaged region called Newfoundland, a whole province,

and we cannot stand by and see a nearby province getting that kind of tax treatment if in fact it does mean that we are going to be jeopardized in job opportunities that are on the horizon for Newfoundland. We will take a strong, firm stand on that and make it clear to the Prime Minister and everybody else, and to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. No question.

MR. SIMMONS:

Final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Final supplementary, the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

The Premier is skating all around the issue. We did not need to wait until last night to realize that the Port au Port Peninsula, Bay d'Espoir, parts of Fortune-Hermitage, parts of the Avalon, have a worse unemployment record than Cape Breton. Did he just learn that last night, Mr. Speaker?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage is on his second supplementary, and the rules are clear. Let the hon. member ask his question, and not give a speech, and I will answer the question.

MR. SIMMONS:

I will do that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon., the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

MR. BARRY:

If I could get on a point of order. Obviously, the member for Fortune-Hermitage is getting close to the nerve, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the Premier would like to write the question and pass it over to the Member for Fortune-Hermitage?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! To that point of order, I have already indicated to the hon. member in his first supplementary that it was unnecessary to have long preambles, so I would ask him if he would put his question directly now.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are skating all around the issue. The issue is that Newfoundland has higher unemployment in many pockets than Cape Breton. And, in view of that, I ask the Premier, What went wrong? Did he not get his message through to his new buddies in Ottawa? And how is he going to rectify it now to ensure that we get the kind of tax treatment that we deserve and we deserved before last night but were neglected? How come he explains the discrimination? Is he not being heard in Ottawa? Is all this talk about buddy-buddy a lot of sham to fool the public? Why is not his buddy in Ottawa listening to him? When are they going to start listening to him?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, they started listening to me last September so that in February we could sign a

document that was better than that of Nova Scotia on the offshore -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Aha! - that hon. member was too cowardly, when he was a part of the Government of Canada, to sign. He hid away. So, number one, they listened to us, Mr. Speaker, after September, because we have an Atlantic Accord that the hon. member never had the decency to sign or the support.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, they listened to Newfoundland when we signed the largest highway programme in our history, \$181 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So we have the Atlantic Accord with a \$300 million development fund, we have the highways agreement at \$181 million, that is \$481 million from September to May. That is not bad! That is performance, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

My question is directed to the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker, in light of press statements in recent days from the various hospitals, I think one yesterday from the Administrator

of St. Clare's to the effect that there would be forty-five beds closed, a statement made by, I believe, the Administrator of the Health Sciences Complex, pretty well to the same effect, and also a statement made earlier by the administrator of the Janeway Hospital to the same effect, that because of cutbacks in the budget that there would be a cutback in the number of beds in health services, will the minister give the House and the people of Newfoundland the assurance that this will not happen, that there will be no lessening of medical or hospital services in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Yes, I am aware that it has been announced. There will be certain cutbacks made in the General Hospital, St. Clare's and the Grace. These cutbacks will occur; they have occurred for many, many years, long before there was any talk of restrictions made in the budget. They were closed for many reasons. They were closed because it was a holiday time, they were closed because patients did not want to go in a specific time of the year, usually, during the Summer holiday period and during the Christmas holiday period. Reasons they were closed was because doctors were sick, because doctors went on holidays, because nurses were not available. Yes, this is occurring. Fifty-nine million dollars have been given to the Health Sciences Complex to operate the Health Sciences Complex and the Leonard Miller Centre.

A recommendation has been made by the Royal Commission on Hospital and Nursing Aid, that the budget

of St. John's hospitals would be frozen for a three-year period. Yes, the board of directors are aware that they have a duty and responsibility to the people of this land, a social responsibility, a fiscal responsibility. They are exercising their discretion in reducing the number of beds that are available to the public. There will be no interference whatsoever with the admission of acute cases. Yes, there will be a delay in admission of what we call 'elective', or people on the long-time waiting lists. We must also analyze those waiting lists. We must determine where priorities lie. We know from continuing experience that not alone in this province, but in all provinces across this nation there might be people on waiting lists one, two and three, depending on these hospitals. There might be people on this waiting list who do not wish to go in during the summer holidays but during the Christmas holiday. There might be people who have changed their mind about having elective procedures.

Yes, beds have been closed. It will cause, yes, a delay in admission of elective cases, in the chronic care category.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The time for oral questions has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has not been granted.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Premier is in agreement that the federal budget has not lived up to expectations created in Newfoundlanders by Mr. Mulroney's promise to inflict prosperity upon us, and whereas yesterday's federal Budget of Finance Minister, Michael Wilson, utterly failed to recognize that job creation is the number one priority of this country, and whereas it placed undue tax burdens on middle and lower income earners, and whereas it utterly neglected to include specific programs for job creation in Newfoundland where unemployment is at chronic and crisis levels, and whereas it is actively discriminatory in offering preferential treatment to one specific area of the Atlantic Provinces, namely Cape Breton, and whereas it represents a breach of faith on the part of the federal government insofar as the federal government has made repeated commitments to the Canadian people that job creation would be the main thrust of its first budget, therefore, I ask government and all Members of this House to grant leave to debate the following motion.

Be it resolved that this House go on record as condemning Finance Minister Wilson's Budget as turning its back on Canada's poor and unemployed and in particular for offering neither hope nor

substance to Newfoundland and her economically bludgeoned overtaxed citizens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, we can obviously, I do not know what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), what proceeding he is taking. Is he asking to adjourn the debate on a matter of urgent public importance or, I distinctly heard the hon. gentlemen say he asks leave of the House. And I can say that leave is certainly not given with respect to the matter.

Secondly, it is not a matter of urgency, Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of, from the point of view debate. The precedents are here. We are now, the next order of business, as the hon. gentlemen knows, is going to be the Budget debate, at which time the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the other Members will have ample opportunity to make any comments they wish to make as to the impact, or their misrepresentations of the impacts, shall I say, of the federal Budget upon the province of Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, order, please.!

Leave has not been given.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 1. The Budget debate. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker. I guess we will have to have a few comments in the course of the Budget debate on this matter. I think the first point that comes out very clearly, Mr. Speaker, is that this Budget does represent a breach of faith, a breach of trust. Where Mr. Mulroney, as did the Premier of this Province, went to the people looking for a mandate to create jobs, Mr. Speaker, and we see the Federal Government by its own admission, stating that unemployment in this country is expected to fall by only .6 per cent. Now, do we take it from that, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite will have to indicate, are they prepared to accept that if we go down on the same percentage, that we are prepared in this Province to accept 26 per cent as opposed to 26.6 per cent unemployment?

MR. BUTT:

That has changed.

DR. COLLINS:

That is a false jump probably.

MR. BARRY:

Well, then, I would be very interested when the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) participates in this debate. I will be very interested, because he did not give us anything in his Budget Speech -

DR. COLLINS:

I spoke for an hour and a half.

MR. BARRY:

He did not give us anything in his Budget Speech, Mr. Speaker, about this. We are looking for some special initiatives. We did not get them from the Minister of Finance for this Province. We were hoping, therefore, we would

get some from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) for Canada, to deal with job creation on a priority basis and, Mr. Speaker, it is not in the Federal Budget either which means, Mr. Speaker, that we are not going to see any surprises as far as job creation is concerned, as far as the reduction of unemployment in this Province is concerned. And, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the whole thrust of the budget being that it is good for Central Canada - make no wonder Don Johnston and other members in Quebec or Ontario would get up and say 'not a bad budget for their part of the Country' if that is in fact what they are saying, because it is, Mr. Speaker, tilted towards Central Canada, and especially Western Canada, which means, Mr. Speaker, that if it is tilted towards the Western Provinces and Bay Street Central Canada, if on an average unemployment is projected to go down by .6 per cent across Canada as a whole, we could probably expect to rise in Newfoundland. We could expect to rise because money, Mr. Speaker, is being taken out of Newfoundland by this budget. Dollars, Mr. Speaker, that makes the wheels of industry go round, are being taken out of this Province, going to Western Canada, when we pay higher gasoline prices at the pumps. That 15 cents per gallon, Mr. Speaker, is the same as we ship our dollars off to pay for the Western oil agreement, it is the same as if we ship jobs off because there is going to be fewer tourists coming in which means that there will be fewer jobs in the tourist industry. We are going to see higher increases in the cost of living and otherwise because transportation costs will go up as a direct consequence of higher fuel costs. That will make our

industry less competitive still because -

DR. COLLINS:

Are you sure the costs will go up?

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are not.

MR. BARRY:

If the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is saying that we should pay no more heed to what the Federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) says than what he has said in his budget that might follow. If we pay no attention to the Minister of Finance - we are not paying any attention to the figures in the Newfoundland's Minister's budget.

DR. COLLINS:

There are three things, you have mentioned one of them. What are the other two things? Have you read (inaudible) those two things are?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have read enough to know that fuel prices are going up. Fuel prices are going up. Will the Minister agree with that?

DR. COLLINS:

(inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

The Minister can -

DR. COLLINS:

Increase income tax.

MR. BARRY:

Oh yes, well - maybe we will talk about the other thing I guess is that there is going to be a surtax on middle income earners.

DR. COLLINS:

(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Oh, Mr. Speaker, the Minister can slip some notes to members opposite if he does not want to speak in the debate himself and he can add his points. If we pay attention and if we listen and if we believe the Federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) and what he is saying, even though the Minister might not expect us to believe what he has said in his budget, but if we believe the Federal Minister, then we know that fuel prices go up which means dollars go out of Newfoundland, which means jobs go out of Newfoundland. There is going to be a net loss of jobs to this Province. We are going to be worse off. The unemployment rate is going to be higher, there are going to be fewer people employed then this time yesterday, before that budget was brought down.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that this is happening in Cape Breton that they have this special programme for tax exemptions because, Mr. Speaker, we have to now ask how does that impact upon the job figures and the Mobil Environmental Impact Statement and how does that impact upon the industries that would locate otherwise in Newfoundland to supply the offshore? It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that many industries might very well locate in Cape Breton. Not all that far from Hibernia if you take a look at your map, Mr. Speaker. Not far to move from North Sydney to Hibernia. Some slight increase in steaming time but I am sure that a company that is moving pipe or that is moving barite or moving other product offshore for offshore oil and gas might very well when they look at what they saved in the tax exemption decide that they are going to locate in

Cape Breton. Now, I have nothing against the good people in Cape Breton. I find that they are very, very much like Newfoundlanders in their long suffering patience with very adverse economic conditions and I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that they will see many benefits from this Federal Budget but, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that it would not be at the detriment of this Province and I would hope that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians would see the same opportunities as will be available to Cape Bretoners because we do know and all we have to do is look at the statistics brought back by the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) where he goes up and he finds in a community - Plum Point -

MR. FUREY:
Trout River.

MR. BARRY:
Trout River. The community of Trout River. The community of Trout River out of 118 young people, Mr. Speaker, 116 out of 118 young people in Trout River are not working. Unemployed. No help being offered, no hope for the future. Now, I know, Cape Breton has it hard, but Mr. Speaker, I would say there are a few communities in Cape Breton that could point to that type of horrifying, terrible statistic.

We move down the West Coast, we move to the Port au Port Peninsula, Mr. Speaker, we know that during the election the unemployment rate amongst young people was in the high eighties, low nineties. So, 89, 90, 92 per cent unemployment amongst young people on the entire Port au Port Peninsula. And we are very interested in these figures that are now being brought out by - I

think it is the Economic Development Committee in Corner Brook - where they are establishing that the true unemployment rate on the West Coast is something like 32 per cent on the West Coast of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate amongst young people is pushing 50 per cent on the West Coast. Now, we are in a situation where these are figures that cry out, cry out for special treatment. They cry out for the type of incentive that was provided by the Government of Canada Act. I mean what were we saying during the election. What were we saying during the election in terms of how to stimulate the economy. What were we saying that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) poo-pooed.

MR. FLIGHT:
Laughed at it.

MR. BARRY:
Laughed at it. We said, Mr. Speaker, reduce taxes and stimulate the economy. And, now look what is happening, the Government of Canada -

AN HON. MEMBER:
They did not reduce taxes.

MR. BARRY:
Exactly. In Cape Breton they decided to stimulate Cape Breton, they reduced taxes. But what are they doing here?

AN HON. MEMBER:
What is it? Ten per cent now, is it? Eight per cent? What is it?

DR. COLLINS:
(Inaudible)

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I realize that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)

may have large * lips but lip-service is lip-service, Mr. Speaker, whether it be from large lips, middle-sized lips or little lips and we hit a range of lip service, Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the house, depending upon the size of the lip, but it is still lip-service. Empty, empty rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, sure there were tax decreases. Yes, there were tax decreases. Some minor changes in the tourist industry which we compliment the Minister for, which we said was a great first little teeny-weeny start.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The rest of Canada has had it for the last thirty years.

MR. BARRY:

The rest of Canada right, has had it for the last thirty years. And our progressive Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), has finally gotten around to it. How many budget speeches was it? Four, was it the fourth one for the member?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Seven.

MR. BARRY:

Seven. Oh my heavens. Seven budgets later, the Minister of Finance for Newfoundland finally takes an action that has been taken in the rest of Canada, almost from time in memorial and he polls it up as a progressive step. Mr. Speaker, it just confirms that we have not the Progressive Conservative Party, this wing of the party is the Regressive Conservative Party with the philosophy that is shown by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in holding this out as a great, great, meaningful step to deal with unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, it is very sad, you know, to see the Premier talk of how he is going to aggressively go up to this conference now, after the budget it out, and he is really going to push the case for Newfoundland in terms of alleviating regional disparity. That, Mr. Speaker, is an example of the newspeak that we are into. 1984 has passed us and you know something - It may not have happened throughout the general public of this Province but newspeak has arrived within government in this Province. Remember 'newspeak' in Orwell's book, 1984, Mr. Speaker, where if government did not like the meaning given to a word, well, they would just give it another meaning, Mr. Speaker. It is like Alice in Wonderland, you know, Lewis Carroll's Through the Looking Glass where words mean exactly what I intend them to mean, Mr. Speaker. It is nothing more, nothing less. So, we have, Mr. Speaker, this newspeak now. The one word that is best an example of that is the word 'consultation'. Consultation, a nice four syllable word con-sul-ta-tion. Consultation as now defined by the Premier of this Province and by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) of this Province means after the boots have been put to the Newfoundland taxpayer by their colleagues in Ottawa -

MR. TULK:

With his new shoes.

MR. BARRY:

With his new shoes. He had a pair of hobnailed boots on, Mr. Speaker, it was not shoes. After he put those to the necks of Newfoundlanders, members opposite, the Premier and the Minister of Finance, they are going to consult

the budget. It is like the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) - maybe this gives us an indication as to why his new name is 'Landslide'. His consultation with the Minister of Forestry was to run up to Ottawa after the forest centre had been done away with. He then went up and consulted and he came away and he said, Mr. Speaker, remember these words 'He came away and he said, 'He had a nice cup of tea.' He had never been treated better, Mr. Speaker, in all the time he has been going to Ottawa. And then we said, 'Did you raise the matter of the forestry centre?' He said, 'Oh no,' Mr. Speaker, 'I did not want to upset the Federal Minister. I did not want to disrupt this great report that I have right here in my tray with my federal counterpart.'

MR. TULK:

I had my sandwich and left.

MR. BARRY:

I had my little cup of tea, Mr. Speaker, on nice china, I had a nice chat, now that was consultation. On the one hand, Mr. Speaker, it is doing it after the fact, trying to lock the barn door after the horse - not only the horse - the cattle, the chicken, the piglets, the whole bloody issue was gone, Mr. Speaker. He was then trying to lock the barn door. But, not only that, Mr. Speaker, even though it was after the fact, but when they do get up after the fact, they do not even raise the subject matter. They do not even get to the core of the issue. Mr. Speaker, that is consultation.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Mad Hatter's tea party.

MR. BARRY:

The Mad Hatter's tea party had nothing on it. The Mad Hatter's tea party was a very serious academic discussion in comparison, Mr. Speaker. The Mad Hatter's tea party was a think tank in comparison, Mr. Speaker. It was a thinker's conference compared to the type of consultation, the type of discussion -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. FENWICK:

The Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) will not rest until it is built anyway so you are okay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I can understand why the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is so concerned about Mr. Cashin as he sees the votes of the fishermen leaving him in Placentia area but, you know, Mr. Speaker, they are coming to the Liberal Party. They are coming to the Liberal Party. The great move has started and I can understand, Mr. Speaker, the bitterness of the member opposite because he realizes that not only is he not getting into cabinet this session, not only has the Premier put it to him again and promoted young turks from the backbenches over his head despite the great contribution that he has made to the Conservative Party in being defeated - I think it was fifteen times - the first fifteen times he ran being defeated but still hanging in there. Finally getting into this House and then being ignored, Mr. Speaker, then being ignored by the Premier of this Province and having other members catapulted over his head into the

cabinet, into parliamentary executive positions, Mr. Speaker. I can understand the bitterness but the real bitterness, Mr. Speaker, comes about because the member realizes this is his last chance to get in the government, because it is his last to get into the House of Assembly. He will never make it here again, Mr. Speaker. And that, Mr. Speaker, is why we have that particular tinge of bitterness.

We have, Mr. Speaker, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) I am sure going to jump up and down for joy, Mr. Speaker, and indicate to us why it is he is so happy about the budget of the Government of Canada when we should consider what is it doing for fishermen in this Province. Let us just take that little example now. What is the federal budget going to do with that constituency out there - the fishermen of this Province? There are a few in Placentia, there are a few in Burin-Placentia West. Now, what is that federal budget going to do for the fishermen?

We are now, Mr. Speaker, going to have these members opposite get up and explain to us how their constituents, the fishermen, or the fisher folk are going to be better off. How they are going to be better off under this budget which first of all sees a decrease in expenditures for fisheries generally of some \$60 millions, which sees, Mr. Speaker, an indication that unemployment insurance is going to be changed as of March 1986; to be tightened up as of March 1986. Tightened up, not loosened up. The unemployment insurance program will be tightened up as of March 1986. There are going to be less benefits. It is going to be

harder to get on, Mr. Speaker. We see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) for Canada stating that there is going to be wharfage fees imposed upon our fishermen And a new concept, dredging fees. Now, that is going to be lovely for rural Newfoundland, is it not? Dredging fees. Dredging fees are now going to be imposed, Mr. Speaker. Dredging fees.

MR. TULK:

Next they will tax calls to the weather office.

MR. BARRY:

Now the next thing, in order to get the weather, we are going to have to pay. I suppose we will all have to decide whether it is going to be worth the price.

DR. COLLINS:

Your arguments were described as hysterical.

MR. TULK:

Would Newfoundland's answer to the Care Bear be quiet? Listen and learn!

MR. BARRY:

I think it is time for a little hysteria to set in on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker. If that is the only sort of move they can make, if they have two stages, dead stop and hysteria, I would rather have the hysteria. If that is the choice that we have from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Collins), if he considers that it would be hysterical to do something to try to deal with unemployment, if he considers that it would be hysterical to decrease costs for fishermen rather than increase costs, it is time we had a little hysteria in this province, Mr. Speaker. Because if that is our choice, if the Minister of Finance can only move

from a catatonic state of unconsciousness as far as the economy is concerned, then come on hysteria! Where are you? Bring on the hysteria, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, our fishermen are going to be hit by the increase in fuel costs as well, which will be the direct result, Mr. Speaker, of Newfoundland and Labrador paying for the western oil agreement. That is what we are going to see. The agreement that was entered into, the Western Accord that was entered into between Mr. Mulroney, Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, saw, I think Mr. Lougheed of Alberta said, "We could not have done any better. We got everything we expected to get". Now, who is paying for that? Who is paying for that, Mr. Speaker? The fishermen who pay higher fuel costs in this province will be paying for it. The person driving the car who pays an extra 15 cents per gallon at the pump will be paying for it, Mr. Speaker.

The truckers, Mr. Speaker, who have to pay for their fuel to bring goods in. The consumer in the stores have to pay higher costs. The aircraft traveller who has to pay higher airfares as a result of higher jet fuel costs will be paying, Mr. Speaker.

What is happening is that Newfoundland and Labrador, all of us, each and every one of us in this province, will be paying the price that has been exacted by the Western Premiers as part of Mr. Mulroney's efforts to build a Tory dynasty in Western Canada. That is the price that was paid, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is going to indicate to us whether his government is going to be prepared to reduce provincial taxes on gasoline and

other fuels in light of the fact that the federal tax is going up, or is it all going to be socked to the poor old consumer again?

Mr. Speaker, we asked the Premier today in Question Period a question he refused to answer. We saw him fail to give us any position on the Come By Chance Refinery yesterday but we will get another crack at that on Monday. We see him more and more sidestepping questions, refusing to answer. One question we asked was did he make representation to the Prime Minister of Canada to get a similar program for Newfoundland as is being given to Cape Breton and Nova Scotia, and when did he do so

Now, we all saw, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier did not, because he refused to answer that. He refused to answer that, he sidestepped it, Mr. Speaker. He said that it is not normal to consult. Now that it part of the newspeak definition of "consultation".

MR. TULK:

Wilson claimed he consulted everybody.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Wilson was bending over backwards consulting. He was beat out from consulting.

MR. TULK:

Yes, as a matter of fact he said, "You see what cooperation and consultation with the provinces can do". Those were his exact words.

MR. BARRY:

That's right, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Minister of Finance bent over backwards talking about consultation.

One glaring gap, Mr. Speaker, for me was that there was no reference to any payments under the Atlantic Accord. Now, it may be there, but I have not been able to sift completely through these Budget documents yet, but there does not seem to be any reference to payments under the Atlantic Accord. So one has to wonder does that mean that this money, this Development Fund and so forth, is just money that was coming to Newfoundland under another subhead, so that they did not need to set up a particular subhead for Newfoundland?

MR. TOBIN:

That is not true.

MR. BARRY:

Well, we have to ask that, you know. We have to. Members opposite can get up and explain how it is that the Atlantic Accord payments are being dealt with, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mulroney, in the federal election in September, had as one of his planks that he was going to create jobs for young people. I think it was some sort of employment tax deduction that he was going to provide. Now, there was nothing in the mini-budget last Fall, and there is nothing in yesterday's Budget for creating jobs for young people. That, Mr. Speaker, is so cynical a breach of faith, so cynical a breach of trust with the young people of this province that I fear it will come back to haunt Mr. Mulroney, just as it is coming back to haunt our Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in this province who has continuously turned his gaze away from the hardship being suffered by the 16,000 to 20,000 young men and women under the age of 25 in this

province who see no hope, Mr. Speaker, as time passes of their ever getting productive work.

Mr. Speaker, there were other little funds that were reduced. I think the RIDP grants program is going to see \$150 million cut out of it. Now this is the program that saw money provided for the upgrading and modernization of the Abitibi-Price mill. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) might indicate whether he has any concern about this fund now being cut back by \$150 million. It is the same fund, I think, that assistance for Kruger came from. I think it is the RIDP fund, that -

MR. SIMMS:

No, the funding for the modernization in Grand Falls came from (inaudible) -

MR. TULK:

Not Grand Falls.

MR. SIMMS:

- modernization programs, and so did the Kruger (inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

I think this is the one that is being cut back.

There is other industry, Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland that may need assistance of this sort in the future and that is a fund that is now going to be eviscerated.

You know, there is nothing for municipalities. The Government of Canada has, over the past number of years, been taking a special interest in matters such as urban renewal, and they have been providing funds for municipalities for urban renewal and so forth, but nothing in the budget for municipalities. Mr. Speaker,

there is a general indication - there are a number of little warning signals that are dropped in by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) because they did not apparently have the courage to come out and do what they intended to do in this budget, they just gave a warning to people involved in the unemployment insurance programme - get ready for March of '86 because the boom is going to be lowered . They also said something about airports, Mr. Speaker, when they talked about airports being transferred to provinces and being downgraded to municipal status, which, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of some concern - the new member has left the chamber now but I am sure he is in the precincts of the House somewhere - The new member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) would do well, Mr. Speaker, to have this checked out with respect to the Deer Lake airport. What does this statement in the budget mean for Deer Lake? The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) I know will be checking that out for St. Anthony as already he has expressed concern about the changes that we might see there. I think it would probably be more dramatic at Deer Lake because of the higher level of jet traffic that we have there at Deer Lake although I must say I am very pleased to see the high level of activity at St. Anthony when I took my trip up to speak to the Strait of Belle Isle Liberal Association there a couple of days before the election. There were airplanes going all over the place, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:

A crowded meeting too.

MR. BARRY:

Had a dandy meeting. Obviously, a

very successful one, too.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a heavy gouge taken out of the pockets of middle-income and lower-income earners. Something like \$2.4 billion, Mr. Speaker, in total is being removed from their pockets. Now, the way the federal Finance Minister (Mr. Wilson) presented this horrendous gouge which is similar to the way the Provincial Minister (Dr. Collins) leads up to nastiness in his own budget. First of all, they talk about the great tax exemption and you would think, Mr. Speaker, that we should haul out the palm leaves and engage in hosannas by the time they are finished. But the net result when you do your calculations, Mr. Speaker, is that we are going to see tax breaks of approximately half a billion dollars to Canadians. Tax breaks of half a billion while they are taking out in increased taxes \$2.4 billion. So, the net result is a loss of about \$2 billion for the taxpayers.

MR. CALLAN:

Like a dentist this will not hurt a bit.

MR. BARRY:

This will not hurt a bit, did it? As he hauls out the good tooth instead of the one that you were having the toothache in.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Finance Minister (Mr. Wilson) said that there is going to be an increase in sales tax. He said, 'Oh, it is going up 1 per cent,' Mr. Speaker, 'from 10 per cent to 11 per cent.' He had a convenient lapse of memory that it went up from 9 per cent to 10 per cent in September, Mr. Speaker. So what we have actually seen is an increase from 9 per cent to 11 per

cent since this new prosperity inflecting regime was elected in September of last year in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few more general comments on the federal budget before I get back to the budget of the province. We have to be seriously concerned about the fact that there does not seem to be any replacement for the PIP programmes. The federal minister is taking the possession that the success rate out there - the fact that they are having oil discoveries is going to be enough to maintain a high level of exploration. Well, Mr. Speaker, all the federal minister has to do is look at the experience in Western Canada and he will see that unless incentives are continued for exploration the number of wells drilled is going to seriously go down, seriously fall. This is what happened in Western Canada, Mr. Speaker. Incentives were removed and the drillers just voted with their feet. They took off for the United States. A recession occurred in Western Canada, exploration fell off. Not because there was no oil being discovered in Alberta

DR. COLLINS:
(Inaudible)

MR. BARRY:
No, Mr. Speaker, because of the common just basic fact. The basic fact that it cost so much money to drill wells and companies only have so much money within their internal cash flow to put into drilling wells and if they have to use their own money, their own limited funds to the extent they now will have to, there is going to be a lot less exploration. And, Mr. Speaker, do I take it that the Minister of Finance (Dr.

Collins) is saying that this is now satisfactory? Because I understood the Premier had indicated -

DR. COLLINS:
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:
But I understood the Premier was seriously concerned about the fact that there was no replacement for the PIP grants. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on the other hand seems to be very smug and very relaxed and accepting it -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Very happy with it.

DR. COLLINS:
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:
Is the Minister of Finance saying that there is no need for a replacement for the PIP grants?

DR. COLLINS:
There is no need for the Liberals blaming me, I am saying that.

MR. BARRY:
Is he saying that there is no need for a replacement for the PIP grants, Mr. Speaker?

DR. COLLINS:
What I am saying is (inaudible)

MR. BARRY:
Oh, so we are going to be heard and our exploration effort is going to decline if the PIP grants are not replaced. Is that what the Minister is confirming now?

DR. COLLINS:
They are going to be replaced.

MR. BARRY:
Oh, they are going to be replaced.

Well, I am wondering what the purpose of a budget is. Maybe the Minister would indicate when the PIP grants are likely to be replaced. Is it not unusual that they would not be replaced in the budget? Is it normal for a government of Canada? Unlike the minister opposite I always thought the Federal Minister of Finance gave the real intentions with respect to expenditures. I thought that the Federal Minister of Finance if he intended to make expenditures during the year he believed that they should be setup in the budget. Now, I know the Minister of Forestry does not accept that. He has already said that we should not believe the figures that are in the Newfoundland Minister's budget because he has no intention of being bound by those restrictions in his department. That is not a bad attitude for a Minister. You have to protect your turf, you have to be aggressive, you have to protect your department. You have to make sure you have a few dollars to spend. So we know that the same credibility is not there for the figures contained in the Newfoundland Minister's budget as there is in Federal budget but we really thought, Mr. Speaker, that in the Federal budget we would see a statement of intention to spend money to replace PIP grants if that in fact was intended. So, I think we have to assume, Mr. Speaker, that there is no intention to replace PIP grants and I think that that means that we are going to see fewer wells drilled off Newfoundland and Labrador and that, of course, means that we are going to see fewer jobs. We are going to see fewer jobs from offshore oil and gas as a result of the PIP grants not being replaced.

Mr. Speaker, what we see in the federal budget is a continuation of the shell game while stating that the No. 1 priority is unemployment. It is obvious when you look at what is actually done that that is only rhetoric. That the real objective is the cutting of the deficit. That is the first and foremost priority, the same as is the case with the Provincial Minister of Finance. And, while Mr. Mulroney, like the Premier here promised jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs, if you elect me. What they have given, Mr. Speaker, is tax, tax, tax, tax, tax and the jobs are missing. The jobs are very conspicuous by their absence. We have the federal Minister of Finance fixated by the deficit in the same way as is the Premier and the Newfoundland Minister. We have no agenda for job creation, no systematic planned programme of reducing the rate of unemployment and the increase in the numbers of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we have no acknowledgement by the Government of Canada, as they have acknowledged for Cape Breton, that one quarter of our work force is unemployed, one quarter of the people who are still looking for work. That does not include the people who have thrown up their hands in despair and given up. The federal budget does not recognize that 40 per cent of our young people - over 40 per cent now, I suppose - are unemployed. We got a good indication as to why the Newfoundland Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Premier did not raise our cigarette, liquor and gasoline taxes, they were waiting for the federal minister to do that, and Mr. Mulroney. So they just said, After you, Sir, and they passed over that joy, that pleasure which

finance ministers and premiers have in socking it to the smokers and the drinkers. I know there are none in this House, Mr. Speaker, but there is one or two still left out there who have to now pay that much more for their sins than they did this time yesterday morning.

MR. FUREY:

He did not do it to raise money, he wanted to cut down on those sins, right. He was looking out for the health of Canadians.

MR. BARRY:

Is that the reason he gave? You mean he is cutting out that little tot of brandy for medicinal purposes that we would all like to have once in a while, that hot toddy that I had to supply to the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) who was in the throes of a heavy flu, and it was the only thing, I think, that managed to get him through the night, that helped him make it through the night, Mr. Speaker, that little medicinal hot toddy? Has he overlooked the fact that we do have those therapeutic applications of liquor? Do we get an exemption if we use it for a hot toddy, for medicinal purposes? Can we keep the receipt and send it in, together with the doctor's bills, and get an exemption if we put a little hot water and a little bit of lemon in it? I do not know. I did not see it mentioned in the budget?

Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing now, regrettably, is Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Wilson bringing all Newfoundlanders to that great political orgy which they had out West. We are all being invited to the party, except, Mr. Speaker, it is a bring-your-own contribution, as far as the people of this

Province are concerned. We are being invited to the party, but we are not going to make it to the refrigerator, we are not going to make it to the kitchen table, we are not going to make it to the liquor cabinet, Mr. Speaker. We are going to the party and what are we going to get out of it? We are going to get the satisfaction of seeing an attempt to prop up a Tory dynasty. That is what is happening. That is why we have all been issued with this invitation to pay more for gasoline, to pay higher personal income taxes. It is because we have an invitation to participate in that great Tory consultative process which has as its objective the sole purpose of trying to entrench a Tory political dynasty.

But I can understand why Mr. Mulroney is putting so much emphasis on the Western Provinces. He realizes he is all gone as far as the Atlantic provinces are concerned. As far as Newfoundland is concerned, as far as New Brunswick is concerned, I think even as far as Quebec is concerned, the writing is on the wall already. As we see the resurgence of Liberal support, Mr. Mulroney will sock it to us more and more as he tries to get us to pay for the affection he is trying to buy in Western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we can expect a continuation of this type of sock-it-to Newfoundland, sock-it-to Atlantic Canada, except for Cape Breton, because there is a lot more political affection that Mr. Mulroney is going to have to go out and purchase. Judging by recent election results, he is going to have to go out and purchase a lot more political affection, over the next few years.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that really disturbs me about this recent budget, though, is the serious cutback in transfer payments.

MR. PATTERSON:
Whose budget are you knocking now?

MR. MITCHELL:
The federal budget. The good-news budget, according to the Premier.

MR. BARRY:
For the benefit of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), as a new member he is not fully conversant with the technique employed by the provincial minister. You see, the provincial minister is going to come into this House shortly, it is usually on the average of every three months, and he is going to say, Sorry, my projected figures for the operating deficit are gone, I am way out, out to lunch, overboard, and he is going to explain that it is not his fault. He is going to say it was something that was done to him by the Government of Canada. So, you see, this is why referring to the transfer payments is fairly important. Because this could be the reason he is going to use, in two or three months, when he comes in and gives us an update and says, I am way out again. Sorry, I blew it again, the operating deficit has doubled, or tripled, or quadrupled, gone to Hades in a hand-basket, anyhow.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Where?

MR. BARRY:
This year's deficit in the provincial budget that we are now debating, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER:
You sound like you have the

provincial budget and the federal budget confused.

MR. BARRY:
I am explaining to the member for LaPoile the interconnection and the relevancy of the federal budget for debate on the minister's budget. Because the transfer payments of \$2 billion which are going to be lost, our share of that is going to be part of the excuse which we will get from the provincial Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) when he comes in to explain how he blew it again.

MR. SIMMS:
Carrying that line of thought a little further, in explaining the tie-in to the member for LaPoile, are you also telling him about the \$2 billion being espoused by Mr. Wilson as it ties in with the \$2.8 billion cutback in transfer payments Mr. MacEachen was talking about the year before? Is there any tie-in there?

MR. BARRY:
I tend to think Mr. MacEachen's influence is still there and still stronger than the Premier. Judging by what is being done in Cape Breton, I think Mr. MacEachen is still a man to be reckoned with on the federal scene. Mr. MacEachen is not yet a political eunuch. Mr. MacEachen, and I suppose we have to give some credit to Premier Buchanan as well; Premier Buchanan is obviously a Premier who has established a real rapport with the Prime Minister and Mr. Wilson. Premier Buchanan obviously understands the consultative process. The Premier of Nova Scotia obviously understands what real consultation is all about. When we see what has happened in Cape Breton, when

we see the benefits that Cape Breton has derived, we can see what Mr. MacEachen has wrought, Mr. Speaker. Mr. MacEachen still has more influence with Mr. Mulroney than does the Premier of this Province, by all evidence as to what has happened in Cape Breton. Because, you know, even Premier Buchanan never showed great concern, I have to say, for Cape Breton and in fact I think, if I remember correctly, Buchanan lost in the provincial election. He lost most of the seats in Cape Breton.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:
(Inaudible) I think so, a few days.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I do not mind a few intelligent comments, but I am getting a lot of gibberish now that I cannot quite make out, so I wonder if we could have a little quiet?

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Even Premier Buchanan does not seem to pay a lot of attention to Cape Breton, perhaps because he lost the majority of seats, I believe. They lost a number of them anyhow, some to, I believe, the NDP, who have a foothold in Cape Breton still, although it is less than it was.

So, it is obvious that Mr. MacEachen's influence is still there and still stronger than the

Premier of this Province's. It is an amazing story of a political career that Senator MacEachen - a Senator, no longer in the House of Commons - apparently is able to wield more influence and bring about better results for his constituency than is the Premier of this Province. And, really, we have to ask the Premier to seriously reconsider that switch he has made of going from mad dog to lap dog. It is a serious change, Mr. Speaker, in style that we have to ask the Premier to reconsider, Can he be as effective, Mr. Speaker, as a lap dog, as he thought he would be?

MR. TOBIN:
Use your own mind, boy! Do not be using Rex Murphy's brain, use your own!

MR. BARRY:
I know there would be nobody using the member for Burin - Placentia West's. If he were in his right mind he would not be using it anyhow! First of all, Mr. Speaker, the debate would be over before we found it.

MR. SIMMONS:
He is only half-effective with his wit.

MR. BARRY:
That is right.

We have, Mr. Speaker, a situation where the Premier's new conciliatory approach apparently has actually come about for the reasons that we gave several months ago. It is not because the Premier really feels that he is being effective in that role, it is because he has no choice. He was basically told by the Prime Minister of Canada, keep quiet if you want to see the Atlantic Accord.

Now, what we have to ask is, Where is the Atlantic Accord? We are half-way through this session of the House of Assembly. Where is the legislation for the Atlantic Accord? Where is it, Mr. Speaker? When will we get an opportunity - the Minister responsible for the Atlantic Accord is strolling behind your Chair in a dazed sort of fashion. Mr. Speaker, when will that minister get back to work and bring in legislation that we can debate with respect to the Atlantic Accord? Where is the Atlantic Accord? What is the member waiting for? What is the Premier waiting for? Why are they holding off introducing the Atlantic Accord? That is what is puzzling us. We have been here waiting to debate that. Maybe they are going to try to slip it in with that pile of legislation that builds up towards the end of each session, they are going to try to slip it in a whip it through in that legislation. No, no, it will not work, Mr. Speaker, that technique will not work. That Atlantic Accord is not going to be sneaked through in the dead of night so that we cannot point out some of the serious flaws in that agreement such as Clause 54.

MR. PATTERSON:

Look out for August! Look out for August!

MR. BARRY:

August is going to be a very warm month, Mr. Speaker. I think we had better check out the air conditioning in this House. If we do not see that Atlantic Accord legislation being tabled soon, Mr. Speaker, we, unfortunately, are going to be trapped here. We are going to be trapped here during the dog days of Summer. Because it is an agreement, Mr. Speaker,

that has to be thoroughly explored and has to be thoroughly discussed.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, the flaw in the Atlantic Accord is Clause 54.

Now, I tried to establish from the Premier yesterday just what is the position of the Government of Newfoundland. Are they supporting the three bidders? Would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) indicate, by a nod of his head or something, whether he is supporting the three bidders that are prepared to reactivate the refinery? Has the Minister of Finance told Petro Canada to throw away the bids, toss away the bids of those companies that are proposing to dismantle the refinery?

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where we will want to know whether the Newfoundland Minister of Finance and the Premier are making any representation to Petro Canada to tell them to throw away those bids, lose them in that round wastepaper basket on the floor of their offices, those bids that deal with dismantling Come By Chance? What we want, Mr. Speaker, is a commitment by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that the Premier and the Minister of Finance will make strong representation and, indeed, insist that Petro Canada consider only those bids that go for reactivation of Come By Chance. Because, Mr. Speaker, if we do not have further processing of oil and gas onshore in this Province, if we see a continuation of this Clause 54, what we are going to see is the export of jobs in the petroleum industry from Newfoundland to other provinces of Eastern Canada. And members opposite might be able to explain

to us, How is it that we regularly get up in this House and we talk, Mr. Speaker, about not exporting round fish? The member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) would be able to tell us a little bit about the jobs that are lost in his constituency because fish were taken right from the wharf by truckers and moved to other provinces.

MR. MITCHELL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

God, I never thought I would get anybody up over there!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

On a point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. MITCHELL:

I am quite aware of the problem in the district of LaPoile in relationship to fish that has been shipped across the Gulf. One of the first things that I was able to accomplish after becoming elected was to get that problem rectified.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MITCHELL:

I am happy to say that, as of today, and in the future, all fish caught during our Winter fishery will be processed in Newfoundland, processed by Newfoundlanders, and that is a great accomplishment of this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, I would not speak to that point of order, I just say that it is an excellent point of order. It is a good point, of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. BARRY:

What? Representation from both sides of the House, and it is an excellent point - you see, that is the point I have been trying to make, that Members on both sides of this House have regularly been in agreement that it is wrong to export fish in the round to other provinces because doing so exports jobs. And I am delighted to have the Member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) confirm that that is the position of the newer members of the House, as well.

Now, I want to have the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) explain to me whether that is not the same position as taken with electricity in Churchill Falls. I know that is not a matter of direct relationship to his district, but I am sure that as an individual who has been involved with the political process, involved with a number of political parties as a matter of fact, from time to time, I understand, I am sure he has kept himself involved with current political issues. And I am sure he has views upon whether we should be exporting electricity to Quebec.

Does the Member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) have any views on the exporting of electricity to Quebec? Does the Member for LaPoile agree that this should

continue.

Silence and acquiescence. We ask the Member for LaPoile, does he believe that we should export electricity to Quebec? Is that what the Member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) is saying by his silence, that we should not try to change the Upper Churchill contract, that we should continue to have electricity processed for Quebec.

Let the record show, let "Hansard" show, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:
The Upper Churchill contract, look!

MR. BARRY:
Let the record show that the Member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) is -

MR. MITCHELL:
Would the hon. member yield for a minute?

MR. BARRY:
What?

MR. SPEAKER:
Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) yield to the member for LaPoile.

MR. BARRY:
Is this a Point of Order, a question, or what?

MR. MITCHELL:
If you would yield to me, I would like to respond.

MR. BARRY:
Just for the response.

MR. MITCHELL:
I would like to respond to your question.

MR. BARRY:

Just for the response, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MITCHELL:
Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I was told when I came to this Assembly was to sit and listen. I have been doing that and, I must say, I have not learned too much in relation to what has been coming from the other side.

One of the things I have learned in the past is what actually happened. And I do know that the problem with Churchill Falls, the problem with our energy in this province, is the direct result of the Liberal Administration before this Administration. They gave away our resources, and that is why, today, the people of Newfoundland have to pay the consequences.

We have the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), Mr. Speaker, who was Minister of Energy for four years and did nothing about it. And, I must say, since I have been on this side of the House, we have taken steps to try to correct this situation. And I am sure, in due time, this situation will be corrected; that the export of electricity through Quebec will be rectified the same as fish being exported from this province was rectified.

I am sure every member in this House will concur with that, and if the Opposition on the other side would like to put forward some good, sound evidence that they have a solution to this problem, I am sure that every member on this side will listen to it and will concur with what they have to say.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition
(Mr. Barry).

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the comments of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell). I am sure they are very sincere and well-intended. There is just one little minor point that maybe the member for LaPoile could clear up at the appropriate time and that is, if he was so concerned about the Liberal policy with respect to the Upper Churchill, maybe the member might explain how is it that he was the president of the Liberal Association in Baie Verte - White Bay for a number of years after that contract had been entered into. I wonder! There is just that little slight inconsistency in the position of the member, Mr. Speaker, which, at the appropriate time, the member for LaPoile might be able to clarify, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Make it a Point of Order so I don't lose my space.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MITCHELL:

Mr. Speaker, it is a known fact that at one time I did support the Liberal Party in this province.

MR. TOBIN:

Shame, shame.

MR. BARRY:

After the contract was signed?

MR. MITCHELL:

From what I can understand, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr.

Barry), who is not speaking in this debate, is looking at the Budget that this House has just recently brought down, and he cannot find anything wrong with it in order to debate it -

MR. TULK:

Answer the question, that is all.

MR. MITCHELL:

- so he has to waste time insinuating that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) he was a Liberal.

MR. TULK:

It is a waste of time, is it?

MR. SIMMONS:

You are going to duck it, are you?

MR. MITCHELL:

Now, I am not ashamed to admit that at one time I was a Liberal in this province, and so were a number of other people.

MR. BARRY:

You should not be, either. You should not be, either. You should be ashamed to admit you are a Tory.

MR. MITCHELL:

When the candidate for the Liberal Party, Mr. Rowe, came out to LaPoile and gave his speech at the nomination meeting, that was one of the arguments he brought up, how I had been a Liberal at one time, and how he had been around the political party for some 25 or 30 years and he finally had his eyes opened. He finally had his eyes opened. When my turn came to speak, I said, "Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the candidate for saying all the kind words he did about me, but I would also like to remind him that it did not take me 23 years to get my eyes opened, I got my eyes opened 14 years ago, and the reason I did

was because I looked around and saw what was happening in this province; I saw how all of our resources had been given away for Confederation. We saw the Premier of that administration travelling around the world, enticing companies to come in here to establish with no equity position whatsoever, none whatsoever, come in here with a free-hand.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I am afraid that is not a Point of Order, the hon. Member gave some past history

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition

MR. BARRY:

I thought it was not a bad Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. It was not a bad Point of Order. We have now had the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) -

MR. SPEAKER:

May I interrupt the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) for one moment to welcome sixty-four Grade IX and X students from Little Heart's Ease Integrated All-Grades School, with their teachers, Lloyd Martin, David Peach, and Peggy Lewis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that was a pretty good point that the Member for LaPoile raised there. Because, we have confirmation that he remained a member of the Liberal Party for approximately five years, from

1966 to 1971. The Upper Churchill contract was signed in 1966. So it obviously was not the signing of that document that caused the member to bolt from the Liberal Party.

But I am delighted that I have this confirmation of a policy by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) because that is exactly the point that we are leading up to, you see. And the point is, Mr. Speaker, whether it be fish, whether it be electricity, or whether it be oil and gas, what is the difference?

Now, will the member, Mr. Speaker, decide that he cannot support this Clause 54 in the Atlantic Accord which says that Newfoundland cannot have oil and gas processed in this province, that it must go, Mr. Speaker, to the Eastern provinces of Canada, the other Eastern provinces? Will the member for LaPoile be on his feet, Mr. Speaker, in this debate condemning the Premier of this province and condemning the government that entered into that Atlantic Accord for the wording of that Clause 54? And will the member, Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, tell us his concerns for exporting jobs? Will the member for LaPoile explain to us, when he rises in debate, how he can find the difference between exporting jobs in the oil industry by exporting oil? And what is the difference in condemning...

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please.

A point of Order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is probably a good idea at this time to remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) that he is speaking by leave of this House. Because a couple of days ago, my colleague, the Member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was recognized and quickly took his seat. I support his decision to allow the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) to speak by leave of this House, because it is a tradition that the Leader of the Opposition have unlimited time, and I would not want to interfere with that. But I would just like it to be clearly understood, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition is speaking by leave of this entire House, any member of which can take away leave. So I would like to remind the Leader of the Opposition of this matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point, there is no Point of Order.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that Point of Order I would just like to say that I am delighted when the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) stands up anytime the Galleries are full, because it makes our job a lot easier when we are able to show the level of debate that comes from that side of the House. Every time the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) gets up he just establishes, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing over on that side of the House just tired, stale rhetoric. There is nothing in the way of new ideas, but I understand Your Honour has rules that there is no point of order.

Mr. Speaker, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) and all

members opposite are going to have to explain if they condemn the export of fish in the round, because that is the export of jobs, and if they condemn the export of electricity because that also is the export of jobs, then how can they sign or support Clause 54 of the Atlantic Accord which is exporting oil and is also the export of jobs. Why is the member for Lapoile not on his feet regularly in this House fighting to have oil and gas processed in this Province? Because that is the only way we are going to see permanent jobs, long-term jobs, created for the young people, the 16,000 to 20,000 young people, 40 per cent of young people under twenty-five who are now unemployed. That is the only way, through developing our resources for processing in the Province, the only way we will see long-term jobs created. And what is happening now, what members opposite are doing now, is the same thing they have been condemning in the fishing industry and in the hydro-electric industry. What they are doing, Mr. Speaker, is developing a resource, namely oil and gas, in order to get the short-term construction jobs - building concrete platforms - and they are ignoring that they could be keeping oil and gas in this Province, having it processed - not just oil and gas resulting - having petro-chemical industries, having textiles manufactured, having plastic manufactured. Mr. Speaker, having the resource processes to its fullest in this Province is the only way that we will see long-term jobs created for that 16,000 to 20,000 young people under twenty-five, for the close to 60,000 people in total, who are not walking the streets without hope having graduated from

school, from university, the College of Trades, College of Fisheries. They are up in my office everyday, Mr. Speaker, they are coming in with the saddest stories. They are saying, 'I am desperate, I am becoming discouraged. I do not know where to look. I cannot even get inside a door with my resume anymore.' There are thousands out there, Mr. Speaker, who are on the brink of despair and we have to do something to see that permanent jobs are created in this Province. And the member for Lapoile (Mr. Mitchell) has a heavy responsibility to explain how he can support a clause in the Atlantic Accord which would see oil and gas exported and permanent jobs being shipped out to other provinces because that is what is being done.

Newfoundland is going to be a laughing stock. We have seen Peter Lougheed and the Alberta government, time after time, say that they would not put up with the export of oil and gas from Alberta in the way that it has gone on in the past. And over the years they have gathered more and more of the petro-chemical industry of Canada in Alberta. But members opposite, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) seems to have lost all spirit. It seems like the spirit is drained right out of him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

He is washed out talking to the flying undertaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we would all be delighted to pass the hat around and chip in to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) to do a good job.

MR. YOUNG:
(Inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

I do not think that in a physical sense that we are going to have to expect that but in a political sense there will be, I think, an early demise of the member for St. John's East.

MR. TULK:

There will be a lot of political undertakers around.

MR. BARRY:

In the political sense, yes, we are going to need a very active series of political undertakers when the next election is called and we have to deal with members opposite, Mr. Speaker. I know the whip has given up on it. Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in this Province that, unfortunately, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is ignoring. He is ignoring the crisis of unemployment amongst our young people and amongst the population generally. The budget that has been placed before this House which we are now debating, Mr. Speaker, does not live up to the Premier's mandate. He said, going into the election, 'I want a mandate to create jobs.' What do we see in this budget that has been brought down? What did we see in the federal budget that came down last night? We see a breaking faith, a breaking of the trust that was placed in the Premier and in the Minister of Finance by the people when they have not put forth ideas such as the apprenticeship and training programme that we have recommended. An apprenticeship and training programme, Mr. Speaker, would go a long way towards dealing with the problem of unemployment amongst young

people under twenty-five. We would subsidize the salaries of young people who would be employed in the private sector. We are not saying that government can create new jobs but we are saying that with the assistance of the private sector we can. We could subsidize the salaries, Mr. Speaker, of young people graduating from university, trade school, College of Fisheries, more of these would then be employed by the private sector, Mr. Speaker. These young people would gain experience from rubbing shoulders with entrepreneurs. They would learn how to, perhaps, create jobs themselves. They would learn what business is all about. They would learn how to work, Mr. Speaker, which is not something that come automatically to a person. A person has to have certain routines developed, has to have certain discipline instilled, Mr. Speaker, in order to be able to work. And when you have young people who have been four or five or six years out of school having to throw up their hands, unable to find employment. When we closed the House yesterday we were talking about the CBC show on unemployment in Great Britain where there are a million young people walking the streets or sleeping in bed until the sun goes down every day because they have nothing to look forward to in terms of employment. But, Mr. Speaker, there are social problems that are going to be created. We are going to have young people say, 'What is the point? We might as well try another system, this system is not working.' They become totally alienated with the democracy, with the democratic process, with politicians because they say, 'What is a politician doing for me? What is the political process doing for me or

for my family and my friends?'

Mr. Speaker, what we have is a lack of realism, unfortunately, in this budget. We have rhetoric that does not translate into action, however. We have lip service being provided from big lips, little lips and medium-sized lips but it is still lip service. All members of this House, when they get up, and they use these wishy-washy, mealy-mouthed, phrases about being concerned about the unemployed about when they can do something about it they do not do something about it. Until they try, Mr. Speaker, to bring in an apprenticeship and training programme such as we have proposed, until they look at what is being done in West Germany, in Italy, in the United Kingdom -

MR. PATTERSON:
Russia.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I will go to Russia, I will go to China, I will go to any country in the world if it means getting the unemployed of this Province back to work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear.

MR. BARRY:
I would even listen to the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) if he had a few ideas about dealing with unemployment.

MR. PATTERSON:
You should be down with your socialists (inaudible).

MR. TULK:
Oh, go on, boy, go on. Do not be so childish and foolish, open up your mind.

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, there we have it, there we have it, an apprenticeship and training programme is a socialist idea, you see. What he is saying is I should go to Russia. He is saying it is a communist idea, Mr. Speaker, to have an apprenticeship and training programme. The political dinosaur from Placentia, Mr. Speaker, is an example of why we now have the regressive conservative party governing this Province. Not the Progressive Conservative Party, the regressive conservative party".

MR. PATTERSON:

Who put Crosbie Offshore into bankruptcy, and who put Fishery Products in and 5,000 men out of work down in my hon. friend's district? Who did that?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

Who wanted to close the ERCO plant?

MR. TULK:

It it a good job he did, otherwise we would never have had a settlement.

MR. BARRY:

If I am that powerful, I do not know why I am wasting my time trying to form the government of this province. If the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is prepared to give me all that power and authority, why am I wasting my time trying to form the government? I am a pretty powerful individual already, I would think.

MR. TULK:

You must be a complete and utter genius. You've got to be a complete genius.

MR. BARRY:

I am gratified by the compliments that are passed to me. I am gratified, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Placentia would give me that amount of power.

MR. PATTERSON:

I do not know what kind of power you had in Placentia when I trounced your man out there."

MR. TULK:

Some trouncing.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, a landslide we had out there, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), unfortunately as we know, is growing excessively bitter. The longer he is kept out of Cabinet, the more backbenchers, young buckaroos who are just in the House of Assembly only a couple of years, are promoted ahead of him. And he is getting more and more bitter because he knows he is never going to make it into this House again. He did so poorly in the last election, he knows that the base is there now, and he is gone. He has missed his last chance to get into Cabinet. It is all gone, Mr. Speaker, it is all gone.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just that we have young people who are becoming alienated, it is not just that we have young people who are becoming frustrated, the province is worse off because we do not have the shoulders to the wheel that could come from these young people who could be out there working in the economy producing, generating riches for this province, increasing the benefits to all Newfoundlanders, causing our Gross Provincial Product to increase. That is the way we have to deal with the deficit of this

province, put people to work, have people making a contribution to the economy.

But no, Mr. Speaker, the Tory approach to government is that it is the deficit that comes first, and in order to deal with the deficit, you have to create unemployment, you have to have unemployment increase. And that is why we have seen unemployment increase in the period of time members opposite have been in power. In 1971 there was a 9 per cent level of unemployment. Then we had a change of premiers in 1979, and by that time unemployment had gotten to 15 per cent. And now unemployment, this year, has gotten up to over 26 per cent. It has almost tripled. The Tory government, with its fixation on the deficit, with its fixation on increasing unemployment in order to deal with the deficit,

that is the mentality that we are dealing with, and that the people of this province are dealing with, and that is why, by the time we are finished with members opposite, over the next three to four years, you will not be able to find a Tory in this House. After the next election you will not be able to find one, Mr. Speaker, they will be obliterated, annihilated, demolished, totally wiped out!

MR. PATTERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please! A point of Order, the hon. the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson).

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I am very interested in putting young people and old

people to work. When the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was Minister of Energy, we had two holes dug on either side of the Straits and I was wondering what it would cost to fill in those holes with pick and shovel.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that Point of Order, I rule there is no Point of Order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that is a very interesting point. Those holes that were put in on both sides of the Straits had a very, very important purpose, and the purpose was to get an electrical intertie between the island of Newfoundland and Labrador. That was a project that I had well underway before I suffered a slight political setback, Mr. Speaker, and I did not have the opportunity to complete that job. But do you know something? I was out of the House of Assembly for 4 years, from 1975 to 1979, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) was in during that time, and when I came back, do you know that I did not find a single thing that had been done in terms of getting an electrical intertie between the island of Newfoundland and Labrador? There was not a single thing that had been done by the member for Placentia, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), or the current Premier.

MR. SIMMS:

What about when you came back?

MR. BARRY:

There was almost nothing done, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

What about since you came back?

MR. BARRY:

Oh, yes, since I came back. In the couple of years that I had in government after I came back in 1979, we saw a lot of things started, Mr. Speaker. We saw negotiations commence with Quebec. But do you know something? We had a Premier who was unable to conclude a negotiation, Mr. Speaker. We had a Premier who insisted upon taking the case to Court, going all the way to Court and saying, 'No, by jingoos, no by jingoos, I am not going to negotiate a deal. I am not going to negotiate a deal with the Premier of Quebec, I am going to take him to Court and I am going to win everything. I am not going to give up something in the course of negotiations to try and get a fair deal for Newfoundland, I want everything. I am taking her all the way, I am going to court.' And he went to court and he got blown out of the water. He lost and then he had to slink back with his tail between his legs to the bargaining table. But where is his negotiating power now, Mr. Speaker? Where was his negotiating power once he went back to the bargaining table having lost the case, Mr. Speaker?

But you know something? We are still, we are still ready to proceed -

MR. PATTERSON:

Your Liberal team in Bellevue.

MR. BARRY:

That is a winning team, Mr. Speaker, a winning team.

We are still prepared, Mr. Speaker, to support any action taken by members opposite to continue with that attempt to get an electrical intertie, a transmission line between Labrador

and the Province of Newfoundland. Because if that had been done when I started it, in 1975, if that had been completed, you would not see the increasing electricity costs that you are seeing now in this Province, you would not see the fuel adjustment charge that is crucifying elderly people, poor people in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

Members opposite laugh at the rising electricity costs. They laugh at their inaction. They laugh at their incompetence. But, Mr. Speaker, they are going. They are going. We started the job this time, we will finish it in the next election. There will not be a Tory found East of the Funks.

AN HON. MEMBER:

East of the Funks?

MR. BARRY:

West of the Funks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, during the course of the election campaign, I had to reveal that hidden desire, that hidden objective that I had as the Leader of the Opposition. I had to reveal that hidden objective, that I wanted to become Premier. Mr. Speaker, I did not want to do it. I did not want to reveal that desperate objective that a Leader of the Opposition would have of wanting to become Premier, but I felt it necessary just in case there was somebody who was not aware of that. I felt that we had to point out in the course of our campaign, that there is a Premier in this Province supported by a group of yes men who have, unfortunately, been bring Newfoundland further and further

* backwards. The unemployment figures, of course, are one of the best examples when in the course of conservative tenure we have seen unemployment go from 9 per cent to over 26 per cent, almost triple. But even in the time of this Premier's administration we have seen it go from 15 per cent to over 26 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not performance, that is not what people expected when they voted the hon. gentleman into office and when they put members opposite into office. They were expecting more from members opposite, Mr. Speaker, than for them to laugh off unemployment, laugh off the need to have job creating, laugh off any efforts to get a transmission line between Labrador and the Island.

MR. TULK:

They should be called the laugh off government.

MR. BARRY:

Let us hear members opposite when they get up to speak indicated did they or did they not support this idea in 1975, did they not support it now, today, for us to get a transmission like between Labrador and the Island of Newfoundland.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, yes.

MR. BARRY:

Would that not keep down electricity costs, Mr. Speaker? Should not the Premier have stayed at the negotiating table with the Province of Quebec to get a deal? The member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is saying 'Yes, he should have.' You had better not let the Premier hear you say that or you will lose your new job.

MR. BAKER:

You will not be the gofer.

MR. TOBIN:

I am saying to you, Sir, that you drew up that proposal because you knew you could not win Placentia West and Frank Moores gave you a nice patronage appointment.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate part about this is that this is the type of constructive debate we see from the member for Burin - Placentia West. A large part of the problem is that government is not acting. It is not acting because it has no ideas, the Premier has no ideas, the Cabinet has no ideas and the backbenchers, the deep recesses of the backbenchers, as exhibited by the member for Burin - Placentia West, those crevices of the backbenchers from which regularly crawl the member for Burin - Placentia West. They have no ideas, Mr. Speaker, because if they had ideas when they crawl out from underneath those crevices in the backbenchers, Mr. Speaker, they make a few constructive comments. They get on their feet like a man, Mr. Speaker, in their own seats and get up and make a constructive comment. And all we have had from the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), the member for Placentia proper (Mr. Patterson), is the occasional wisecrack, Mr. Speaker, the occasional jeer, the occasional snide remark. Look at Hansard, Mr. Speaker, I know you read it every night before you go to bed, go through the index, Mr. Speaker, go through that index and look for the speeches from the member for Burin - Placentia West, look for the speeches from the member for Placentia. Now you know where you will find them, Mr. Speaker, you will not find them under the names of the members in

the Hansard. Where there speeches are contained and where their speeches are concealed is every so many line in Hansard where it says, an hon. member: Oh, oh., an hon. member: Hear, hear., because Hansard editors do not bother to put in the trash that is thrown out in the jeering comments that they get from these members. So all you see in Hansard, if anybody wants to look at it, we do not have today's here yet but it is coming, yesterdays, if you want to look at Hansard you will see regularly the speech of the member for Placentia is, 'An hon. member: Oh, Oh.' Let us see yesterday - look, the first page, 'Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear. That was the speech of the member for Placentia yesterday.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. PATTERSON:

I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition tell us what transpired between he and Mr. Cashin when they flipped a coin in Ottawa dealing with the leadership?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing but respect for the leader of the Fishermen's Union within his capacity as leader of the Fishermen's Union. He has a lot of respect from people on all sides of this House. People listen to him, Mr. Speaker, because of his understanding and knowledge of the trade union movement and his understanding of

the fishing industry. As a matter of fact, it is unfortunate that the Premier of this Province has not met with him any more than once, imagine this, has not met with the President of the Fishermen's Union more than once since 1979. Shame, shame, shame for the Premier of this Province to refuse to meet with the President of the Fishermen's Union of this Province. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you in another three or four years when I am Premier of this Province, when members here are sitting on the other side of the House having formed the government, Mr. Speaker, I will meet on a regular basis with the President of the Fishermen's Union. I will be delighted to consult with him on the problems facing fishermen. And if there had been more consultation between the Premier and members opposite and the President of the Fishermen's Union, they would not be socking it to the fishermen the way they are now. We would not see a federal budget come down last night with nothing for the fishermen but higher costs and higher user fees. We would not see the cost of fuel for fishermen going up. We would not see wharf fees going up. We would not see dredging fees coming in. We would not see \$60 million be in cut on fishery expenditures, Mr. Speaker. We would not see members opposite in a cowardly, hypocritical fashion letting fish plants close in this Province. You are leaving it up to Fishery Products, you are passing the buck to Fishery Products. You are afraid to take responsibility for the fishing industry, Mr. Speaker. If there was consultation with the President of the Fishermen's Union that sort of thing, I am sure, would not be happening. Well, Mr. Speaker, I

have that * respect for the President of the Fishermen's Union in his unique capacity.

Now as a politician, Mr. Speaker, I have to confess that the President of the Fishermen's Union has his rights as does the member for Placentia, to toss his hat into the Liberal leadership race. And, you know, it did not happen. But I must say, Mr. Speaker, we were surprised, on this side of the House as I am sure members opposite, when we saw the President of the Fishermen's Union having been the guest speaker at the departure dinner for the Liberal Prime Minister of Canada at the time, Mr. Trudeau, make his next political appearance working for another political party. Now that was a bit of a surprise to us, Mr. Speaker, but that does not in the slightest take away from our respect for the trade union knowledge of that President of the Fishermen's Union. We have a lot of respect for that gentleman, he is understanding of fishermen, the fishing industry and the trade union movement, it is only with respect to his political judgement that we have to raise some questions. So I hope that that clarifies the matter. As far as the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is concerned, I hope that clarifies it. But, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier will not do it, I would hope that the member for Placentia, or the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) might invite in Mr. Cashin, the President of the Fishermen's Union, and have the occasional chat with him. You gentlemen have fishermen as constituents, you have members of his Fishermen's Union in your districts, if your Premier is not going to invite him in to have a chat, to consult,

then you should do that. And you will be doing nothing to help your constituents in the fishing industry if you show the same disrespect for the President of the Fishermen's Union that has regularly been shown, and continues to be shown, by the Premier of this Province. It is shameful, Mr. Speaker, it is shameful, the fact that there is no consultation on a regular, ongoing basis with the President of the Fishermen's Union.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is the same sort of thing that has been going on in the labour movement generally, as far as members opposite are concerned. They will not consult with any members of the Trade Union Movement. Their idea of consultation, Mr. Speaker, is that the day they are bringing in a freeze on wages, the same afternoon they are bringing in a freeze on wages, invite the people in and say, I am going to have a freeze imposed on you.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, talking about consulting with labour, I consulted with the teachers in the last election and I would like the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) to know that.

MR. BARRY:

Consulted with who?

MR. SIMMONS:

The teachers.

MR. PATTERSON:

With the teachers.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue, to that point of order.

MR. CALLAN:

It is a little bit sickening, I believe. The two most noted hecklers we have on the government benches are the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), of course, and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). The only contribution they make, as the Leader of the Opposition has said several times this morning, is to heckle. Here they are: The member for Burin - Placentia West thinks he got re-elected on his own merits, he has said that several times, when he knows full-well he would never be here today if it were not for the Marystown Shipyard, which was put there by the former Liberal Government.

The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) would not be here with his 141 vote majority if it were not for the ERCO phosphorus plant in Long Harbour, which was put there by Joey Smallwood and the former Liberal Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, John Crosbie is on record, and the member for Placentia is on record as saying that the answer to ERCO five or six years ago was that it should be closed down and everybody working at ERCO put on welfare. I have heard the member for Placentia say that.

MR. PATTERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:

I am speaking to a point of order,

Mr. Speaker.

Now, that was their solution. As the member for Placentia can see, on the back of my brochure that I used in the last election, the present Leader of the Liberal Party, as the former Minister of Energy (Mr. Barry), instead of saying that the ERCO plant should be closed and everybody put on welfare, went out and renegotiated the ERCO contract, saving the taxpayers of this Province \$168 million. These are some facts. These people, Mr. Speaker, are hecklers and that is all they know anything about.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel that I have to respond to that point of order. I certainly need no lecture from the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) as to how to conduct myself in this House. I can say that I have not been named in this hon. House because of the type of conduct unbecoming a member. The member for Bellevue was refused the right to sit in this House because of conduct unbecoming a member, and I would say that the conduct of the member for Bellevue has been the most despicable type of conduct I have ever witnessed in this hon. House.

The representation that he has given to his district during the past three of four years is not worth the hon. gentleman's being in the House.

MR. BARRY:

He was just re-elected. He was

just re-elected.

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, and so was I, and with a bigger majority than you and he put together.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not need any lecturing from either the member for Bellevue or the Leader of the Opposition. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition said, 'He was just re-elected.' Mr. Speaker, as I said, I was just re-elected on the Burin Peninsula, and that is more than the hon. gentleman could say when he ran in that district.

And, Mr. Speaker, he refers to the Marystown Shipyard as being the saviour of my political career.

MR. BARRY:

It is true.

MR. TOBIN:

It is true?

MR. CALLAN:

They sent you to Europe free of charge, at the taxpayers' expense.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I can say to the hon. gentlemen, Yes, the people of the Marystown Shipyard did support me and supported me enmasse. They supported me, because since I became the MHA for Burin - Placentia West we have, as a government, put contracts valued at approximately \$60 million into the Marystown Shipyard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

If he wants to make statements, Mr. Speaker, where is the \$60 million he pumped -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order! Order!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, could you ask the Leader of the Opposition to restrain himself?

MR. BARRY:

Order! Order!

This is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

We are talking about conduct of members, Mr. Speaker, and there is the Leader of the Liberal Party bordering on being named by the Speaker, I would suggest, for unbecoming conduct.

MR. BARRY:

See what goes on, Mr. Speaker?

MR. PATTERSON:

Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by asking the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) to show me where the \$60 million is that he put into the district of Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

The member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) talks about me being kicked out of the House of Assembly. I did it on a very high

principle. The Premier went out to my district on several occasions and promised to keep the Markland hospital, but he closed it down. I called the Premier a liar, I refused to withdraw my remarks because they were true, and that, of course, is why I was kicked out of the House of Assembly. And I would do it twenty times over. There is nothing despicable about it, it is standing up for one's principles, for one's district, and the people who sent me here in the first place.

MR. SIMMS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

It is rather obvious that no point of order has been made here. The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), I do not know what he rose for, but presumably it was to try to clarify some situation in his own mind, and to try to get us to conclude that we agree.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for us to try to bring the debate back to a reasonable level. That will be difficult with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) being the speaker but, in any event, I think it would be appropriate. There is obviously no point of order but a point of nonsense, raised by the member for Bellevue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I rule that there is no point of order, it is a difference of opinion between several hon.

members.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) would get up and point out how absurd the point of order was that was raised by the member for Placentia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No!

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was raised by the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan).

MR. BARRY:

I am delighted to see there is continuing dissention in the ranks of members opposite. What is happening is she is falling abroad over there, she is coming apart, Mr. Speaker.

We just had a moment to see the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) in action. As the member for Bellevue rightly pointed out, Mr. Speaker, they are known for their heckling and their gibing. We all know of Mr. Jekyll and Dr. Hyde, or is it vice versa, Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde? Over there the member for Placentia is Mr. Heckle, and the member for Burin - Placentia West is Mr. Gibe. We have Heckle and Gibe, Mr. Speaker.

I was just going through Hansard, Mr. Speaker, to see the speeches of Heckle and Gibe and I found a few of them. This is Wednesday, May 8, just taken at random, and

we have a few of the speeches of Heckle and Gibe here. We have one speech on May 8 and I think this is probably from either Heckle or Gibe, I am not sure, it does not say. It says, 'Hear, hear!' Then on the next page, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Heckle and Mr. Gibe again are reported in Hansard as saying, 'Oh, oh!' Then we have a continuation of this right through, Mr. Speaker, 'Oh, oh! Hear, hear!'. This is a record of the speeches that are going to go down in history, that come from the hon. Heckle and Gibe. This is what Newfoundland history is going to record in terms of the contribution of these members in debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us get back to the real issues. We have a Premier and we have members who came to the people in 1975; the Premier said, Elect me and I will create 40,000 jobs. That promise was made, Mr. Speaker -

MR. DINN:
That was in 1979.

MR. BARRY:
1979. That promise was made in June, 1979. He admits he made the promise to create 40,500 jobs. Now, it was not 39, 273, or 53,607, it was 40,500. Now, do you know that in June, 1979, when the Premier made that promise, there were 181,000 Newfoundlanders working? In February of this year, when he went back to the people, do you know how many Newfoundlanders were working at that point in time? One hundred and sixty-two thousand. So from 1979 to when the election was called, when he sought the mandate to create some more jobs, we actually lost 19,000 jobs in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

MR. BARRY:
That is the record of the Premier. That is the record of members opposite. That is the record of Heckle and Gibe, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:
Shame on them! Hang your heads.

MR. BARRY:
Is it any wonder -

MR. TOBIN:
We got you here. We got you now.

MR. BARRY:
They got me. Mr. Speaker. They got me.

MR. SIMMONS:
That is their game. They got everything but the truth.

MR. BARRY:
Heckle and Gibe have got me, Mr. Speaker. I am gone. I am dead. I am finished. It is all over. Mr. Speaker, where do I send my resignation. How do I get to Government House? Can I do it by mail? Can I do it by electronic mail? Can I do it by courier, by passenger pigeon? How do I get my resignation out? They got me. They got me, Mr. Speaker. Heckle and Gibe have laid me down to die in this debate, they have wiped me out, Mr. Speaker. It is their incisive wit, their rapier wit, their rapier repartee.

MR. PATTERSON:
What did you say about energy?

MR. BARRY:
They have got me, they have trapped me. The devasating logic of their argument in this debate has wiped me out, has crushed me.

I will have to slink away from this House as a result of the input that these hon. members had today, as a result of the suggestions they have made for creating jobs for young people in this Province.

MR. PATTERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. PATTERSON:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, on April 19, 1975 said when speaking on energy, 'We have to keep in mind that just as energy is becoming more costly in other parts of the world, we cannot expect it to be other than the same here in Canada and in Newfoundland.' Now he is slinking around saying, 'Oh, we should be going down the cost.' What changed the cost? The cost is escalating in generating power.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), let us be fair to him, he is absolutely right. He is absolutely right. By the way, we should all have a round of applause, I think that was his maiden speech.

[Applause]

MR. BARRY:

The member for Placentia, Mr.

Speaker, is absolutely right, I did say that. And do you know something, Mr. Speaker? At the time electricity in this Province was less than one-tenth the cost of what it is now. Now, there is a difference, as they say, between scratching your head and tearing yourself apart.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between scratching your head and tearing it off. And this is one of the problems members opposite have, they have no concept of changing time. They have no concept of when the price of electricity is going through the roof, and they are still talking about increasing it, and when it was at a basically modest and reasonable level in this Province, back in 1975, as all well know. Mr. Speaker, they see no difference, that is the problem. They are unable to stay in touch with the reality of this Province, they are off on cloud nine, a cloud that generally has a heart of petroleum.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Call it one o'clock.

MR. BARRY:

No, I need every minute I can get, Mr. Speaker. There is a lot of work to be done in this Province. There are a lot of problems in this Province to be solved. There are a lot of jobs to be created, Mr. Speaker, and we have to spend every minute we can, while this House is open, dealing with these problems. Because we cannot let members forget, we cannot permit

the smugness that is over there on the other side to continue, we cannot permit the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) to be so smug when he knows that he promised that there would be a federal forestry centre for Corner Brook.

MR. SIMMS:

I never promised that.

MR. BARRY:

His federal counterpart promised and he supported it, and now, Mr. Speaker, that has been cancelled.

MR. SIMMS:

Your forestry critic wants it in Grand Falls.

MR. BARRY:

That has been cancelled, Mr. Speaker, and what has the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands done to get that federal forestry centre for Corner Brook? He went up for a cup of tea with his federal counterpart. After the decision had been taken he did not even raise it with his federal counterpart because he did not want to raise anything upsetting, the same lap-dog attitude of the Premier of this Province, this love-in that they have going now with the new Government of Canada because it is a Tory Government. The previous government, in their opinion, could not do anything right, and overnight we saw them go from mad dogs to lap dogs. In one election, Mr. Speaker, from made dogs to lap dogs. And they are now in a situation where they are trapped. They are trapped now. They have thrown everything upon maintaining a friendly relationship with Ottawa. That is their only hope as they see it.

Mr. Speaker, I have to point out to them there is a difference

between showing respect, being co-operative, being conciliatory and kissing boots, Mr. Speaker, in picking up crumbs.

MR. PATTERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

MR. PATTERSON:

I resent those remarks, Mr. Speaker. I would like to quote to you what the Leader of the Opposition said speaking on energy: He said, 'I do not think there is too much concern being raised in the general population about this. I think everybody recognizes, when you look at the fact that fuel prices have quadrupled, in some case gone up five times for periods of time, that a 15 per cent increase in the rate payable for electricity, Mr. Speaker, is not unreasonable in this time of rising costs. This, I think, is the answer to the hon. member's question.' Who said that?

MR. BARRY:

What was the date?

MR. PATTERSON:

Who said it?

MR. BARRY:

What was the date?

MR. PATTERSON:

No, you have a research officer whom you are paying thousands and thousands of dollars, let him dig it out for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

What is your answer.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. CALLAN:
It is a point of interruption, Mr. speaker. He should be named. He should be chucked out of the House.

MR. BARRY:
It is a point of nuisance, Mr. Speaker.

I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn. I could say, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, that on Monday we will be continuing with the Budget Speech, and we will give the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) an opportunity to continue on with his hysterical and very boring participation in that debate.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, May 27, at 3:00 p.m.