

**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

**VERBATIM REPORT**

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I would like to welcome to the galleries today thirty-seven grade VIII students from St. Patrick's Girls Elementary School, Patrick Street, in St. John's, with their teacher, Anna C. Meaney. On behalf of all hon. members I welcome you to the galleries.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

HON. T.A. HICKMAN(MINISTER OF JUSTICE): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Industrial Development I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt A Supplemental Agreement Made Between Government, Newfoundland Refining Company Limited And Other Companies."

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation. Sir, it has come to my attention that The 4-H Adult Leaders' Conference that was scheduled for the weekend at Gander has been cancelled. I wonder if the minister could inform the House whether or not this is so.

HON. J.G. ROUSSEAU(MINISTER OF RECREATION AND REHABILITATION): I would like that on notice.

MR. S.A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of questions that we would like to ask but the Premier and ministers are not in their seat again, as usually. It is typical. Sir, how can we ask questions? How can we ask the government questions, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member may rise in his place to ask a question, otherwise he is out of order.

MR. NEARY: Sir, could we postpone the question period until the ministers and the Premier get in their seats in the House where they should be?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! It being Private Members' Day we should

proceed with motion number four. I think the hon. member for Bonavista North adjourned the debate, and not being in his seat, according to the rules then he loses his chance to continue the debate.

Is there somebody else who would wish to speak?

MR. E.M. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, I would not say there are any rules on it but since the last speaker was from this side of the House, if there is a gentleman on the other side who wishes to speak I will gladly sit down and give him the opportunity to speak before I say a few words.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, no, I mean, there may well be a number who would wish to speak but I am quite prepared to say a few words now if that is the wish of the House, because I do not wish to have two from our side in succession, one after the other, if there is some other hon. gentleman opposite who wants to say a few words. Does the Minister of Finance want to speak? I mean I am easy.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): No, I have to go downstairs.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay, we will let the Minister of Finance go downstairs then, and I wish him all success.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker! I shall be quite brief on this, Sir, because I believe the subject has been very well canvassed in the debate and we have had two full private members' days, two full afternoons of the House, Sir, on this motion and in addition we had about one-half of another private members' day. So in all we have had two and one-half private members' days on this subject and we shall have some debate today, a few minutes from me and perhaps a few minutes from some of the other hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of this chamber and then doubtless my friend and colleague, the member for Bell Island can be enticed into saying a few words.

Now, Sir, let me come right to the point. The motion moved by

my friend the member for Bell Island states in its preamble quite clearly, quite succinctly, quite forcefully the reasoning which lead my colleague to bring in the motion.

The first statement is a statement of fact. It says;

"WHEREAS the present administration claims that they would award contracts for the expenditure of public money only after public tenders have been called; then it went on

"WHEREAS contracts involving the expenditure of substantial sums of money have been awarded to Mr. George McLean and/or companies in which he is involved including N.A.C.O.M. Limited, without any public tenders having been called; and

"WHEREAS the present Administration claimed that they would not indulge in any practices whereby the public interest of the Province would conflict with the private interests of any other body," (again a statement of fact, Sir); "and

"WHEREAS Mr. George McLean has been and continues to be with and without remuneration, an adviser to the P.C. Party of Newfoundland during the two most recent Provincial general elections and during the Federal general election of October 1972" (again, Sir, a statement of fact); "and

"WHEREAS it appears that substantial sums of money have been paid to Mr. McLean and/or his associated companies in advance of the performance by them of such work as they have contracted to perform; and

"WHEREAS there are persistent reports about the inferior quality of the work being produced for the Government by Mr. McLean; and

"WHEREAS the public interest requires and demands that these matters be thoroughly investigated."

That is the gist of the argument, Mr. Speaker, the gist of the factual case on which this motion rests.

My colleague, in introducing the motion, spoke at some length, expanded upon the statements he made in his resolution (the ones which I have just read), gave further illustrations, further examples of exactly what he meant, of the evidence underlying these statements, these

charges, these accusations and concluded by moving the resolution itself which says;

"NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a select committee of eight members be appointed to investigate into and report upon the matters set forth above and any other matters incidental thereto, said committee having the power to send for persons and documents and to examine witnesses under oath."

What happened then, Mr. Speaker? Well, the first thing that happened was the Premier entered the debate, a rather pleasant experience and all the more pleasant for being so novel. He spoke at some considerable length. His speech covered thirty or forty pages of the Hansard. It took most of an afternoon. We listened to it with a great deal of interest. I am sure the Premier listened to it with a great deal of interest as well, because I had the impression he was reading it for the first time.

MR. A. EVANS: You would not know the difference.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the Premier would not know the difference. That is quite true.

As for the honourable gentleman from Burgeo, Sir, if I could be assured that he could read, we would be further off than when we started.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the Premier came and made a lengthy speech. I listened to it, most of it, sitting here in the House, and other portions of it, while standing outside the House but within the range of the P.A. systems. I listened to it and I read it. I have never heard as unconvincing or as uninspiring or as insubstantial a case made as the Premier did in his speech.

My colleague, the gentleman from White Bay South, made a very good speech here, one week past, in which he exposed the main threat of the argument advanced by the Premier. He did it admirably and I think adequately and so I will not attempt to do it again except to mention that the Premier's main argument seemed to be quite simply, "Well, maybe we have been had boys, but everybody else have been had boys and how can you expect us not to be?" Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland sent the present administration into office not to do the things which

they accused us of having done when we were in office BUT to be a different and hopefully a better type of government. Well, the Premier's speech and the actions of the administration in the past year have exposed that as being a vain hope. The people of Newfoundland were misled. They were fooled. They were taken in. We saw it on the Hawkes Bay incident, where the Premier went down there the day before the election and made the statement, that his colleague, yesterday, the Minister of Finance, confirmed, that it could not have been made with any knowledge of the full situation.

We have seen it in something like the Shaheen deal - and there will be more on this later - where the administration have now made an arrangement and the same Minister of Finance and the same gentleman from Fortune Bay, the Minister of Supply and Services, would have had us believe that Mr. Shaheen was the archenemy, the archdevil, the archfoe. Now we have the Premier of the Province going on the radio and on the television and saying that Mr. Shaheen is an estimable gentleman, that his credit is superb, that his organizational and development talents are even greater.

Then finally we have the George McLean incident. The Premier's speech is a most incredible, just a most incredible admission of political guilt. There is in it no rebuttal whatsoever of the facts put forward by my colleague and there is not even any real argument with the arguments, put forward by my colleague, with the opinions he deduced from the facts. There was a vicious personal attack on the gentleman from Bell Island, but we are growing accustomed to that. We are growing accustomed to a group of men on the other side, Mr. Speaker, who with one side of their mouths made vicious personal attacks and then with the other side of their mouths get up and become somewhat mealy-mouthed and pretend that they are above that sort of thing. The record speaks for itself. All one has to do is read the Hansard, Sir, and one will see it.

The Premier did not deal with the charges. He merely said there was no conflict of interest. That is not the fact, Mr. Speaker, There is a conflict of interest. Mr. McLean is acting for companies doing business with the government, and the Premier saying that there is no

conflict of interest does not make it so. The only way we can find out whether or not there was a conflict of interest is not from a statement from a Premier or any other minister who, after all, could be heard, fairly and with justice could be heard to be accused of being in a position of having to say there was no conflict of interest. They will hardly admit that there was one, hardly. We do not have any saints in human form sitting across from us, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier merely said there was no conflict of interest and attempted to spread a large whitewash brush over Mr. George McLean and his enterprises. Well, he did not succeed because if one reads the speech by the Premier and then reads the documents tabled by a number of the ministers, the Minister of Fisheries, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Tourism and one or two other gentlemen, in a sequence much like a Greek chorus trouping out onto a stage and unburdening themselves of their sins, laying these carefully crafted documents on the table of the House and pretending that somehow that made it all nice. If one read those, Mr. Speaker, one quickly sees that the arguments put forward by the gentleman from Bell Island have not been dealt with.

After two and a half days of debate, Sir, those charges stand unrebutted by anybody on the other side. The honourable gentleman from Bell Island made a number of smaller points and some of those have been challenged. He did not pretend they were all correct. He said in his remarks, "I understand this is so. Is it so?". That is fine but the major statements made by him, Mr. Speaker, in the motion, the body of the motion, stand unrebutted.

The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, the present administration did claim that they would award contracts for the expenditure of public money only after public tenders had been called. They have given George McLean and his company substantial contracts, hundreds of thousands of dollars, without any public tenders being called. What defense does the Premier offer? He misquotes me. He does me the courtesy to quote me but he does not do me the courtesy to quote me correctly. One has only to look at the Hansards. It can be found at page 3,677.- we are a wordy

lot in this House, Mr. Speaker - 3,677 of Hansard for the first session of this thirty-sixth General Assembly, where I said that I quite agreed that one could not call tenders for films. But I was never the one who had said it, it was the gentleman opposite who said they do that. Then I went on and said, "I do find it curious that this admission comes from an administration that has made such a fetish of no conflict of interest."



MR. ROBERTS: The Premier in quoting that in the House managed to add the word "not" at a crucial moment, it completely changed the context of the quotation. I do not think he meant to do it, Sir. I think his advisers had briefed him badly. We are growing accustomed to that, but the fact remains that the statement was quoted incorrectly.

That is the only evidence the Premier offered to rebuff the statement. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, and it stands on the record that this crowd of men who form Her Majesty's Ministry in this province now, went from Cape Chidley to Cape Race, from Cape Ray to Cape Bonavista, saying, "nothing without public tenders," and the moment they get into office they fall all over themselves giving George McLean business, hundreds of thousands of dollars worth.

By the way, it may be of interest to the House, Mr. Speaker, to know that Mr. McLean's companies are doing business illegally in this province. I am told that the law of Newfoundland says that a company, not being a Newfoundland company, cannot do business in this province unless it is registered under the appropriate legislation. As of, I confess I did not check it today, two or three days ago when I last checked it, neither NACOM nor any other firm bearing George McLean's name was registered to do business in this province. This means, as I understand it, they have no status in the courts, they cannot sue or be sued. I am not sure what other legal actions it has, but it interesting to note they have not, as far as I know, complied with the law of this province. If they have done so, they have done it either within the past twenty-four hours or they have done it under another name. They have not done it in the name of NACOM or in any combination of George McLean and McLean Advertising or so forth.

MR. ROBERTS: The telephone directory in St. John's does list a McLean Public Relations Service, but it does not go beyond that.

Now we go on. The next statement is that the administration claim that they would not indulge in any practices whereby the public interests of this province would conflict with the private interest of any other body. The Premier made a sorry spectacle of himself on this. There were something like eighteen factual errors in his remarks of the quality that somehow A.E. Aimes, the justification for the current state of affairs is that A.E. Aimes apparently retains McLaren Advertising Company who did work for the Government of Newfoundland, I think for two years, on the tourist account. It may have been two or three or maybe even four years, but they latterly did not even have the tourist account, they still have the Aimes account.

The Premier managed to get a seventeen year error in that. He claimed that it had been going since Confederation. Aimes came to work for the Government of Newfoundland, I believe in 1965, when the syndicate was formed, on the advice of the then comptroller and deputy minister of Finance, Mr. Denis Groom, the syndicate of bond houses was formed. That same syndicate existed and continued to exist until last year when the Minister of Finance was once again overruled in a major question of policy and the Burns Brothers and Denton firm were retained to act for the government as their financial syndicate.

I counted up I think eighteen errors by the Premier in his attempted rebuttle of that section of the motion. None of the Premier's statements, Sir, go at all to the heart of the matter, none give any evidence to show there was no conflict of interest.

We have made a prima facie case. This company does business with the government and it also represents any number of companies

MR. ROBERTS: that also do business with the government. Perhaps the leading example is Burns Brothers and Denton, a firm which has no standing whatsoever in the bond market. I am told they are a very large house when it comes to shares and buying and trading shares, a reputable firm but not known at all in the bond market. They were I think the tenth or twelfth largest firm dealing in municipal and provincial bonds.

A. E. Aimes, who came to the government on the advice of Mr. Groom, I was not in the Cabinet at the time, but several honourable gentlemen opposite - no I am not sure if they were - probably the gentleman from Fortune Bay was a member of the Cabinet at that time. The gentleman from St. John's West, the gentleman from Burin were not. They came in in 1966 and I think by then the syndicate had come into existence.

The A. E. Aimes firm were of course the largest in Canada in provincial and municipal bond issues. But we find it very interesting that the Burns Brothers and Denton firm have retained Mr. McLean's services for a number of years. Lo and behold! they show up being given the financial account for the province. Some little while was it not after the honourable Minister of Finance said, "we are not going to change the A.E. Aimes firm, they are doing perfectly good work for us, we are not going to change them? Then, Lo and Behold! it was announced one day in one of these lightning revelations that, with no public preparation, no putting the word around the financial community to say: "We are unhappy with the performance of Aimes, we would like to get somebody else. Will any firm that is interested please drop us a line or write us a letter and let us know and we will then choose from among the available offerings."

No, no, Lo and Behold! like the tablets coming down from the mountain, Mr. Speaker, Burns Brothers and Denton were given this

MR. ROBERTS: account, a very substantial account. I have no idea what the fees are, The fees of course are proportionate to the bond issues, to the borrowings. But in view of the Minister of Finance's record to date, in view of what I suspect he will be doing when he brings his budget into the House shortly, I suspect that Burns Brothers and Denton are going to be immensely wealthier as a result of their association with Newfoundland.

Their association with Mr. McLean predated that. One of the few clients Mr. McLean has is Burns Brothers and Denton, one of the few clients his firm has. Lo and Behold! the great, juicy plum taken away from a firm with no political connections at all, to my knowledge. A. E. Aimes did not come to Newfoundland because of any connection with the Liberal Party. They came because they were the leading bond house. They came because in 1964 and 1965 and 1966 the Government of Newfoundland was engaged in borrowing relatively large sums of money, large by the standards of the mid-sixties.

I can remember quite clearly, it was seven o'clock one summer evening, there were two men left working on the eighth floor - Denis Groom, who had the room that is just out by the elevator, I do not know who is using it now, Denis Groom was there, He was Financial Adviser to the Premier and I was there as the Premier's Executive Assistant, We were the only ones left and we fell to talking. Mr. Groom was a worried man; we had to borrow between \$80 million and \$100 million in the next eighteen months. These were our long term cash needs. The money had been financed on short term notes in the normal way and this made it necessary to set up the long term borrowings and he was not doubtful but he thought it was a large job, a man size job to borrow that money, and of course he did succeed in borrowing it. The government succeeded in borrowing it with his advice.

MR. ROBERTS: Well he suggested we get a syndicate. No more would we send out telegrams, The government of this province, Mr. Speaker, used to send out telegrams asking for bids on bond issues and they would come in, The then Comptroller of Finance, Mr. Walter Marshall, would receive these, they would be sent to him. He would make a recommendation that such and such a bid be accepted for a \$20 million bond issue and that syndicate or firm would be given the right to sell the bond issue and would get their fees that way.

Denis Groom said that was not good enough, not in view of the borrowings that we were then involved in, and they pale into insignificance compared to the current scale. So the syndicate was formed with the Aimes Company, the leading company in Canada. I do not care if the government dropped them, that is again their decision, but I find it very interesting that they dropped them in favour of a firm with next to no standing in the institutional field at all, firm who, by coincidence, are one of the few clients of the estimable gentleman, Mr. George McLean.

I am not saying it is a conflict of interest. I am saying it is an apparent conflict of interest. It smells, it stinks, it should be investigated, either it will be investigated now by this select committee or it will be investigated in due course. It will be investigated because it is something that should be investigated. Whether or not there is anything wrong, I do not know. All I know is, apparently there is something wrong. The Premier in his statement made no defence at all of this, no defence at all.

Now I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but I am just making the same point again and again. I know there are other honourable gentlemen opposite. They agree that money has been paid out to Mr. McLean and to his companies before the work was done. That is

MR. ROBERTS: in the documents tabled by some of the honourable gentlemen opposite, last week. They made no comment at all about the persistent reports about the inferior quality of the work being produced for the government by Mr. McLean.

Except, I noticed the Premier last year in the estimates admitted that in the Fisheries Department they had to stop payments to Mr. McLean because the work had not been done properly. There were references to that in the debate last week, that monies had been withheld because he is not able to perform credibly and properly.

The Minister of Fisheries has admitted that the contract with Mr. McLean, for \$6,000 a month, for public relations services for the Fisheries Department had to be renegotiated because Mr. McLean could not do the work, could not do it. It took the minister from June to October to renegotiate the contract-- June to October, by the minister's own admission. McLean was paid at the fully \$6,000 a month rate for that, so he got \$18,000, even after the minister admitted publicly, in his own document, that he was not doing the job.

That is the sort of reasoning that leads us to say that there are persistent reports about the inferior quality of the work being produced for the government by Mr. McLean. We have the example of the gentleman from St. John's North, now enjoying his much deserved holiday in the Canary Islands, as I understand it, his month long holiday.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lucky.

MR. ROBERTS: Lucky Well, if the honourable Minister of Education wants to be put out of the Cabinet, he too can have a holiday in St. Mary's. I am not sure the gain would be worth the gamble. I have no fear about the honourable gentleman being put out of the Cabinet because

that would be a blow. That would be a disaster. The gentleman knows the difference between a disaster and a catastrophe, Gladstone and Disraeli. Well Gladstone said when someone asked: "What is the difference?" Said Gladstone, the Prime Minister of England: "If Disraeli were to fall into the Serpentine, the lake in Hyde Park, that would be a disaster. If someone were to pull him out that would be a catastrophe." The honourable gentleman leaving the cabinet would be a disaster, his staying in would be a catastrophe.

We have the example of the gentleman for St. John's North, Sir. I have here a cutting from the "Toronto Sun" sent to me by the managing editor, the issue of January 3, 1973, an article by Mr. Robert MacDonald, a staff writer, apparently, with that newspaper. It says that a disillusioned "X" cabinet member claims the government of Premier Frank Moores could 'teach Joey Smallwood some tricks and patronage.' John Carter a thirty-eight year old St. John's former businessman charged he was 'flung out' (eloquent phrase, not quite as eloquent as being shafted, but eloquent) of the Moores Cabinet because he was 'too straight-laced' in his opposition to political 'favours'—in an interview.

By the way the honourable member for St. John's North has not denied these statements, he has sort of hedged around them somewhat. I regret that he is not with us today.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has reaffirmed them.

MR. ROBERTS: He has reaffirmed them, has he? Okay. He certainly has not denied them because, of course, Mr. MacDonald is an old friend of the gentleman for St. John's North. Mr. MacDonald is a good newspaper man.

Mr. MacDonald goes on "In an interview the former Education and Youth Minister (that is the former Education and Youth Minister, Mr. Speaker) "said he had objected to such things as proposals to have film strips made by a Toronto Public Relations Firm at a cost of about \$4,000 when 'the strips could have been done by my department, with our own equipment, for about \$500.'" Then there are a couple of paragraphs that are not relevant to this debate. They are not of praise to the administration but I will not read them. It goes on; "I was not Mr. Popularity with Mr. Moores," said

Carter." I may add that is an understatement. "A one-time President of the Newfoundland Progressive Conservative Party. He also ran against Moores for the Party Leadership. Carter said he incurred the Premier's displeasure. "Honourable gentlemen opposite might take note that a Premier's displeasure is obviously a very heavy burden, a very heavy burden to carry.

Anyway, the newspaper story says "Carter said he incurred the Premier's displeasure for stopping an attempt." Haw, haw, he dared to stop it. "He paid this, political head, for stopping an attempt to have the film stripe work go to NACOM Limited, a Toronto Public Relations Firm headed by ...". You all bet your sweet biffy, Mr. Speaker, who headed that Toronto Public Relations Firm.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was not Martin Goldfarb.

MR. ROBERTS: It was not Martin Goldfarb, the honourable gentleman's, sweet biffy is not being bet this time. Any other tries? Well then I will have to surprise the House by saying it was after all, Mr. George McLean. Who? George McLean.

And as the story goes on, a nice story, Mr. Speaker. It looks good on the front page of the "Toronto Sun." By the way it is an authoritative paper in Toronto. It goes on quoting the gentleman for St. John's North again. "McLean had done public relations work for the party during the election campaign. So they are handing him a lot of contracts now. Moores did not openly overrule my decision to stop the film strips awards but I know he was displeased." I wonder how he knew? He probably knew on the 2nd. of December.

Mr. Speaker, it would be hard to find more damning evidence, hard to find a stronger statement. Ha! Ha! the tribe has come. Mr. Speaker, I bid welcome to the Premier, the Minister of Industrial Relations, and the Minister of Highways is hiding behind him, There he is, he is welcome. If I were the Minister of Highways, I should not hide. As I have said, it will be hard to find more damning evidence in support of this motion.

The Premier's statements in the House, his speech, in no way contradicted or denied the facts, He took issue with the argument, as one would expect



of course, but he did not take issue with the main facts. Here we have one of his former colleagues, the gentleman who still supports the administration politically, who said it is politically, in a newspaper article. That has not been denied and similar articles were carried in the local press, subsequently, saying Mr. McLean got business because he was connected with the Tory Party. Mr. McLean was getting business that cost far more than was necessary. That is the whole gist of this motion, Mr. Speaker. Not that Mr. McLean has been hired to do public relations work for the government. Governments have valid information, valid policies and programmes that the people should be informed about. Indeed the then Minister of Social Assistance would do well to have George McLean. I was astonished to read that the minister will not allow the citizen's rights group, whatever they are called, to put a little desk in the welfare office on Harvey Road so that people can be informed of their rights.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I can believe that. The honourable gentleman went against it in part because I was in favour of it.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: There you are, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman would like to go over -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. If the honourable gentlemen would like to go over to Harvey Road, they would see how confidential it is that waiting room that one goes into as one comes off Harvey Road into the government building.

MR. MURPHY: We inherited it. We inherited it.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree the honourable gentleman inherited it. Now he has the opportunity to improve it.

MR. MURPHY: It is on the way, it will not belong now.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we heard that slopan in 1968 in -

MR. MURPHY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Bonavista Trinity Conception. "It will not be long now."

Mr. David Rooney proved, in October 1972, it was not long at all.

Now as we were saying -

MR. MOORES: We still account that as a brilliant statement last year.

MR. ROBERTS: That is a very good statement. Would the Premier like to have another election?

MR. MOORES: No, I am going to get you in Bonavista Trinity Conception.

MR. ROBERTS: All right we are on.

MR. MOORES: Any time.

MR. ROBERTS: Bonavista Trinity Conception. I will tell you who will be happiest, the gentleman for St. John's West.

MR. MOORES: In a provincial seat.

MR. ROBERTS: In a provincial seat? Sure. Or in a federal seat.

MR. MOORES: I do not want to go federal, but I know you have nowhere else to go, but that is your problem.

MR. ROBERTS: Come to White Bay and run.

MR. MOORES: No.

MR. ROBERTS: No?

MR. MOORES: We are talking about an independent area, right?

MR. ROBERTS: Right. Bonavista Trinity Conception. The Premier has already run once. He has been elected by a big vote there, and his political heir paid the price for the Premier's representation. A 4000 vote majority became a 4000 vote deficit in four years. That is not bad. Not bad. The Premier might remember, Mr. Speaker, that the test of a politician is not getting elected, is getting re-elected because then the people can sit in judgment. The member for Burin was re-elected, running on a different party ticket. The member for St. John's East has been re-elected, the member for St. John's West was re-elected.

MR. MOORES: And the Progressive Conservative Government was elected.

MR. ROBERTS: But not re-elected.

MR. MOORES: No, nor has the Opposition either.

MR. ROBERTS: The Liberal Government have been re-elected five times in this province.

MR. MOORES: Are you taking the responsibility for that too?

MR. ROBERTS: No I am not. I wish I could, but I can take responsibility -

MR. MOORES: Of being in opposition, exactly.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course I can.

MR. MOORES: Sure you can, all of us.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course I can, and let us have the Progressive Conservative Government go to the people now and see if they can get re-elected.

MR. MOORES: We will go to the people, we will go to the people -

MR. ROBERTS: We were not quite so keen, and on the George McLean record let us go, Mr. Speaker. Sure.

MR. MOORES: You can go on the George McLean record or any other record that we stood on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, do you think the Premier could control himself somewhat, he is getting a little red in the face?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: As I was saying about Bonavista Trinity Conception, where the honourable gentleman for St. John's Centre has reminded me the slogan was "It will not be long now." And what was the other slogan?

MR. MOORES: It was not long now.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Robert Nutheem wrote them. They were good slogans. What was it? "Seek not to have a job but to do a job." I think that was the slogan in 1968. That was the one that they used at the famed Bonavista meeting that cost \$25,000. It was a great meeting. They filled the stadium in Bonavista. A great meeting. But we will see about that. Bill McGeorge McLean.

As I was saying, the government have a valid reason to make points public, to make information public, even the member for St. John's East would have to agree with that - peering owlshly at me as he is. He is a very owlsh looking gentleman when he peers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ho ! Ho ! Ho !

MR. ROBERTS: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, obviously, Sir, on the other side we have twits as well as owls.

MR. MOORES: That is the past pluperfect of the verb "to want."

MR. ROBERTS: The verb is not a parliamentary one, so we shall not use it. It is hard to be angry with the Minister of Industrial Relations or, I am sorry, the Minister of Industrial Development. It is hard to be angry with him. It is hard to take him seriously but it is also hard to be angry with him. The other honourable gentlemen well, you know, can stand on their record. I do not envy them that prospect. I look forward very much to the next contest. I can tell you this time we will not have Mr. William Saunders resigning on a Monday and telling both the former

leader of his party, lying to the former leader of his party and to the then leader of his party and saying he had not resigned.

AN HON. MEMBER: What a shame!

MR. ROBERTS: What a shame. Yes, to lie is a shame. It is a shame. Then the same honourable gentleman turning down his pension, turning down his sessional pay, all this leading up to an election. Would the Premier agree to a royal commission to investigate Bill Saunders, Oldford, Shea and Burgess? Will he?

MR. MOORES: If it is required.

MR. ROBERTS: I made a statement. Will the Premier agree to it? The Premier brought up Mr. Shea and Mr. Burgess.

MR. MOORES: That is right and you took them.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. The Premier is quite true on that point. Will the Premier agree to a royal commission to look into the mysterious resignation of Mr. Saunders from the House of Assembly?

MR. MOORES: We are already investigating Mr. Doyle, so maybe they will surface.

MR. ROBERTS: Pardon?

MR. MOORES: We are already investigating Mr. Doyle.

MR. ROBERTS: That is fine. I am talking about Mr. Saunders. If the Premier wants to bring in Mr. Burgess, Mr. Shea and Magistrate Oldford, I am quite happy to have them all looked into. There were four: two gentlemen resigned from the House in mysterious circumstances. One of them, Bill Saunders, lied, lied; not to the Premier but he lied to me, he lied to my predecessor, Leader of the Liberal Party. He resigned, his letter of resignation I now have - dated 28 February, which was a Monday. Mr. Smallwood called him Monday night. I saw him on the Tuesday afternoon in Carbonear and to each of us he said, "I have not resigned." I stood here in the House on Wednesday, March 1 -

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I remember it. I shall not forget it. I remember it.

I remember it, and said that Bill Saunders was not here and said why. The man had resigned two days before. The man has not drawn his sessional pay. The man has not drawn his pension. The man is now driving a Lincoln Continental car.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where?

MR. ROBERTS: Around Conception Bay, a car formerly owned by Mr. George G. R. Parsons. He has bought it secondhand from George G. R. Parsons Limited.

AN HON. MEMBER: How long was he in the Liberal Government?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know. He is not doing so badly is he. His only known income is \$6,000 a year from the Power Commission. It is very interesting. I would ask the Premier if he would appoint a royal commission and if he wants to look into Mr. Shea, Mr. Burgess, I am quite happy to have them looked into.

MR. MOORES: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Sure! Does the Premier want to look into that too.

MR. MOORES: No.

MR. ROBERTS: Will the Premier answer my question? All right, I will put a motion on the Order Paper later and we will deal with it. Now back to George McLean where we will be doing some investigating, either now or later. The wheel turns. It may take a while. It took twenty-two or twenty-three years for it to turn before. It will turn again. While I may or may not be in this House or may or may not be the Leader of the Liberal Party twenty-two or twenty-three years, two or three years from now I expect to be around. We shall see.

George McLean, Mr. Speaker, has been getting business from this government. He has been getting it in dubious circumstances. We have the word of a former minister for that, getting unnecessarily. I have not said getting improperly. I do not know that. That is why we moved the motion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the motion may or may not come to the vote today. A number of other honourable gentlemen are scribbling frantically

and will doubtlessly be tempted to say a few words. The Minister of Finance looks like he is building himself up for another of his outbursts. We shall expect that and listen to it with glee and with joy. I find him most entertaining. Sometimes he is even informative.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well he has a lot of babies to his back, Mr. Speaker, to look to.

Now, as I was saying, this motion may or may not come to a vote today but it will come to a vote eventually. It will either be accepted or rejected. If it be accepted, a select committee will be set up. We will have a majority of government members on it. It will look into certain events. It will summon witnesses. It will hear evidence under oath. Questions will be put. Answers will be given. If the government have nothing to hide, if there is nothing wrong with George McLean, nothing wrong with the dealings between Mr. McLean and his companies and with the government, then surely they have nothing to fear from an investigation. If on the other hand they have something to hide, naturally they will not allow the investigation. People who have something to hide do not want investigations. That is obvious and so it seems to follow. It seems to follow, Mr. Speaker, that if the government do not support this and it does not pass, it is because they have something to hide. If they have nothing to hide, I have no doubt at all that they would be having this select committee. We might even have the R.C.M.P. make some raids. We would have the whole paraphernalia and they would try to destroy the member for Bell Island by saying that there is nothing in his allegations, nothing in his statements.

MR. NEARY: They are trying to do that anyway.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I know they are trying to do that but they will not succeed. But the fact that they are obviously not going to vote for this

motion to me, Sir, leads squarely and thoroughly to the conclusion that they have something to hide. Maybe they will accept it. Maybe they will. I hope so. I would love nothing better than to be on that select committee. I have about one hundred questions myself for Mr. McLean. I have never met the gentleman, by the way, even though we both share Elizabeth Towers. Elizabeth Towers, obviously, is a large place.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier is there too. Of course, he is. The seventh floor is a very cozy little floor in the Towers, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the sixth?

MR. ROBERTS: I know nothing about the sixth. Okay the seventh. The Premier on one end and my parents on the other, and I have temporary boarding rights there.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, the Premier is spoken for. They are both in good hands, I guess, Mr. Speaker. If this resolution does not pass, Sir, it will be because the government do not want it to pass. That is true. If it do not pass, it will be because the government do not want it to pass. The only reason that they could conceivably not want it to pass is that they have something to hide. If they have nothing to hide, you think they would welcome it because it would clear Mr. McLean's name once and for all. It would clear him of all these charges and allegations and would put the gentleman from Bell Island in a very embarrassing position of having made these statements in good faith. He has made them in good faith and given his evidence, and then had them exploded as not having substance. I ask the government to support this motion. If they have nothing to hide, the motion is to their advantage. If they do not have anything to hide, they should support it. If they do not support it, it will



be because they have something to hide. I think the people of Newfoundland will come to that conclusion. I know the House will come to that conclusion. I, for one, am going to vote for the motion. I will vote for any motion to investigate anything. If something cannot stand investigation, then it should be investigated. I will support the motion. I think my colleague should be commended for bringing it in, accepting the torrent of personal drivel abuse which has been his lot. I will vote for it and I ask every member of the House to vote for it. It is the only way to prove whether there is any substance in these charges or not. I believe there is substance but until we know, until we investigate, we will not know. I am going to vote to investigate them. Thank you.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak in this debate. It appears that we are all being forced to participate in it, therefore I will have a few words. Now it is a very peculiar thing, Mr. Speaker, but it is a technique that is being refined and honed to a fine point by honourable gentlemen opposite - this resolution exemplifies this new, not new technique but new refinements of the old technique of the smear tactics. The honourable gentleman ended his speech by saying that we should vote for this resolution so that a select committee could report and clear Mr. McLean's name once and for all or not clear it. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have never heard anything of any weight or consequence against Mr. McLean's name, except what the honourable gentlemen opposite have said the slanders, the aspersions, the illusions, the abuse, the verbal attacks, the personal attacks that they have made on him is the only criticism, the only attacks I have ever heard on Mr. McLean's name. The opposition have for the last four, five, six, eight, ten months, having criticized, abused, slandered, attacked personally, attacked in his business, attacked in his reputation, this man George McLean, now call on this House to pass

March 14, 1973

Tape no. 601

Page 6

a motion to appoint a select committee to investigate the man whose name they are attempting to ruin and then they tell us that this is the only proper thing to do, clear his name once and for all.

There is nothing wrong with Mr. McLean's name except for the kind of vicious attack that is being made upon him by honourable gentlemen opposite, of the Liberal Opposition.

The independent member of the New Labrador Party I do not think has addressed himself to the subject. Anyone can do that. Who is going to be picked next to be attacked? Burns Brother and Denton, Mr. Speaker, a reputable investment firm who have been in business in Canada since the early 1930's, who are one of the leading investment dealers, stock and bond brokers in Canada, have been attacked, criticized; it has been alleged that they are penny ante in the field. Their business name has been attacked, their reputation has been savaged, that they are just minor in this field, that they have only been appointed for political purposes and in fact, they are only appointed because George McLean, his Eminence Rais, this sinister figure who has the government by the throat, who has us by the windpipes, who has us by the whatnots, that George McLean had Burns Brothers and Denton appointed, one of the leading firms in Canada in the stock and bond market.

The House and the people of Newfoundland are asked to believe that Burns Brothers and Denton were only appointed because George McLean told us, told the Premier, told me, the Minister of Finance, to appoint them. Mr. Speaker. I do take advice, direction and guidance from the Premier, but I can assure you I take no advice, direction or guidance whatsoever from George McLean. He has no influence, not a jot, not a tittle, not an iota of influence does he have on me and never once. Mr. Speaker. never once has George McLean ever spoken a word to me about Burns Brothers and Denton. Never once. Not once. George McLean had no more to do with Burns Brothers and Denton being appointed our fiscal agents than Pierre Trudeau had and Pierre Trudeau has not spoken to me since the Liberal Leadership Convention, when I was foolish enough to vote for him and help inflict him on Canada since 1968, with the consequent results in our unemployment rate that I

mentioned yesterday. This is a new technique.

Who else are the opposition going to pick on to attack and savage and try to ruin the name of in the next few months so that they can bring another resolution before the House and ask us to appoint a select committee to investigate that gentleman? Who is next? What other person that the government do business with or appoints to carry out a job?

MR. NEARY: (First part inaudible) or E.P.A. will be next.

MR. CROSBIE: No, those are Liberal firms that were treated very well when the Liberal Government was in office. I do not think they will be asking for an investigation of that. And I do not think they will be asking for an investigation of Brother Green at the trade school who was moonlighting and held two jobs, one full-time at the technical college, getting paid by the public of Newfoundland, and the second unknown to the public, executive assistant to the honourable gentleman opposite, where he got another salary, unknown to the public.

MR. NEARY: A good man. A good man.

MR. CROSBIE: Two salaries. I do not care if he is a good man or he is on the side of the angels, that was an impropriety. Perhaps we should investigate that.

MR. NEARY: What about the honourable minister's...

MR. EVANS: What about the psychiatrist who released you?

MR. CROSBIE: If a psychiatrist got his hands on the honourable gentleman, he would never release him. He is a perfect specimen for examination by a psychiatrist, psychologist and all other ologists.

Mr. Speaker, we have a new technique. The only word that we have heard in criticism of George McLean has been from the honourable gentlemen opposite and now they want us to clear his good name. What hypocrisy, what shameless duplicity to ask us to appoint a select committee to clear the name of the man that they have spent the last eight or ten months trying to ruin. The hypocrisy of it all baffles the human imagination.

Mr. Speaker, we were just accused of trying to destroy the member for Bell Island. We do not have to try to do that, the honourable gentleman is doing it himself and he spent the last three years doing it. Frankly, it could not matter less to us what happens to the honourable gentleman for Bell Island. The only trouble is, it would be more pleasant if he were at least amusing or adding something to the House, but he does not. Still, this is one of the things when you go into public life that you have to put up with, people like the honourable gentleman opposite, the member for Bell Island.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition said that we should have a select committee so that the dubious circumstances surrounding George McLean could be looked into. What dubious circumstances? It is as plain as the nose on your face the circumstances. Every government has public relations work to be done, every government has tourist work to be done, films to be produced, every government does. They do not call tenders in that kind of work because it is not the kind of work you can call tenders for. They appoint someone to do that work.

The Government of Canada at Ottawa is this year spending millions of dollars on public relations work and on this kind of work which they are not calling tenders on, which you cannot expect them to call tenders on, and who are they giving it to? They are giving it to the advertising agencies and the public relations personnel that helped the Liberal Party in the election. That is the system. What is happening in the other nine provinces? The same thing, exactly. What is happening in Newfoundland? The same thing.

It would be foolish to stand up and deny that McLean is getting the work because he helped the Progressive Conservative Party. Sure, that is why he is getting the work.

MR. MURPHY: He proved his worth, did he not?

MR. CROSBIE: Well the Progressive Conservative Party thinks he did. He is getting the work yes, quite frankly, because he is a supporter of the government, of the Progressive Conservative Party. Nothing is more

obvious. You do not need a select committee to investigate that. The question then is; is he competent to do the work and are his prices competitive? That is the question. As far as I know his prices are competitive with what was being charged by people like Goldfarb. Do you remember Goldfarb? Marvin Goldfarb who was the one who said that politicians could be sold like tomatoes, there in 1971. The Liberal Party of Newfoundland grabbed him up and appointed him as their public relations man, strategist and poll taker. He found that he could not get that bunch of rotten tomatoes back into office again, that his statement was not correct.

When we asked questions about that in 1971, Mr. Speaker, we did not attack Marvin Goldfarb personally. We certainly asked about Goldfarb, he was out around doing a public opinion poll for the Liberal Party and being paid \$80,000 by the Liberal Government for doing a so-called tourist survey which never turned up or the results of it did not. We asked was he being paid by the government to do public opinion polls for the Liberal Party. That was denied. We never stood in this House and said that Marvin Goldfarb was a crook, or Marvin Goldfarb was a thief, or Marvin Goldfarb was in dubious circumstances, or that Marvin Goldfarb was insolvent, or that Marvin Goldfarb's business had a poor credit record, or that he was a carpet-bagger. We never abused the man personally, Not like George McLean is being abused by the member for Bell Island and other honourable gentlemen opposite. His only crime in their eyes is that he helped the Progressive Conservative Party get elected.

You could be critical of him getting this work from the government without abusing him personally. You do not have to call him a carpetbagger, you do not have to say his credit record is poor, you do not have to say he is operating illegally and all the rest of that. What we are witnessing is not a criticism of the government for appointing George McLean to do this work nor any fair criticism that he is incompetent for the work or he is overpaid for the work or that the work should not be done at all, because that is the real issue. The

real issue should be; is the work he is doing necessary? That is the real issue. Then, is he competent to do it?

All we have heard are harangues against McLean, abuse of McLenn, slander of McLean and then the honourable gentleman has the gall and hypocrisy, the leader of the Opposition, to get up and ask us to vote for this select committee so that Mr. McLean's name can be cleared once and for all.

It would not matter what report a select committee brought in about McLean, the member for Bell Island would be on the radio the next day to say that it was a fix, saying it was a frame-up, saying that McLean's carpetbagging had swayed the select committee and so on and so on. It would not help McLean or protect McLean at all. I just want to make that comparison, Mr. Speaker.

When we opposed what was being done with Goldfarb and Ronalds-Paynolds, we never stood in this House and attacked them, we did not try to ruin them, we asked questions such as, were they being paid for doing work for the Liberal Party? That question could well be asked about McLean and the answer would be that he is not. That is the difference in the two approaches.

We all have our own views as to whether McLean work is all necessary or unnecessary. As president of the treasury board, I would certainly like to see some of it cut down. There are a lot of other things in a lot of other departments that the ministers do not agree with me on, but the government feel that these are things necessary in those areas, and McLean has not been shown to be incompetent to do it.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition said that if we will not agree to this motion, then we must have something to hide. What convoluted, what queer

reasoning is that? Are we going to hear that all this session? The gentleman from the opposite side gets up and makes some charge against the government, something farfetched and then the government denies it and the members opposite get and they say, "Well, if the government will not agree to have a select committee investigate this charge, the government has something to hide." I mean that is the oldest, most foolish trick in the world. We are not going to fall for that. We have nothing to hide, as it has all been given to the House. The Minister of Tourism bared his soul. The Minister of Fisheries bared his soul. The Minister of Education has bared his -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

MR. CROSBIE: No, he is going to. He is going to bare both souls. It has all been given to the House. The public has the facts and let me say, Mr. Speaker, the public are sick and tired of this. The public can see that George McLean has been persecuted, pilloried, slandered unmercifully and unfairly by gentlemen opposite and they will respond. I would say the pro-McLean vote in the District of Bell Island today would be seventy-five per cent. If the hon. gentleman would resign, Mr. McLean would be tempted to run against him on Bell Island in a by-election.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman has building materials on his mind and as well he should, as well he should. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: If you do not have it on your mind you have it on your tongue because the hon. gentleman is an insidious slanderer, an insidious suggester of corruption, an insidious attacker of persons and generally insidious.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).



MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, to come back to the fiscal agency. I have already stated that Mr. McLean had nothing whatsoever to do with Burns Brothers and Denton being appointed our fiscal agents.

MR. NEARY: How does the hon. minister know that?

MR. CROSBIE: Because the hon. gentleman was one of the persons who appointed him and had something to do with it since he was Minister of Finance.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier is the boss, not the Minister of Finance.

MR. CROSBIE: You are darn right he is, Sir.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. minister knows that now, does he not?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, he did consult me.

MR. NEARY: Oh, come on now.

MR. CROSBIE: I did not hear about it on the radio like the hon. gentleman used to do in the old days. Remember when he was all heart and no brain? Today he is no brain and no heart.

MR. NEARY: Consulted the hon. minister over election time.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, to come back to the fiscal agency. This government took office on January 18, 1972, and for most of last year we continued the syndicate as it was, in Canada, led by A.E. Ames and Company.

I have no hesitation in saying, as I said last winter, that we found them competent and able to do a good job and they have done a good job for Newfoundland but this government felt that there should be some changes in their fiscal agency and there have been. The position today is that the fiscal agency in Canada is headed by Burns Brothers and Denton Limited. There is a management committee of four or five firms including Dominion Securities, I cannot remember all the other names, Wood Gundy and so on. A.E. Ames and Company are one of the underwriters in our syndicate in Canada. In the United States we have appointed Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner and all that crew together with Burns Brothers and Denton and Greenshields, as our fiscal agency in the United

States. In Europe our fiscal agency remains A.E. Ames and Company. A.E. Ames and Company with the German banks are in exactly the same position they were in in our syndicate in Germany and are still in the syndicate in the United Kingdom. There has been no change there. Burns Brothers will be joining those syndicates. As our fiscal agents in Canada they have to be a part of that too. We have retained A.E. Ames in Germany. Our relations with them are still good. Naturally they regretted losing their leading place as being our fiscal agents for Canada but they have accepted that.

Burns Brothers have done so far an excellent job for us. We have had two bond issues in Canada, \$20 million each time, and up to this last year, this fiscal year, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland was unable to borrow in Canada in the last couple of years because of the disrepute the Liberal Administration in this province was in. They were afraid to take a chance on an offering in Canada and up until this year the largest we had ever had in Canada was \$15 million, but this year we were able to have two \$20 million issues which were well taken up led by Burns Brothers and the new syndicate. They have certainly shown that they can perform well and we are hoping that they will be able to perform well in the year coming up.

Burns Brothers and Denton, as my information is, Mr. McLean has done some public relations work for them for some five or six years, not lately, not just recently. He was not taken on to try to get them some business in the Newfoundland Government, he did not need to be and he did not. As far as A.E. Ames and Company are concerned, I do not know if they have any problems, I doubt that they do. They are just involved in the business world and they may donate to all parties, they may donate to none, I have no idea. I do understand though that they are represented in the public relations field by McLaren, which is the same firm that used to represent the Liberal Party

in Newfoundland, McLaren Advertising, and that is probably only a coincidence the same as McLean's participation with Burns is a coincidence.

Now that is the fiscal agency. There has been a change -

MR. NEARY: Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Carried. The hon. gentleman is going to be carried away when the next election comes. When the hon. gentleman from Bell Island speaks in this House, Mr. Speaker, all he does is add to the sum total of human ignorance, and that is what he has done in this recent debate and we are going to hear from him later on this afternoon. So after we hear from him this afternoon, the sum total of human ignorance will be raised even that much more.

MR. NEARY: There will be some new charges made and especially the minister will squirm out from under.

MR. CROSBIE: Okay, I am used to squirming.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: Inside or outside charges.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, make them outside the House will you, so that they can be dealt with properly.

I think I have covered pretty well all. No, there was this letter that the hon. gentleman has been trying to make something of, which I gave to McLean when I was Minister of Economic Development. "To whom it may concern." Now I had this checked by the officials in Tourist Development, I was asked, by a letter from McLean, so I sent it down to the officials. I asked, was this customary and would they think it would be all right. Similar letters to this have been given out on many occasions before. "To whom it may concern, This will advise that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador have consented to the publication of the magazine "Newfoundland and Labrador 1972" by McLean Public Relations, for which your advertising support has been solicited." All the purpose of that letter is, to show people that they had the consent of the government to publish this magazine. There

is no threat in it. There is no implied threat in it. It simply shows that McLean had consent from the Government of Newfoundland to publish the magazine "Newfoundland and Labrador 1972." If they do not want to put an advertisement in it, they do not have to. There were none of them contacted me and said, "Do you want me to put an advertisement in McLean's magazine?" I would have said I do not give a darn whether you put an advertisement in the magazine or not.

MR. NEARY: Did the hon. minister read the letter put out by Public Relations Consultants enclosing that letter?

MR. CROSBIE: I do not even know who they are.

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister should read that.

MR. CROSBIE: Well I am reading the letter that they were given from me, which follows others letters given to other people in past years who wanted to put out tourist supplements and so on in Newfoundland.

There was nothing wrong with that letter and nothing to be made out of that letter because it is an innocent letter which just shows that there is a publication that the government has consented to and if you want to advertise in it go ahead and if you do not want to advertise in it do not. It would be a pretty foolish advertiser who would advertise in it because they had a letter from the government consenting to them publishing a magazine. So the hon. gentleman cannot make much out of that.

The hon. gentleman does not want to live in the past, they keep telling us over here. They hate it when we go back to the past, even if it is just a year or a year and a-half ago. If we mention anything from the record of the Smallwood Administration, they cringe and twinge and winge and wind and they say that is past history and you should not be discussing the Liberal Administration, you should be looking to the future. Here they are today, all they want to do is look at Mr. Saunders and moan and groan about when Mr. Saunders resigned and the Leader of

the Opposition did not know he had resigned and we are all supposed to feel palpitations because he did not know he had resigned. It is too bad he did not know he was going to resign. It was not our fault. We had nothing to do with it, whether he knew it or did not know it. The hon. gentleman forgets when he brings up that incident something I would like to remind the House about, How in October 1971, hon. gentlemen opposite were defeated in an election. How they lost it by six or seven per cent of the popular vote and how they manoeuvred and wiggled to stay in power in defiance of the popular will when they did not even have half of the elected members. How they twisted and turned at every opportunity to stay on in power by their fingernails and their toenails and the desks had holes in them,

MR. CROSBIE: where they were gripping on trying to stay in power, in defiance of the electorate. They had lost the election and after twenty-two years it still was not enough. They defied the popular will and stayed in. They try to inveigle poor Hughie Shea and then they went to work on poor Tommy Burgess to try and stay in power, and who knows how many more they would have worked over if Mr. Saunders had not done the patriotic thing and resigned and put an end to it.

The people of Newfoundland will not forget that every one of the honourable gentlemen opposite, except the member for St. Barbe North, I think the member for Bonavista North was elected in October, if any one of those gentlemen had to resign between October and January, we would have had a change of government as we should have had. But every one of them defied the popular will. Everyone of them co-operated in keeping that machine in. Everyone co-operated so that Mr. Doyle was permitted to go off and do his damage and the rest of it, in December 1971. But we should not discuss that now. They do not want to look at the past. I am only discussing it because they brought up poor Mr. Saunders and attacked him, because he did the right thing and resigned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I for one will not vote for this resolution. This resolution is based on ten months' slander of a man, in his person, his reputation, his character and his business, deliberate attempts, vicious attempts to injure him and his business here and in Ontario, attempts motivated by political motives alone and now they ask us to appoint a select committee to clear his name, the name that they and they only have slandered, stamped on and tried to blacken. It would be criminal to vote for that motion.

MR. HICKY: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay the House too long, but as one minister who was involved in some work done by McLean Company, I feel obligated to provide some information.

The McLean Organization did some slides for the Department of Social Services while I was minister of that department. He did a slide, Mr. Speaker, on adoptions, at a cost I believe of \$4,000. The reason for that, to give a brief history of why we elected Mr. McLean to do that slide, was because the younger children who were available for adoption were being adopted fairly quickly, reasonable progress was being made, at least. But children of an older age, five years and over, we were making little headway with, having difficulty finding homes. The previous administration, in its efforts to find homes, had failed. The advertising programme as brought in by the former administration had failed miserably in this area, had had a reasonable amount of success, Mr. Speaker, I will concede, in placing younger children, but in terms of the children five years and over, little or no progress was made.

It was decided, therefore, that a new approach should be adopted, that we should try, make an effort at least and try something new to place greater emphasis on the children who were year by year losing the opportunity to get a decent home and a family to take them and provide for them and raise them.

So we engaged Mr. McLean to do a slide with our own officials, pointing out, in a professional way, the mechanics of adopting a child, from step one to where the prospective parents made their initial enquiry, right on up to the time when the adoption was finalized in the court.

Mr. Speaker, all of the officials in that department who have any responsibility for the adoption programme, when the child welfare division viewed that slide, some of them viewed it on two

MR. HICKEY: on three occasions, improved upon it, made suggestions and so on, all agree that it was an excellent piece of work, far beyond what in fact we expected. This is just one of the things, Mr. Speaker, that the McLean Organization was asked to do by this government. And yet there is no denying that this programme and many others by other departments is really one of the reasons for the vicious attack which has been made on this man personally and his organization.

Honourable gentlemen opposite may attempt all they wish to imply that there was wrong doing or there was poor performance or there was patronage or there was anything of this nature, but getting right down to it, Mr. Speaker, one cannot bring in a resolution, as the honourable member for Bell Island introduced in this House, and attack Mr. McLean and his company and yet say that the programmes or the basis for such programmes was a good idea.

In launching their attack on the McLean Organization, they are in effect launching an attack on any and every effort to provide necessary information to the people of this province, be it under an adoption programme or be it benefits that are available to our people through the Department of Fisheries, Education, Highways or any other department. It might be convenient for them to say, "Oh we agree that the programmes are good, what we disagree with is the man who provided the programmes or the man who did the work."

That cannot be, Mr. Speaker, they are hooked whether they like it or not. They are hooked on this one. They cannot abdicate the responsibility now by saying those programmes were good, it is Mr. McLean they were after. They were after Mr. McLean, the programmes he developed, the whole bit. That is what they were after, a cheap piece of political



Well, Mr. Speaker, it is almost incredible, it is impossible for one to appreciate, and above any other honourable gentleman in this House to bring in such a resolution was the honourable member for Bell Island, the charges that he has made against this man, while he himself is the subject or involved at least in two enquiries -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege please, I think Your Honour ruled in this House yesterday that no member would make reference to that enquiry. I might point out to the honourable minister that it is he who is being investigated because it was he who made the charges and not me. The honourable minister is being investigated. But I think Your Honour ruled yesterday that there would be no reference allowed to that enquiry in this House.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have no intentions of involving myself in any details of the enquiry. I merely made reference to it. There is nothing wrong with that. I say, I repeat -

MR. NEARY: There is something wrong with it. Your Honour ruled in this House yesterday that there would be no reference to it. I would like to hear Your Honour's ruling now, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The feeling here yesterday was that honourable members would do the House the courtesy of refraining from mentioning that particular enquiry while the point of order was being researched.

MR. HICKEY: Fine, Mr. Speaker, enough has been said on it anyway. The people of this province are well aware of what I refer to. That does not detract from what I have said. The honourable gentleman has no basis, none, he is the last person in the world who should bring in such a resolution. He should be seen and not heard. If he want to apply that to any enquiry, he may, but I make the statement and I stand by it.

This House is well aware

of what I referred to. Yet, Mr. Speaker, Lo and Behold! we get a resolution and a vicious, scurrilous attack not on a company, not on the programme but on the individual. It must have shocked all members of this House and everyone who listened last week when the member for Bonavista North, just before he adjourned the debate, not only did he attack Mr. McLean and following in the footsteps of his colleagues on that side but began a discription of the man, a discription by size, such a personal attack, such a level, Mr. Speaker, to lower oneself. The like has not been known, I would suggest, in the history of this honourable House, in this province.

Yet the very people, Mr. Speaker, who have just left government, the very people who involve themselves in much, much worse in terms of patronage than this government will ever, are the very people to point the finger now at this government for every single move, every single act. We are all suspect. It has been an accepted principle, Mr. Speaker, that one is innocent until proven guilty in any court in the land. Not so with the opposition or certain members of the opposition. Not so, Mr. Speaker. If you do not bow to their every whim, if you do not provide every last piece of information they require, you have something to hide. You are either involved in conflict of interest or you are involved in a deal. You are a crook. This is the inference. They do it in their sneaky little way, by innuendo. There are not enough words, Mr. Speaker, in the English language to condemn the contemptible act for which the member for Bell Island and some of his colleagues are guilty of, on that side of the House, by their vicious innuendos and inferences against ministers, backbenchers and members of this House.

For five years, Mr. Speaker, I sat on the opposite side of this House in the opposition and for five years I asked the former Premier and the government to do one thing, to do away with the Law of Immunity. Mr. Speaker, I ask this government to give serious consideration to it now. The law which protects a member of this House, as I understand it, coming from anyone who has any knowledge or the best knowledge of it, is to be used only in time of urgency or emergency where the public interest is in danger. That, Mr. Speaker, has been abused to no end in this honourable

House. Everyone is suspect. Charges and countercharges are made, the very essence of contempt, Mr. Speaker, not only against members of the House but against people who are not able to defend themselves, who are outside this chamber.

There is a lot to be said, Mr. Speaker, for doing something about repealing that law. When anyone makes a charge against a member of this House, who is here to stand up and defend himself, they are brought to order by the rules of this House and they are either asked to prove their charge or withdraw it against a member who sits and listens, who is able and capable of defending himself. Yet, any member of this House and particularly of late, members of the opposition, they stand in their place and destroy any citizens of this province who do not have a voice in this House, who are unable to defend themselves, in fact, Mr. Speaker, who are unable to utter a word in defense, who have no recourse to take that member to court. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is because of this law that we find Mr. McLean the subject of the ridicule, the condemnation and the scurrilous attack that we have heard of him for the last number of weeks.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Bell Island does not possess the guts nor the ordinary courage to stand in this House and say anything about anyone other than when he is protected by the rule or law of immunity. His bluff has been called on many an occasion but he has never answered the call.

It is pretty easy for anyone to stand in his place here and involve himself in a scurrilous attack to destroy someone's character, when he is not going to be taken to task for it the next day. Has there ever been an honourable member who has engaged in such a performance when challenged to step outside the bar and make the similar charge? Has there ever been one who has involved himself in an unfounded charge or a charge against character? Has there every been one, Mr. Speaker, to go outside this House and make that charge? Very few, if any. Those who did had good, solid grounds for their charge.

Mr. Speaker, we can talk all we wish, we can spend all the time we wish in attempting to uplift the level of debate in this House, in an attempt to bring back the dignity that belongs to this House and to do away once and for all with personal attacks, not only on members of this House but more important on people of our province, on citizens who are outside this House. It will not happen, Mr. Speaker, as long as certain honourable gentlemen occupy a seat.

Last year I was accused of a personal attack on a member of this House. My record is available, Mr. Speaker, for the last six or seven years in this House. Be quite, now! During that time, Mr. Speaker, there has never been an occasion when I have launched an attack or referred to any member of this House or any citizen of this province, personally or otherwise, the only time that I engaged in anything which was near personalities towards honourable members of this House was in a matter of defence, as a matter to defend myself because I was constantly being attacked personally. The prime mover of such an attack, Mr. Speaker, was none other than my honourable friend from Bell Island. No stone left unturned to destroy me. Nothing short of character assassination, employment record, you name it he has attempted to do it.

Mr. Speaker, it is like the old Newfoundland saying, "It is a long road that does not have a turn." The honourable gentleman will get what is coming to him. He will get his answer for his vicious attacks over the last five years. He will get his answer, Mr. Speaker, for his vicious attack on George McLean. It may not be the subject of any enquiry but it is this kind of attack, it is this kind of performance, Mr. Speaker, that will bring the result, that will bring home to the honourable gentleman what he rightfully deserves. He will get that. Make no mistake about it.

MR. NEARY: Where and when?

MR. HICKEY: The honourable gentleman just wait. Let him, as I told him so often, let him make hay while the sun shines because he may not be around to make hay very long.

He should not, Mr. Speaker, judge everyone by himself. I make no threats against any honourable gentleman or any citizen of this province.

I do not resort to such low-down tactics. He speaks of himself not me.

Mr. Speaker, what is even more amazing and which is something that no one, I am sure, on this side of the House - I doubt if there is anybody in this province, whatever their political persuasions may be, who are able to comprehend how the honourable gentleman and a few other:

former members of the former administration, former members of government, who all of a sudden appeared to be Mr. Clean, who all of a sudden are shocked by the simplest hint of patronage, of conflict of interest, of awarding tenders and I could go on. You name it, anything. Some of the honourable gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, who had just gotten out of government -

MR. NEARY: Lay charges. Lay charges.

MR. HICKEY: I do not hesitate, Mr. Speaker. There is nobody, Mr. Speaker, in this province who knows any better than the member for Bell Island that when I have a charge to lay, I lay it.

MR. NEARY: Well lay it. Lay the charge now.

MR. HICKEY: It was laid last year.

MR. NEARY: No, it was not.

MR. HICKEY: It was made. It is in the process now, Mr. Speaker, of being proven.

MR. NEARY: To the tenants, and the minister is being investigated.

MR. HICKEY: Ha! Ha! Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman wishes to think that, if that is any consolation to him (I know he should be worried and I know he is) then so be it! I am open for investigation and inspection seven days a week, three hundred and sixty-five days a year.

MR. NEARY: What about Newfoundland Farm Products?

MR. HICKEY: Newfoundland Farm Products -

MR. NEARY: What about all the others? The scandal -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like for the honourable gentleman to go on.

MR. NEARY: Sure. Do you want me to go on?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, tell us about Newfoundland Farm Products. What about Newfoundland Farm Products?

MR. NEARY: What about the outstanding debts?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I challenge the honourable gentleman now, if he had the decency, the courage or the common guts to put it into the good old Newfoundland way. I will provide the opportunity for him. I will take my seat and let him tell this House about Newfoundland Farm Products or anything else pertaining to me that he can dig up.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the car - tell us about the automobile.

MR. HICKEY: Up!

MR. NEARY: Tell us about your trip to Bermuda.

MR. HICKEY: Up! Are you going to get up?

MR. NEARY: Is there anybody else who is going to speak in this debate, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HICKEY: No. The honourable gentleman will not get up because, Mr. Speaker, as if it were necessary, as if we needed it, here is a clear-cut example -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, according to the rules of this honourable House, when a speaker takes his seat, Sir, then he is finished and then the other speaker has to carry on.

MR. HICKEY: I provided the opportunity. I called his bluff. I asked him to get up. I challenged him to get up and repeat and give a little more information on Newfoundland Farm Products. Does he want me to give it?

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the car.

MR. HICKEY: I will tell you about Newfoundland Farm Products now that you want to know.

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the trip to Bermuda and tell us about the cigarette situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Provincial Affairs has the right to be heard in silence. The hon. member for Bell Island has been for some time making remarks that are completely out of order. I hesitate to call him to order but I do so in this case.

MR. HICKEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, before I say this, I ask the House to bear with me. It is off the subject but by inference and by innuendos

yet another vicious charge is made against me, as if there is something to hide. The honourable gentleman wants to know about Newfoundland Farm Products and now I will tell him.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Keep his mouth shut and listen. Seeing he is so interested in my personal affairs, Mr. Speaker, he will have it. Newfoundland Farm Products, Mr. Speaker, what the honourable gentleman refers to was a matter of a writ, a writ against me for money owed to the Newfoundland Farm Products, which is a crown corporation of this government, of the former government. Does the honourable gentleman want me to deny I owe money? Is that what he wants? Well I will not.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order, if I may? We all know what this sort of thing leads to in this House, Mr. Speaker, and since it is not relevant, I will ask Your Honour to rule this irrelevancy out of order so that we can carry on with the subject matter of the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: The honourable member has a point of order which is perhaps well taken. I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that the remarks that are being made by the hon. Minister for Provincial Affairs have been solely and wholly provoked by remarks made by the hon. member for Bell Island. While there is perhaps some merit in the point of order that has been raised, I would also urge Your Honour, with respect to the point of order, to caution and recation again the hon. member for Bell Island to desist from deliberately attempting to bait in a base and personal manner people on the other side of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The point of order by the member for White Bay South and reference to it by the Minister without Portfolio are both well taken. The member for Bell Island has been repeatedly called to order in this House. The Minister of Provincial Affairs was addressing the House to the point. The member for Bell Island persisted in bringing extraneous



materials into the debate and while it may be completely out of order for the Minister of Provincial Affairs to reply, it would appear inevitable that there would be a duty upon him to reply to remarks of that nature. Therefore while both honourable members are out of order, if the hon. member for Bell Island persists in bringing extraneous materials into this debate, which he originated, then they will have to watch their tone.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not involve myself in this kind of discussion with any pride. I, the same as any other member of this House, like a certain amount of privacy, be it my financial situation or my personal affairs. The hon. gentleman from Bell Island has on a number of occasions made reference to this. Now he asked for it, so he is going to get it. The issue he refers to in such a contemptible fashion, as if I had something to be ashamed of, in relation to Newfoundland Farm Products, is simply a matter of a writ which was issued against the firm of Towne and Country Drive-In, which I owned, for an amount of which was owed by a business which went out of business approximately two years ago. The writ was issued while the former administration were in office and thereby, Mr. Speaker, hangs a tale that we might get on to some other time as to why that writ was issued by a crown corporation against a minister of the crown. When it was issued, I happened to be a minister of the crown.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that money was paid. The money could not have been paid before that. The business was closed. Does the honourable gentleman find fault with that? Would he have me pay it through some other means, like corruption? Would he have me pay it by means of under the table deals? No, Mr. Speaker. If I owe money, I will owe it until I pay it by the money I earn, not by what I can squeeze out of someone

else, through corruption or anything else. Now does that satisfy the honourable member?

MR. NEARY: A point of personal privilege, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the honourable minister if he is referring to me and if he is, would he make the charge?

MR. HICKEY: If the cap fits, Mr. Speaker, he can pull it right down over his chin.

MR. NEARY: I want a ruling from the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: I see no point of personal privilege involved here. The Minister of Provincial Affairs has been allowed to digress into matters which are certainly irrelevant to this debate. I would suggest that there may be another time or place in which that matter may be debated. I would ask that he resume the debate on the resolution that is under discussion.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, that is fine. I abide by Your ruling. I have no desire -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Why do they not listen for a change?

MR. ROBERTS: What are you getting at?

MR. HICKEY: I have no desire, Mr. Speaker, to belabour the point. I have no desire to talk about my personal affairs, none, but I am not going to stand here or sit here and have someone imply something about me. I have nothing to be ashamed of since I was born. If the honourable gentleman can say the same, he is lucky.

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the car.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, you want to know about the car, do you? All right we will. Do we want a debate on the car?

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us about all the cars.

MR. HICKEY: It is up to the honourable gentleman and the House. I can assure the honourable gentleman I have nothing whatsoever to hide about the car, the trip to Bermuda or anything else. The honourable gentleman has much more to hide than I - much more.

Maybe instead, Mr. Speaker, of going into the silly details of that car that was used by me, and paid for I might add, maybe my reply to him should be in the provision of some information to the House and a reminder to the honourable gentleman how he used a government aircraft to go from St. Anthony to St. Pierre to have dinner.

MR. NEARY Not true!

MR. HICKEY: Or from Burin.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not true.

MR. HICKEY: Not true.

AN HON. MEMBER: No indeed it is not.

MR. HICKEY: Well that will do for the record, Mr. Speaker, we can all look a little further than we can think. Later on, Mr. Speaker, who knows they might even be talked into providing the evidence.

MR. NEARY: Let us see it. Produce it.

MR. HICKEY: The same people, Mr. Speaker, who are so upset, who are so offset with Mr. McLean because he was recognized by this government for a job well done and given some business wherein he performed, paying him for good excellent work that he does, the same gentleman, the prime gentleman, the member for Bell Island, as a member of the former administration, do not tell the House at all about how the former administration chartered Lundrigans jet to go to Labrador, at a cost, Mr. Speaker, of \$2300, when they could have gone there for \$150 return; not tell us about the former Premier and party chartering Lundrigans jet to go to Moncton at a cost to the taxpayers of \$1775. Do not tell us, Mr. Speaker, about the former Attorney General and the former President of the Council chartering Lundrigans jet to fly to Montreal, at a cost of \$2893, as opposed to the going rates by EPA or Air Canada. We do not hear anything about this, Mr. Speaker. I am not suggesting that because that was wrong, if this government had done something wrong that it is justified. I am not suggesting that at all. But this government have done no wrong as it applies to Mr. McLean, in regards to the issue we are debating today.

But who is accusing us? Mr. Clean and some other honourable gentlemen who sat in as members of government when instead of going the cheap way, instead of spending the people's money to the best of their ability and getting the most out of it involved themselves, Mr. Speaker, in pure adulterated patronage by chartering a jet from Lundrigans at a cost of

four trips - \$10,073, when in fact those trips could have been made for something over \$1,000.

Does the honourable gentleman for Bell Island want some samples of patronage, well there it is, look. Does he want some more now about the car?

MR. NEARY: Yes, let us have it.

MR. HICKEY: Does he want to hear about the car on Roache's Line?

MR. NEARY: No tell us about the car the honourable minister had.

MR. HICKEY: Does he want to hear about that?

MR. NEARY: No we want to hear about the car you had.

MR. HICKEY: Does he want to hear about the car the honourable gentleman got from the pool-

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. HICKEY: To just drive around town -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HICKEY: when his own was in the garage.

MR. NEARY: We have one hour.

MR. HICKEY: That was not for personal use at all, I suppose? What was he doing?

MR. NEARY: We have an hour or so.

MR. HICKEY: Visiting the Girls Home or the Boys Home in Pleasantville.

MR. NEARY: We have an hour or so, let us hear it.

MR. HICKEY: He could have walked.

MR. NEARY: We have an hour or so, let us hear about it. Tell us all about it. We have an hour.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, but I am the villain. We are, all of us.

MR. NEARY: No, a fool. The honourable minister is a fool not a villain.

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, you know I am no different than anybody else. I would be more concerned if the most uneducated, simplest citizen

of this province called me a fool. I would be awfully concerned and I would be hurt. But when it comes from the honourable gentleman for Bell Island, it is like water on a duck's back,

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HICKEY: Because nobody in this province listens to him.

MR. NEARY: Thick skin.

MR. HICKEY: Not as thick as the skin that is on the honourable gentleman, because that, Mr. Speaker, is impossible to penetrate.

MR. NEARY: This is really good stuff, a good debate, good material.

MR. HICKEY: I have one consolation, Mr. Speaker, in my department now I am responsible for the environment. Last week we approved some air quality regulations, if the members of the Clean, Air, Water and Soil Authority knew or heard or listened to some of the garbage that comes from the honourable gentleman, they would bring those regulations into effect in this House, they would put a stop order on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: They would flush him down into the toilet.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me just say, it is the main purpose in my rising, let me just say that I would vote against this resolution if for no other reason, if for no other reason, Mr. Speaker, even if the Opposition had proved conclusively that there was something wrong I would vote against this resolution because of the personal scurrilous attacks that have been made on that man, Mr. McLean. If for no other reason I would vote against it for that. But, Mr. Speaker, I voted against it for more than that, because the man was only paid for performance and he was given the business because he did a top-notch job for this party of ours in changing the government in this province - was there anyone else -

MR. NEARY: What an admission that is?

MR. HICKEY: Was there anyone else, Mr. Speaker, was there anyone better to do the job of public relations? We did not have to wonder what

kind of a job could be done. We knew, Mr. McLean and company, insofar as his dealings with the department that I was concerned with, Mr. Speaker, and other honourable ministers have dealt with theirs, let me say provided slides which were of a top-notch quality, provided slides to that department which the officials say and which I agree will provide a new approach and if there are just one or two homes provided a child, Mr. Speaker, over the age of five who at this point in time cannot find any way into a home, then all the money, that \$4,000 or in fact the total paid to George McLean, will be well spent. Nobody should know that better than the honourable gentleman for Bell Island who had the privilege of being minister of that department for three years. But no, he is not interested in that. He is the gentleman who tells us that his heart bleeds for the poor of this province. What hogwash! What garbage! The honourable gentleman cares about no one but himself, his own political hide and it is only through an attempt to sustain his own political hide that this resolution is before this House.

MR. A. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, in entering this poor excuse for a debate I intent, as usual, to be very brief. No doubt I can understand the stupidity of the members opposite will as usual place themselves in direct opposition to the great majority of the people of this province, who owe the McLean interests an unending debt for the small part they played in helping this province attain its first government since Confederation. I also see a certain amount of jealousy emanating from over there. As a matter of fact I am reasonably sure that the brochure prepared by the McLean interest for the Tourist Department contained a vivid picture of the father of mushrooms surrounded by progeny, three I believe; (the member for Harbour Main said) the member for Bonavista North in his blueberry patch and the Leader of the Opposition or the member for St. Barbe North fully kilted, doing the highland fling, Mr. McLean would be hailed as a hero by the members opposite, and probably extolled as a creation of that never to be revived party, known as the Liberals, and would not be using

up the valuable time of this honourable House. I would suggest that the honourable member withdraw the motion and consult his acquaintances for the answers.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

HON. L. BARRY: (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of personal privilege. I have to confess that I am not quite clear if the rules permit me to do so at this time. However, because of the potential danger I think it is something that I should raise at the earliest possible moment. I refer to a certain editorial in the "Evening Telegram."



I will not criticize the paper, If I could explain to the honourable members what has happened. Last Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of making a few remarks to the Alexander Murray Geology Club at the university and the "Telegram" coverage was quite good, I thought, except for one sentence in the coverage which was a misquote. The words were taken out of context and the impression was totally different than that that was intended or that was conveyed at the time.

The misquote would basically lead to the effect that as Minister of Mines and Energy or not just myself but the Government of the Province had not concerned itself with the pollution regulations or the environmental regulations regulating the movement of petroleum products to the refinery at Come by Chance. I was quoted as saying that while I was not too familiar with the regulations at the present time, that if I decided to run in three or four years that I would make well sure that I knew the regulations by that time because of the number of fishermen in my district.

Mr. Speaker, this is a completely wrong impression that is being given. I decided to ignore the misquote in the "Telegram" at that time, because, I thought it would be passed over. However, I now find when I get back and I look at the editorial in the Monday edition, the March 12, edition of the "Evening Telegram" I find that the "Telegram" has taken the misquote of their reporter from last Wednesday and decided to base an editorial on it. This sort of self-generating misimpression, I think, has to be squelched as soon as possible because there is a danger of giving the wrong impression to the people as to our government's concern for the protection of the environment.

My statement at the time of this meeting was that because of lack of action in the past, the provincial government finds itself in the position of lacking the necessary expertise to be able to keep complete and total surveillance over activities off our coast. I also pointed out that this falls within the jurisdiction of the federal

government with respect to their protection of the environment under the B.N.A. Act.

My statement was that because of our lack of expertise the provincial government had to rely to a great extent on the federal regulations. This is a statement of fact, Mr. Speaker, we do have to rely on the federal regulations. We are improving our expertise in this area. Again, my statement was that while personally I was not completely familiar with the environmental regulations, this of course is primarily the responsibility of the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment and he has some good officials in his department who are keeping on top of the situation. Again, to me it is amazing, we have an issue which could be a pretty controversial issue. The protection of the environment is very much in the forefront of everybody's mind these days and we have a supposedly responsible newspaper generating from their previous misquote a full-fledged editorial implying that the government is not concerned with the protection of the environment. This to me is shocking and I ask the "Evening Telegram" to take note of my statements and to clarify the matter.

One other statement that is made directly related to this, if I could by leave, Mr. Speaker, just for a moment, I will not delay debate on this other momentous matter. One other criticism contained in this same editorial is a criticism of our government for raising the expectations of the people in our province by talking so much about oil and gas.

Our government is very much aware of the dangers of creating artificial expectations, of giving people the impression that there is going to be a bonanza, a Klondike off our coast. Mr. Speaker, we have clearly, time and time again, stated that is not our purpose. The thing to be realized here is that whether a stain of oil is ever brought ashore to Newfoundland, whether a drop is ever brought to the surface on the continental shelf, the fact remains that today, this

very day there are millions of dollars being spent in exploration and the reason that our government is talking so much about oil and gas is to make our people aware of the opportunities in this area so that they can take advantage and not have to rely on people from outside coming in.

I thank you for the leeway you have given me, Mr. Speaker, on the second point but again I submit that it is too important a point to permit a false impression to continue on, it is a matter of vital concern to the economy of our province. If our businessmen do not get information about what is happening off shore, they are going to miss opportunities. That is the only point I want to make.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador South:

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few words to say in this debate regarding the matter before the floor, not too many. I think altogether too many words have been spoken already in this matter. Perhaps some of them have been spoken in moments of passion but what I have to say here today I hope to say quite dispassionately.

I should like first of all to inform this honourable House, Mr. Speaker, that I should like to disassociate myself from any of the disparaging comments that have been made toward Mr. McLean's personality or his appearance. I think this kind of thing is altogether beneath the dignity of this House and it would be an insult to the people who sent me here if I were to indulge in that.

There are a few things that I have been able to dig up in my own personal investigation. I do not have at my disposal the resources of the official opposition, I am not able to mount a full scale investigation but from the investigation, enquiries that I have made myself and from the things that have been brought before the floor by my honourable colleagues here in the opposition, I should think that there is room for concern.

Without going over all the various points that have been raised reraised and repurgitated again and again, I would like to just for the

benefit of the honourable members on the other side very briefly run down through the points that have been raised in this debate.

I would like to start by going over the original resolution. What we are attempting to do is decide whether or not we are going to establish a select committee of this House to enquire into certain activities of the McLean organizations as they pertain to government. The resolution states; "That a select committee of eight members be appointed to investigate into and report upon the matters set forth above and any other matters incidental thereto..."

There is nothing terribly earth shattering in that, it is simply trying to get at the facts of the matter before the House in a way that we are not able to do in private enquiries nor investigations. There have been allegations of the work paid for but never delivered. If that be true, then that is a serious breach of trust. There are questions as to the quality of the work and whether, or not we are getting our money's worth in fact. There is a question of a certain number of publications which it was alleged were destroyed. I understand that an agreement to have "X" number of these copies distributed was made with the government. I would like to know whether that agreement was kept

were carried out? How many were destroyed? If these copies that were destroyed were part of those that were supposed to have been distributed? If that were the case, then why?

The question of the solicitation of the advertising in a private publication, with the government's endorsement, I find this very, very strange. It is highly irregular to say the least. I am quite disturbed at the comments from the honourable member for St. John's West and the honourable member for St. John's East Extern, when they quite blatantly come out in support of this practice of political patronage. To my own naive way of thinking, I have always assumed that political patronage was a thing that has always been with us but is really not something that we come out and admit and even boast about openly. I should think that is the kind of thing that we should be trying to discourage. If we are in fact to be honourable men, then perhaps we should try to, as quick as possible, get away from this practice.

Now I have been involved myself in public relations and advertising and this kind of thing, and it is altogether legal I suppose for anybody to put his endorsement on a letter soliciting advertising. In fact no consent is needed from anybody to go out and sell advertising, certainly not from the government, therefore it is highly irregular for a member of government to put his signature to such a letter. To my mind at least, it implies that if certain advertisers do not buy perhaps the same kind of thing will be practiced as was practiced in the last administration when we saw liquor licences being removed and this kind of thing, when you did not kick into the kitty.

Regarding the films and indeed all other aspects of the public relations effort by Mr. McLean and his company, of course I agree that we cannot tender for contracts on this kind of thing,

but it is an established procedure that when an agency is offered such a large amount of money as this to be spent in public relations and advertising, it is established procedure that you then go to the various agencies who are capable of delivering and asking them for proposals, setting forth your guide lines and asking them for proposals as to what they will do in these cases.

As far as I know, this was not done here and this leads into another quite serious matter. I am wondering if it is the policy of government, of this particular administration, to go around creating monopolies, because if they are not asking for proposals, we do have several other reputable creditable advertising firms, native born firms, people who need the work here in Newfoundland, who, I am sure, would be quite delighted to have a chance to get at some of this government's money. If no opportunity were given to them to bid or to make proposals, then what the government is doing in fact here is to create a monopoly for government public relations work.

If this were not done, I think we should find out why it was not done and whether it is government policy. I think we owe at least that much to the people of this province.

The matter was raised regarding Mr. McLean's connection with other agencies outside government. It is possible. It is nothing new. It is possible that there can be a conflict of interest. There is reasonable cause to doubt that there is not a conflict of interest. I think that it is in the interest of this House, in the interest of the people of this province and perhaps in the interest of Mr. McLean and his firm that we should take a very close look and find out once and for all whether or not there is conflict of interest.

We have had enough of all of this kind of thing in the past I think, Mr. Speaker. The question I would like to put to

these honourable gentlemen on the other side of the House, before they bring this matter to a vote, is whether or not they remember what went on before. Whether or not they recall why it was they got into politics in the first place, whether or not they can remember the times when they were afraid to open their mouth because somebody might be after their job. The fear that we had to live under, I know, I did and I lost my job because of it.

We were supposed to be elected to stop all this. We were given the mandate. You were given the mandate, Mr. Speaker, the people on the other side of the House were given the mandate to clear up this business in government.

Now we have seen all of the thousands of the mad schemes that have been carried out by government in the last two or three administrations, perhaps not going all the way back over the twenty-two years. We have seen liquor licences being suspended. We have seen people not being able to get liquor licences because they did not prescribe to a particular political philosophy. I am wondering if that kind of thing is still with us.

Some very serious questions have been raised. All we are asking of this House, Sir, is that they consent to the appointment of a committee to say yes or not, whether this administration is the same as the last administration. If it be so, then that is their business and I am sure that they are going to have to answer to the electorate the next time. That is all I have to say. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, this has been a pretty long debate. I do not know how many days now, it has been going on three or four days.

As usual, the honourable member for Labrador South has been very much to the point and has raised the kind of questions and the kind of debate which should be generated by any resolution that comes

before this honourable House.

There is not much point in my repeating all of the information and the arguments that have been put to this honourable House in so far as this debate is concerned. The honourable member for Labrador South very properly drew attention or asked what had happened to some of the copies of this publication that were allegedly I think thrown into Robin Hood Bay. Well, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that question has already been answered by the Minister of Tourism, but regardless of whether it has been or not, my understanding is that government funds were not used for the creation or the printing or the publication of this pamphlet, this tourist pamphlet that went out.

Surely, if government does not spend money on the publication of these pamphlets, government again has no jurisdiction or right to say as to how they are going to be disposed. I think it is significant that we have been told that approximately 70,000 of these publications found their way into the hands of hotels and similar institutions in the province.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if there is one thing in this province that we have been very, very neglectful about and neglectful toward, that is the publication of the attractions we have in this province that will appeal to people throughout North America.

Not too long ago I was speaking with one of the Canadian Consulates in the United States and he expressed to me a great deal of concern over the fact that Newfoundland has never seen fit to really invade the potential tourist market of North America. He pointed out to me that nearly every week a minister of the Crown, from either New Brunswick or Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island, is somewhere on the Eastern Seaboard of the United States, making



speeches that have been arranged by the Canadian Consulate offices. The speeches they make are not speeches that the Minister of the Crown here would make, I am sure would not be the kind that would be acceptable in their provinces. But they believe

Mr. Speaker

If we are going to develop the tourist industry or if they are, of their province, then the things that we take for granted have to be brought to the attention of the potential customers that we can have in Newfoundland. The suggestion was made by the hon. the member for Bell Island that we should not promote this sort of thing because there is not enough traffic across the Gulf, not enough ferries to take the traffic that is coming. That, Mr. Speaker, was not what happened this year. This year we saw a tremendous increase in the number of people coming across the Gulf into Newfoundland. Hopefully, with the additional ferry on this year, there will be further increase. But surely the Government of Newfoundland is not to be expected to sit back, take no action, avoid using the expertise of Mr. McLean or anyone else to promote what we have here and to await a decision of Canadian National Railways to provide additional accommodation across the Gulf.

The simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of publicity, the kind of publicity that we have been getting during the past year in particular, will do a great deal to put dollars in the pockets of our people. The kind of publicity that we have been getting during the past three or four Wednesdays will not, I submit, Mr. Speaker, do the same thing or accomplish the same purpose. I do too, Mr. Speaker, draw to the attention of the House, and I do this in reply to the remarks of the hon. the member for Labrador South, on the question of public tenders, quite recently this House, and I realize I am not allowed to debate for a second time a bill that has gone through this House, but quite recently this House passed unanimously a new act called the Department of Public Works and Services Act and I think it is very significant that in that act, Mr. Speaker, there is provision that in all the purchases of supplies to the value of \$1,000 or more there must be public tendering and public opening of tenders. I think that is a welcome change. I think it is what the people of this province ask for and I think it is what they are entitled to receive.

I think it is equally significant, Mr. Speaker, that the provision in that act also says that in instances such as where the amount is less than \$1,000 or where there is only one person in the province who can provide that service, that reasons have to be submitted and filed and reported to the Auditor General.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we can stay here from now until doomsday and unless there is a willingness on the part of hon. members of this House to observe the proprieties and to see to it that government funds are honestly spent, that we can pass legislation and pass resolutions until they come out of our ears and we will not arrive at the kind of results that Newfoundlanders expect of us and which I believe, Mr. Speaker, from what I have seen in this House, that we as representatives of the people in this House are determined to give. The hon. the member for Labrador South inquires as to what is being done with printing. I can advise this House that, I hesitate to say for the first time because this generally gets one into trouble, but it is significant that this year, the year 1973, all of the printing of the tourist publications that will emanate from the Department of Tourism will be done by local firms in Newfoundland, Newfoundland firms. This has not been done in the past, to my knowledge. It could be that somewhere in the last twenty years somebody can dig out a brochure that was printed by Dicks and Company or Gray and Goodland, I do not know. They have the capabilities of doing that work. I understand that this seating arrangement, which is a bit more attractive than we had in the past, was printed by Dicks and Company. Somebody apparently got the negative mixed up but be that as it may, it is a local publication and a local endeavour.

My understanding is and I agree with the hon. member for Labrador South, when he says that public relations work is not the sort of thing that one can call tenders on, and it is my understanding that in arriving at a decision to use the work of this company of Mr. McLean

so long as it performs, one retains him not simply for his expertise in public relations work but also for his expertise in filming and his knowledge of getting the maximum exposure of whatever he is publishing for Newfoundland, in the various parts of North America, where they do the most good.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to, just for one minute, indicate why I feel that this kind of resolution does not really do much for the House of Assembly, certainly it does very little to endear it to Newfoundlanders. But it is the unusual approach that is used particularly by the hon. member when he introduced this resolution. I do not know if it is a carry-over of the sort of trepidation that the hon. member for Labrador South referred to, but the only remarkable disclosure that has really come out of this debate is that we know that the security of this building is in good hands. We know that. I have never had very much doubt about it but once in a while you hear people say that they do not like coming in here working at night because there is a lonely feeling. But we do know that security is in good hands because we know that the hon. member for Bell Island is watching it. He is watching this building very carefully, so he tells us on page 682 of Hansard, because he checks the security books to see who signed in and who signed out and where the lights come on and where the lights go out. It is a great consolation to me to know and I am sure of other hon. ministers that when we are working in our office, somewhere lurking in the shadows is the hon. member for Bell Island watching who is coming in. He is either behind the busts in the lobby of Confederation Building or he is out behind Gaspar Corte Real or somewhere, but he is here.

Out of that little observation, that a gentleman named Edward Coady who I learned for the first time or at least the hon. member for Bell Island says that he is presumably on the staff on this company of Mr. McLean. I do not know if he is or not but in

any event a Mr. -

MR. NEARY: It should be Edward Swain.

MR. HICKMAN: A Mr. Edward Swain. Hansard was incorrect. A Mr. Edward -

MR. MURPHY: No, no -

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. gentleman was incorrect.

MR. HICKMAN: No, I read from Hansard on page 682 -

AN HON. MEMBER: No, the hon. gentleman from Bell Island was incorrect.

MR. HICKMAN: Anyway it is a Mr. Edward Swain. He came in, signed the security book and allegedly went to the eighth floor and now we have this resolution before the House. Then, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Bell Island went on and he made what to me is a kind of accusation that I feel has no place in this House, because it is an imputation as much as it is an accusation. He was talking about Mr. McLean and he said, "I asked the Leader of the Opposition if he would get certain information on the McLean Organization for me, from Toronto, and the Leader of the Opposition got the information for me and I now pass it on to hon. members to show them what they are dealing with." Mr. Speaker, listen to this and I am still quoting from the hon. member, "The company is in peculiar financial problems. They do not seem to have credit anywhere." Now if these things are not correct, they are libellous and slander to the highest order and I have no doubt the hon. member for Bell Island will have no hesitancy in saying it outside of the House because truth is a good defense to this kind of reaction.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Outside of the House. "Much of the revenue come from film contracts out of various Newfoundland departments such as tourism, highways, fisheries. The Minister of Fisheries says no involvement in his department." Now listen to this, Mr. Speaker, and I am still quoting, "The company is in constant difficulty with the civil service in

Newfoundland. It has become a political issue." Well, obviously you do not need any report to say this. Then it goes on to talk about the turnover of Mr. McLean with employees, that the Toronto office has seven employees including himself. Now what I say to this, Mr. Speaker, is that if these kind of accusations are to be made, if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition gets a report from someone in Toronto, this hon. House

is entitled to know from whom the report was received. Was it Dunne and Bradstreet? Because, if it is Dunne and Bradstreet, if the honourable the member for Bell Island had gotten up, Mr. Speaker, and said, "I am now reading from Dunnes bulletin or from the Retail Credit Company or from some other company," naming it or indeed "I am reading from an article in a magazine," he knows that having read it, he is then obligated under the rules of the House to table it. This then gives the honourable members of the House the right to assess the accuracy, the validity, the expertise of the person arriving at the slanderous, damaging statements.

When you read it, when you hear it being said, it has all the earmarks of an authentic report. Now it is no good saying, Mr. Speaker, it is not an answer, that we can give this to a select committee. It would even be a sillier answer to say, "Well, now if we have a select committee, we will get witnesses." This is not what select committees are all about, Mr. Speaker. This is not the kind of accusation, this is not the kind of debate that this House of Assembly is supposed to be a party to. When I say, Mr. Speaker, that no honourable member in this House, I do not care where he sits, should have intelligence so insulted that he should be called upon to vote for this kind of a resolution, based upon these statements and they are statements. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition today says that opinions are being deduced from facts, but where are the facts? This is what this House has to ask. Where are the facts? From a report not named and not tabled? That is not fact.

From the observations of the honourable the member for Bell Island as to who signed the security book? That is not a fact.

From the opinion that may be expressed as to whether the right kind of pamphlets are being used to promote the Tourist Industry in this province? That is not a fact. That is a matter of judgement. The government of the day uses its judgement to decide whether, in the opinion of the Minister of Tourism, a particular approach should be used in developing the Tourist Industry of this province. These are not facts.

You do not have silly resolutions that are not based on facts. The recitals in the resolution, "WHEREAS there are presistent reports about the inferior quality." From whom but the opposition. From whom?

If any honourable member of this House is to be called upon to support a resolution, then in my opinion there has to be far more convincing facts than we have seen during this debate or have heard during this debate. No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we as a government should object at all to debate of this kind on private members' day. Four days, why not have five or six or seven? If any honourable member of the House feel that this resolution is worth four or five more days debate, I think we should have it. It will be one sure way of emptying the galleries. It would be a discourtesy to the press but I think we should. Why not have it for a few more days? I do not see anything wrong with it. I think that we should. Sure we should. I look forward to the wind up of the debate by the honourable the member for Bell Island, when he gets his foot up on the chair.

I just want to bring this to the attention of the member for Bell Island because it has been bothering me for a long time and I do not like to see him when he is trying to orate in the Smallwoodian pose. He should follow it to the letter. There is no point in getting up, as the former Premier used to do, and put up your trousers this way as you are about to debate, unless you can do it properly. Then again he always puts his right foot on the chair and everybody knows that as much as the honourable member poses as being a rightist, he is not. That is not the way that it is done, Mr. Speaker. If you want to imitate any of the former orators that we have had in this province, then do it and do it properly.

Well, Mr. Sneaker, during this debate maybe it is necessary - I doubt if it is - but maybe it is necessary to from time to time make disparaging remarks. Not all of them are slanderous but remarks and insinuations -

MR. NEARY: Quote me some remarks that I made that were personal or slanderous  
Quote me some out of the -



MR. HICKMAN: Let us have a look at the -

MR. NEARY: Yes, let us have a look at it. We have been hearing about it all afternoon. Now, let us hear from it.

MR. HICKMAN: Look at this one, this little one. Remember this;

Page 691. "In addition to the cost of shooting the films, Sir, the production cost, done in a haphazard way. Another firm in Toronto to be paid for the script and film but where is it?" Then: "Christopher Pratt narrated the film. I do not know whether he got paid for that or not, Sir. The honourable Premier might be able to tell us whether he got thirty dollars an hour for narrating that film. If he did, Sir, he was grossly overpaid because his voice..."

MR. NEARY: Is that slanderous?

MR. HICKMAN: I am not talking about slander. "Because his voice is not suited for that sort of thing, no more than mine is suited for this microphone here!"

MR. NEARY: That is a matter of opinion. That is not slanderous.

MR. HICKMAN: It is not a question of matter of opinion. Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making is this, it is a very simple one, that fine, young Newfoundlander who in this particular field has attained more fame in his particular vocation than any Newfoundlander today, should not be the subject matter of a debate and this Sir Christopher Pratt sort of thing -

MR. NEARY: Why not?

MR. HICKMAN: Because, Mr. Speaker, we should be lauding him to the sky. We should be standing here and saying, Mr. Speaker, how delighted we are and how proud we are that Newfoundland produced a Christopher Pratt and how proud we are that he has the courage to remain in his native province and to produce his works here and bring fame to his province and to this land. That is what we should be doing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: And we should laud the fact that he is a good Tory.

MR. HICKMAN: If he be a good Tory, Mr. Speaker, it confirms what I have always suspected about him that he has the same intellect as so many of his family have shown over the years in public life and in the development of the business community and professional community

of this island.

MR. NEARY: Yes, professional heckler of public meetings.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, it is not just the simple singling out of a great Newfoundlander but it is the fact and it is the same sort of thing that the honourable the member for Labrador South refers to when he talks about fear. Not the fear that you are going to get nailed over the head when you get sent outside but the fear, Mr. Speaker, that if you become involved voluntarily or if you become involved for a mere pittance in doing work for the government - it does not make any difference what government it is - that you are going to be then subject to snide remarks and ridicule in the House, where honourable members have immunity.

Any honourable member who runs and gets himself elected and sits in the House of Assembly obviously is prepared to take any kind of legitimate criticism that the rules of the House provide. My concern is and my suggest is that what we want to get in this province are more and more talented, young Newfoundlanders involved. I was not very proud the other day when I sat here and watched a bunch of students in the two galleries listen as the honourable member for Bell Island ridiculed the restructuring because it emanated from Memorial. Well, what we should be doing in this House again, Mr. Speaker, is telling these young students at Memorial and the people who are teaching and working there that we want to avail of their expertise and we want to keep it in this province. Do you think that they are going to do it, Mr. Speaker, if they feel that every time that they preform a public service they are going to be subjected to snide remarks and the kind of stuff that we have seen in this debate.

MR. NEARY: But quote some. We have not heard any yet. What are they.

MR. HICKMAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, every speaker that I have heard from the opposition.

MR. NEARY: It is no wonder the minister is so dangerous.

MR. HICKMAN: I am doing my best. Every speaker that I have heard from the opposition benches always conclude by saying that if we have nothing

to hide, we will vote for this resolution.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HICKMAN: That is like the old story of the bishop and the rector where the bishop said to the rector, "Do you like eggs?" The rector said, "Oh, yes my lord, I love eggs." "Are you sure that you like eggs?" "Oh, yes I love eggs." "Well, here is an egg", he said, "eat it." The rector said, "But my lord, it is a raw egg." "Ha, ha, you do not like eggs!"

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the same sort of attitude

Mr. Hickman.

the same sort of argument that is emanating from the opposition benches. If you have nothing to hide, you are not going to deal with it in the estimates, where the minister, putting through his estimates, if he has a public relations programme in there, has to defend it to the committee, explain to the committee the work that is going to be done, where the contractual relationship with any one doing business with the government can be questioned and exposed -

MR. NEARY: We tried to question it last year.

MR. HICKMAN: He has to go to a select committee -

MR. NEARY: Do you want to hear what the Minister of Fisheries said last year?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I read all about this in Hansard. It may come as a shock to the hon. member for Bell Island, but I have read Hansard. This is the only argument that can be put by the opposition to call upon the government to vote for this resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: No, I am not going to sit down. I do not want to sit down. Sure I love it. I have endured it now for four days, four Wednesday afternoons .

MR. NEARY: Roll your eyes.

MR. HICKMAN: Roll my eyes, that is right. The only forgiveness that I ask, Mr. Speaker, is that I do ask forgiveness of the people on Bell Island. I ask Divine Providence to look upon them and protect them from the honourable member. Having done that, Mr. Speaker, and if that can be accomplished, then they can rest secure .

Mr. Speaker, I know that this will come as a great shock and a great surprise to honourable members in the House (the hon. member

for Labrador North is there waiting anxiously, in anticipation. He is wondering if I am going to vote for or against the resolution) but after very careful consideration and knowing that I must have something to hide, I am afraid that I am going to have to vote against the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I think there has been a lot of garbage and unnecessary words spoken in this debate; nevertheless, I think the motion has some significance. I think the important significance of this debate is the fact that the Premier of the Province told this House last year that such services as George McLean's Organization is providing for the province would be on public tender. The question was asked of the Minister of Fisheries in the House and he said that there would not be any expenditures for his Department of Fisheries go to George McLean, which in effect they did, and now the results have been revealed. I think in this respect here, Mr. Speaker, what are we looking at? We are not looking at George McLean. I do not think any one on this side of the House, personally, wants to slander or any character assassination as far as Mr. McLean, as a person, is concerned. More abuse and garbage have come from the other side of the House in this debate and more time was lost by slandering my colleague, the hon. member for Bell Island. He prompted a lot of it and naturally they took the bait. It is time-consuming to the House, Mr. Speaker. I am sure you will agree with me that it is time-consuming.

When we look at the calibre of our honourable ministers on the other side of the House, and they want to partake - they do not believe in it but they are so receptive as to get involved in this type of debate. I do not know for what reason they do it. Are they

defending themselves? Are they defending the government? Are they defending the Premier? Why is it done? It seems to be going on and on all the time. What I say in this respect on this debate, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that it should not happen. This province should not have spent \$260,000 or \$500,000, whatever the case may be, whatever the amount, and give it to George McLean when the Premier of this province said that it would not be spent in that way. If the Premier or his minister had to come out publicly and say, "look we cannot go to tender for public relations; we cannot get suitable people in this province to do our promotions in tourism, we have to go to the Mainland, we have to get our good friend George McLean because he has the best calibre." They did not do that. They told this House - they deceived the people of this province and this House. Whether the Premier himself went to his ministers and said, "look, George McLean is going to be down tomorrow, give him a contract for \$40,000 or \$50,000, whatever the case may be" - and they never had any recourse but to go ahead and do it.

What this resolution has done, Mr. Speaker, is displayed this before this honourable House. The honourable minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: The money was spent and the Premier of the Province said that it would not be spent unless there were public tenders called for. Mr. Speaker, I agree that the Premier of the Province has the authority to go ahead and tell his ministers to spend \$40,000 or \$50,000,

where there is a debt to be paid Mr. McLean for the good job that he did, maybe this is true. This political patronage is a way of life nowadays, we are becoming more aware of the situation in this province every day.

I think the resolution has displayed this thing in this House that the Premier said it would not be spent. He did go ahead and spent it. He gave the beacon to his ministers or they took it upon themselves to spend money on George McLean and ultimately the province ended up spending \$260,000, a half a million, whatever the case may be. So if this is not deceiving the people, if the honourable the Premier had to come out and say look we have to spend the money, he came out and make a number of press releases, every minister gets up in the House and makes a press release on some aspect of his department almost everyday. But they did not see fit to let the public know that. They were going to spend this money this way, Mr. Speaker, I think is where the essence of this particular resolution fits very well into this honourable House.

Thank you very much.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH): Mr. Speaker, a great deal certainly has been said on this particular resolution and I would like to have a few words as well. First on the service that NACOM is providing and secondly more specifically on the resolution, what it seems to suggest, what its adoption by this House would result in, The kind of debate that it has engendered.

NACOM is among other things, such as the film that has been referred to in that, but within the Department of Education, is providing for various departments slide presentations of government services, government programmes to be made available to the people in different parts of the province. With that there are transportable electronic apparatus to show it and also in some instances arrangements for distribution through the media, television.

They give an example of four such slide presentations, one is in the area of fisheries and it is essentially an explanation of the loan programme for fishermen who wish to build wooden boats or indeed for people who wish

to build wooden boats for the fishery and are boatbuilders, may not themselves be fishermen. Should the government or should not the government endeavour to explain clearly, distinctly, in the media which for many much more immediate than print, in a media which is much more dramatic than print, in a media which can explain frequently rather complicated procedures for applications, because any programme when it is offered by government almost necessarily becomes somewhat complicated? Should the government merely send out application forms, booklets explaining regulations and sent these out? Or if the government are serious about encouraging and developing resource based industries, should we not make available the information as clearly and dramatically, without bureaucratic jargon, without reams and paragraphs of regulations?

I am inclined to think the answer is pretty straightforward. I think honourable gentlemen on the other side would agree as well. They may say somebody else should do it or they may say it is not being done well or any number of things, or others should do it, but obviously sending out



stuff in print all the time with complicated regulations, and that in many areas and for many people is not very immediate, I think it can be generally agreed that for the kind, grass-roots resource based programmes which this government and this province must develop, we have to think in terms of television and slide presentations, slide presentations if they are televised or shown in halls or at meetings where people can see them together and discuss them and talk about them. That is one kind of programme.

There has been another, and I think the hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment referred to it, which was done for the former Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation, and that is explaining the procedures of child adoptions. I think the point he made there was that whereas there had been great increase or not too great difficulties in adoption programmes for children below a certain age there had -

MR. NEARY: We had to wait for George McLean -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, we did not have to wait for George McLean. That is not necessarily the point. I think the point is we did have to wait in order to get this programme and the opportunities and the procedures explained more vividly than you can do in print, than you can do in regulations.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, the hon. gentleman agreed with me a moment ago, leaving McLean out of it, the hon. gentleman agreed with me a moment ago when he said that in order to explain government procedures for loans for wooden boat constructors, it was worthwhile getting these in the visual media. I think to be consistent one may also say that procedures and regulations and methods bureaucratic when they refer to child adoption could also be more vividly and interestingly and dramatically presented through the visual media. At least that has been the experience of most people. I mean if so, the whole area

of educational television and the use of radio, the use of slides, the use of film projectors, this whole movement not only in Newfoundland throughout Canada, throughout North America and the world is based upon another fallacy and that is that print is all we need. If you stick enough stuff in books or pamphlets or on paper, if it is in script, that is all you need. But it has more or less been proven that script does not communicate with everybody and that visual media are necessary if one is to get the right kind of results.

There is one as well in municipal affairs which explains the services of the department and particularly made for the smaller rural communities in the province. There is also one to explain the opportunities available to men and women in vocational and technical training in the province. So these are the kinds of projects which government, they are the kinds of opportunities, whether they be loans for boats, adoption programmes, educational opportunities, especially in vocational and technical education; these are the kinds of opportunities which government has an obligation to make known to people who can most benefit from them. I think we certainly have to learn something from recent trends in the past and that is that you can do this most effectively through the visual media or certainly that the visual media must be included in any such programme.

So these can be used basically in two ways, either on television or in various communities and town halls, fishermen's halls, in schools where people can meet and see them together. The cost of each slide presentation, each presentation, and by that I mean the equipment as well, the total cost is \$4,000.

MR. NEARY: What is the total amount spent to date in the Department of Education?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I am talking about this right now. I can take that

as notice of a question. I do not have the exact figure here.

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do not have the exact figure here.

MR. NEARY: Do not have the total amount spent to date in the Department of Education?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: So the cost of each slide presentation is \$4,000.

MR. NEARY: How many slides?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, Mr. Speaker, that includes, as I say, the equipment. There are two \$500 breakdowns, a playing unit including projector and sound \$500. This is within

a total of \$4,000, and recording the sound, a copying of coloured slides so that more than one can be available, \$500, which leaves \$3,000 as the cost without the equipment.

MR. NEARY: How many times \$4,000?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The total cost is \$4,000.

MR. NEARY: How many times that, please?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman will allow me to continue. We have made comparisons with similar programmes in two other provinces. So remember the total cost is \$4,000, the Government of Quebec a similar service, a similar kind of programme for its Labour Department, the cost was \$4,800. A significant difference. From \$4 000 for this in Newfoundland to \$4,800 for the Government of the Province of Quebec. And a check with the Province of Ontario, for a programme general for promoting the benefits of the province \$6,500.

MR. NEARY: I did not know that Mr. McLean was over in Quebec.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I do not think Mr. McLean did it but it did not make any difference really who did it. The relevant point is that we now may compare three areas of identical service in terms of slides to be available for watching in groups or on the mass media with three governments, the Government of this Province, the cost was \$4,000, the cost in Quebec, for a similar service, was \$4,800, and the cost in the Province of Ontario, for a similar service, was \$6,500.

MR. NEARY: That I doubt.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now that does not mean -

MR. NEARY: That I doubt.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well the honourable gentleman I know is not, I am quite sure he is not wishing to suggest that I am deliberately misleading the House. Those are the facts that I have.

MR. NEARY: The honourable minister knows what I mean.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No, to tell you the truth, I do not. But you will have an opportunity to tell me. But to be perfectly frank, I do not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this does not necessarily mean that there might not be someone who would do this for \$3,999. There might be somebody who would do it for \$1,000, we would have no way of knowing, having canvassed everybody who is capable of doing this and what their cost could be.

MR. NEARY: Five hundred dollars.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well we will get to the \$500 later, That is quite a difference actually when you are thinking about the remark of the honourable member for St. John's North.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right. I certainly intend to get to that.

But it is quite obviously, I put these figures forward as true and factual and I am sure that the honourable gentleman accepts them as such. I am not fabricating these figures. I am not making them up. Now it may well be if one looks somewhere else maybe you would find it for \$3,900, if one were to attempt, as every government department in every province in Canada, for a similar type of thing.

MR. NEARY: Look in your own department, the Department of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: We are going to get to that, Mr. Speaker, we are going to get to that in time but we have to take one step at a time because I know the honourable gentleman opposite would not wish the debate to progress in anything but a logical manner, one step to the next one. Certainly I am incapable of making these mental leaps, I have to take it all in sort of in-stride and one step after the other.

MR. NEARY: Infant steps.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Sometimes they are, Sir, sometimes they are. However, we cannot all keep up with the giant strides of the opposition, we do our best on this side to toddle along. So far, I think we have been holding our own.

However, be that as it may, back to these figures which are an interesting point of comparison. I will repeat them again because I think they are

quite significant. They certainly establish that this province has not squandered, wasted and thrown away its money and that for this service we are willing to pay anything because we are great buddies with McLean. They certainly established that we have paid a competitive, a very competitive price for the service we have gotten. Again, they are; Newfoundland \$4,000, Quebec \$4,800, Ontario \$6,500.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will get now to the point just mentioned and that is the statement or suggestion, statement I suppose, quoted by some honourable gentleman opposite and made some months or so ago by the honourable gentleman for St. John's North, and that that is within the Department of Education

the same thing could be done for - and I believe the price he quoted was five hundred dollars. I do not particularly like distinguishing or arguing with or refuting his statement when he is not here, but there is nothing, obviously, that I can do about that.

MR. NEARY: Get him back from the Canaries.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do not intend to keep speaking for a few days on it, to wait for his arrival. However, Mr. Speaker, I presume what the honourable member from St. John's North meant (I presume, I do not know) was that some kind of slide presentation, some kind of audio-visual presentation could be done by people in the audio-visual branch area of the Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, the work that is done there is for use in classrooms. This is for use in classrooms, this is not and never has been nor, while I am not a judge of photographic equality, I am assured that it has never been done with a view to use on television, to repeated constant use in the mass media or to preparing programmes which would travel throughout the province and could be used for a number of years. What we are thinking of is a pretty simple (and I do not use that in the pejorative term) an unsophisticated, straightforward is the right word, a straightforward audio-visual aid of a slide which can be projected and which can show the anatomy of the frog or whatever else one shows.

MR. NEARY: What about a child for adoption? What is that?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There is absolutely no comparison, no comparison.

MR. NEARY: Is that a slide?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: These are things to be used on the mass media not just to be shown in classrooms. There is a complete and total difference and I am assured, Mr. Speaker, that (well I am not assured, when I speak about the honourable member for St. John's North I cannot be assured naturally, he is not here) I presume that he was referring to the work done in taking slides for audio-visual work, just about

all of it in the classroom or in a learning situation. This has nothing to do with broadcast and rebroadcast on the mass media nor nothing to do with being used perhaps for two or three years, I do not know, in travelling around the province. There is a total, total difference there.

However, there is no doubt that the Department of Education or any other department could do it if we got the personnel, if we got the equipment, if we got the expertise, if we had, and in order to make films, presumably we would need somebody with quite a bit of production and direction experience. We could take on a number of highly paid people, put them in the civil service, experts in photography, experts in cinema and experts in whatever they are, we could put them there and it could be done. It could be done in the Department of Education, it could be done in the Department of Rural Development, it might even be done by my friend the Minister without Portfolio.

MR. NEARY: Do not undermine the civil service now.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Oh my goodness, how the honourable gentleman puts words in your mouth. Who had ever undermined the civil service? What did I say, Mr. Speaker? I said that it could be done if we had the people to do it. Anybody will agree that if you are going to do something in any area of the mass media, I presume they would agree, you either do it well, it either communicates well or there is no sense doing it at all. Five hundred dollars for such a kind of production as this is completely unrealistic. Sure, slides could be made for five hundred dollars to go out as audio-visual aids, but the kinds of productions for continuous use, not only in groups but in the mass media, definitely could not.

However, as I was saying, if you wish to establish such a structure, employ the necessary, I do not know how many, people and get the necessary capital equipment, if you were going to spend all that money to do it, you could. You could set up your own public relations and promotion services in government. However, Mr. Speaker, I for



one would be very wary of doing this because I would think these basic services which we are talking about and of which people need to be made more aware, that this is a programme which need not, should not and indeed will not accomplish its task if it has to continue too long. Because when people are aware, they should be able to participate in the programmes.

If after one or two or how ever many years the programme and the funds and the assistance available for wooden boat building are well known and if the other areas , if there is a general awareness of opportunities and vocational and technical education and all these things, obviously this does not have to be nor should it be a service which continues for ever. It is there to fill a specific need, and the better they do their job the quicker they put themselves out of a job. So, naturally, it is incumbent upon government to make sure that they do it well. Obviously. I mean, that is true of any commercial enterprise.

However, if instead of having it done by private enterprise, if we were to set up a division of government, if we were to set up an additional bureaucratic structure (and bureaucratic is not a pejorative term it is, you know,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: it is what all the public servants are. They are in a bureaucracy) if we were to set up this additional bureaucratic structure, and if in two years or three years, I do not know how many years, the need were filled, what are we going to do with people who have rightfully, within the public service, tenure, who have pension rights, who have put in a number of years, who are not in free enterprise, who do not have any other clients, they do not have any other clients at all they just work for the government on the salary, what are we going to do in two years or three years or one year, when the need is filled, when the task of communication has been completed, when the job is done and we are stuck? Well the capital equipment can be sold and presumably you can get your money back but what are we going to do with the five or seven or eight, however many people there will be, presumably highly skilled professional people, what are we going to do with them?

Certainly with private enterprise there is always the problem that they will perpetuate their service and it is up to government to make sure the job is done well and as quickly as possible. If the problem is solved, then one does not have to continue with those expenditures. But when you build up an adjunct, when you build up an addition bureaucratic structure, when the job is done what do you do? You do not just fire people from the public service.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very bad governmental policy to set up divisions in departments and public agencies and to increase the bureaucracy for temporary needs, whether those temporary needs are one or two or three bureaucratic structures.

MR NEARY: Ever hear of printing and photography?

MR OTTENHEIMER: That is inherent in the laws of bureaucratic organization.

MR NEARY: Every hear of printing and photography?

MR OTTENHEIMER: Oh, Mr. Speaker, now certainly, what has that got to do with it?

MR. NEARY: Well that is already established.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes but Mr. Speaker, we are not talking merely about printing and photography, we are talking about a very different kind of thing than what is done there and a very different kind of thing in the slides that are made for use in the school room. While I certainly say it could be done by government, the Department of Education or anybody else, if so you only and necessarily build on an extra bureaucracy, when the need is filled in one two or three years you still inherit it. Whereas when you deal with private enterprise, then they can be told at any time, the job is done or we do not want you or we want somebody else or we do not think this is necessary any longer, They have no seniority. They have no pension rights. They have no claim on anybody and that is that.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said as well about the calling of tenders, and in the preamble to the resolution I believe the first one, "whereas the present administration claim that they would award contracts for the expenditure of public money only after public tenders have been called," etc. Mr. Speaker, I think it is generally agreed that, obviously, when the government said they were going to call public tenders, when anybody makes that statement, in the area in which public tenders can legitimately be called, I am not aware of any provincial government in Canada which calls tenders for this kind of service which, if you want, is partially artistic although it is imaginative or creative or whatever you want to call it. I am not aware that it is practiced in any province of Canada or with any department of the federal government to call tenders in that area.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: For a whole public relations programme which includes slide presentation but which is essentially the public

MR. OTTENHEIMER: relations of the government and Mr. Speaker,  
I think the honourable gentleman will find -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Tenders can be called for the purchase of  
films, obviously a film library in the Department of Education  
or in any other department who might have a film library, and  
if you are purchasing capital equipment, We are talking here about  
a service.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the honourable minister, it  
is 6:00 P.M. and I do now leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday  
at 3:00 P.M.