



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 21

VERBATIM REPORT

Wednesday, March 7, 1973

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! As mentioned yesterday, it being education week we are honoured today to have three groups with us in the galleries. I would like to welcome twenty-eight grade VII students from Bay Roberts Elementary School, Bay Roberts, with their teacher Mrs. Marjorie Roache; nine grade VIII(C) students from Woodland Junior High, Trinity Bay, with their teacher Miss Sharon Babb and seventy grade V students from Woodland Elementary in Dildo, Trinity Bay, with their teachers Mr. John Boone and Mr. Roland Cranford. On behalf of all the hon. members I welcome you to the galleries and trust that your visit here is very interesting.

HON. G.R. OTTENHEIMER(MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, the construction of a second oil refinery at Come by Chance as announced by the Premier will mean thousands of additional employment opportunities for Newfoundlanders. The government is determined that training programmes will be available so that Newfoundlanders will be able to take maximum advantage of these employment opportunities. In this regard I am pleased to announce that meetings have been arranged for the week of March 26 involving the provincial Departments of Education, and Manpower and Industrial Relations, the division of Vocational and Technical Training, the College of Trades and Technology, the College of Fisheries, Memorial University of Newfoundland, the Federal Department of Manpower and representatives of the Shaheen Organization.

The purpose of the meeting is as follows: (1) to forecast as accurately as possible the manpower needs and skilled labour force required for the construction of a second refinery; to do the same, that is forecast manpower and skilled labour needs for the permanent work force at both refineries; to plan training programmes and sandwich courses necessary to assure that a sufficient number of Newfoundlanders will be trained to take maximum

Mr. Ottenheimer.

advantage of these employment opportunities. Next to allocate specific training programmes to those institutions best prepared in terms of staff and facilities and best situated geographically to offer the programmes necessary. Next to ascertain the province's training requirements in terms of instructors necessary to implement the above and to establish a time-frame so that as far as possible skilled manpower will be available when it is required.

In the past, residents of the province have been deprived of opportunities for gainful employment because of insufficient co-ordination between the manpower training programmes and the needs of industry. The meetings arranged for later this month will be the first in a series of such seminars and it is hoped that through this procedure it will be possible to synchronize training programmes and manpower needs.

I have a copy to be tabled, copies for the opposition and copies for the press.

HON. DR. A. T. ROWE (Minister of Health): When the Medicare Programme commenced four years ago on April 1, 1969, an arrangement was made between the Newfoundland Medical Association and government to the effect that government would pay doctors ninety per cent of the fees established by the association in the year 1967. Since 1967 there has been no general increase in the fees paid to doctors, although the cost of living has gone up just over twenty per cent. Generally speaking salaries, fees and incomes of everybody, whether they are self-employed or working for someone else, have increased during the past four years in an endeavour to keep pace with the rising living costs. Sometime ago the Newfoundland Medical Association commenced talks with the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission regarding a new fee structure which would include a general review of the position in other provinces as it applied to medical fees being paid to general practitioners and to some medical specialists.

Although doctors in Newfoundland rate high, as far as overall

payments are concerned for members of the medical profession in Canada, a large factor in the higher incomes here is that there are many more patients per doctor than there are in most of the other provinces. While the Newfoundland doctor is in the higher paid bracket of the Medical Profession of Canada, he is also the hardest pressed physician and this can only be rectified by increasing the number of doctors which will result in lower individual incomes.

A study of the doctor/patient ratio in the provinces shows Newfoundland with one doctor per twelve hundred and sixty people; Nova Scotia, with one doctor to nine hundred and fifty-five; New Brunswick, our closest, one doctor to twelve hundred and forty-four; Prince Edward Island, one doctor to twelve hundred and nine; Alberta, one doctor to nine hundred; Saskatchewan, one doctor to one thousand; Manitoba, one doctor to nine hundred and twenty-six; British Columbia, one doctor to seven hundred and forty-six; Ontario, one doctor to eight hundred and thirty-nine; Quebec, one doctor to nine hundred and sixty-one.

As a result of discussions between the Newfoundland Medical Association and Newfoundland Medical Care Commission recently completed, the new arrangement will provide an increase of about 4.7 per cent in payments to segments of the profession; particularly general practitioners and medical specialists, for a total increase of \$800,000, an amount which is on target with the estimates prepared, by the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission, for government. In addition as a result of an arrangement made in 1970, a system of general proration was applied with the understanding that this would be reviewed when the new fee schedule was reviewed. It has, therefore, been decided to institute a method of selective proration whereby each doctor's income and pattern of practice is studied and if his profile is found to vary to any great degree from his colleagues in similar practice and without good reason, then his income will be prorated. This is effective, January, 1973, the 4.7 increase, effective April, 1973. The matter of proration is very important. The type of proration brought in by the previous administration was not fair.

It was a blunt instrument which bludgeoned the innocent with the others. If a man were the only specialist of his kind in the island and if he were working abnormally long hours or if his practice location made it so that he had no associates to help him in other types of practice, although he was doing a needed job, his volume of work, through no fault of his own, was very high and he was consequently prorated after a certain level. What I have approved now is individual selective proration. That is where the computer suggests that a doctor is seeing too many patients in the time available, that is too many to be able to be giving them the attention they need or doing too many visits for a certain complaint, compared with the average doctor, then he would be prorated. There will be two results to this.

In the first place there will be considerable decreased earnings directly because of the proration of doctors who are so identified. I am inclined to think that this will have much more widespread an effect and produce more savings financially. Other doctors who are inclined, perhaps, to do things that they should not will take note and desist. The exact financial effects I cannot predict but I am hopeful they will be equal or even better than mass proration. I am watching this closely and in the months ahead will be able to see the results.

We have the active co-operation of the Newfoundland Medical Association in this and both they and the government are very concerned to see that the scheme works properly, economically and is not abused.

The difficulty of not only recruiting doctors into Newfoundland but retaining them, necessitates that our payments must follow the schedules applying in at least the other Atlantic Provinces. Fee increases have become effective recently in other provinces as follows: British Columbia 6.5 per cent; Alberta, 6 per cent; Ontario, 4.5 per cent; Saskatchewan, 8 per cent; Nova Scotia, 15 per cent; Manitoba are still negotiating and also I understand the other three provinces.

In reviewing these figures for increases granted to medical doctors

in the other provinces, it will be seen that the new one now granted to those in Newfoundland is one of the smallest. In my opinion the greatest health problem in Newfoundland today is the shortage of doctors. The reason doctors' incomes are high is because of the shortage of doctors. The reason why people have to wait for appointments is because of the shortage of doctors. The reason patients have to wait for hours in doctors' waiting rooms is because of the shortage of doctors. The reason Newfoundland cannot fill all the medical posts and practices is because of the shortage of doctors.

In the Canadian Medical Journal which is a twice monthly publication of the Canadian Medical Association, there is a section here: "Job Opportunities For Doctors in Canada." In this particular issue there are no less than, over one hundred, in actual fact one hundred and twenty-nine advertisements per doctors. If you look at some of these, it is difficult to know how doctors could resist for instance: "medical doctors needed for U.S.A., beautiful, friendly towns, want many Canadian doctors, general practitioners and specialists, very high dollar pay, paid expenses and benefits; physicians all fee paid, exclusive positions, write confidentially. For Northern Ontario, to join an established number of practices in fifty designated, underserved areas of Ontario, guaranteed annual income, basic \$33,000." The opportunities are existent in every province of Canada for doctors.

Now for years Newfoundland has been a stepping stone for doctors who would pause here and after a few months or a year travel on to the greener pastures of the richer provinces. If it is my mandate to find doctors to overcome these problems that I have outlined (I fully believe that it is) then I think that an expenditure of public funds leading to an increase of 4.7 per cent in income and more important the change and method of proration is amply and fully justified on behalf of the people of the people of the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House I am not permitted to debate the statement at this point so I shall not. That in effect means that I shall make no comment upon it because the minister touched so many matters and in such confused fashion that it is impossible to make a comment that is not a debate. I think all I should say is that the minister is (I am judging only from his statement which is all I know about) obviously confused and on the defensive. He obviously knows that he is doing the wrong thing. I cannot go beyond that now, Mr. Speaker, because under the rules I cannot debate. I serve notice now that when the minister appears before the committee with his estimates, we shall go into this at some length. The minister will have the opportunity then to elaborate upon some of the astounding statements he has made and I shall have the opportunity to state

some questions. The need for doctors is known to anybody who has had any connection with the health professions in Newfoundland. That is fine but the minister's moves, I submit, will do nothing except add to the cost of the salaries. No matter how reasonable the increase may be - and I do not quarrel with that - the fact remains that we are now going to spend an extra \$800,000 a year on doctors and I submit that this will not increase by one percent the number of doctors coming to this province.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS

MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution:

WHEREAS during the first session of the thirty-sixth General Assembly, the present Administration saw fit to end the mothers' allowance; and WHEREAS the present Administration said, its primary reason for ceasing to pay this allowance to the mothers of school children was the fact that the Government of Canada intended to introduce the Family Income Security Programme; and

WHEREAS both the Premier and the Minister of Finance said publically that if the said programme was not introduced that they would reinstate the mothers' allowance; and

WHEREAS the Family Income Security was not implemented; and

WHEREAS the mothers of Newfoundland have need of this allowance to help to meet the expenses of sending their children to school; and

WHEREAS the Government of Canada by changing the equalization formula, have given the Government of Newfoundland an additional \$24,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning on the first of April, 1973.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House is of the opinion that the present Administration should immediately make provision to reinstate the mothers' allowance ; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that such payment be retroactive to the beginning of the 1972-1973 school year.

HON. WILLIAM W. MARSHALL: (MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution as submitted by the honourable the member for Bonavista North is out of order on two grounds.

Number (1) the recitals themselves are argumentative but most importantly it calls for the expenditure of public money which it is not possible to bring in under Private Members' Bills. It is only the government that can bring forth measures requiring the government to spend money.

MR. EDWARD ROBERTS: (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. Whether or not the recitals are argumentative or statements of fact is a matter for Your Honour to decide as Your Honour will and Your Honour has.

The second point is superfluous and specious because the resolution does not call for the expenditure of funds. Its records the opinion of the House, Sir. The opinion of this House is not expenditure of funds. I submit the gentleman raised the point simply because he does not want the matter debated.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall take the resolution under advisement and rule on it later, hopefully later this afternoon.

HON. JOSEPH ROUSSEAU: (MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND RECREATION): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that on tomorrow I will ask leave to introduce the following bill;

A bill, "An Act Respecting Allowances For Certain People In Private Homes For Special Care."

HON. GORDON DAWE: (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS): I give notice that on tomorrow I will ask leave of the House to introduce;

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Elevators Act."

HON. DR. T. C. FARRELL: (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave of the House to introduce the following;

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

HON. THOMAS V. HICKEY: (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): Mr.

Speaker, I have the answer to the question (106) on the Order Paper, March 5, asked by the honourable member for Twillingate, question (80) on the Order Paper March 1st, since last Friday, by the honourable member from Twillingate.

HON. JIM REID: (MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table in the House, the honourable House, the answer to question (103) on the Order Paper dated March 5, asked by honourable member from White Bay South and answer to question (51) on the Order Paper dated February 26, asked by the honourable member from White Bay South and answer to question (52) on the Order Paper dated February 26, asked by the honourable member for White Bay North and answer to question (53) on the Order Paper dated February 26, asked by the honourable member for White Bay North and answer to question (54) on the Order Paper dated February 26, asked by the honourable member for White Bay North and answer to question (55) on the Order Paper dated February 26, asked by the honourable member for White Bay North.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Since a report of the former Department of Community and Social Development regarding the installation of water systems in unincorporated areas states that until such time as a firm policy can be formulated, St. Barbes North should remain at a standstill. Can the minister inform the House as to the progress of the formulation of any policy that will help unincorporated areas to get a water system?

MR. SPEAKER: I think that it is the type of question that should be placed on the Order Paper.

HON. HAROLD A. COLLINS: (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): I can tell the honourable member from St. Barbes North that my officials are looking at the problem in St. Barbes North and other areas where there are communities which are not incorporated and hopefully they will be able

to announce a policy in due course.

MR. F. ROWE: The question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister indicate to the House what other provincial districts have had a complete stoppage to the construction of water systems in their communities?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before we go into orders of the day, I do not have a question but I wonder if I may be permitted to move a motion. Perhaps the Premier would wish to move it and I should second it? There died on Friday or Saturday, I am not sure, perhaps Monday or Tuesday, at New Harbour in Trinity Bay, a gentleman who's funeral is today, Mr. Edmund Charles Cranford. Mr. Cranford was one of the men who served in the National Convention. He was the member for Trinity Centre. Mr. Cranford was an elderly gentleman, eighty-seven years of age when he died. As far as I know his membership in the National Convention was his only active involvement in elective politics but Sir, that in itself is enough to qualify a man to be one of the leaders of Newfoundland. His death, Sir, reduces by yet another the very small group of men left - I am not sure how many men are left alive who served in the Convention. Mr. Charles Ballam who of course is still very much with us. There are a-number of others.

There are not many men left alive, Mr. Speaker, who served in the National Convention. It is hard to remember that really it was only twenty-seven, twenty-eight years ago the National Convention was elected. Just in that short a time, not only have these men all passed from public life but the last of the men to serve in public life was the late Bill Keough, the honourable W. J. Keough, who was in this House until his death two or three years ago, excluding of course - I am sorry - Mr. Smallwood who was in this House until he retired on the second of March, 1972.

I am sorry, the gentleman from Harbour Grace, would he please, for a minute - this is a very, you know it is a very deadly serious matter. It is a matter of some comment that very few of these men are left, Sir. I can name Mr. Michael Harrington. He was a member of

the National Convention. Mr. Burt Butt who was a member of the National Convention and Mr. Edgar L. Rickman, he was a member of the National Convention, Mr. Charles Ballam and there are other honourable gentlemen. We may name others.

I would move, Sir, or if the Premier wishes I will second his motion that the Clerk of the House or Your Honour write to Mr. Cranford's family to express our regret and to take note of the fact that we have passed a motion with regret of the death of a man who was one of the leaders of Newfoundland.

HON. FRANK D. MOORES: (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, on occasions like this when people like Mr. Cranford die who played a very meaningful role in the public of Newfoundland, it is a sad occasion. There are not, as the Leader of the Opposition said in moving the motion, many of these people left or many people left who initiated Confederation with Canada. I did not know Mr. Cranford

personally and I can only say that it gives me not pleasure but certainly as Premier only too gladly am I willing to second this particular motion I ask you, Sir, to pass on our deepest sympathy and to thank those people who still survived, from that particular historic occasion for the tremendous contribution that they made in bringing this province into the great confederation. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for making this motion today, as well.

On motion, resolution carried.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Education. Since just this morning in one of the daily newspapers the President of the University publicly defined a regional and a community college, Will the minister indicate whether or not these definitions given by the president are consistent with the thinking of his own administration or are we to assume that the president is the government's spokesman on education now?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would raise a point of order there and point out that I will not answer the question. I believe it is out of order and it would be improper for me to comment upon opinions and definitions, presumably they are opinions, by the people outside the legislature.

MR. ROWE(F.B.): Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. member for Port au Port. Since a community college, as defined by the president, has nothing to do with the university at all, I ask the hon. member why he is submitting a report or a brief to the university regarding the policy and the curriculum of a community college for Stephenville.

MR. SPEAKER: I find this question out of order as it can be placed on the order paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Premier indicate to the House if the government have received any offers to purchase the steel plant down at the Octagon?

MR. MOORES: Would you repeat the question, please?

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. Premier indicate to the House whether or not the government have received offers for the purchase of the steel plant at the Octagon.

MR. MOORES: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. the Minister of Education. Could the hon. Minister of Education define the difference between a vocational school and a community college?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the estimates I would be glad to discuss these things but I do think oral questions at this are on matters of some urgency, that the question of defining various institutions is not certainly by custom recognized as a legitimate line of questioning. I would not wish to get into a series of definitions of vocational education, technical, continuing, community, junior, ad infinitum, Sir. I do not think that giving definitions is the purpose of the question period.

MR. ROWE (F.B.): Mr. Speaker, in view of all the announcements that are being made by various people concerning community and regional colleges, can the minister indicate if there are any long-range plans being developed for other areas of the province such as Labrador, the South Coast and Central Newfoundland regarding regional colleges?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That I certainly can answer, Mr. Speaker. Yes, one of the specific terms of reference of the task force is in the area of continuing education, accessibility to post-secondary, accessibility to other educational courses and to a broad range of social needs, certainly not all academic and not all educational, what is usually understood by that term, and this is under study with the task force and under study in the Department of Education.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. Premier gave me an off-the-cuff answer to the question that I put to him on the steel plant there

a moment ago but I wonder if the Premier would undertake to find out for sure if the government have received any offers to purchase or take over or operate the steel mill.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I most certainly will and if there are any offers that are meaningful this House will be made aware of them. There are no offers of an consequence that I know of, of any substance that are before the government at this time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Social Services would indicate to the House, now that the Liberal Government in Ottawa has granted a \$25.00 a month increase in the federal old age pension, will the Minister of Social Services tell the House whether it is the intention of his department to continue the provincial assistance of \$30.00 per month to the spouse of an old age pensioner who has not yet reached the age of sixty-five and therefore does not qualify for the old age pension? In other words, Mr. Speaker, will the provincial assistance be stacked on top of the federal old age pension where only one member of the family qualifies for the federal allowance?

MR. MURPHY: Is that for me?

MR. NEARY: Wake up, boy.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question we will still continue to serve the function that we are designed for and that is to serve the needs of the people. Our policies will be made known at an appropriate time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that does not answer the question.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Fisheries? Can the minister inform the House what success the dragger, "Boston York" is having with experimental fishing up off the Coast of Labrador in ice - which is jointly chartered by the Fishery Products Federal and Provincial Governments?

MR. CHEESEMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon.

member for Fogo, on the first trip of the boat, I believe it was twenty-three days, I am subject to correction on that, the ice conditions were extremely heavy. It was, as members are no doubt aware, the first try in this sort of fishing conditions, however the voyage itself. However, I think it could be termed to be reasonably successful. Approximately 400,000 pounds of fish were obtained. I understand that the boat is now on the second trial fishing voyage. But, generally speaking, the ice had been considerably heavier than had been anticipated but they did manage to fish although not as far north as they would have wished to at the time.

MR. WINSOR: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister know which area the ship is operating in and supplementary to that, what proportion of the charter is the provincial government involved in?

MR. CHEESEMAN: I have the daily reports down in my office and I would be glad to make the exact areas known to the House. I will table that information later. As far as the provincial government's involvement in the venture, this does not come into play until such time as the whole chartered term has been completed, money has been determined to have been lost, that is the fish landed would not pay for the cost, the federal government will then participate in any such loss to the extent of, (and I am speaking from memory now, again I have the information) I believe it is \$250,000 and I am subject to correction on that at this moment because I am speaking from memory. The provincial government is then in an agreement to pick up any deficit that remains beyond that point, to a maximum of \$75,000. In other words, in the first instance if the "Boston York" in her experimental fishing pays for herself, there would be neither federal nor provincial money. If after the voyage have been completed, the federal government had put in anything up to \$250,000 (if in fact that is the correct figure now) then again the provincial government would not be called on to put in anything but if there were a loss beyond \$250,000 and whatever amount that was, up to \$75,000 would be paid by the

provincial government, but it is hoped that there will be neither federal nor provincial money required to pick up any deficits.

MR. WINSOR: So what the hon. minister is saying is that the provincial government can only be involved up to the maximum of \$75,000 if there is any loss in the venture.

MR. CHEESEMAN: If there is a loss beyond that which the federal government have already agreed to pick up, which is, as I said, subject to correction but I am reasonably certain it is \$250,000, that would have to happen first before we would have to put in anything.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have to get back to the tired, sleepy, old Minister of Social Services again and ask the minister if he is aware that the old age pension -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: What is the point of order?

MR. MURPHY: Address a minister with respect.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I will bow and scrape to him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! If the hon. member for Bell Island has a question would he proceed.

MR. NEARY: I have no intention of bowing and scraping to the hon. minister, Sir. Is the hon. minister aware -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question please?

Is the hon. minister aware that the federal old age pension will be increased as of April 1, 1973 and if so, what will become of the provincial old age assistance? Will it be continued or will it be dropped? This is quite important,

Mr. Speaker, because time is running out.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Bell Island is entitled to ask a question but not make a speech after he has asked his question.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the point of order without interruption from the sleepy and tired minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MURPHY: When the time comes everybody will know about it.

MR. NEARY: The time is now.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I speak -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: I mean if the honourable gentleman for St. John's Centre does not know the rules, he should learn them, Sir, as best he can, if he can. To the point of order, Sir, I submit that the honourable the House Leader is being much too hasty. The honourable member for Bell Island was just merely stating his question. He knows the rules. He will not launch into a debate on this. All he asked was a question. He was merely saying the time has come. Are the ministry going to act?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable minister does not have the answer to the question would he get the answer for the House?

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to remind all honourable members that they should refrain from debating and making speeches when asking questions. I feel that perhaps the question of the hon member for Bell Island is out of order because he has already asked the same question before.

MR. NEARY: It was a different question altogether, Mr. Speaker. The second question is a supplementary question that I asked the minister.

Mr. Speaker, is he aware that the old age pension, the federal old age pension is going to be increased the 1st. of April, next month, the 1st. of April 1973? If he is aware of this, will the government be continuing

to pay the \$30.00 old age assistance, provincial assistance to the old age pensioners? The minister has not answered the question.

MR. MURPHY: I do not intend to.

MR. NEARY: The minister says he does not intend to. What arrogance! What arrogance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable member for Labrador South.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I would like to direct to the Minister of Highways. Can the honourable minister inform the House what steps have been taken to open the highway to Red Bay?

MR. FARRELL: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MARTIN: To Red Bay.

MR. FARRELL: I gave some answers on this and I gave assurance to the House yesterday that we will be opening the road to Red Bay, weather permitting, and I initiated instructions today to that effect.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: We shall continue with motion (10), I think the honourable member for St. John's East adjourned the debate last night.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, pity it is really that the time of this honourable House is to be further taken up with a resolution of this nature, because with respect to the remarks made by the honourable the member for Bell Island and the honourable member for St. Barbe North, over the succeeding two weeks, I think it can be truly said that never before has so little been said about so much in relation to this debate on Mr. McLean.

The member for Bell Island as a matter of fact over the past week, Mr. Speaker, was really I think crying for mercy. The honourable member for Bell Island, who introduced this resolution, in the first instance, said he would like to see the McLean motion off the Order Paper so that he could get on and bring on another motion, because a member is only allowed to have one motion on the Order Paper at a time. So I think then, Mr. Speaker,

by these remarks the honourable member for Bell Island is really attempting to start to beat a retreat, as well he may, from the specious, silly arguments that have been brought up in this House with respect to this particular resolution.

We should not have to occupy the time of this House of Assembly with the remarks either of the honourable member for Bell Island or the honourable member for St. Barbe North. As a matter of fact all members in this honourable House ought to hang their heads in shame that a motion of this nature and the type of debate that has gone on that we are occupying our time was rather refreshing, over the past week, to see this House occupied with such matters as regulation of collection agencies, as matters with respect to the termination of wages when industries go out of business, landlord and tenant regulations. We had to come back to this again today.

In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the members of the opposition are well they should be, very, very embarrassed by this particular resolution that they have brought up which was going to be one of their big guns and their big arms that was going to defeat this government and cause an exodus across the House, which was going to bring us down to our knees because of the great scandal under which we laboured. Because of the innuendoes that have been made from time to time and because of the seamy little hints that have been made both in the news media, by the members of the opposition and in this House, it is necessary to deal with the points raised by the member for Bell Island and also by the member for St. Barbe North.

As I say, Your Honour, I apologize to the House for having to waste the time again but it is necessary when stones are cast to at least put up a shield to try to protect oneself.

One of the great sins and transgressions with respect to the involvement of McLean enterprises was supposedly the fact that NACOM Limited, the company which is operated by Mr. George McLean, was not registered in the province. We were supposed to see something wrong and bad and seamy in this, that this was something that made the whole situation unclean

and nasty and brutish, in short and we should not be involved in it and we are painted the same colour as the previous administration with respect to it. And what nonsense is that?

NACOM Limited is a company that is incorporated I believe in the Province of Ontario. There have been 'N' number of companies, many, many companies that have existed here and carried on business in this province without having registered under the Companies Act. The fact that NACOM Limited may or may not be registered has absolutely nothing to do with the quality of its work, neither with the wisdom nor lack of wisdom of this government in engaging the services.

Another point brought up, which was brought up for the purpose of casting a light on or a bad light on this present administration was the question of the \$500 which was allegedly charged with respect to pictures that appeared in a pamphlet that was used for the purpose of tourist development, that was made by the McLean organization. Now the pictures where I believe of the honourable the Premier and the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works, I am not sure.

MR. CROSBIE: I did not get there.

MR. MARSHALL: Well the honourable Minister of Finance was not there, but I think it was the honourable the Premier and the honourable the Minister of Economic Development then who is now the Minister of Public Works. I think that probably \$500 is perhaps not too great a price to pay for the picture of our Premier, I know the people on the other side of this House at another time and other climb would have gladly paid much more than \$500 for a picture of the Premier of the day.

But the fact of the matter is this, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: In 3-D.

MR. MARSHALL: In 3-D behind barrels of fish and what have you, before the barrels caved in on top of them.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is this: We have found and this is a great revelation, great so that members of the opposition had better

sit up and heed it, that there was an invoice allegedly incorrectly sent by the McLean organization to the government. Now is that a crime? The honourable member for Bell Island or the honourable member for Twillingate sent in an invoice to the government, the crime is whether the government pays it or not. The government ignored it. It made an inquiry at the time and found that the invoice had been sent in error. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the government did not, would not and had absolutely no intention whatsoever of paying the amount of the invoice. So the rug comes out from underneath the argument, the specious argument of the opposition on that point.

The next thing was the fact that allegedly 80,000 copies of this great publication were taken out in the dead of night to Robin Hood Bay and some person came up with a match and ignited them and they went up in flames, in other words they were not used. Well, Mr. Speaker, to that I can say that the government could not give one piffle as to really what happened to them because the government did not in fact pay one single solitary dollar, dime, nickel or cent for this particular publication.

In actual fact we were glad to see this publication being used. It was brought together by the McLean organization as a self-liquidating project, where they solicited advertising from private enterprise and received advertising from private enterprise for the purpose of promotion of tourist potential. It was exactly the same thing, Mr. Speaker, as a project by "Atlantic Advocate", no relationship to the government at all, no monies expended by the government. So, where is the great sin there?

MR. MARSHALL: The honourable the member for Bell Island made allegations that Mr. McLean went out or one of his employees, seeking advertisements and accusing people of being Liberal if they did not purchase the advertisements. I have hear people being accused of being Liberals for worse than that. But, Mr. Speaker, that is without any relationship at all to this government, without any authorization; it would not happen with the authorization of this government, it did not happen. We had managed to check with the authorization of Mr. McLean, if in fact it did happen, which I somewhat doubt.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the days of solicitation of advertisements from private individuals ended with the Liberal balls. You remember when there was a Liberal ball and there was a programme, there used to be great solicitation throughout the land for advertisements and what have you. That is not the type of thing that this government goes along with and the allegation that the honourable the member for Bell Island made with respect to that, is completely and absolutely without any foundation, without any basis of fact, and we invited him to withdraw it.

MR. NEARY: And the letter the Minister of Finance wrote?

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know what letters the honourable Minister of Finance wrote. What has that to do with the price of fish as it were? Then we come - of yes he is running now, he is down on his knees I see, which he ought to be.

This business about public tenders that constituted the great bleat of the whole resolution, that public tenders (we dealt with this the other day) that public tenders were to have been called by this administration. I said the other day that we would bring in legislation and we already have and it has already

MR. MARSHALL: been passed, giving effect to the calling of public tenders. To talk about public tenders in relation to this is absolutely and completely ridiculous. I repeat what was said the other day, if the board of directors of Paramount studios are going to produce a film, they do not call for bids on that, they do not call for tenders, they go to the best man available and we went to what we considered was the best man available because after all, this is the man, true who had relationships with the P.C. Party during the election campaign, that in itself, with the conceit that oozes from some portions of the honourable opposition, that in itself ought to be justification enough of using the services of Mr. George McLean.

Another thing that was stated was the honourable member for Bell Island made what I consider to be a base allegation to the effect that the McLean Company was in peculiar financial trouble. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not the type of allegation that we ought to tolerate in this particular House. The source that the honourable member quoted was an unnamed source from the Mainland.

Mr. Speaker, when a member of this House quotes something and does not give, or refuses to give the source which he is quoting, or bears the responsibility for the statements which he makes, in other words he stands behind the truth of the statements himself.

MR. NEARY: Want the letter now?

MR. MARSHALL: We will deal with the letter in a minute. We are dealing with the honourable member right now.

MR. NEARY: If you want it, I will table it.

MR. MARSHALL: So the honourable member for Bell Island wishes to talk about the McLean Company or perhaps the honourable member would like to hand it to me, any time, we will deal with it. I will deal with it in a moment but right now, as I say, we are dealing with the facts

MR. MARSHALL: about the scurrilous allegation by the honourable member for Bell Island quoting an unnamed source allegedly emanating from Ontario to the effect that the McLean group were in trouble. Now as I say, I invite the honourable member to retract that particular allegation and that particular remark.

Mr. McLean is a man of national and international repute in the public relations field. He has a number of clients who would do credit to any public relations outfit. He acts for various foreign governments, governments outside of Canada itself and many large corporate concerns. I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, I absolutely fail to see how there can be any relevance with respect to the alleged financial trouble of McLean. Number one, that is not our concern.

What concerns us is that we have value and the second item is that I do not believe it is true and I think it is very unfair for the honourable member to use the immunity of this honourable House for the purpose of bringing out an allegation like that, because that can do nothing but impair the credit of an innocent private individual who has no recourse whatsoever. If the honourable member really believes that and he has the courage of his conviction, let the honourable member make the statement outside the House and then let Mr. McLean take his obvious recourse.

Another question that was brought up was that apparently one of the justifications as to why McLean was not good was that George McLean or one of his staff was kicked out of, the honourable Minister of Fisheries office.

But, Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether that occurred. I know it did not occur. But if it did occur and anyone knows Mr. George McLean and the honourable Minister of Fisheries, if it is going to happen again, I would say let us know because we would all be very interested to see the honourable the Minister of Fisheries wrestling with Mr. George McLean. It would be quite

MR. MARSHALL: a feat.

Indeed the honourable minister was walking around with a limp a few days ago and that is what made me inquire but I have since, and I know he will forgive me for revealing this particular aspect of his private life, I found that he was actually suffering with gout; so that he was engaged in the same endeavour that all of us are engaged in, trying to convince the public that Tory times are not hard times after all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another great revelation that we had, a great revelation from the honourable the member from Bell Island, was the fact that allegedly Mr. McLean was paid the great amount of \$116,000 in June, or his organization. This same poor company by the way, that is in dire financial straits, was paid \$116,000 in June by this government for work, and so it may have been. Mr. Speaker, let me indicate that it is a standard practice in the business in which Mr. McLean is involved for there to be progress payments with respect to the work and in particular one third of the payments are given upon submission of what they call completed shooting scripts for films. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that this is exactly the same practice that is followed in every commercial pattern, by every government in Canada, in dealings and relationships with individuals like Mr. McLean and indeed was practiced by the previous government. I am not condemning them for it because it is the way the trade is carried on. It was practiced by the previous government, Mr. Speaker, in connection with a film by Mr. Lee Wolfe which was also a film of quality.

Now I know that the honourable the member for Bell Island is chafing at the bit there and the honourable members of the opposition have all seen that particular letter that he dug so deeply for, Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, in his possessions and finally managed to locate it.

MR. MARSHALL: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that if any letter existed, it would only have been a letter for the purpose of attempting to encourage the development of a viable, good pamphlet for the purpose of developing a good tourist potential in this province. To attempt to again, Mr. Speaker, insinuate that there is something seamy and nasty and brutish and short in that is absolutely and completely ridiculous.

The films that have been presented, we have received value from McLean right from the word go and there has been nothing said by the oppositon - I mean look, they even had to come - the honourable member for Bell Island who entertained us two weeks ago with his large speech, the mover of this resolution, came and even made the insinuation that NACOM Limited, I am sure Hansard will show it, he insinuated that it might be Nutbeem and Company.

Now he had no basis in fact to mention that anymore than I would have to get up in this honourable House and say that NACOM and company means Neary and Company or what have you. But it just shows the depths to which the opposition will go, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of attempting to paint us as black as they possibly could. It is very low, Mr. Speaker, because I cannot conceive of the honourable the member for Bell Island in bed with Mr. George McLean.

No, Mr. Speaker, I was also appalled, I might say I was also very much appalled by the attitude of the honourable the member for St. Barbe North; for whom I have a great regard, as I have for the honourable the member for Bell Island, in his obvious mental lapse of joining in the foray with the honourable member for Bell Island in his "diatrabé" which is really what it was because -

AN HON. MEMBER: "Diatribé."

MR. MARSHALL: "Diatribé?" "Diatrabé." "Diatrabé" in St. John's, "diatribé" outside. In any event, Mr. Speaker, another argument that is being used (and I do not see - really we should not have to take the time of this honourable House to refute these specious, foolish, silly, trivial arguments) but another argument that was used was that there was a conflict of interest.

I have spoken times before about conflict of interest, so I am going to say just a few words in whispered tones about conflict of interest. We use public relations men, Mr. Speaker, as all people do, public relations firms, for the purpose of communicating out decisions to the public and not for the purpose of making those decisions and that is a very, very real distinction. I do not know of any arguments, the arguments that were made were useless, they were unfounded and I think they have been demonstrated here, these are the only things that I can think of which were used by both honourable members when they were giving their speeches. They proved, to my mind anyway, the old medical theory that (the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications will agree with me) that all they did, all the honourable members succeeded in doing was prove the old medical theory that eventually all parts of the body get very tired except the tongue, because certainly the tongues of the honourable members did not.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we want or we should ever attempt to justify the involvement of any group or any programme because of the fact that the previous government did the same. I have

avoided reference to the "Goldfingers Firm and the Ronalds-Reynolds and what the heck have you, because that was an abject disgrace, Mr. Speaker. Their involvement in this province was an abject disgrace. All they succeeded in doing was to push the voices and the pictures of the honourable the ministers of the day right before an election right into the faces and into the ears and eyes of the people of Newfoundland when they obviously did not want to see them.

The fact of the matter is, with respect to the McLean involvement, it is justified by its work, the work that it has done. It has made films, as the honourable the Premier has indicated, giving all the information quite fully and quite openly. It has made films with respect to the fisheries, it has made instructional films for our fishermen and it has also made films which are geared to acquaint the rest of the world and particularly Canada with the urgency, the necessity, the dire necessity and importance of the fishing industry to this province.

We have to be concerned with that, Mr. Speaker, because nobody else seems to be. Certainly the federal government does not care a whit about our fishing industry. The big brave Canadian Nation is afraid to implement these same provisions as the little Nation of Iceland has implemented to conserve its continental shelf. The Prime Minister of our land does not seem to care too much about what happens on the East Coast, as witnessed a few years ago when on a visit to Russia, on the agenda was the discussion of fisheries on the Pacific Coast and not a thing on the North Atlantic. There have been no preparations and no involvement as far as we know, as far as I know, really indepth preparations with respect to The Law Of The Sea Conference which is coming up in a year and a-half, to which this province ought to be and should be and must be invited, despite the petty jealousies of sovereignty of the jurisdiction of international law by the federal government.

The McLean group have very effectively prepared a film drawing to the attention of all Canadians the dire necessity of the

fishery to this province. They have prepared very good films with respect to instructing fishermen in their labours, educational films and those also in the area of tourism itself as well as in many other areas and have done a very fine job for this province.

Just to give you one illustration, Mr. Speaker, I have a book here which I am prepared to table, called "Sports Afield" dated February 1973, which is an international journal - an international magazine into the hunting and fishing recreations. On it we have a very attractive article by a Jerome Robinson, about a drive to Labrador, Labrador South, a visit by Mr. Robinson and his family to the Town of Forteau, in Labrador, in the District of the honourable the member for Labrador South. His recounting of how cheap it was, how economical the journey was and how pleasant it was on to the Island of Newfoundland, up to the point of uniting with the ferry and over to Labrador South itself. It is a very attractive and complimentary article.

This article, Mr. Speaker, was motivated really by the public relations efforts of one Mr. McLean and NACOM Limited in order to encourage as I say, the tourism potential of this province. That is action in words, Mr. Speaker. The person who is not with McLean, but the person, Mr. Jerome Robinson, was directly contacted, the publisher was directly contacted by Mr. McLean and it was through the offices of Mr. McLean that they came into the offices from the point of view of being introduced here, they were looked after by the McLean organization, all part of their undertaking here and it is very, very commendable.

I do not expect the honourable member for White Bay South to understand this, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact, that contrary to the administration of which he was a part, this administration is determined, absolutely determined to develop our natural resources, to protect our fishery, which is our most precious natural resource, to develop the tourist potential of this province, to develop our deep-water ports and on and on ad infinitum. In the

wisdom of this administration, it has chosen to select the offices of one of the most prominent public relations experts in Canada to assist us in this. We have had, as the honourable the Premier has ably demonstrated, certainly judging from previous years, but we do not want to judge, because God help us if we start judging by what the other crowd did, Mr. Speaker, but judging from previous years, we have at least one thousand percent more value for our money. We are satisfied with it, the job is being done.

I would suggest that the honourable member for Bell Island should gather up his mushrooms, hang his head, go down to Portugal Cove, go back across the Tickle and as far as I am concerned I invite him, Mr. Speaker as I am sure he will after considering the arguments which have been placed, because his were very specious, they were unworthy of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that has not improved in this province in the past two years is the calibre of the opposition. We are not going to do anything on the other side to lighten it, but it is quite, frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is a big, big disappointment when the members on the other side of this House deal in picayunery to the great extent that they are doing. I invite the honourable the member for Bell Island as the honest, affable individual that he is, to withdraw this resolution and I am sure the members on this side of the House would give him the unanimous consent which he requires to withdraw it.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that the honourable member who just sat down did not deal at all with the sum and substance of the resolution, namely; that a select committee of eight from this honourable House be appointed in order to enquire into accusations and reports of conflict of interest and alleged wrongdoing or quasi-wrongdoing on the part of the government in its relations with this Mr. McLean and his associated interests. The honourable member did not even deal with that point, the simple request for a select committee, which if the government is free from blame can do the government no harm, it can only improve the government's image, but if the government is blameworthy in these matters, Mr. Speaker, it

could of course tarnish the government's image considerably. The honourable member would not even deal with that point, Mr. Speaker, and that in itself is noteworthy.

Mr. Speaker,

I have nothing against this gentleman, Mr. McLean, As a matter of fact I cannot afford to have anything against him, I am afraid to have anything against that gentleman, Mr. Speaker. If that gentleman, Mr. McLean were ever to sit on Your Honour for example he would be able to wrap you up and put you in a shoe box.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity last week, a couple of weeks ago -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Listen to them defend their great friend, there is enough of him. They have spent about two weeks each square foot of him.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity a couple of weeks ago to go up -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE(W.N.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister from Malawi can speak later on in this debate. All we hear from him is wise cracks and smart alecky statements. I have nothing against the gentleman. As I say I am a little bit afraid to have anything against him so I will say nothing against the gentleman himself, Mr. Speaker. But we do have to say something about the actions and the antics of this government with respect to that gentleman. I have listened now for two private members' days, two Wednesdays, to the hon. the Premier and to the hon. Minister without Portfolio who has now left his seat, in a pathetic manner attempt to whitewash this man and to whitewash, well we are not worried about him but to whitewash the relationship which exists between Mr. McLean and the government. We have heard from the Premier although not to such an extent as we heard from the hon. minister today. We have heard childish, trivial statements made in reply to the hon. member from Bell Island, we have heard all kinds of smart aleck and wisecrack

statements in a pathetic attempt to disentangle the government from the conflict of interest which obviously exists in respect of Mr. McLean and his interests.

When I finished listening to the hon. Premier last day, Mr. Speaker, I thought that we were dealing with a man who should be in the book of martyrs. He was a man who was portrayed by the hon. the Premier, as we mentioned last day, as almost St. George himself, a man spotless in reputation, a man who was probably the greatest advent in human form that this province has ever seen.

AN HON. MEMBER: The second coming.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): The second coming is probably one way of putting it but, Mr. Speaker, it was incredible to hear the hon. the Premier go out of his way to try to whitewash the relationship. He might be a friend of Mr. McLean. Mr. McLean is a fine gentleman. I was about to say that I had a long chat with him and the Minister of Tourism, on a plane going up to Montreal a week or two ago, and I found him an entirely delightful man. I found him to be an intelligent man. I found him to be a hum-
humourous man, a man who probably does have something to contribute in the field of public relations. I would not say that I would consider him to be the most brilliant public relations man or director of movies in Canada today. I would say that he is not close to the top of that list although there is nothing wrong with him. I would say he is probably an ordinary mediocre type of public relations man as we would find them in Canada today, neither the best nor the worst, a man who probably does a fairly competent job.

But to hear the hon. Premier in this House one week ago try to make this man look like he was Cecil B. DeMille, the second coming of him, a man who probably should be directing movies for Hollywood and some of the more progressive European movie companies, you know to hear the Premier go on like that was really pathetic and funny, Mr. Speaker, because everybody knows that such is not the case with McLean or NACOM

or whatever other associations he might have.

There is one other point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to touch on, and that concerns the allegations against my hon. friend and colleague, the member for Bell Island, where the Minister of Finance and the Premier and this gentleman opposite me, with whom on most issues I agree with but who I disagree with on this one, their attempt to try to condemn the hon. member for Bell Island for so-called making use of his immunity in this House, his absolute freedom of speech in this House to make allegations.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Mr. Speaker, do I have the right to be heard in silence? Would Your Honour mention the rule to the hon. minister? To hear them try to condemn the hon. member for exercising his immunity in this House and making allegations. Mr. Speaker, as far as I know and I follow the news, I have followed the news for the past year or so, most if not all of the allegations made by that hon. member in this House two Wednesdays ago were made outside this House, through the media, in the past year or so since this government got into power. There might have been one or two which he has made, I think the reference to this letter he might not have made any reference to before

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, he did.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Well, maybe he did that as well. As far as I know every single allegation which he brought forward in this House a couple of weeks ago and on which he had obviously done considerable research was made by him, every one of them had been made by him earlier outside this House, over radio, television and in the public media generally. So for the hon. Minister of Finance or the Premier or the hon. Minister without Portfolio to drag a red whale across the issue and try to say that he would not make these statements outside the House, Mr. Speaker, is a terrible thing to come from members of the present ministry. In

any event, Mr. Speaker, even if he had not made these statements outside the House, for these hon. ministers and members of the House to try to belittle him for making use of one of the rights which was fought for, namely immunity, the freedom of saying whatever you want to in this House, for them to belittle that and to make fun of that and to challenge the hon. member on that ground, Mr. Speaker, is again a terrible misuse of the privileges of the House.

The only reason that we have that right and freedom in this House, Mr. Speaker, is to enable members to try to get to the bottom of things without risking suits and actions for libel and slander which would ordinarily be able to be brought against members of this House and then it goes before a court, probably with a jury, and if there are political repercussions, the jury could decide probably any way, either way, and a man could find himself, even if he tells the truth or even if it so happens he cannot back up what he said with every scintilla of proof and evidence that some judge or jury might require, finds himself mulcted for damages. That is why we have this privilege and this immunity in this House, Mr. Speaker, so that a member can come into the House and make allegations which he believes are true although he might not have every scintilla of proof and evidence to back it up, so that a select committee of this House can be set up with equal immunity and with equal privilege to subpoena witnesses, to talk to people, to hear evidence and decide whether the case made by the hon. member in this House does have any basis to it or not.

For the hon. Minister of Finance, who should know better; I do not expect, this is not meant unkindly, I do not expect as much from the Premier or from the hon. minister, as they have not spent as long in the House as the Minister of Finance. He has become a master of the rules of this House and privileges and immunities of this House and for him to come in and belittle that doctrine of immunity which

people shed blood to preserve throughout the history of England, Mr. Speaker, is a terrible thing to hear from the mouth of a minister especially a senior minister like him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another point which was made by the Premier again and by the Minister without Portfolio although he did not dwell on this so much and that is their insistent and incessant attempts whenever they are accused of anything to try to compare themselves with the past administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: No way.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): Everything, Mr. Speaker, not only this particular point about conflict of interest with the McLean interests but on every single issue that is raised in the public media or in this House this administration after one year in office tries to squirm out from under, to squeeze out of it by trying to compare themselves favourably with the past administration. But, Mr. Speaker, on that point I can only say this, that the last administration was in power for twenty-three years, something which I hope never happens in the history of this province again. I sincerely hope that no administration, including this one after the next election, or that one over there, ever is in power in this province for more than eight or ten years at the most. But here we have - and naturally if they are in power longer than that, power has a tendency, as Lord Aiken said, to corrupt and make politicians arrogant and to make them think that they own the province, own the country. That is why government should not be in power for more than two terms or so without being turfed out by the electorate, so that they can be taught a lesson so they do not have time to become arrogant in power.

But we have this government here which has been in power for one small, short year, coming out and trying to compare themselves favourably with the latter dying days of an administration which was

March 7, 1973

Tape 501

JM - 6

in power for twenty-three years, nearly a quarter of a century and then they are surprised, pleasantly surprised if by some way they can measure up favourably

The people of Newfoundland do not want to hear that kind of comparison and the people in this House do not want to hear it, I submit, Sir, by and large. It is time for this government to try and do, nobody expects perfection from them, but to try and do some of the things which they have gone on record in the public press and media as being elected to do for the people of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having gotten that particular item off my chest I would like to deal with one or two of the matters which the Premier and minister mentioned earlier in their speeches to this honourable House. The Premier cited to the House, Sir, some figures which we accept. We have no choice in this House but to accept figures given by any member of this House or facts given by any members of this House. There can be a dispute as to opinion or as to interpretation or as to inferences drawn from the fact.

I have no hesitation in accepting the figures from the honourable the Premier, not only because he is the Premier of the Province and a member of this House but as man. I do not think that he would go out of his way to give erroneous facts to this House and I think the facts he gave and the figures he gave were probably true within the limits and within the perimeters or what not in which he gave them.

But, Sir, surely such figures and such facts are subject to opinion, subject to value judgments, subject to all kinds of interpretation. Reasonable men can differ on reasonable questions. The truth, Sir, has many facets, when you look at it from various angles. Therefore for that reason the figures given by the honourable the Premier are suspect, not because he had any intention to mislead anybody, I am sure he did not, I am sure the Premier never has in his life and never will in his life. But they should be at least scrutinized by other people to see exactly what is going out of the public chest in this province to Mr. McLean and his interest and why it is going out. The figures and the statements as to the quality

of Mr. McLean's work surely should be subjected to other opinions, expert opinions of members of this House, and of other people that a select committee of this House could call in to look at them.

The statements of fact made by the honourable the Premier concerning the competitiveness of the figures and the quality, the cost, the prices of Mr. McLean's work, surely is suspect if only because nobody else in this House to my knowledge has had an opportunity, certainly nobody on this side has had an opportunity to analyze these figures and these facts for themselves and to draw their own legitimate inferences and deductions from these figures. That alone, Mr. Speaker, is reason enough to have a select committee of this House established to look at this whole operation between the government and Mr. McLean and NACOM and whatever else there might be.

The Premier also mentioned, Sir, that this international firm, this far-flung international firm of Mr. McLean was doing copious quantities of other work for other provinces I believe for other countries, for other companies in Canada and elsewhere. We have to accept that statement from the Premier as well. But I for one, one member of this House, would like to have additional information, I would like to know what proportion of that gentleman's work is done in this province? What proportion of his work is done here? He might have contracts with Greece, with big multinational companies, they could be small or large. I would like to know what proportion of his income comes out of the public chest of this province?

I would submit, Sir, from my own sources, without having any hard facts to go by, but I would submit that not less than one-third to one-half of the work done by Mr. McLean is done for this province one way or another either through solicitation for ads, for magazines and periodicals which have this government's blessing or by producing things which go to the television stations and which this government pay the television stations for when they put it out, rather than Mr. McLean. I would submit, Sir,

when compared to that administration. What a stupid, foolish comparison and contrast, Mr. Speaker? This government here, not only in respect of the McLean interest but in other regards as well, have already painted a public image to as great an extent if not greater than the previous administration did after more than twenty years in office and that in itself is a shameful and scandalous thing. To hear this government comparing themselves to the last administration is pathetic beyond words because this government, and I am glad they did do this, this government got elected by the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, because they said they were going to do things differently from the past administration. They were going to call public tenders. They were going to make sure that there was none of this patronage and throwing around of public funds to people, and friends of the party in office getting all the plums and the juicy little tidbits. They got into power, Mr. Speaker, on that promise to the Newfoundland people.

For them now to throw up the fact that after one year in office they are not quite yet as bad as the previous administration is shameful beyond words, in my estimation, Mr. Speaker. They should not do it. There should be no reference, besides the fact that it is politically stupid, the people of Newfoundland are not prepared to listen to that kind of thing any longer, they want to see action from this government. Besides that fact, Mr. Speaker, it is foolish and nobody in this province wants to hear it any more. They want to hear what this government are going to do to cure defects in our system, to remedy possibilities for corruption, to bring in conflict of interest legislation for every member of the government and every member of this House of Assembly. They do not want to hear white-washy comparison between this administration and the previous dead, dying, poured upon the administration of two years ago of which I was apart and for the most part was proud to be a part. But I have a great deal of shame with regards to some of the things that grew up after twenty or twenty-five years.

and the television station may pay Mr. McLean directly, there may be sort of a triangle affair there. I would submit, Sir, that not less than one-third of Mr. McLean's work is done for the government of this province. And surely that is a relevant fact to determine and surely again that is reason enough to get a select committee of this House working on these allegations and accusations made by my honourable friend the member for Bell Island.

The Premier in his attempt to white wash Mr. McLean, dragged in Mr. McLean's so-called investment in this province. He may be making an investment in this province, a lot of people have made investments in this province, a lot of people have made investments in this province when money has been lashed out to them from the public chest which made them very anxious to stay in this province, Mr. Speaker. Mr. McLean has established his operations in this province, Great! I am glad, I am delighted that Mr. McLean is doing that. Surely we need a good, a pretty good public relations firm, a pretty good film-making firm or whatever they are in this province. But all that indicates to me, Sir, is that he must know or have been promised that times are going to be very good for him in the next few years as a result of his close association with this government and with the Progressive Conservative Party. That is what that indicates to me.

The man comes down and invests in this province, establishes an operation in this province, hires on people hand over fist, makes a tremendous investment, perhaps not all from public funds, maybe some of his own money is invested in it as well. That to me indicates one thing, not that he is going to be putting out little tourist brochures from which he will get no return to speak of, but that he is looking forward to some massive returns from some source in this province and the obvious source in the province to look for these returns from is the government of this province with whom he has such a close relationship and for whose party, which this government represents, he did so much work in the past.

Then the Premier again makes a pathetic attempt to refute what the honourable member for Bell Island had to say about Burns Brother and Denton, Burns Brothers and Denton presumably the financial agents, the fiscal agents of the government now. The Premier thought that he had done such a beautiful job by saying that Burns Brothers and Denton had been working for McLeans six years before this government ever got involved with Bruns Brothers and Denton, and as if that takes the government off the hook with regard to any possible conflict of interest. All that indicates to me again, Mr. Speaker, is that

MR. W.M. ROWE: Mr. McLean, with his close relationship with the government of this province, probably promoted Burns Brothers and Denton at the expense of Aimes and Company, the former fiscal agents of the province, probably promoted his client Burns Brothers and Denton with this government and therefore got Burns Brothers and Denton hired on by the province as their fiscal agents at very lucrative returns and I know whereof I speak. I have seen some of the fees which are charged by so-called underwriters and fiscal agents for provinces. It is a very lucrative occupation, Mr. Speaker. I only wish some members of this House were involved in it. They would be very well off indeed.

We have the Premier coming out here and saying, "oh no, no conflict of interest between McLeans working for the government on the one hand, and for Burns Brothers and Denton on the other hand," Burns Brothers and Denton being the fiscal agents of the province, "no conflict of interest there." Burns Brothers and Denton had McLean as a client six years before they did any work for this province. How ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, obviously without proof to the contrary there was a definite conflict of interest. It definitely happened as far as I can see unless the Premier can give us some proof to the contrary, that McLean's pushed Burns Brothers and Denton at the government of this province. It tossed out Aimes and Company, pushed Burns Brothers and Denton down the throat of this province, that is what happened there. The evidence seems to speak for itself. The legal maxim of res ipsa loquitur, the thing speaks for itself, applies to this case obviously and patently, Mr. Speaker.

We had the Minister of Finance, who I am sorry is not in his seat today, come out a couple of days before Burns Brothers and Denton came on as the government's fiscal agents and say, "no, we are completely satisfied with Aimes and Company, there is no intention on anybody's part to change them, Mr. Speaker." Then

MR. WM. ROWE: within a couple of days or a week, they are flung out on their ears and in comes these buddies of McLean's, Burns Brothers and Denton.

Now if that does not merit some sort of an investigation, Mr. Speaker, by a select committee of this House, then I submit nothing merits investigation by this House or a select committee thereof.

All that this House is asking for is something which no member of the government side who has spoken yet has even attempted to meet in argument. This resolution and this opposition calls for a select committee of the House to look into these allegations and accusations and all these vague and nebulous things that we hear in the public and on the street and hear from members of the press on occasion. What is going on between the government and McLean? If the government, as I said before, has nothing to hide, they can only gain by setting up a select committee. If they have something to hide then they can only lose by setting up a select committee and therefore we will see how this government votes. We will see how this side of the House over there, Mr. Speaker, votes when this resolution is put to it. Nothing to hide - vote for a select committee. Something to hide - do not vote for a select committee.

Even the members on the other side are smart and cunning enough to see that and I submit now that it does not take a genius to know how they are going to vote either, Mr. Speaker. I wish they would vote for a select committee. I do not like, anymore than any other member of this House, to see any man or any government or any institution or any administration with a pall or a cloud hanging over their heads. If there is some problem which has arisen because of certain actions and statements and conduct going on, then it is up to the government to free itself, to get out from under that cloud

MR. WM. ROWE: or pall hanging on its head. No man likes to be accused of anything in one of Her Majesty's Courts, but if I am accused today of manslaughter or murder or some heinous offence, it is no good for me to say to myself, "well I did not do it therefore I will not do anything about it, let them prove their case."

Mr. Speaker, if I knew that I was as innocent as a new born babe, I would do everything, dig up every piece of evidence and fight like a dog in the courthouse to prove my innocence. It is all very good to say that guilt has to be proved beyond a shadow of a doubt, but that does not mean a man does not conduct a defence, Mr. Speaker. That is all this government is required to do, merely submit their case to a select committee of this House and see where the chips lie after that, see whether they can disentangle themselves, extricate themselves from this cloud hanging over them concerning McLean.

I hope they do, Mr. Speaker. I hope they do extricate themselves. Then at least we can go on and do something important in this House. But as long as this cloud is hanging over them, they are duty bound not to meet these accusations by some mealy mouth platitudes voiced in this House, wisecracks from the honourable member for St. John's East, half with tongue in cheek. It is a serious matter and if they are accused and if there are allegations made, let them meet them, let them submit to a select committee of this House and let us hear what evidence is brought forward from people under oath. Let us see what has turned up there. If there is any foundation to the allegations, then I would submit the government shall know what to do. If there is no foundation to these, then I for one shall be glad that the government of this province has gotten out of this cloud which is presently hanging over their head.

MR. WM. ROWE: This government, Mr. Speaker, did not hesitate when there were allegations of wrong doing, no more than allegations, allegations of wrong doing with regard to the previous Premier of this Province, Joey Smallwood, did not hesitate to lash out a commission to a royal commissioner to investigate. They did not hesitate, Mr. Speaker, when there were allegations against the honourable member for Bell Island, my friend. They did not hesitate to get a Judge of the Supreme Court to enquire into these allegations.

Surely, in their own best interests, it is up to them now to allow a select committee of this House, which is really I submit the only type of an enquiry which can be conducted with regard to a sitting government. You could not have a royal commission sitting on it, it would be irregular altogether. A select committee of this House to enquire into any allegations of wrong doing by this government. They are quick enough themselves off the mark whenever there is any allegation. Although I hear the Premier and some of his colleagues, I hear by the grapevine, are sorry they ever got into that kind of a thing, Mr. Speaker, because that leads nobody anywhere, with regard to the former Premier of this Province, a highly respected man, one of the most popular men that ever lived in this province. They know now it is politically stupid to have gotten into that sort of a thing but they did not hesitate, nor did they hesitate with regard to my friend the member for Bell Island, but they hesitate long, they are very reluctant when it comes to accusations made by us or anybody else against them. Then they hesitate to set up any kind of a commission of enquiry or select committee to look into their own closets and turn over a few rocks under which there might be some things buried by the present government of this province.

Some questions which immediately spring to mind without any study, without any thought whatsoever, what amounts really have been paid to George McLean by this government, and for exactly what work?

MR. WM. ROWE: What happens, for example when Mr. McLean does something for this government, for the Department of Highways say, an arm of the government, and then the government takes that and gives it to C.J.O.N. or C.B.C. to show on television, well C.J.O.N. because they would be a commercial operation. Do they pay C.J.O.N. and C.J.O.N. then pay a certain amount of money to McLean's, or does the government pay McLean's directly? What happens in that particular case? That is the reason I am asking how much of the public treasury is going to Mr. McLean, how many tax dollars are going to him? Because I do not know and I would submit, Sir, that very few people in this House do know if these figures presented by the Premier really show the exact picture, not because the Premier wanted to mislead, I am not saying that, but merely because there are other ways of payments being made. Perhaps not from the government at all, directly from Mr. McLean.

Agency fees, my honourable friend says, where do these come from?

AN HON. MEMBER: Production costs.

MR. W. ROWE: Where do these things come from, Mr. Speaker? Who sets the fees as far as McLean's are concerned? Who sets them? Do they write their own ticket? The Premier gave us some figures on competitiveness which I have already submitted ought to be scrutinized a little further. Do they write their own ticket? Do they come up with a harebrained scheme and say, "we think we should do this for you and this is what we will charge for it," and the government okays it. How are the fees arrived at, Mr. Speaker? Surely a sensible question to be submitted to a responsible select committee of this House, representing both sides of the House, with a majority from the government side. Surely a sensible question.

There was some allegation made earlier that Mr. McLean's operations are paid in advance by the government. I do not know if the Premier dealt with that point or not,

MR. MARY: No, the minister without portfolio confirmed that is true.

MR. WM. ROWE: The minister without portfolio confirms it, well I did not hear him myself, I was out of the House at the time.

 Paid in advance for what, Mr. Speaker? For what?
For work that is not done, for some

harebrained scheme that some four or five year-old could dream up which is supposed to be to the benefit of this province? What next, Mr. Speaker? That is a question which should be put by the select committee to the government and to Mr. McLean and any other witnesses that are called in.

Does the government actively support Mr. McLean's soliciting private commercial operations for advertising money? This is the first time that I have seen this letter, for example. My honourable friend the member for Bell Island has given it to me. Where is that one gone? Yes, here it is, Mr. Speaker, an undated letter with lots of space left for the name of a company to go in - " X Y " and company. Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Department of Economic Development, Office of the Minister, St. John's. No date, no name; "This will advise that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has consented to the publication of the magazine "Newfoundland and Labrador 1972" by McLean Public Relations, for which your advertising support is being solicited." Now, Mr. Speaker, signed by "John C. Crosbie," I know you should not mention names in the House, signed by "John C. Crosbie Minister of Economic Development."

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. W.N. ROWE: There is a copy of his signature there which I assume is correct. If the honourable minister can disprove that it is - or prove that it is not correct, I would be glad to accept his word. I will be happy to table this. Do you want it for anything? We will get us some copies made off and we will table that letter.

Does the government support Mr. McLean and his nabobs in going after commercial people in this province and (well black-mailing is a criminal offence so I will not use the word) twisting their arms, encouraging them to throw money into the pot, Mr. McLean's pot for work done by Mr. McLean? Do they, Mr. Speaker? It is no answer for the honourable Minister without Portfolio to say, "Oh the previous administration did this kind of thing with the Liberal Ball." Maybe they did, I had nothing to do ever with the Liberal Ball myself,

but I saw that there was often a very hefty programme with lots of names attached, many of them from "a friend" probably contributing to both sides. That is no excuse, Mr. Speaker, two rights do not make a wrong or two wrongs do not make a right, rather.

Mr. Speaker, this is a kind of question which should be put to the select committee to ask witnesses, to ask members of the ministry, to ask Mr. McLean and other people, to ask advertisers what kind of pressure was put on them by the government orally, verbally or in writing? What kind of big stick did Mr. McLean wave when he went or sent one of his men to get advertising from commercial operations throughout this province? Maybe it was all sweetness and light, maybe it was marshmallow, maybe there was nothing strong-arm, but this letter which I have just read and which the honourable member is now getting copies of for this House, for the table of this House. This letter certainly indicates that there is some funny business, some monkey business going on behind the scenes, Mr. Speaker. Surely that is a proper question for a select committee of this House to enquire into and to answer.

Another question that arises and it involves how much public money is going to McLean and how is it going, indirectly, directly and for what? How many departments are involved? How many boards which might have autonomous operations, boards which are so-called independent boards but which are under the control of Ministers of the Crown and under which we may never see any item for advertising or public relations? How many crown corporations may be involved in this sort of thing? The Power Commission, the Newfoundland Housing Corporation which, Mr. Speaker, we may never be scrutinizing when the estimates come before this House because they are sort of outside the ambit of the detailed clause-by-clause study that we give the estimates when they come into this House. That, Mr. Speaker, certainly must be support for the selection by this House, the appointment by this House of a royal commission to look into the relationship between the government in all its aspects and all its

arms, the relationship between the government and this fellow McLean.

What is the exact relationship between McLean on the one hand and Shaheen or some of the Shaheen associated subsidiary companies on the other hand? How did they work, Mr. Speaker, how did Mr. McLean fit in with any recent negotiations which went on which we will have an opportunity to debate in this House later on? What happened there exactly? Surely, Mr. Speaker, the subject for detailed enquiry by a select committee of this House.

On any of the work that Mr. McLean did, did any other public relations firms or film making firms have any opportunity to bid or to make proposals to the government? Were any invitations sent out by this government to any other firm of which there are a number in St. John's and of course a greater number across Canada? Did they do it, Mr. Speaker? I have not heard that they have not, the question has been glossed over so far by the members who have spoken, but surely this is a question which a select committee can look into.

Then the honourable the Premier and this was sickening, the honourable the Premier waves before this House a few words uttered in a debate by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition and I am sure he will deal with this when he has an opportunity to speak in this debate, but I will make a point on it while I have the opportunity, waves before this House a few words spoken by the Leader of the Opposition concerning the calling of tenders for this type of work and tries to pretend that this is wholesale vindication of the government's case, the government's position in dealing at non-arm's length with Mr. McLean and his associates, something which was probably quoted out of context, but even if it were not quoted out of context, it was a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition which was obviously subject to any kind of an explanation which the Leader of the Opposition could easily have given if asked earlier, before it was waved before this House.

The Leader of the Opposition is presumed to have said that you do not call tenders on this type of work. That may be so. You do not call tenders on this type of work, but surely what you do do, Mr. Speaker, is to indicate to the public, the people who are in this business, surely what you do is this, indicate to them what you have in mind that you want to do, give to them the financial limitation which you have on this work and then invite from a number of different public relations firms, film making firms and what have you, proposals and some idea as to what they will do on a given subject for a given amount of money.

This is what is done in respect of many architectural designs. This is what is done when some firm or country wants to put up a large expensive modern building in many cases. They invite the leading architectural firms to submit proposals as to how this should be done within a given financial limitation. That is how it is done, Mr. Speaker, and that is what I am sure the honourable Leader of the Opposition would have said, although I have not talked to him about it, if he had been questioned by the Premier on that particular point.

But no, the Premier comes in and says; "Look, page 559 of Hansard, the Leader of the Opposition says no tenders on this type of work." Of course, no tenders on this type of work, how can you tender for this type of work when all you can do is invite proposals on a presentation, proposals with a certain financial limitation on a certain subject? That is done everywhere in the world it is not even beyond the wit of this government to do that kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, but I have not heard that they have done it. Maybe they have, I would not mind hearing if some member of the government can tell me they have invited proposals and invitations from other firms on work previously done by Mr. McLean or work that is being done by Mr. McLean or work to be done in the future. I would be

completely satisfied on that point, provided some half decent proof could be supplied to me on it. But I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that this is not being done. This again is certainly a legitimate, sensible and reasonable question for any select committee of this House to ask the government to examine the government, to cross-examine the government, if necessary and Mr. McLean and employees and other firms to see if they have in fact received invitations to make presentations or proposals by this present administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: Why not? It is a simple question. Surely there is a simple answer. I would not mind having the answer because it will give us a better idea and the public of this province a better idea as to what this government is like. If they are lily white, let them be lily white. I am delighted that we have a lily-white government. If there are any tendencies in the other direction, after a measly one year in office, then I think the public should know that as well, Mr. Speaker. Let the public make up their mind. If they want to put up with that sort of thing, that is up to the public. The electorate, when it speaks, is final. There is no appeal. They make up their minds. They flung us out. They threw us out in the last election and partially threw us out, dismembered us, in the election before that. I am delighted. I go along with that decision. The same opportunity will arise in another couple of years. Maybe they will keep this government in or they will fling this government out. At least the people of this province should know what is going on and what kind of seedy relationships are being entered into by this particular government. Another point, Mr. Speaker, which demands, which cries out for some kind of an explanation and some enquiry - there is wholesale disenchantment and disillusionment on the part of employees and ex-employees of McLean's operations. Without giving any names (although in a select committee I am sure that a number of these gentlemen would come forward and give evidence),

there are a number of ex-employees, one probably within my earshot here today, within my voice raised today, Mr. Speaker, who is so fed up with what is going on in Mr. McLean's office and what he is doing to this province and the money he is filching from this government and the public chest that he gave up in disgust and he has told me (this is something that will come out if a select committee were set up) Mr. Speaker, that there are other employees who are in exactly the same position with Mr. McLean but who are not going to starve to death in order to prove their point. They have to make an income for their families. They have to keep bread on the table. They are not about to jeopardize their livelihood. It is all very good to talk about principle if you got a million in the bank. When you are living on five or six thousand a year or less, principles have a tendency to evaporate. A higher principle reigns, looking after your own well-being and your family, Mr. Speaker.

I am sure that in a closed session, under oath, that we can get some very interesting information from ex-employees and maybe (although I am less certain on this point) present employees of this gentleman Mr. McLean and his associated companies.

Everywhere I turn I run into somebody whose son or brother or father or something is taken on by Mr. McLean to make films in this province. I am delighted. Maybe we are the Poland of Canada. Maybe we are going to have a flourishing film-making industry in this province, Mr. Speaker. Maybe we will be an eastern Hollywood as my honourable friend says - the Hollywood of the east coast. I doubt it. I do know that there are people being hired on, how many I really do not know except that the impression that I get is that there are quite a number being hired on, Mr. Speaker. Surely we should enquire into that. What plans does McLean have for the future? What plans do the government have for the future with regard to this gentleman? That is a legitimate question for a select committee of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is well-known, this is fact, admitted to by all sides, that Mr. McLean acted - oh, I got a little afraid there for

a minute, Mr. Speaker. I thought the honourable member was coming over to do something drastic. He is the man I fear second worst in the world - McLean number one and him number two, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: Okay, Mr. Speaker, we have the confirmation of the minister that the letter which we tabled (I do not know if it has been tabled yet) is okay. Is it tabled yet? We have the confirmation of the minister (I do not know whether he said it jocularly or seriously) that it is tabled.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: Oh, we are going to hear it now. If the honourable minister had some place to go - he has been over here and now he is over there. I suppose he would probably be hanging from the chandelier if we had a chandelier in here, Mr. Speaker. I expect to see his seat out in the middle of the floor some time. The honourable minister is fed up with what happened in the previous administration and surely the Minister of Finance is now fed up, sickened by what is going on in this present administration. I have no doubt, Sir, that the honourable minister would get out of this government if he had somewhere to go in politics. Maybe with some openings now coming up in other fields, perhaps federally or something else, the honourable minister might see his time to get involved in that and get out of this because I am sure he is most discontent, Mr. Speaker, where he is now. I am sure he does not enjoy it. I am sure as bad as the other crowd were, this crowd is worse. That is what is going through his mind, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: You got a sour puss, he said.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I am sure that the honourable minister is chafing at the bit to bring in this conflict of interest legislation. I am sure of that, because I think he is honourable and honest in his intentions to make sure

that no member of the government or no member of this House can take advantage of his public position to put money in his own pocket. I know he is honourable in that regard and honest but I am not so sure that he is making much headway in trying to get this through, to get an order-in-council, allowing this to come to the House, Mr. Speaker. We might hear from the honourable minister on that. I find it sad in a way that this honourable gentleman who is one of the greatest political talents that this province has produced in the past five or six years, a man who took on -

MR. CROSBIE: You are on the right track now.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I must say that when the honourable minister strode in, with fire in his eyes, fists flung up, talking about confirming me, well then I decided that I better soft-pedal it and give him a few pats on the back. Hopefully when he gets up he will be a little easier on me, because I am shivering in my boots here, Mr. Speaker. He has a new suit as well, Mr. Speaker. It is savage to go ahead with it today. But just to continue this eulogy on the honourable minister - eulogy is probably the right word, I suppose - eulogy is usually given at death, political death in this case.

This eulogy on the honourable minister, Mr. Speaker: A great talent, a man of strong principles, a man who more than any other force in this province, defeated the last government.

MR. MORGAN: What happened to George McLean?

MR. W. N. ROWE: I bringing it around now, Mr. Speaker. I realize that the hon. member for Bonavista South may find it hard to follow but if he is patient and listens for a little while, he will hear. Maybe we will hear him in this speech, in this debate as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker. All we can do is sit back there - well he is not as bad as some of his colleagues, he does have something to say. I do not want to be unkind to him. He does

have something to say. His other colleagues sit back there like a bunch of crackies and nip and bark and never get up and say a sensible word in this House.

Mr. Speaker, this honourable gentleman that I am talking about, the Minister of Finance must be sickened by what is going on in the present administration. He is a man who has high principles, a man who more than any other force, political force in this province, defeated Joey Smallwood and the previous administration by dint of hard work, perseverance and getting his ideas across. Whether the ideas were right or wrong or whether they were ill-advised or not is another question, a question of opinion, but he worked at it and he had strong principles. He felt his principles and his principles must now be sorely tried and bent by remaining a member of this present administration. I doubt if he will be there very much longer, if he can see a way to squeeze out. I would say that if the Premier can find a way to flick him out, he would not hesitate for two seconds, Mr. Speaker, to do it, if he could do it with some credibility.

Mr. McLean acted for the Tory Party. Certainly this is a legitimate question for a select committee of this House: Does he still work for the Tory Party? Was he ever paid by the Tory Party of this Province for work which he did leading up to the October election the year before last and the March election of last year? That is a legitimate question because if he were not paid, Mr. Speaker, then some very interesting speculations arise from that revelation if it is ever made. Surely a select committee of this House, both sides, a majority from the government side, can look into that question and decide whether, in fact, anything as heinous as that

here with regard to the conflict between the Tory Party and the government of this House did in fact exist and does in fact exist now. I hope that it does not. I hope a Select Committee of this House will prove that it does not, that he was paid by the Tory Party for work in full, that he was paid shortly after the work was performed, that no part of his actions, his relationship with the present administration are as a result of his not having received any money from the Tory Party for public relations work which he did for them leading up the two elections.

I am not making any accusations. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that interesting speculations arise from what you see in this province today and it is up to the government to either allow these accusations to fly about and further speculations or rumors to develop as a result of them or to defend themselves in the proper form before a Select Committee of this House. Let us have a look at some evidence. Let us have a look at some testimony by witnesses under oath in closed session so their identities can be protected if necessary. That is all we ask, Mr. Speaker.

The honourable member for St. John's South is taken by the scruff of the neck and ignominiously flung out of the cabinet. When he is out of the cabinet - North rather, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for St. John's North.

MR. MURPHY: Will you make up your mind.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, listen to that, Mr. Speaker. The minister, the expert on Malawi affairs comes into this House. Imagine he is over there hove-off in his seat. Look at him. My! Mr. Speaker.

The member for St. John's North was tossed out of the cabinet and after he is tossed out ignominiously, the last man to hear about it was he, when he found his seat occupied by somebody else after he walked into the cabinet room one day. Mr. Speaker, when he is flung out of the cabinet he comes up with charges, not to the local press although afterwards I think, he did confirm them but to some Mainland press members.

He makes charges of patronage in this government, money flung around to McLean and other people, presumably for work that was not done

or work which was not up to standard, work which was not quality work. He was sickened by it. Although one has a tendency to say, "well, sour grapes," all I can say is that a man's oath of office is less strong when he has been done dirty himself and is likely to come out with some truthful statements and his tongue is likely to loosen somewhat. He comes out and makes these blanket accusations against gross patronage by this present administration in respect of McLean and respect of other people.

Made -what was it he said - made Joey Smallwood look like a Sunday school teacher or something to that effect. That was some job. If he made Joey Smallwood look like a Sunday school teacher, Mr. Speaker, then I shudder to think what is going on, I must say, over there. My former leader will know what I am talking about.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Smallwood knows what I am talking about. Mr. Smallwood was anything but a Sunday school teacher. Mr. Smallwood was a ruthless, cunning, brilliant some would say approaching genius in the art of politics and no Sunday school teacher ever reached that pre-eminence in the art of politics. If these people are as good in that field as he was, well then they are in for twenty-three years. If they are not, they will be thrown out the next time.

When it comes to charges of patronage, it was then that the honourable member for St. John's North said that they are worse than the previous administration ever was. Well then, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what to say about that particular statement. I would assume that the honourable member for St. John's North does not have sort of tender morals. I would say that he knows whereof he speaks and that certain things that are going on are certainly rubbing him and have rubbed him the wrong way. I would like to hear what he has to say on oath before a Select Committee, in secret session if necessary, to get at the truth in this thing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one final comment. I have never seen any of these

films which Mr. McLean has done there around Christmas time. I got an invitation to go to some kind of a hoose party down in the Sir Robert Bond Auditorium which I turned down - not that I do not have a drop now and then - but I was not too anxious to go to that particular one and I find out later that what it was was really a public showing of some films. I did not see them, unfortunately. I hope that Mr. McLean or the government can arrange to show these films publically once more. I would like to make some judgements and come to my own opinion on what they are in fact like. "Come And Paint And Photograph Us," Mr. Speaker, what a name. What a name for a film to be going out through Canada. Is that the name, Come And Paint And Photograph Us or With Us or what?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Come And Paint And Photograph Us.

MR. W. ROWE: "Come And Paint And Photograph Us." Come, Mr. Speaker, "Come Pilfer And Fleece Us", "Come Filch And Diddle Us," that is what they should be changed to, Mr. Speaker. What a condescending title. I hope the film itself is not similiar to the title "Come And Paint And Photograph Us." That is your Mainland mentality right there, summed up in four or five words, Mr. Speaker.

Here we are down here a bunch of quaint, rustics, half starved to death probably, stund surely. So, come down, come down, take a few shots at us. Go bring back your shots and your photographs and your paint and your paintings, bring them back and have a great laugh up in Etobicoke or wherever you go up in Toronto, up in Upper Canada.

MR. NEARY: Go to Southern Labrador and the Great Northern Peninsula. Get a few pictures of the equipment broken down.

MR. FARRELL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker, would you mind saying that again?

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, does anyone mind if I carry on.

MR. FARRELL: I am sorry but I mean, I cannot listen to this honourable -

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, is there a point of order?

MR. NEARY: Leave the House.

MR. FARRELL: I am not leaving, you leave.

MR. NEARY: Leave the House.

MR. FARRELL: I will not leave. I am not listening to anything like you over there without accepting - we do not have to listen to this very long, do we?

MR. NEARY: If you do not like it, leave, leave.

MR. FARRELL: Oh, I will stay around just as long as you.

MR. W. POWE: Any chance of carrying on, Mr. Speaker? That is all I had to say, Sir, that this is a typical, typical, typical, condescending, patronizing idea of Mainland Canada concerning most of Newfoundlanders and most of Newfoundland and here it is being perpetrated, carried on, imbedded into the folk memories of the Mainlanders in Canada concerning this province and its people. "Come And Paint And Photograph Us", condescending.

No Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker, who had been doing a film would have permitted or would have dreamed up such a title as that. They would have dreamt up something else, not something which gives the wrong impression about this province, perpetrates the bad myth about this province not the good myths. Our good myths and our good attributes are nothing to be afraid of. Our bad attributes are nothing to be afraid of but misrepresentation such as this, "Come Paint And Photograph Us - we will hold still for you and pay us a quarter, Mr. Speaker, pay us a quarter and you can take my snap. What next, Mr. Speaker, what next? It is that kind of a thing that puts the devil right in me and in my colleagues on this side of the House. I am sure the people of Newfoundland are fed up with that kind of an attitude, patronizing, condescending attitude.

I think that it probably would be better, as I said earlier in response to the Minister Without Portfolio, if they did change it to "Come and Pilfer And Fleece Us", "Come And Filch And Diddle Us". That should be the title of that, Mr. Speaker and it would give a correct impression to Mainland Canada, Mr. Speaker, then, not an erroneous impression

concerning how stupid Newfoundlanders are. They will hold still for you. Give them a quarter. You can paint their picture or take a snap, Mr. Speaker.

If the honourable minister would agree not to talk for Lent, then I will give up eating for Lent, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that he could never agree to that

MR. ROWE, W.N. anyway, Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say. This, Mr. Speaker, this relationship between the government and McLean, this conduct on the part of the government and Mr. McLean speaks for itself *res ipsa loquitur* there is no question about it at all. If there is any defence which the government have to put up to it, let them not rise in this House and come out with mealy mouth platitudes, smart alex comments white washing Mr. McLean, St. George and the Dragon, we do not want to hear any of that. Mr. Speaker, all we want to know as responsible members of this House representing our own constitutencies and the people at large in Newfoundland is whether we are being filched and pilfered by these people or whether there is a legitimate relationship going on. That is all we ask and I support wholeheartedly, Mr. Speaker, the request of this resolution to set up a select committee to enquire into these matters.

MR. SPEAKER. Before I recognize the honourable member for Bonavista South; earlier today I accepted under advisement a resolution from the hon. member for Bonavista North. I would like to rule on that now.

I find that the resolution is a request for expenditure of public monies and as such I cannot accept it. I refer to Beauchesne, page 214, section 249, para. 1, which says: "No cases can be found of any private member in the Canadian Commons receiving the authority of the Crown, through a minister, to propose a motion involving the expenditure of public monies. No principle is better understood than the constitutional obligations that rest upon the executive government of alone initiating measures imposing charges upon the public exchequer.

On one occasion in the English Commons the consent of the Crown was given to certain formal resolution proposed by a private member, with reference to charges in courts of law, to be defrayed out of the consolidated fund. It was thought, however, that any resolution placing a charge on the consolidated fund should be moved by a minister of the Crown and the more regular procedure was thereupon carried out. It was distinctly

affirmed however that the member who proposed the motion involving the charge was within his right when had the sanction of the Crown. But it was generally admitted at the same time that it was better as a matter of policy that the proposition should emanate from a responsible adviser of the Sovereign.

And to Beauchesne, page 167, Section 199, part of section (4) "any irregularity of any portion of a motion shall render the whole motion irregular."

The honourable the member for Bonavista South.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak again the resolution presently before the House of Assembly brought in by the member for Bell Island.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one reason why this resolution is before the House of Assembly, one reason only, and that is the vindictiveness of the opposition and the Liberal Party against a man and a company and a firm that played a very influential factor in the last two provincial elections. It is just the main reason of plain simple vindictiveness. We see a resolution before the House of Assembly casting innuendoes and cast again the character of a man, like Mr. McLean and his companies, simply because that company was influential in defeating the Liberal Party in the province. With all due respect to the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that all resolutions of this nature not be allowed to come before the House of Assembly. It is downgrading this House of Assembly. It is bringing shame to the House of Assembly. And I say, shame to the opposition in this case.

Maybe forgiveness can be given to the honourable member for Bell Island. But after the Premier in this House of Assembly a number of days ago clarified the situation by answering in detail all the questions put forward in the resolution, answered in detail, Mr. Speaker, maybe forgiveness is given to the honourable member for Bell Island but not for the honourable member for White Bay South. Today in this House of Assembly he continues to

castigate the character of Mr. McLean.

MR. ROWE, W.N. No, no, the government.

MR. MORGAN: Simply for the one reason, because Mr. McLean played such a major part in bringing this government into power. One reason only.

We see a resolution which comes in and says: "whereas without any public tenders having been called." Who says so? So one member of the House of Assembly brings in a resolution saying, no tenders were called because he thinks so, and the media in the province covered this. It goes to every nook and corner of the province and the people are believing it because one member brings in a resolution that says it.

And he goes on to say; "whereas it appears that substantial sums of money have been paid to Mr. McLean." It appears to whom? To one member of the House of Assembly. These are the kind of things in this resolution which are casting innuendoes. It goes on to say, "Whereas there are persistent reports." Persistent reports from where? From this government? From the opposition? Or from Bell Island? I think the latter is where they are coming from.

This kind of resolution, like I said before, is bringing shame to this honourable House. The honourable member for Bell Island claims that Mr. McLean was a carpetbagger. Mr. McLean is a very successful businessman, a very successful public relations man. He has proven that he is a very capable public relations man.

The questions that could have been asked, the questions such as; "Were there any advances paid to Mr. McLean public relations between January and July 1972?" That kind of question can be placed on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, very easily, and answered by the Premier. Questions such as this "Was there \$4,000 contract to Mr. McLean for work in the Department of Education, which could have been done for \$500. by that department?" That kind of a question could be placed on the Order Paper to the honourable Minister of Education and answered. Questions such as: "Does Mr. McLean

do work or act on behalf of specific departments of the government in general? Such as slide presentations and adoptions for the Department of Social Services?" That could have been placed on the Order Paper to the Minister of Social Services. "The use of vaccines for the Department of Health" a question to the Minister of Health. I can go on, the Department of Labour, and the Department of Tourism regarding the wildlife slides and the film promoting tourism in this province and the film on the fisheries. Why were not these questions placed on the Order Paper where they should be? And the respective ministers could have answered these questions, but no the opposition choose to bring in a resolution just to cast innuendo and continued on with downgrading of a public relations firm doing a good job for this province, doing a tremendous job for the tourism industry of this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tourist industry.

MR. MORGAN: Tourism.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tourist.

MR. MORGAN: That is what is wrong, the vindictiveness because this man helped to bring the Tories to power. No other reason.

The honourable member for White Bay South this afternoon tried to continue in the same line as the member who introduced the resolution (after listening to the Premier's explanations) and bringing shame to this honourable House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is very important business to be carried out by this honourable House, very important business but if we are going to waste the private members' day on resolutions such as this, Mr. Speaker, I say without any reservation I want no part of private members' day in this honourable House of Assembly. If we are going to bring in resolutions that are going to castigate characters outside of this House of Assembly, I do not want to have any part of it. It is a waste of time, not only bringing shame to the House, it is a waste of time to this honourable House of Assembly. I sincerely hope in the future that the opposition will be more constructive not destructive. Maybe hold back a little vindictiveness

because they were defeated in the last election and work on behalf of the province not on behalf of their party in this honourable House of Assembly.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. T. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my strong opposition to motion No. 10 on today's Order Paper placed there by the honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Surprised.

MR. DOYLE: I am not surprised that you are surprised.

The hon. member is now going to hear facts and not fictions which he seems to thrive on. I fully concur with the hon. member for Bonavista South who has just said, and other hon. members on this side, that this motion is a scandalous waste of the time of this hon. House. This is the third Wednesday afternoon we have wasted on this motion, questions about which if they had been placed on the order paper they would have been answered as are all questions on the order paper. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, very strongly that the hon. member who made the motion was not used to having questions answered on the order paper and he expects this government to operate the same way as his previous one did. Well we are about to give the lie to all that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, selling the Province of Newfoundland is like selling anything else and we have to bring into play salesmanship. We have a product to sell and in this case the product is ourselves, Newfoundlanders as we are and Newfoundland as it is, our environment, our scenery and everything we have to offer. Mr. Speaker, as in the case of any business firm in the world experts, and I underline and emphasize the word experts, are always employed to help in the selling of the product which a given company or province or country has to sell. In this case, Mr. Speaker, this government has engaged the services of the McLean group and/or NACOM Limited, call them what you will, and as far as I am concerned the quality of the items they have produced to date is exactly what we want and I am firmly convinced that we are getting full value for our money and as long as that continues I see nothing, absolutely nothing wrong in the way we are going about our business.

I should point out for the benefit of the three members in this hon. House from Labrador, one representing each party in this House, that as soon as facilities are available in Labrador and I am

talking about accommodation facilities, we are straining at the bit to do a major film on Labrador. People on the mainland and in the States are asking us, crying out for film on Labrador but at this point in time unfortunately there is not much point in producing a major film on Labrador to bring people to Labrador because unfortunately we do not have the accommodations there. This will come in time and the roads will come in time.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

DR. FARRELL: - for me to take over in the state they are in at the present time.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. DOYLE: Do I have the floor, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to remind hon. members that the gentleman speaking has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hansard verbatim report of February 21, 1973, page 690, and I quote, the hon. member for Bell Island is speaking and he says, "But, Sir, if I were the Minister of Tourism, and they will certainly be glad down in Trepassey and Ferryland and Cape Broyle and all these places, they will certainly be glad to know that the minister is out trying to get people to come down and photograph and paint them down there on the Southern Shore." I can assure the hon. member for Bell Island and all other members on the other side of this House that the people of the good Southern Shore are delighted that finally somebody is getting out and trying to get some tourists up to the Southern Shore to see what they have to offer. I am proud of my

district and I hope every member in this House is as proud of his as I am of mine.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. DOYLE: They are getting a darn sight more pay in one year than they got from you fellows in twenty-three. Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the crux of the matter. I am about to do something that I hope the hon. member for Bell Island is sitting down because I would hate, just hate to see him have a heart attack right here in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to table on the table of this House a complete paper of some six pages detailing the relations between the McLean group and the Department of Tourism or as it was known the Division of Tourist development for 1972-1973. Attached to the original copy are some samples which are referred to in the copy, that is the main copy, and here are fifty copies more, one for every member of this House and for members of the press and if those are not facts I do not know what you want.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE(W.N.): (Inaudible).

DR. FARRELL: Oh, no, no. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for White Bay South I think he went a couple of hours or an hour and a half and repeated himself many, many times. I do not intend to repeat myself, Mr. Speaker, I just rise to voice my strong opposition also to this motion from the hon. member for Bell Island. I am not going into all the repetitious statements that we have heard here all day. I agree with the previous speakers on this side of the House. I myself personally feel that the expenditures by the Department of Transportation and Communication or Highways as the opposition like to refer to it at this time, and I feel we have had enough time wasted on this subject already. I have here the facts with regards to NACOM or McLean or whatever, in detail, every dealing they have had with my particular Department of Transportation and Communication and I am submitting

my case to the hon. members of this House.

I would like to mention one remark. I think the hon. member for White Bay South mentioned the Department of Highways particularly and films made for that department. I have here in detail a copy which will be given to all the hon. members of the House and the press outlining exactly the expenditures of my department in 1972 and 1973 and I am sure it will answer all questions. Again I would say in conclusion that I resent very much the implications against Mr. McLean, the unfounded implications and repetitious remarks from the opposition about this gentleman. I would like to table these, Sir, with copies for the press.

Thank you!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: Pinocchio himself.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. CHEESEMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I rise to voice my objection to the resolution I think the first comment I should make is that if information is required then at least we should be allowed to give it. It would appear to me that that was part of the exercise. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the remarks already made by my colleagues on this side of the House. I think it is only right and reasonable in view of the debate that has gone on that the dealings and that the record of amounts and what was involved should be tabled and I intend to do as my colleagues have done in making this information available pertaining to the Department of Fisheries. There are two things however I would point out in tabling this information and one that is on page two, paragraph two, where no reference, and this has come about actually since this has been compiled, if the two training films referred to there are completed in this year there will be a total cost for those two films of \$9,000. On page three, at the bottom

of page three there is reference to a slide presentation which is due the department and which I said there may or may not be completed. I understand from conversation with Dr. Barrett, of the Fisheries College, yesterday that he requires a slide presentation on trawler activity for use at the college so the chances are that that will now be done. The training films hopefully may or may not be completed by the end of the year.

Public relations information flow, I think there has been no argument from anybody really of the necessity for it. The only real regret that I have is that in the Department of Fisheries

at any rate and that is the only department on which I can comment, I do not think that we have been geared to be able to take full advantage of the many services that have been offered but I guess that is our fault and not anybody else's and I hope that that situation will improve in the future. With those remarks this information will be tabled.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable Minister of Forests and Agriculture, I should like to table, on his behalf, the information for the honourable members of the House and for the press, regarding the relationship of the McLean Advertising Group with the Department of Forestry and Agriculture. As other honourable members have mentioned, they had copies for the press and for the honourable members and I so do have the same. So I now table them for the information of all.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I would just like to say that it is rather amusing to hear the honourable member for White Bay South mention the title of one of the movies that were shown some time ago, "Come Paint and Photograph Us," especially when he had not seen the film because the title of course relates directly to the content of the film and there was no intent on anybody's part to indicate by the title of that film that Newfoundlanders are second class citizens or somehow are in their rustic condition that they were in 1497 or any such thing.

It indicates unquestionably the opposition's inadequacy in its ability to bring forward concrete arguments in favour of their resolution that they have on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker. If the honourable member for White Bay South had seen that film, it shows plainly that the title refers directly to the scenery that we have around this province. This is what we are saying to the tourists and the people on the mainland and other places. Come and paint, and photograph us, photograph our scenery, photograph the Gros Morne National Park Area, photograph the Southern Shore, photograph or

MR. PECKFORD: paint Central Newfoundland and so on. It saddens me because as long as leaders of our province still try to maintain in this honourable House that in some way we are inferior, that we still have this which is a cliché now, this inferiority complex which somehow or another we are supposed to have. Surely goodness we are going to have it for a lot longer if people such as the honourable member for White Bay South keep advocating this kind of thing, to try to maintain and avow that the title of a film without even seeing it, when the invitation was offered to him, and perhaps he will see it soon anyway, without even seeing the film to condemn the title of the film to back up a reason for having a select committee of the House to investigate this thing, indicates to me, without question, just how inadequate the argument - it is symbolic of all the arguments coming from the opposition concerning support for this resolution.

MR. GILLET: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to take up much of the time of the House in dealing with this resolution. I agree with my colleague and friend the honourable member for White Bay South. I have always been sceptical of mainlanders coming down here to Newfoundland and Mr. McLean and/or his organization might be different, they might be a unique mainlander or a unique group of mainlanders.

I remember a few years ago there was a writer down here. Was that not for Centennial Year or for some celebration? He wrote in the mainland papers concerning the cathedral here, how the steps were worn down by the fishermen's hard boots. Farley Mowat, for instance, has done nothing to enhance Newfoundland and I have always been sceptical about these people. Nobody but a Newfoundlander can love Newfoundland well enough to do a one hundred per cent job on selling it and

Mr. Gillett.

in promoting it. I agree with my honourable friend here. Furthermore if, as has already been said by this side, the rumours and the allegations are incorrect, then why are the government afraid to have a select committee appointed? It seems to me that everything that is mentioned on this side is related to the past. Now I was not a member of the past administration or the past government and, as I see it, the past administration is not on trial here. It went on trial last year and was condemned, almost to death, not the party but the administration was. What I do see is this government on stage performing and if it does not perform within the next two years better, let us say, than it has in the year past, it too will be adjudicated. The adjudicator, as my honourable friend, the member from White Bay South, said, are the people, the voters of Newfoundland. What they adjudicate is final.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. GILLETT: I do not know because I have not read the reports from the various departments. I am just wondering if these reports really answer the resolution, perhaps they do. If they do, well and good. If they do not, I still think that the resolution as it stands can only give to the people of Newfoundland the true picture of what this government are doing. At this point at least, I have to speak in favour of the resolution.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise first in support of this resolution and I extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Bell Island for really digging into what is seemingly very difficult records to obtain and to come up with so much information in respect to the said gentleman and his said companies. I only know Mr. McLean by sight and, of course, if you ever see him once, you will never forget him, because if you ever meet him on the road, you certainly have to walk around him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bell Island has raised

several questions and I was indeed disappointed when I heard the Premier of the Province speak for approximately one hour as a rebuttal to the member for Bell Island and to my knowledge he did not answer one of the questions that were brought forward by the hon. member for Bell Island. These, to date, are still unanswered. In these propaganda sheets that have been distributed in this House, the questions are still unanswered.

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Has not the honourable gentleman the right to be heard in some sort of silence?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable gentleman does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now as I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted by the member for St. John's Centre, Mr. Speaker, these pieces of paper which have been apparently typed up rather hurriedly during this last week or so, do not yet answer the many questions that the member for Bell Island has brought forward.

in this House during the month of June 1972, when the estimates were brought forward to this House, we in the opposition did a little probing at the time, of the various ministers who brought their estimates forward, and it is interesting to note in one department in particular and the department was the Department of Fisheries, which was questioned and asked what involvement there was of the McLean interest; the answer was a direct no. The minister tried to side-step the question but a littler further on in the estimates we discovered that between the month of January 18 up until the time the estimates were presented to this House, a total sum of \$55,000 had been paid to the McLean Companies or the McLean interests.

\$43,000 of this can be found under head 14-13-05, now it took a bit of probing on our part to find this out. There is another \$12,000, I did have a note on it but I do not know exactly where it is but it is in the estimates for the Department of Fisheries. Now this is only over a four or five month period, and this is only one department alone. If we take a look at the propoganda sheets that have been distributed to us here this afternoon, we find in the Department of Fisheries there is \$83,000 mentioned. In the Department of Tourism, there are so many figures mentioned, there are thousands and thousands of copies and I see many figures with \$3,000 and \$4,000 and there is also a figure here for the cost of one film - \$58,000. Of course the minister is only talking about one film.

Then in the Department of Transport and Communications, we find that the total payment for the period of April to December and I presume this is the fiscal year - April 1972 to December 1972, we find \$50,000 was paid. Now this is less than half the period that the McLean interest has been involved with the present government.

It would appear, to me anyway, that the statement from the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture could not have even been read by him because it is not even signed. Apparently this department is not too heavily involved or at least it appears that it is not. Of course the minister is away and I am not quite sure of this. It still leaves a big doubt there of how deeply the department is involved.

I am sure if you take, for example, the Department of Fisheries, Transport and Communications or the Department of Tourism, I can understand possibly that the Department of Tourism would have justification for being involved greater than the other departments, but if you consider that we have at the present time eighteen departments, and if you are running into \$80,000 or \$85,000 in a five month period, this present government is going to give the McLean or McLean interest possibly over \$2 million worth of business a year.

Now this is a pretty good business. Well, Mr. Speaker, here are the facts. You can take them and add them up for yourself. It is a bunch of propoganda, but that is what this present Tory Government consider as facts. Mr. Speaker, for over \$2 million I would work also.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before the present administration came to power in this House, we had all kinds of statements inside the House and outside, that once we are elected

we are going to have bids on everything, everything was going to be tendered for. Tenders were going to be open in public. There was nothing under the board whatsoever, no deals under the table.

Mr. Speaker, what a change we find and of course you know the people of Newfoundland were promised a drastic change, a change like they never saw before. That part of it is correct. It is a change like we have never seen before because here we find that one company can move into Newfoundland and take over one aspect of our provincial government. Many people may not consider that this man and his company are fleecing the government. Well I do. I think they are taking every possible cent that they possibly can get from the public treasury and these statements today are not justification for any government to award contracts without tenders. This is no justification. It is not worth the paper it is written on. It is meaningless and it does not in any way, shape or form answer the questions of my colleague from Bell Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: I do not intend to read them. They are not worth reading.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Did I hit a sore point? Is it true what I am saying? It must be because you are all up in arms up there.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the present administration seem to think that if we are going to do anything in Newfoundland, if we are going to try to sell Newfoundland to the tourists of North America, if we are going to do a film on the fisheries or a film on the interior of the wildlife in Newfoundland or a film on our highways or even a film on Labrador that we should involve this professional, this extraordinary so-called professional from upper Canada and bring him down here and give him money, advance him money and let him go to work and make films.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if today we wanted a film on the fishery of Newfoundland we do not have to go outside of the present departments of our government. We have an extension service at Memorial University and they have enough film to put together any type of a film that you would want to present to any portion of North America. They can do an excellent and superb job and they have done it. Their services are there for our use and we are not using the services that are at hand, we are not taking advantage of the extension service of Memorial University. They have excellent films on the fishery in particular, excellent films as I have seen some of them and I know some of the hon. gentlemen across the way have also seen them. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is no need for us to engage any so-called specialist to do this type of work that already has been done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution calls for a select committee of eight members -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the resolution calls for a select committee of eight members. Now, Mr. Speaker, really setting up a select committee is not all that difficult and if the present government have nothing to hide, if there is nothing wrong with the interests of Mr. McLean and his associates in Newfoundland, if everything is above board, if there is no hanky-panky work going on

under the table, why can we not have the committee? Why can we not have this select committee? Let us bring in a full report, a true report and show the people once and for all, because if there is nothing wrong -

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, would you ask the honourable member to keep it down a little.

MR. THOMS: Is that a point of order?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on the so-called point of order, the hon. member for Placentia West should know a little better. He is being rude, impertinent, out of order, insulting and nasty.

MR. BARRY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. If there were anyone impertinent and nasty, it would be the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. BARRY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, the hon. Leader of the Opposition feels that in order to be aggressive, you must be nasty. Now that is not necessarily so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I agree. The hon. gentleman from Placentia West is consistently nasty and is most passive but not aggressive. The point of order, however, is this: There is an organized attempt on the other side, involving a number of honourable gentlemen (Your Honour has had to call them to order a number of times) to prevent my colleague from the right he has to be heard in silence. Your Honour is trying valiantly to enforce the rules of the House. I say that there is an organized attempt by a number of honourable gentlemen opposite to try to shout down my colleague. He will not be shouted down because he has the right to speak in this House, Sir.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the honourable gentleman who was speaking make any objection. As a matter of fact, I thought he was rather

enjoying the repartee that was going back and forth. The honourable member has the right to raise a point of order. Does the hon, the Leader of the Opposition feel that the honourable members on the other side of the House need his guidance in looking after the enforcement of the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us not get into a debate between two honourable members of this House. I again remind members on both side that the honourable gentleman has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, if this present Tory Government do not have anything to hide - it should not have because they campaigned on a platform that they would be lily white and pure. There would be nothing wrong with their wheelings and dealings. There would be no money spent in Newfoundland that should not be spent. They even went so far as to accuse the previous administration of the tactics, the methods that they, to this day, are using. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if there is nothing wrong, why not have the select committee. Let it bring in its report. Let us verify it, whether things are proper or improper. If they are proper, you have nothing to worry about. If they are improper, you should resign.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as my speaking in this honourable House, I was elected by the good people of my district to come in here and the reason they elected me was so that I could come in here and speak in the way that they knew that I could speak. I will endeavour to show - if I have to shout, I will shout. I will not sit down to give way for any honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I would like to remind the honourable member speaking that that is not relevant.

MR. THOMS: I got sick that time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Thoms.

Mr. Speaker, there were in the estimates last year that were presented to this House, many hidden monies that did not come to light or at least I suspect there were. Mr. Speaker, I am in grave doubt as to why they were spent and to whom they were paid. Mr. Speaker, this committee could look into all

monies that were allocated in the estimates and bring forth a true picture to this House and Mr. Speaker, if they were right and proper at least I would be satisfied. If they were not right and proper then let the blame fall where it may.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Bonavista South said that the facts and figures that were presented were correct.

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

On motion debate adjourned.

MR SPEAKER: It being now 6:00 of the clock, I do leave the Chair until tomorrow, March 8, 1973, at 3:00 P.M.