



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 9

VERBATIM REPORT

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

HON. R. L. CHEESEMAN, MINISTER OF FISHERIES: Mr. Speaker, an announcement was made today by the honourable Jack Davis from Ottawa which I feel will be of considerable interest to this province. The announcement had to do with the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation and its participation in the 1973 season and for a three year period.

In order that this should be clarified for the benefit of those who perhaps have merely heard the statement and are not aware of the impact, I would like to now make a statement.

I am very pleased to learn today of the approval by the federal government of a programme put forward for consideration by the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation. The effect of this proposal is for the corporation to become more involved in the production area of the salt fish industry by means of the upgrading of processing facilities and the addition of machinery, etc.

Since assuming office, this Government through the Department of Fisheries have been in constant touch with the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation. A number of meetings have been held with Mr. Maloney, President of the corporation at which time we expressed the concern of the government over the declining production of salt fish, particularly in view of strong market demands and prices. This concern was brought about by the fact that production of salt cod fish over a five year period had gone from 432,000 quintals to a 1972 figure of approximately 100,000 quintals. I should say here, the 432,000 was five years ago, today's 1971, which is 1972 figures, was approximately 100,000 quintals or twenty-five per cent of the five year ago production.

Mr. Maloney during the course of our meetings, assured us of his concern in this regard and further assured us that he would be making suggestions to the federal government and impressing on them the need

MR. CHEESEMAN: for a capital programme which would permit far greater participation on the production side of the industry. I have therefore been well aware for some time of the steps being taken by Mr. Maloney to meet the needs as we saw them. I am of course very happy to see that in this instance the federal government has agreed with our thinking and with that of the corporation.

Hopefully this programme will reverse the present

desirable trend of decreasing production and to allow the salt fish fishermen and the processing industry to benefit to a greater degree from this lucrative market. In keeping with our own express desire and that of the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation it is encouraging also to note that the proposed programme will place greater emphasis on consumer packed production of salt fish products. This emphasis will we hope provide additional employment opportunities within the industry in terms of the upgrading of our products. We are happy with the announced overall programme particularly as it is in line with our own thinking and recommended course of action expressed by us to the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PETITIONS

MR. F. W. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition. actually it is a double-barrelled petition. It is from the Community of Change Islands. The petition is signed by approximately 280 citizens of that community.

The prayer or the request is for the upgrading and restructuring of the road through the community. That is part one. Part two is for a construction of a road from Change Island itself across the island to South End.

Now, Sir, Change Island is strickly a fishing community. I recall the other day the honourable Minister of Justice in his capacity as Acting Premier making a statement to the effect that the people have a right to live where they wish. Be that as it may, and I have no argument on that score. However, if people are going to live in communities were they are isolated then it is the duty I think of the government to provide facilities and services in order that those people, especially the fishermen, will have an opportunity to provide a decent living for themselves and their families.

So, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this petition and ask that it be laid on the table of the House and have it referred to the department to which

it relates.

MR. W. C. GILLET: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition signed by 280 residents or I should say voters perhaps of Change Islands. I am well acquainted with Change Islands. I have been there on many occasions. As my honourable friend from Fogo has stated, it is solely a fishing community.

and a good fishing community, very close to the fishing grounds, it is a very enviable community. Being an island and not being in a location where it can be connected to the mainland by a causeway it will always remain that unique society of an island I would say. Now I do not know the distance from the tickle, Change Islands being a community on both sides of the tickle for the most part, to South End. But I would say it is about six miles.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nine miles.

MR. GILLETT: Nine miles. This, of course, will give a very narrow gap, so to speak, to the mainland and I think it is something that has to come, definitely has to come if Change Islands is to be a viable community. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support this petition wholeheartedly and trust that the road will be upgraded around the community and a new road constructed to South End.

MR. G.M. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present to this hon. House and the contents reads as follows: "We, the residents of the Goulds Road, Makinsons, make petition for the upgrading of the piece of road leading from the Conception Bay Highway to the Hodgewater Line, commonly known as the Goulds Road." Mr. Speaker, this road for a number of years nothing has been done with it. This spring the road have been done just about one mile and the people in this area are gravely concerned because the children have to walk out to a school bus over a mile. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, after twenty-two years with nothing done on this road I, as a member for Port de Grave, suggests great urgency to see that there is something done about it.

I have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in presenting this petition to this House and ask that it be placed upon the table and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition presented on behalf of the people on the Goulds Road Area near Makinsons. I think

that it is about time that something was done about that piece of road. The children have to walk considerable distances to get school buses and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the only part of the District of Port de Grave where children have to walk long distances in all kinds of weather to get a school bus. The hon. member who presented the petition is well aware of this as the hon. member owns the school bus, I think, that operates in that area. If the hon. member is not able to convince the Minister of Finance to use some of that windfall, that bonanza that came from the hon. John Turner the other day, in Ottawa, in the new budget, then perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I might be able to make a suggestion to the hon.

member for Port de Grave, that he tried to get the project included in federal funding for a provincial make-work programme. This administration is still procrastinating on that matter, Mr. Speaker. There is \$8.4 million if not more, it is probably up to \$10 million or \$12 million now, available to this province for make work programmes and we have not heard a thing about it yet.

No proposals have gone to Ottawa yet and it is there for the asking. These are forgivable loans, Sir, they are grants and forgivable loans. Perhaps the honourable member can get that road included in one of these projects as a make-work project for that part of Conception Bay.

QUESTIONS:

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answers to two questions asked earlier in the House by the honourable member for Bell Island and the honourable member for Twillingate.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Will the minister confirm or deny that there is an investigation on the illegal importation of cigarettes and tobacco into this province, for resale? If so, has the report of the investigation been received and will it be tabled?

MR. J.C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): The answer is no. I will not confirm it nor I will not deny it.

MR. NEARY: Obviously the minister is hiding something, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: I want to set the member's mind at rest. Actually it is public knowledge that there is an investigation of cigarette smuggling, I suppose you might call it, from other provinces into the province. I have not checked on it lately to see what the status is, but there certainly is some illegal activity going on. Whether there were any prosecutions laid I do not know. I do not think anyone has been charged yet.

MR. NEARY: Would the honourable minister undertake to check on it,

Mr. Speaker? He did not answer the second part of the question: will the report be tabled in this House when it is received?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the report is not likely to be tabled in the House. It would be the basis for charges to be laid, so it is not customary to table that kind of thing in the House.

MR. P.S.THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Does the minister plan to place a contingent of the R.C.M.P. in the Gambo Area?

AN HON. MEMBER: A whole fort of them.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other questions?

MR. W.N.ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Will the minister inform the House what steps have been taken by himself or his department to replace Dr. Misik who unfortunately passed away recently in the Town and Area of Hampden? Can he also inform me particularly, Mr. Speaker, as

to what chance when a doctor is likely to be found to replace Dr. Misik in that town.

HON. DR. A.T. ROWE (Minister of Health) Mr. Speaker, as was mentioned in the House a few days ago, it was with considerable concern we learned of the sudden death of Dr. Misik.

At the present time the arrangements are being made by Springdale and Deer Lake to give emergency services to the area. On the question of a replacement, I cannot be specific. There are at the present time ten doctors being vetted for the operation, to come to this country in the next four or five months. Hopefully one of those will be placed in Springdale and Deerlake to cover the emergency.

MR P.S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. In view of the fact that the Happy Valley Hunting Association is unhappy with the Caribou Management Area and Zone of Labrador and the Caribou Licensing allocations in Labrador, does the minister or any member of the Wildlife Division contemplate meeting with the representatives of that association?

MR DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I take notice of that question. I will undertake to have the answer by tomorrow.

MR M. WOODLAND: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Finance. I would like the minister to inform the House if he is aware that the woodland's manager of Labrador Linerboard in Goose Bay is leaving his job and also the mechanical superintendent - Mr. Temple I think his name is? For what purpose are these persons leaving that particular job?

MR CROSBIE: I am aware of the fact, Mr. Speaker, of the change being made in the woods operations because we are terminating the arrangement with Forrestral. I forget their full name. Anyway Forrestral were managing the woods operation for us, and they have been given notice of termination. We are going to manage the operation ourselves.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

MR. CROSBIE: It was never contemplated that this would continue. They were brought in on an emergency basis last year, in February, to carry on the operation of woods and recommend what should be done to develop the woods plan, this kind of thing. There is no longer any need of that and we will be putting our own woods manager there and this is presumably why Mr. Gleason is going.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. In view of the comments made on Monday by the Federal Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, has the minister contacted the honourable Jean Chrétien with reference to discussing the needed changes if any in the boundaries of the Gros Morne National Park?

MR. E. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I have contacted Mr. Chrétien's office, of course. Mr. Chrétien is ill. He had a heart attack some times ago. He is only in his office during the question period in the House of Commons or only at work, but we have contacted the honourable Jean Chrétien.

We are trying to arrange meetings now relative to the Grose Morne National Park.

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day, motion 5, the hon. Minister of Highways.

HON. DR. T. C. FARRELL (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, the amendment we were discussing concerning the denturists, I feel that this honourable House has exhaustively debated this subject in a most constructive, I would think, and nonpartisan manner on both sides. I feel that most that probably needed to be said has been said already. As I was speaking at the close the other day, I thought I would add a few more remarks to my previous statements. I did say that the health of our people and the continuous improvement of our health facilities, including dentistry, is absolutely essential to our well-being.

I know to my personal knowledge that the Newfoundland Dental Association over the past several years have been working very hard to improve the dental facilities throughout the province and have discussed the possibility of mobile clinics, even to areas which do not have any roads. We have discussed with our people and I feel they have been doing quite a bit to improve the facilities. At this time, as I said the other day, under the situation that exists presently in the province with denturists, there are a lot of areas that have to be very carefully looked at. I know I am repeating some of the matters and points that were brought out the other day. I do repeat, however, that a rigid enforcement of our existing laws be maintained under the Dental Act until this honourable House decides that they should be changed. I repeat that very emphatically. I do regret a few things and particularly the attitude of the denturists because they have refused

to give their numbers practicing outside the laws of our province or any information concerning their qualifications. I think this is a true statement.

Now as has been brought out in certain cases which were investigated by the R. C. M. P., the conditions under which the ones who were prosecuted were practicing, were extremely unsanitary. I do not need to go into this. This is a matter of record. I feel that this is extremely important to our welfare, if they reuse materials in taking impressions and do not have the proper sanitary

facilities, that we are placing a health problem on our own doorstep

I mention that point for the fact that it is so important that very high standards be set up before any legislation is brought in.

I would say that the point about low cost to the public, from our investigations, are not quite correct. It has been proven factually that in areas where they have been licenced that their fees have gradually crept up because of the extra overheads that is necessary under the legislation, in the other areas that their fees have crept up to a level comparable to dentists in supplying the same dentures.

I feel that some of the people who are practicing as denturists in this province have, due to legislation being enacted in other jurisdictions, have been forced (probably not the correct word) into Newfoundland, practicing where there is no legislation to control them.

Now I would like to say that I would fully support denturists in this province. I think figures have been stated at - we are short approximately forty dentists at the present time in the province.

I feel that a training programme such as for instance has been initiated in British Columbia where there has been instituted a two year study under a dentist or in a dental technical college, together with two years under the preceptorship of a dentist or in a certified dental laboratory, I think a very important point here is a certificate of oral health be given prior to them being allowed to go ahead in this province. I feel this is very important.

There are a few other points I would like to mention, the cases that I feel are very important, having practiced for many years in rural parts of this province, that subsidization ideas that have been projected in the last few days in more-rural areas of our province, that this should be considered very carefully by this government,

so that we can get dentists into these rural areas where there is a great scarcity of them at the present time.

I propose that, without any further ado, having made the points that I had not made in my last speech,

that we go ahead and vote on the amendment. Thank you.

MR. C. R. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in favour of that amendment, very briefly. I suppose the need for denturists and dentists is as acute or maybe even more acute in my district than in any other district in the island. At least one member of my family has found it necessary to wear uppers. On several occasions had to visit dentists and, to say the least, the cost is staggering.

There is one point that I would like to go back to and that was the fact the honourable member for Green Bay brought out the other day that this probably should never been brought to the floor of this House or the need might have not been there for the Leader of the Opposition to bring it in had the denturists done what the honourable member suggested and that was to present a brief to the Minister of Health. It probably could have gone through the regular channels and this it would not have been necessary to take up all this time, the time it has taken in this House.

MR. ROBERTS: Does the honourable member think that the House should not take the time on this subject?

MR. BRETT: Not necessarily but it could have gone through regular channels and we would probably have gotten the same results. Since we have all agreed, there has been no disagreement.

MR. ROBERTS: Something funny, funny happened.

MR. BRETT: That is not true.

MR. ROBERTS: It is true then.

MR. BRETT: It is not true.

MR. ROBERTS: Some of the dentists would probably drop dead -

MR. BRETT: Oh, well that part of it, yes. Well explain yourself.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: Another point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make is that we are not aware at this time and this again has been rehashed and said over and over but we are not aware of the qualifications of the practicing

denturists, that is their educational or their professional qualities. We do not know the conditions under which they work. I think this is something that we have to be very careful of. It appears, I say it appears, I am not sure that they do not want to give us this information. So therefore I say at this point in time there is no way that they should be allowed to practice.

The need, Sir, for denturists in our province, particularly in our rural areas is great. But I do not think that the great need should blind us to the real facts at the moment. It is illegal for denturists to practice now. It should remain so until they are properly trained and legislation is set up governing their operation.

As I have said before, Sir, this House has agreed unanimously to set up a select committee to study the problem. This of course is the only sensible solution. I wholeheartedly support the move. But I would like to say, Sir, that the actions of this House to date has already brought some favourable response for the people that we represent.

on both sides of the House, According to the radio and the press, the dentists have decided suddenly to come up with dentures for almost half the cost for which they are selling them now. Probably I should say, and I will go on record, that where you can buy dentures at the moment from denturists for \$25.00 to \$30.00 per set that if and when this is legalized, and I think the hon. Minister for Transportation and Communication just brought this out, I think once they are legalized you will no longer get your uppers and lowers for \$25.00 to \$30.00. I will go on record as saying that it will cost equally as much as what you are going to have to pay the dentists. Nevertheless, Sir, I do support the amendment.

HON. G.R. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at any length on this whatsoever. I would however like to refer to the possible outcome of this debate, the question before the House of the appointment of a select committee which will make a report to the House. Without wishing to anticipate the view of the House in voting on that question or without wishing to anticipate if that vote is affirmative the recommendations of a select committee, without wishing to anticipate that I would make the point that if the vote were affirmative, if the House does in fact pass the question that there be a select committee and if the select committee recommendation should be favourable toward the position of denturists in the province, then I would suggest that whatever the select committee may decide, if in fact it is formed, that it should be done with not haste but certainly without undue postponement. The reason being, of course, that we should in this province, with the technical institutions that we have, and I am thinking in particular now of the College of Trades and Technology, be able ourselves to provide this course. Without knowing very much about this particular profession or skill, it would certainly require at least two and perhaps three years of professional training. It is important that any institution which were

to give this training, and it would be something quite new for the present college, it obviously be important that there be some consultation and exchange of information with recognized institutions giving diplomas and recognized profession accreditation. It would be important to set up a curriculum. It would be important to have proper instructors for it. All of this certainly takes at least a few months

because it is not an area obviously related to health care as it is. It is not an area in which one can move without being completely sure that the course of instruction is appropriate, that the instructors are thoroughly professionally qualified and also, of course, of establishing the entrance requirements for such a course.

Again, without wishing to anticipate the wish of the House or the deliberations of a select committee if in fact there is one, I would suggest that if there is to be one, they realize that this is an area of quite some complexity in professional education, the finding of instructors, the establishment of a curriculum and the recruitment of students. The College of Trades and Technology has courses in paramedical areas, in X-Ray technology and related areas.

AN HON. MEMBER: In pharmacy.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And in pharmacy, yes. This I think would be - there is an area of similarity there related to health care in which it is necessary that professional standards be implemented to the greatest degree.

There is one other remark only that I wish to make and that is and I believe other honourable members have mentioned this, perhaps on both sides of the House. I do not recall it, it is a week ago since this was debated. I do not think that we should, if there are to be practicing denturists, then I do not think that we should incorporate a grandfather clause, because somebody has been practicing or making false teeth for so many odd years, that he automatically qualifies under a new scheme which would give professional recognition and obviously professional regulation. I think it is essential that this be recognized. I would hope that those who are engaged in or interested in or concerned with this whole question, people who regard themselves as denturists or who wish to practice that profession, I would hope that part of their programme does not include this automatic qualification for a person because he has practiced during the past five, four, three, two years, ten years or whatever

it is.

This being an aspect of health care, irrespective of how long a person claims to have practical experience in this area, professional competence attested by examination would have to be insisted on. I do not think that that is universally true in everything, but in dealing with this kind of a matter and I would hope that those who are lobbying -- there is nothing wrong with lobbying for recognition of denturists, realize that there can be no automatic accreditation because of any claim to past experience. There has to be regulation as a profession, professional accreditation which would result from passing appropriate examinations.

MR. CHEESEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not profess to have any particular knowledge of either the practice of dentistry or of the operations of denturists as they apply to our province. I have sat through former discussion in this debate and listened with considerable interest to those who do have such knowledge and have explained the pros and cons as they saw them. I am sure, to those of us who did not previously have this knowledge, that the debate has been enlightening. Now

I happen to represent a district, a rural district, the great District of Hermitage, and the problem in that district is not, shall we have on any permanent basis one or the other but to have anything. Now fortunately, Mr. Speaker, there is a clinic which is operated from time to time in Bay d'Espoir but quite obviously this will never serve the entire needs of the District of Hermitage.

The two main issues which appear to me to come out of the debate is the position of the dentists on the one hand who claim and I would assume rightly so that in order for any one to practice the making of dentures or the fitting of dentures, it would obviously require a certain amount of knowledge. Whether or not this knowledge is held by all of those who are practicing denturists, I am not sure. Quite obviously some board or some regulatory authority of some kind would need to be set up in order to make certain that the health and in fact the value for the performance was there in terms of the work done by the denturist. This having been assured then it is my impression, from listening to honourable members of this House, that there is no objection or no strong objection that would appear from any side. However, I think the other side is the cost involved.

Now quite obviously there is a contentious point between the dentists and the denturists and perhaps those who are promoting or agreeing with the dentists' position and those dealing with the denturists' position. I believe that coupled with any regulatory body, obviously some sort of close watch, if in fact this is one of the reasons for the passing of such a bill - I cannot see how regulations or laws could be built in limiting price; that obviously would be impractical. There should be at least in my opinion some mechanism of control and perhaps supply and demand will create that control. What I would like to see, Mr. Speaker, and in particular as far as the District

of Hermitage is concerned, and I am quite sure the same thing applies to members on both sides of the House who represent rural districts, if we could have denturists practicing throughout the island and particularly if we could have them associated with hospitals, dental clinics and this type of medical facilities, to ensure at least some reasonable standard of medical care throughout these districts. If you required dental work to be done today and if you happened to live in the Community of Francois or McCallum, I would venture to say that whilst the cost of having the necessary work done might be very substantial - I am only again listening to other honourable members who have been speaking and prices have been sort of bandied around of \$100, \$150, \$200 as the case may be which is, by any standard, a real substantial amount of money, particularly for those people who are either unemployed or enjoy only a marginal living.

Now if you add to this the cost of having to leave Francois or McCallum or any of these places, the more isolated communities throughout the entire province, then I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the cost would be at least a third as much again as the work required. So what I would like to see and if it is possible for the Department of Health, having the honourable Dr. Rowe look at this particular bill - it would appear that the amendment will pass and I would hope that then serious consideration might be given if denturist practices are in fact brought in in Newfoundland, to give

some serious consideration to trying to associate it closely with the medical facilities which exist throughout the rural areas.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. B. HOWARD: I just want to say a few brief words in support of the amendment and in rising to support the amendment I believe that such legislation should be brought in to cover the denturists because, Mr. Speaker, they, the denturists, are rendering a service to the people. I might add, a much needed service, one which should not be pushed aside by a group or groups of people. I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that legislation should be thoroughly looked at, keeping in mind all the health aspects involved.

But I am sure of one thing, that the people of Newfoundland will be happy to know that they can obtain dentures at a price which they can afford. For this reason and for many others, I will support the amendment that a select committee of this honourable House be appointed to investigate all aspects of dentistry and the legalization of dentures and report back to this honourable House.

MR. CROSBY: Mr. Speaker, this is quite a controversial subject and there is no point repeating a lot of things that have been said by other people but the real problem in Newfoundland is not whether you have denturists or do not have denturists or how they are controlled or what is to happen to denturists, that is a very small part of the problem. The problem is the need for dental services, for better tooth care in Newfoundland. In my own opinion, if we had fluoridation of water supplies here in this province, we would have far less need of dentists, denturists and everyone else involved in this problem.

It is a peculiar thing, Mr. Speaker, that in a province which has the fewest dentists per capita of any of the Canadian provinces, and very few dentists outside the urban areas, that anytime this issue

of fluoridation is raised, there is a tremendous howl and fuss about it and all of the crackpots and oddballs who get stirred up about this issue come pouring into the public print and I know that tomorrow or the next day or the day after that or in a week's time or ten days time, I will be flooded with literature telling me what a dangerous thing I am advocating in advocating fluoridation.

MR. ROBERTS: It is a Communist plot.

MR. CROSBY: It is a Communist plot and I will be a Communist flunky or a dangerous fluoridationist. I may be a flunky but I am not a Communist.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is a great tragedy. I believe in the Province of Newfoundland there are only I believe two communities or is it one? Two - Gander - St. Lawrence has natural fluoridation and we have here in our own House an honourable member whose teeth survived the experience of growing up in St. Lawrence. He never goes to a dentist, never has a cavity, never gets a tooth pulled, the honourable member for Placentia East, a living monument to the efficacy of fluoridation, already forty-four, forty-five years of age, prime health. Everything was inspected in Placentia East during the election, including his teeth.

he passed the test and he lived. He was brought up in St. Lawrence where they have naturally fluoridated water.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: No, I will not mention that. So, Mr. Speaker, it would be a great thing if the municipalities in Newfoundland that have proper water systems, community water systems, would enter into just the small expense that is involved in fluoridating the water supplies in those communities because the effect of that in the next twenty years and the need for dental care of the children who are living and growing up in those communities now would be absolutely tremendous. That is something that I do not think this House should overlook. I think it has always been the policy, it was a policy of the past government and it is a policy of this one, as far as I know, that the Provincial Government will not impose fluoridation on any community that has a municipal water supply, but certainly it is recommended. I believe that financial assistance would probably be available if it were needed to institute fluoridation and to fluoridate the water supplies of areas. I thought that Corner Brook was going to - Is Corner Brook fluoridated too?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: The City of Corner Brook is fluoridating its water supplies, Gander and as I said, St. Lawrence. It is time for St. John's to do it. There was a vote in the city council when I was on the city council in 1966 on which three of the councillors voted for, three against and the mayor voted against it on the principle that when there was a tie vote the presiding chairman always votes against a change. That principle has gone by the boards in recent weeks but it was the principle when the fluoridation matter was discussed in St. John's City Council. I know that Councillor Wyatt was a great advocate of fluoridation. In that particular debate she came down to the city council chamber to support

floridation. I think it is time now for the City of St. John's to decide to floridate our water supplies.

So the real problem, and whatever we do with denturists or dentists is not getting to the root of it or not getting to the bottom of it. It is really only on the top of it. It is not even getting to the canal. We are only touching the top. How is the hon. gentleman?

MR. NEARY: I still have my own teeth.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman for Bell Island still has his own teeth. He does not know how much longer that he will have them. All depends on how he conducts himself in the House this year. As we saw in Nova Scotia, they had a little flurry there a week or two ago and of course that is not our practise here.

But anyway to conclude, and it may take me some time to conclude now that I have gotten started because it took me some time to start, Mr. Speaker. To conclude, it is a great pity floridation is not something more widespread. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker. I am, as I know most members of the House are very glad to welcome the Premier back again from his trip to Toronto yesterday. We know that he is in rare form as he was up at 5:00 A.M. this morning to catch the plane and he is about to deal with the nub of the matter when the hon. gentleman opposite proceeds in a few minutes time with his resolution. I think that the amendment which I believe is to establish a select committee to report back to the House is a proper way of dealing with this and I hope that select committee will seriously consider the issues and bring us back a report we can all agree on and perhaps enact legislation, if not in this session then in the next session.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if nobody else on the other side wish to speak on the amendment perhaps I could come out and take another chop at it. I was once told by I think it was the hon. Mr. Curtis, Mr. Leslie Curtis, the Attorney General for many years, that there were two subjects

that were calculated to engage the interest of almost any member of the House and almost every member of the House and if legislation came before the House on either of these matters you could count on everybody speaking. Those were the Alcoholic Liquors Act or its various manifestations and the Highway Traffic Act and its various manifestations. I think it is now obvious that to that duo there will have to be added a third subject giving us a trinity, holy or otherwise, of the dentists or the denturists problem. I cannot remember quite as many members having spoken in a debate on a resolution. I may add we are only speaking on the amendment so far, Mr. Speaker. We still have the debate. I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: We will have to go all over this again now will we?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, it was the hon. gentleman's colleagues who quite properly and very well decided but I suggest we will probably finish in time this afternoon to have a few words on the next motion, from my colleague, the gentleman from Bell Island. He has a few words he wants to say. I doubt if that debate will conclude this afternoon. We may be treated to a replay of that next week.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to vote for the amendment. If the amendment carries I shall vote for the resolution as amended but I do not propose to vote for the amendment. To me, Sir, the amendment moved by the Minister of Health is a derogation of his responsibility. It is an attempt not to provide leadership. Now, Sir, let me look at the amendment or let me refer to the amendment and to the resolution. The resolution, Mr. Speaker, and shall I say this has not been stressed by gentlemen on the other side, whether it has been done deliberately or not I leave to others to judge, but it has not been stressed. The only effect of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, would be to direct the government to bring in legislation to allow denturists to practice in this province. It would not

would not require a grandfather clause. I quite agree with the gentleman for St. Mary's and with the Minister of Highway's and the other honourable members who said that we should not have a grandfather clause in this legislation. I quite agree with that. There has been no suggestion of that. All the legislation would do is recognize the principle that there exists in this province a class of dental health workers called denturists or dental technologist or whatever one wishes.

The government in drafting the legislation would be required to set forth the standards. Whether it be a course at the Trade School or whether it be an examination or whether it be any type of means of measuring those standards or means of inculcating them, the government will be required to set it forth. There has been no suggestion, no suggestion at all that if this resolution were passed the denturists would be able to practice. Legislation would still have to be brought in.

All that the resolution does is put off once again the question of whether or not we should have in this province a new category of dental health workers. It puts it off, it puts it in the hands of a select committee. Now that is not a bad thing, Mr. Speaker, select committees can be very useful. I hope that all the honourable gentlemen who vote for this select committee, as I believe they will, judging from their speeches, I hope they will also vote for another select committee because select committees are a good thing. I think that if we are going to investigate denturists we should be willing to take another bite out of another rather unsavoury object. My colleague for Bell Island will be exposing some of its details.

The matter, one may say, should be referred to a select committee, a good thing. The matter has been studied to death in other provinces. It is not as if we are in a new area. It is not as if we are being asked to pioneer or to do something radical or different. Five other Canadian provinces have studied this, some of them have select committees. I know

Nova Scotia had, I do not know if they call it a select committee, but a committee of their House who sat for a year. Ontario, hardly a peanut province, hardly a bannana republic. Ontario have come to the conclusion there should be a category of dental health workers over and above dentists. But here in Newfoundland we are going to study it, as if we had some special expertees or we had some unique problems. Our problems are not unique, Sir, they are the same as elsewhere in Canada except that they are worse and that we have fewer dentists per capita.

So I was disappointed in the Minister of Health. If he were to leadership on this, he would have supported this resolution and not move the amendment. He would have said, let the government accept this principle, we shall now sit down to work, to try and work out the standards. But as it now stands the government are not taking the stand. They are not saying that they are against it. They are merely saying they are not for it. And they are saying, let it be studied.

Nova Scotia has brought in legislation "An Act Providing For the Licencing Of Denturists." It does not set the standard. That has to be worked out.

AN HON. MEMBER: No regulations.

MR. ROBERTS: No. I just finishing saying, no regulations. No regulations. Agreed.

But allowing the principle, and all this resolution that I move, Mr. Speaker, all it does is set forth the principle and it adds some subsidiary principles that the legislation set forth the professional standard to be attained and maintained by any persons practicing as a denturist. How could one object to that? It would be criminal if such standards were not set forth in legislation.

As the honourable the minister has just said; provide for a public board to supervise them. Hardly a new idea, Mr. Speaker. There must be twenty professional groups in this province governed by such boards in one form or another, all the way from the oldest of them, the Law Society

The two, I suppose, newest are the beauticians and the hairdressers. I suppose that is the most recent of these professional or quasi-professional groups. Then finally, the principle of denturists being allowed to practice on their own and not under the direct supervision of dentists.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then the honourable gentleman could have moved an amendment to drop that "Be It Further Resolved" clause. Instead of an amendment to remove, to end any possibility of any action in the foreseeable future because a select committee if it is appointed will meet at least for this session.

DR. ROWE: How can we be sure who is doing the practicing until we have the qualifications -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that is a good question, the denturists have not come into the open. I may add, I have had the only guy, I had Mr. Skakum came to see me one day.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No. But he did come to see me long before I brought this up, at the time of the raids. I had a telephone call from him today which was two seconds long. I now have a note of a conversation he had with one of my assistance and staff people a few minutes ago, and his wife, a very charming lady, has given me some papers.

But I have no brief for the denturists. I am not saying that they should be allowed to practice unless they can prove themselves. Indeed I am specifically saying in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, that there must be standards, and set by the government. If the minister wishes to withdraw the amendment, I will gladly give consent to it. I think his purpose, if it is as he just said, can be achieved by other means must more expeditiously. Let us legalize these people. Let us legalize the principle then we will say what standards must be maintained and what standards must be achieved, then we will have examinations and we will see

who can pass them.

But as it now stands, Mr. Speaker, if this amendment is accepted there will be no possibility of a denturist practicing in this province, I should say for at least one year, by the time a select committee is appointed, meets, considers evidence, brings in a report, it goes through the process of going to the government. The report will come to the House, will come to the government, legislation etc. etc. etc.

So I am against the amendment for that reason, I do not think it is a positive step. I think it is a retrograde step. It ducks the issue. I think the question has been studied across Canada, studied sufficiently and the weight of evidence, Mr. Speaker. If five provinces with far more than half of the people of Canada in them, Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, Ontario and Nova Scotia, if five provinces with far more than half of the people of Canada in them have seen fit to recognize this category of dental health-care people, then why should we not? Are we going to come up with a new principle here? Is there something unique in Newfoundland that requires us to have or not to have? Our history medically, Mr. Speaker, our history medically has been to allow people with lesser qualification because often we have no choice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I have no argument - I do not know why the minister keeps dragging it in. I do not know who they are. It does not matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: One accepts a principle. Then one says to them, let them come forward. If this resolution were passed and legislation were brought in, then it would be up to any individual who wishes to practice. Now they cannot come forth because the dentists will send the police on them. This is the reason I am given, be it correct or not I cannot say, but the reason I am given. Mr. Skakum comes to me second hand as I have said and says that the reason the denturists will not divulge their names is for

fear of reprisals by the R.C.M. Polica. On the evidence, Mr. Speaker, they have a reason for that fear. There have been raids. The dentists in their statement yesterday referred to raids. So it is a reasonable fear, because they are doing an illegal act. They certainly are. There is no doubt at all. So I do not blame them for not coming forward.

I would not come forward, if I were a denturist, and say I am doing something illegal and then know the Mounted Police would swoop in on me; and a dentist there like an avenging angel. I would be dragged into the courts, fined or whatever the penalties the courts would assume. Also, because some of the denturists are working for dentists now as a form of indentured labour, and I do not mean that as a pun.

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, does not represent a step forward, it is a step back. I think this House has enough evidence before it now

now, Sir, to decide in principle whether we should allow this category, this is all this Resolution does. Indeed, it does not even do that, it merely records the opinion of the House and directs the government to bring in some legislation. If we adopt the amendment all we end up with is another select committee, a good thing, a useful thing. I will be interested in seeing if the government like the idea of select committees. We will find that out a little later this afternoon, we will find it out. It will be most interesting, we will see how consistent they are. Another select committee, not into a new subject into one that has been exhaustively studied and on which provinces, most recently Nova Scotia, within the past months and year have recorded a verdict essentially the same as the one I am putting forward now, so I intend to vote against the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the debate in general. I can speak either to close the debate after the vote on the amendment is put. As I understand the rules, I have the right to speak to close the debate on the motion itself. If other honourable gentlemen wish to speak following, indeed, there may be other honourable gentlemen who wish to speak in the debate on the amendment. The minister is not eligible to speak he has spoken, but I for one would gladly consent if there is more he wishes to say on the amendment or, for that matter, on the main motion itself. I am sure my colleagues would agree with me on that.

I have spoken only at this stage to the amendment. There are a number of other points I want to make, I can make them either now or later. Maybe I should make them now and if there is nothing more to be said I will not need to speak again and we can pass on to other business.

MR SPEAKER: The honourable member may continue.

MR ROBERTS: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I shall and then if there are - I still have the right to close the debate later if I wish as I understand the rules.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not so.

MR. ROBERTS: Why not? When I am speaking on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, does not the mover of a motion have the right to close the debate on it?

MR. SPEAKER: There are certain points I want to make about the amendment at the time of putting the amendment.

MR. ROBERTS: That is fine, because I am speaking on the amendment now but I have only the right of any ordinary member to speak on the amendment, then I sit down and eventually we come to a vote and the amendment is disposed of one way or another - accepted or rejected whatever the Committee wishes. Then we go on the debate on the main motion again, as amended or not amended. Do I have the right to close that debate, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: In this procedure you are correct in a sense, but I want to withhold any ruling on the amendment until the time...

MR. ROBERTS: I will speak then with the understanding that in the debate on the main motion I have the right under the rules of the House (not anything new) the same as if an honourable gentleman opposite should move a motion, he has the right to close the debate on that motion. Your Honour inevitably says; "If the honourable member speaks now he closes." That is the end of the debate, it is standard procedure in this House and in all others.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sure it is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you speaking on the amendment now?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I am speaking on the amendment now, but let me deal with some of the other points that honourable gentlemen have made, speaking to the amendment.

I agree with the honourable gentleman from St. Mary's about no grandfather clause. It was a point well made and indeed it would be one that should be watched for very carefully in all legislation of this sort. We have had many groups in Newfoundland that have become incorporated under the terms of statutes of one sort or another and almost inevitably there have been grandfather clauses tucked in and well, let

me say simply without regard to the past that I do not think it should be done again.

The honourable gentleman from St. John's West and fluoridation - I agree wholeheartedly. I do not know if the government should require fluoridation. One can make an argument against it, it has never convinced me. The Government do not require public health measures in the sense of imposing them on the citizens, other than in cases of contagious diseases, venereal diseases, tuberculosis, cholera and that sort of thing. The Minister of Health has the legal power if a person will not get treatment to make him take treatment using the police if necessary.

One is not required to get immunization shots against diphtheria, whooping cough - they are not required. If a parent decides not to take her child or his child to a doctor, there is no way the law requires them to. Maybe if fluoridation is in that category - We are now at the stage in Newfoundland where the government will help financially an ongoing policy in the Health Department. It is unfortunate that more municipalities have not taken advantage of it. The thing must be done through municipalities because, of course, the water systems are municipal. The figure I remember is something like sixty or sixty-five percent of the people in Newfoundland now get their water from municipal water systems, so obviously, fluoridation applied that way would be a very good thing for our dental health.

It is an idea that is coming, Mr. Speaker, and before too much longer, five, ten, twenty years, I do not know, but all across Canada we will have fluoridated water supplies. The weight of expert opinion I think is not unanimous, the gentleman from St. John's West has predicted that a flood of letters will descend upon his head accusing him of being a "Communist Flunkie," I think were his words. I have had an occasional one come in accusing me of a plot to make people's minds soft by feeding them the poison of fluoridation. The honourable gentleman

is familiar with the arguments, if that can be called an argument, Nonetheless we should have fluoridation. That however does not take away from the matter under dispute now. Fluoridating water supplies will not help anybody, as I understand it, other than young children who are growing their second teeth. When does one get one's second teeth? At the age of six? Eight? Ten?

AN HON. MEMBER: Seven or eight.

MR. ROBERTS: Once one is sixteen or eighteen and one's edentation is complete, as complete as nature is going to make it, it is too late. Then one has what one has and one is stuck with it or not stuck with it, but that is it. It will not help anybody over that age and I believe fluoridation is accumulative - you have to start with young children and they work through.

If that is not an argument, the honourable gentleman putting forth the need for fluoridation is surely not an argument against it in any way, having another category of dental worker in this province.

A number of honourable gentlemen opposite have spoken with eloquence about the plight of dentists in the rural areas, and who have said that, and it is true, that dentists in rural areas rely upon the making of dentures for a considerable part of their income at present. They have then taken that fact and twisted it beyond any distortion to support the argument that somehow this means we should protect dentists. Well, Mr. Speaker, dentists are highly skilled and highly trained and highly motivated people. They should be encouraged to do what they are best qualified to do and what nobody else can do. If anybody else, another category of health worker, of dental health worker can do some of the work now being done by dentists and do it just as well, then surely, we should encourage the use of the less skilled, less highly trained people to do the work such as dentures. That is the way to help, as the honourable gentleman from Hermitage said, not to have a dentist making dentures, that is the same as having a highly trained heart surgeon cutting

out hangnails. One uses the man for what he is trained for, the highest level of training he has achieved, then one gets the paramedicals the parodontals or whatever the phrase is to do the work for which they are trained.

That is the whole point in the trend of modern medicine. We could go on about nurse practitioners and all of those things the principle is sound. All the arguments by honourable gentlemen opposite missed the point completely, they missed it completely. To say that because dentists now rely upon dentures, or the income from dentures for part of their income and that therefore we should not, must not allow denturists to practice and thus take away that income is completely to go against what we should be doing in dental health practice in this province.

I would by far rather see us go the other way, Let us subsidize the dentists. Let us use public funds or additional public funds, because they are now subsidized to an extent, let us use public funds to subsidize them further and let them have their full time to do the work which only the dentists can do, down in McCallum or down in the other communities in Hermitage District. That is what they should be doing, not doing work that less skilled people can do.

The argument, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable gentleman from Placentia West put forth, the Minister Designate of Mines and Energy and

Mr. Roberts.

the Minister of Justice put it forth with his usual sincere eloquence and a number of other gentleman did. That argument if anything is an argument in favour of this resolution and against the amendment. It is an argument in favour of using the denturists for what they can do and leaving the dentistry for the work that only dentists can do. If the Minister of Health does not deal with that principle, I shall be sorely confounded because the whole basis of modern health, as I understand it, is to use the auxiliary people where they can be used, to allow nurses to do many of the functions which doctors traditionally have done. It is the only way we can use our scarce dental manpower. If there are going to be subsidies, Mr. Speaker, let them come from the public first, from the treasury, from all the people and not just from the people who pay for dentures.

The hon. gentleman from Trinity North pointed out - it is in the newspapers, Dr. Bowden, a spokesman for the dentists said so yesterday, that the price of dentures have come down or was going to come down. When one reads the dental statement, I will come back to it. It has not come down. It is not a very effective thing. I fear it may be a cheap, second-class "P.R." gesture because there are no guarantees or no nothings built in. I will come back to it. We have no guarantee that at the moment this matter is now disposed of, the dentists will not just jack up their prices or these store-front clinics will not close.

The situation we now have in rural areas is that people are being required to subsidize the dentists by paying these high prices for dentures. If the dentists need that income to continue, then let the state supply it and let the state in return say, "Fine, we will expand the children's dental care service." The dentists have recommended it.

Mr. Roberts.

The officials in the Department of Health are enthusiastic about it, I am sure the minister is. The arguments, Mr. Speaker, are crazy. They are all wrong. The facts, Sir, are correct. The arguments are twisted and distorted beyond safe. The arguments do not support and do not prove the points that they are being led to support and led to produce. I am all for subsidizing dentists. I think one of the great steps forward that could be taken is that if the Minister of Health, when he brings in his estimates, has a provision for mobile dental clinics. For a measure of this sort I would be the first to say, Hosanna! I never managed to get it done. The minister may or may not succeed. There are immense practical difficulties, immense practical difficulties. If he succeeds, more power to him. But let the dentists do what they are supposed to do and let us use public funds for it, Why not? We use public funds for medical care. We use public funds for hospital care. We use public funds for school health nurses, public health nurses. Why should we not use more money for dentists?

Mr. Speaker, let me just say one thing in closing, at least closing for this portion of the debate. The dentists yesterday issued a statement. It has been extensively and, as far as I know, accurately reported in the press, both the radio and television and the newspapers. It is the most positive thing I have seen from the Dental Association in a number of years. I take it that the minister is agreeing with me. Yes, the minister has read it, well so he should. I find it most amusing that the dentists suddenly after all these years discovered some concern, after the House gets at it, after members on both sides begin

going into the problem. We will let the people of Newfoundland judge that for themselves. The thing that concerns me and I would ask the minister, at some point, to deal with this. The dentists say; (I am reading from page three of their statement, final paragraph on that page) "In order to immediately provide an expanded denture service at a reduced cost, the Newfoundland Dental Association has approved the establishment of a store-front type, low-cost denture clinic, at first in St. John's and Corner Brook and later in other centres. The association is also investigating the feasibility of delivering low-cost denture services, via one or more mobile clinics to isolated, rural areas." That is a good thought. It goes on in the next page; "these clinics will provide upper and lower standard dentures at a fee of from \$60 to \$70 each as opposed to the \$100 which apparently is the minimum charge that dentists charged under the N.D.A. fee schedules."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know (the dentists very carefully do not say this) who is to operate these? Are dentists to volunteer to give up their time to go down to the store-front clinics and make them? Are they going to be dental technicians? Who is going to operate them? Who is going to pay for them? Who will make any profits if there are profits? What guarantee have we that these will last? What guarantee have we that we will not in six months be faced with the situation where we are right back where we started, the store-front clinics closed? I find it very interesting that this profession - I have nothing against the dentists and in fact up until recently I have had good relations with them and I hope to have it again. But after years of this sort of treatment, they suddenly find the conscience, suddenly they open low-cost store-front type denture clinics. Suddenly, they offered subsidization by the dental profession. (I am quoting on page four now) Now who are they trying to kid? Who are they trying to kid? What are they up to?

Mr. Roberts.

Just what is this store-front clinic? Is it for real? Is it just something to take the heat off? The hon. gentleman from Bonavista South has put the heat on and properly so. He is concerned with this problem and other honourable members are, because a motion has come before the Chamber and been debated. Who are they trying to kid? Is this a genuine effort? I hope it is. Maybe it is. It is certainly a conversion worthy of Saul on the road up to Damascus, seeing the blinding light and becoming Paul.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, Saul of Tarsus, he was going to Damascus. The only Saul I know of who was converted was Saul of Tarsus. The honourable gentleman has been through some blinding conversions himself.

MR. ROWE: Depending on how the wind is blowing.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, yes, unfortunately you are right. The dentists of this province have raised some serious questions about themselves by this action. If this is done now, why was it not done last year or the year before? Is it being done only because there is some public pressure on them now, because people are beginning to ask questions? How do we know that this is the minimum they can get away with it? How do we know that denturists would not do less? Then the Minister of Fisheries says that we cannot set prices, Why not? I think we probably have the constitutional power to do it in this House. We set fish prices in this province. Why can we not set the price of dentures? The government of this province effectively set the price of medical services by the fee schedule and the agreement to pay.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who set the fish prices?

MR. ROBERTS: Well the Tory Party was going to set them for fresh fish, but the Government of Canada, through the Salt Fish Corporation, set them for salt fish. The honourable gentleman has forgotten the promise to subsidize? We will be reminding him.

AN HON. MEMBER: They give a minimum -

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is the same as setting a price, is it not? The N.D.A. to use the word, are using minimums, setting minimums. This offer is hardly a handsome one. It is a step forward. The dentists were forced into it. I wonder how genuine they are. I think probably the dentists feel that some action had to be taken. I think perhaps they should explain it. I hold no brief for the denturists at all, none at all. If the minister sets standards and the denturists cannot meet them, then they fall by the wayside with never a word from me. The standards would have to be the reasonable Canadian standards. I do not want to see this province become the happy hunting ground for every misfit - I have no idea if the present people are qualified or not - I do not want to see this province become a place for, if you cannot hack it in Ontario or Nova Scotia, you come to practice denturism or to practice medicine or to practice anything. The Dental Association, it is not quite as generous. The King of Troy, Priam, was told to be aware of Greeks bearing gifts. He did not. He was not aware of them and they killed him and Troy was destroyed. Troy stayed destroyed and was lost for 800, 900, 1,000 or 2,000 years. Is this a Trojan Horse, this store-front clinic problem? What guarantee have we? What guarantee have we that they will even be open? The dentists in Ontario are backing off pretty quickly. They were forced into this by the Government of Ontario. I believe the legislation in Ontario has a requirement written in it that the government control those prices or influence them. Here all we have is a voluntary plan. I think the dentists owe us more of an explanation. The minister may have some information that I do not have. I hope so. I do not put my remarks forward to attack or anger the dentists. What I am interested in is this offer.

It is passing strange that it has come up now - passing strange. I do not think it is adequate. In any event even if it is adequate what

Mr. Roberts

guarantee do we have that it will last? Why should the dentists subsidize clinics all of a sudden? Are the lawyers going to subsidize - lawyers donate their services free, under legal-aid or have. Shortly there will be a legal-aid programme. It will be get rich quick for all the lawyers. It is a good thing, more money for them. The lawyers donate their services under the existing legal-aid scheme, the one administered by the gentleman from Placentia East. Even that, the government make a subsidy to cover the cost of the office and the typewriters - I think it is \$25,000 a year now. Are the government going to be asked to do anything to

MR. ROBERTS: put it in here. It is an offer that would - the whole offer by the Dental Association, it comes in suspicious circumstances and when one looks into it, it is not quite as concrete or definite as the dentists would have one believe, judging from their public statements.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone on it a little longer maybe than I intended to. I think I have dealt with the points brought up on the other side. If we proceed immediately to the amendment and as Your Honour rules upon it, and we vote upon it, I propose to have nothing further to say in the main debate unless some other honourable gentleman makes some points that I think should be dealt with, in which case I shall try to deal with them.

I do think the debate has been a useful one. I do hope the minister will reconsider this matter and will agree to accept in principle the idea that we can have a category of dental health workers called denturists. Voting for the resolution, Mr. Speaker, without the amendment, will not legalize any person now practicing in this province, All it will do is require the government to bring in legislation to set the standards by which people can get into it. All it will do is accept in principle the idea of a category of dental health workers called denturists. Voting for the amendment, as I shall not, voting for the amendment will postpone the question, it will require further study of it, further study of the matter which has already been studied exhaustively in other provinces, a matter which other provinces after studying it have come to the conclusion that there should be the same category of denturists which is suggested in the main motion. So I shall oppose the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I hope it does not pass. I believe it should not pass. I believe it is a step back. If it does pass, I shall vote for the resolution as amended, not happily but as by far the better choice than just ignoring it, which after all is what the government have

done until the matter was raised here on Wednesday last. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Well first I would like to say that realizing honourable members sometimes do not have the opportunity to present amendments to either me or the table, before being presented, I would request in the future, if it is at all possible, that such amendments be presented either to myself or to the Clerk so that we could take a look at the amendment from a procedure viewpoint.

This amendment in particular has caused quite a bit of concern from a procedure viewpoint and I am having in essence to make a ruling on it, as such.

I will accept this, under Standing Order 36, Section (B), in which I have to accept the amendment, deleting the words following "be it further resolved" and inserting the amendment "that a select committee of this hon. House be appointed to enquire into and hear evidence on all matters touching upon the work of dental technologists sometimes referred to as denturists and to enquire into all matters pertaining to the practice of dental technology and to report to this House." From Beauchesne, Section 201, page 168.

I will now put the amendment as such. Those in favour of the amendment "aye", those against the amendment "nay", in my opinion the "aye's" have it.

Now before any of the honourable members speak, I would like to refer to section 201 which says, "the object of an amendment may be to reflect such an alteration in a question as would obtain the support of those who, without such alteration, must either go against it or abstain from voting thereon or to present to the House an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question. This question may be effected by moving to omit all the words of the question after the first word 'that' and to substitute in their place other words of a different import.

In that case, the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment but includes the motives of the amendment and of the motion, both matters being under the consideration of the House as alternative propositions."

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the resolution as amended be adopted.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to put him on the spot.

DR. ROWE: This is exactly where we read you now. You have taken the amendment and you have done something with it. Now we are voting on the resolution as amended. I would like to see exactly what I am going to vote on before I speak on it. I am not quite sure where this now fits into the resolution. I want to be clear in my mind before I say what we are -

MR. SPEAKER: What the honourable member is voting on now is exactly what he has proposed himself because this section (201) of Beauchesne negates everything else. So there is no debate on the main resolution. I have put the resolution as such but what the honourable member is voting on is his previous own amendment.

It is moved and seconded that the resolution as amended be adopted, those in favour "aye," those against "nay," carried.

Motion (6).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the honourable Premier is back in his seat this afternoon so that he may hear what I have to say in introducing this resolution. As the whole world knows now, via press and radio and the honourable Premier was up addressing the Albany Club and I might say, just by way of information for honourable members of the House, that the gentleman I will be referring to a number of times in introducing this resolution this afternoon, one Mr. George McLean is an active member of the Albany Club as well as the province's fiscal

MR. NEARY: agents, Burns Brothers and Denton.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the main part of my remarks, I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members of the House to the brochure that is passed out to visitors to the gallery. I am not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, whether this brochure has been prepared by NACOM, one of George McLean's subsidiaries or not. I would like to point out to honourable members, Sir, that the picture of Confederation Building is reversed. I did not know this, I was studying the brochure rather carefully the other day and I felt there was something wrong with the picture of Confederation Building, so I asked my honourable colleague here from Bonavista North, who is a draftsman and a surveyor, if he would tell me what is wrong with the picture and he told me that the Confederation Building is just the reverse of the way it should be in the photograph. So, as I say, I am not sure if NACOM prepared that brochure or not, but if they did, Mr. Speaker, and the honourable Speaker is nodding in the negative, so I take the honourable Speaker's word that they did not prepare this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, most of us have read the book or seen the movie "The Carpetbaggers," the story of the hoard of parasitical yankee peddlers and con men who descended upon the hapless Southern States immediately on the heels of their defeat in the American Civil War. Well, Sir, less than a year ago, I suppose a revolution of sort took place in this province and on its heels we have the same phenomenal, Sir, the influxing of carpetbaggers all set to exploit the potential here in our province.

Among the most notorious, Mr. Speaker, and the most blatant, and the most obvious of these seems or appears to be the local subsidiary of the Toronto-based George McLean Public Relations Firm, NACOM. Incidentally, Sir, I checked with the Registry of Companies and I find that NACOM is not registered in this province and I have been told, Sir,

MR. NEARY: that NACOM derives its name from a condensation of Nutbeem and Company. Undoubtedly, Sir - and everybody knows who Mr. Nutbeem is - undoubtedly, Sir, as a tribute to the honourable the Premier and his in-laws but I hope that if this is so, and the Premier will be able to confirm or deny that this afternoon, I hope that if it is so, Sir, that there will not be any conflict of interest involved here. I have also heard that NACOM stands for North American Communications but I have been unable to establish this fact, Sir, because the company is not registered. Obviously the company has something to hide or it would be registered. I am quite sure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since the McLean Organization appears to be the most notorious of the carnethagging outfits, preying upon our economy, using its close connection with the Torv party to bludgeon business out of government departments, out of industry depending upon government support and even out of local advertisers to support its third rate publications invoiced at first rate prices, I therefore, Sir, felt that it was necessary to propose a resolution to clear up this matter once and for all.

Sir, I would like to show honourable members of this House the kind of third rate publication of which I speak. Here is a tourist booklet published by Mr. McLean in 1972. Members of the government have denied any connection with this booklet, Sir. The honourable Minister of Finance denied in the House when I suggested that he had given Mr. McLean a letter approving the publication. The honourable minister denied it and perhaps when he is speaking in this debate, and I am sure he will speak in this debate, Mr. Speaker, old honest John himself will want to get up and defend the government's position on this. In actual fact, Sir, he did give Mr. McLean a letter which Mr. McLean brought along this province, waved it under the noses of potential advertisers and got a lot of the advertising that is in this booklet, Sir, through a letter given to him by the Minister of Finance approving of this publication. The inference being, Mr. Speaker, that the government and the minister were right behind this.

It is a third rate publication, Sir. The cover is a glossy paper. The inside is a common, ordinary paper that you can hardly read, Sir, and a message from the Premier right on the inside, a lovely picture of the Premier. He is not showing his teeth in this one, not advertising for toothpaste, becoming an order of the Colgate Kid, but not in this picture, Sir.

He says: "It gives me great pleasure to welcome the many thousands of visitors who chose this unique province for their holiday..."

Nice little message written no doubt about friend George, by friend George. Then right on the next page, Sir, we have a picture for everybody to see, the honourable Minister of Economic Development at the time, now the Minister of Public Works. Not a bad picture taken probably twenty years ago now, the honourable minister still has a fair amount of hair on his head. I would say, Sir, that it was taken in the last election that he ran for for the Liberal Party. That is when the picture was taken.

There it is, Sir. No connection, government knows nothing at all about it. The Minister of Tourism told us, no, it is the McLean Enterprise. We know nothing at all about it.

But, Sir, do you know and do honourable members on that side of the House know, the hon. Minister of Fisheries knows, the hon. Minister of Finance knows that these two pictures, Sir, were invoiced at the rate of \$500, each. \$500, each. That was the invoice that came to the Minister of Finance. Oh, Mr. Speaker! It did. \$500 to get that picture put in and \$500 to get the Minister of Public Work, his picture in the publication. The invoice was sent in, Sir, and payment was refused by an official of the Department of Economic Development. It was rejected, thrown out. I do not know if it was ever paid but Mr. McLean is alleged to have made the statement. "Well forget about it, we will get it back some other way."

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, there was a hundred thousand copies of this booklet published. Fortunately, eighty thousand copies found their way to Robin Hood Bay. Under cover of darkness, Sir, eighty thousand copies of this were taken down to Robin Hood Bay and dumped down in the city dump that we heard so much about here yesterday from the honourable member for St. John's North. It is a good thing, Sir, that this was not sent out across Canada and the United States. What

an insult to Newfoundland. A third rate publication supported by that administration

Mr. Speaker, talking about the honourable member for St. John's North, this province, Sir, in my opinion owes the cast-off minister a debt of gratitude for blowing the whistle on the George McLean scandal. The only way the Premier and members of his cabinet can clear themselves of appearances of conflict of interest in this case is to agree to set up this select committee, Sir, to investigate and report on the whole matter of spending public monies with this firm.

Sir, if there is an outfit in Newfoundland today that needs the R.C.M.P. to seize its books, it is undoubtedly the carnetbagging George McLean. Newfoundlanders who have gotten in touch with me from all over this province, Sir, are shocked at what is going on between the government and Mr. McLean and NACOM. Newfoundlanders, Sir, taxpayers are shocked to know that a hundred and sixteen thousand and fifty six dollars and ninety-seven cents was paid out of the public treasury in the period ending June 30th, 1972 to George McLean's public relations. No reason for it, Mr. Speaker, other than to advance him the money so he could set up a company in Newfoundland. A barefaced attempt, Mr. Speaker, for the administration to pay off election campaign expenses out of provincial funds. Why was this money paid out.

Mr. Speaker, when only we were told a couple of weeks prior to this by the hon. the Premier right here in this hon. House, Sir, that no contract, "no contracts," he said, "would be given to Mr. McLean or any of his subsidiaries unless public tender was called." Up to that time, up to the time that the Premier made that statement in this hon. House, "No work," he said, "has been done for the government by the McLean Organization." The Minister of Finance is going out of the House now. Sir. He is going down to see if my figures are correct. Oh, they are correct. The hon. minister will come back and tell us that there was money advanced to Mr. McLean.

MR. CROSBIE: If they are, it is the first time you have been correct.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, June 29, 1972, and I am going to quote from Hansard, Sir. We were dealing with the estimates of the Department of Fisheries. The hon. Premier will remember it and the hon. Minister of Fisheries will probably remember it. We were getting near the end of the minister's estimates and I rose in my place in this House, Sir, and I put a very innocent question to the Minister of Fisheries. I said, "Mr. Chairman, before you take your seat, I wonder if you could inform the committee if McLean's Advertising, McLean's Public Relations or McLean's Associates or whatever they are called, are they doing any work for the Department of Fisheries or the fish industry?" In Hansard they do not say Mr. Minister, they say Mr. Cheeseman so, Mr. Speaker, I hope I will be forgiven for using names. Mr. Cheeseman(minister) answered, "There are no existing contracts in the Department of Fisheries and I cannot see any involvement. I cannot see any involvement," the minister said. "I cannot answer that one specifically. I cannot see any connection that it would have with Burgeo but to my knowledge, no." The Minister of Fisheries says no contracts and he can foresee no involvement.

Well, Sir, the Auditor General's Report to the House of Assembly for the financial year which ended March 31, 1972 says that

under subhead 1412(05)(06) - Public Information Service \$43,000. It does not state whether it is McLeans or not. I want the minister to tell us when he speaks in this debate, and the hon. Premier is sitting there with a prepared speech, prepared a month ago, five weeks ago, by Mr. McLean, and he is rearing to go. He wants to get up and read it. Well, Sir, he will just have to wait for a few minutes until I make my case. If I do not accomplish anything else in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I will get the hon. the Premier to make a major speech in this House. The approved estimates for 1971-1972 made no provision for expenditure charged to this subhead. Since the expenditure was not provided for by the legislature nor by special warrant issues from the Consolidated Revenue Fund on account of such expenditures were in my opinion in contravention of section 38(3) of the Revenue and Audit Act. I hope the hon. Minister of Finance is listening to that. He was always so hepped up that we follow the recommendations laid down by the Auditor General. He was always so sensitive about it, so touchy.

\$43,000 and I would suggest, Sir, that is only for the year ending March 31, 1972, Mr. Speaker. We are not even into the new fiscal year yet, three months. Sir, I would suggest to this hon. House that one of the first requests that the hon. Premier had after he formed the administration of this province and took over from the liberals on January 18, 1972, one of the first requests in writing and I would ask the Premier, if he is going to get up and counter what I am saying this afternoon, that he produce any correspondence that he may have in his possession to back it up. On January 29, Sir, Mr. McLean got off a letter to the Premier, got him off a letter asking for contracts, asking for work. He was desperate, he was hungry, in financial trouble. Eleven days after the Premier formed the administration, January 28, he is begging for work. But the Minister of Fisheries says no, we did not give

him anything and we do not think we are going to be involved. Sir, we will find out when the estimates come up this year how deeply the Minister of Fisheries got involved.

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker. Just listen to this. Quoting from Hansard again, a verbatim report of the House of Assembly. This is a statement by the hon. the Premier. It says here, Mr. Moores. Regarding the McLean involvement, he said, "Certainly there is nothing in my department that he has been involved in. Any particular project that comes up in any department that his services apply to he is eligible to bid on it as others will be." The Premier's own words, exact words, Mr. Speaker. "There is nothing restrictive," he says, "about the individual himself. The reason why he is not listed as a heading, a very large heading, the reason he is not is any more than Sanitary Products is not." Whatever that has to do with it. Mr. Speaker. "I mean," he says, "this is just no place to put a function. The suggestion that was mentioned that he was receiving \$8,000 a week is totally incorrect," the Premier says. The Premier's own words. Sir. "He is not a paid adviser. He has no input." He has no input, Mr. Speaker, he has no input. Do the hon. members of this House know the Premier says he has no input in the Premier's office? Do hon. members of this House know that the tentacles. Mr. McLean's tentacles have reached right into this House and that the Throne Speech that was read at the commencement of this session was in large measure written by Mr. McLean's outfit? Do ministers and members of the government side of the House realize that, that they were sitting there listening to a document written by Mr. McLean's people, employees? They knew all about the Throne Speech before members of the House, before the ministers knew about it.

Sir, go down and look at the security book downstairs for Sunday afternoon before the House opened, I do not remember the exact date,

and you will see a Mr. Ed. Coady of McLean's signed the security book on Sunday afternoon for the eighth floor, the same day, Mr. Speaker, on which radio reported that the Premier had spent some time in his office drafting the speech.

Mr. Speaker, let me give the hon. members of the House a few vital statistics about Mr. McLean and I am not talking about his size.

MR. ROWE (W.N.): You would not have time enough.

MR. NEARY: That would take the rest of the afternoon and the Premier would not get a chance to make that great speech that he has there, prepared by Mr. McLean five weeks ago.

I asked the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, if he would get certain information on the McLean Organization for me from Toronto and the Leader of the Opposition got the information for me and I now pass it on to hon. members of the House to show them what they are dealing with. Mr. Speaker, listen to this.

The company is in peculiar financial problems. They do not seem to have credit anywhere. Much of their revenue comes from film contracts out of various Newfoundland departments, tourism, highways, fisheries. The Minister of Fisheries says, "no involvement in his department." He has set up an audio visual company NACOM Limited, hired a film editor and purchased equipment. 'Have no idea where the money came from', our informant in Toronto says. Well, Sir, I just told the House where the money came from, in advances, given back, given to Mr. McLean for the period ending June 30, 1972.

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker, the company is in constant difficulty with civil service in Newfoundland. It is becoming a political issue on the island. I will say it is, Sir. Most of the activities of the company are now centered in Newfoundland, where McLean has set up a permanent office. He, himself, spends most of his time in Newfoundland. Apparently a very large turnover in his staff, only one employee has been there over one year in both offices. The Toronto office have seven employees including himself, two accountant executives, two secretaries, one audio-tape man, one photographer. The Toronto office accounts are basically Canada Packers, Burns Brothers in Denton - Burns Brothers in Denton, Mr. Speaker, the fiscal agents for the government and the ROM. Board of Trustees.

There is a very interesting statement made in this report, Sir; "the company is constantly in difficulty with civil service." Well, Sir, that is a true statement. I have a number of witnesses, Sir, I will not reveal their names at this moment but I have a number of witnesses, a number of people who have given me information on McLean that are prepared to come before a select committee of this House and tell the members of the House and the people of Newfoundland precisely what they have to contend with from this carpetbagger from Ontario. They are prepared to do it, Sir. They will volunteer. But they are not going to identify

themselves unless they have the protection of the House of Assembly.

Officials down in the Minister of Fisheries Department, Sir, have been badgered and browbeaten to get money, to pay the bills to McLean. They send in a bill one day and the next day are encamped outside the doors of the officials, waiting for their cheque. At one stage, Sir, I am told that the Minister of Fisheries had to intervene and kick him out of his office, get him off the floor. Did not want him around. Undesirables. The Minister of Fisheries says, "no involvement" when we asked him about Mr. McLean.

There are a number of other people, Sir, who are not civil servants, who are independent men, honest Newfoundlanders who cannot stomach this, sort of going down, who are prepared to come before a select committee and give evidence under oath and bring documents, if necessary, to tell all about this McLean mess.

Sir, apart from the names of the firms mentioned our report from Toronto, Burns Brothers in Denton, and the honourable Minister of Finance told us a year ago, almost a year ago, "no need to change the fiscal agencies, he said, they are doing a good job. The ones we have are doing a good job for us." About ten days later the honourable the Premier announced that we were going to change our fiscal agents and then we discovered that Mr. McLean was the PR Firm engaged by Burns Brothers in Denton.

Sir, the proponents of conflict of interest must be having nightmares. Apart from these firms, Sir, we are told in an article in the "Evening Telegram", Saturday, February 3, 1973 "McLeans" - and I am quoting, Sir, "McLeans Empire also extends to the world of industry and business. He handles public relations for Shaheen natural resources of New York - worldwide though not in Newfoundland. Besides the Electric Reduction of Canada Limited public relations in Newfoundland McLean was hired recently to take care of public relations for National Sea Products Limited operations in the province. National Sea Products interests in Newfoundland include the operation of a fish plant in St. John's, as well as a fleet of six

trawlers." In addition, Mr. Speaker, McLean Public Relations looks after Labrador Linerboard Limited, a crown corporation in Stephenville and in Goose Bay."

Then also mentioned in the same article, Sir, is a matter that I referred to earlier in my remarks "The former Education Minister John Carter claimed he was dumped from the cabinet for opposing political patronage." If he was, Sir, I hope he has the decency and the honesty and the courage of his convictions to stand on the floor of this House in this debate and say whether this is so. He said, "he was dumped from the cabinet for opposing political patronage," especially, Mr. Speaker, "awarding of \$4000 contract to McLean for work," Mr. Carter said, "could have been done for \$500". What a revelation for a former cabinet minister to make. Sir! What a reflection on this crowd of millionaires who went around this province telling us what we needed was honesty in government.

Well, Sir, I hope the honourable former minister will be able to take his place in this House and elaborate on that statement. The honourable member did not deny the statement. Follow it up. I saw the honourable member on television. I was rather taken by surprise, Sir, taken by surprise. Whatever you say about the honourable gentleman's politics, I think he is an honest man. He did not have the stomach like all other Newfoundlanders, we have pretty strong stomachs in this province, Sir, but he could not take it any longer. I saw the honourable member on television. I heard what he said on radio. I know, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is too much of a Tory to come over across the House and sit with the Liberals. I realize that, Sir, too much of a Tory.

AN HON. MEMBER: He just does not want to.

MR. NEARY: He would rather sit over there and squirm and twist and turn, Sir. Well that is his prerogative. He can stay over there. He can stay there, Sir, as long as he wants. He can bore from within. He can challenge

the Premier.

MR. ROBERTS: He can bore anyway at all.

MR. NEARY: He can challenge the Premier's leadership of the party. That is his prerogative. That maybe his way of hitting back, getting back. I hope he accomplishes what he sets out to do but I want the honourable member to stand in this House and elaborate on that statement. That is a pretty serious matter, Mr. Speaker.

The honourable Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the present Minister of Industrial Development, he is not in his seat right now, Sir, had a big campaign over the issuing of licences for hunting last year. Remember it. Does everybody remember it? A big to-do down

in the lobby of Confederation Building pictures and all. a new system for issuing hunting licences. The government are proud of it, an improvement over what the old administration did. But, Sir, do you know who paid for that? The taxpayers of this province paid for it. Mr. McLean was hired by that department to create the image and to pump out the propaganda over a little matter, a little matter, Sir, like issuing hunting licences.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, while Mr. McLean was hired and paid to do this job, that there was a gentleman down in that department who was an experienced journalist hired to do the same job, pushed in the background? Does the honourable Premier want me to name names? Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but putting out page after page, I think it was in one day that fourteen pages of propaganda went out from Mr. McLean on the hunting licences alone. They were thrown in the garbage. Then the honourable members on the other side criticize the former administration about the 'Newfoundland Bulletin.'

Wait until we get the total cost of McLean's in this province for the end of this fiscal year, Sir, just wait until we get it, it will make the 'Newfoundland Bulletin' look like peanuts.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to know is, what precedent is there anywhere in Canada or in North America for placing such large amounts of money in the hands of an outfit whose chief aim appears to be to live off the avails of political patronage into the McLean organization.

How much of this amount, Mr. Speaker, that was advanced to Mr. McLean (and the Minister of Finance can tell us about this) how much of that amount of \$116,000 was repaid to the government? What interest was charged Mr. McLean if any? If it has not been repaid it should have been repaid. What about all these film strips we are now hearing about? Glad to see the Minister of Tourism is in his seat today, Sir, just back off his jaunt to Boston, Philadelphia, Montreal, Toronto, New York. He missed Halifax because the honourable member had

to be in the House the day the showing went on in Halifax of "Come and Paint and Photograph Us." Come and paint and photograph us, Mr. Speaker, what a joke, Sir, what a joke! Come and paint and photograph all the mothers of this province who had to do without the mothers' allowance this year. I would like for the honourable Premier to paint one of their faces and see the expression of disappointment. They will have no problem, Sir, in this province to get somebody to paint or somebody to photograph. We have the highest rate of unemployment in Canada, you can go anywhere in the province and you can get somebody to photograph and paint, Sir.

"Come and Paint and Photograph us." Imagine, Mr. Speaker, and the honourable Minister of Tourism and his famous Newfoundland cocktail party, have now taken to the road with that film. I guarantee you, Sir, when it is shown in all these places - and you know, Mr. Speaker, you would think the honourable minister would be ashamed to announce their whereabouts, but no, his deputy minister calls back from Halifax and says: "We are over here in Halifax now, we had a good crowd today." Halifax, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Toronto and Montreal. I guarantee you, Sir, that film will be shown to well lubricated audiences. I would like to find out how much it is going to cost the taxpayers of this province to have that film shown in all these places and how much it will cost to pay the bills of the McLean's representatives that are accompanying the deputy minister and the minister, what production costs Mr. McLean is getting from this film and how much it is costing for booze?

A gin sipping government, gin sipping, they think they can solve the problems of Newfoundland by going off and showing a film, "Come and Paint and Photograph Us," with a glass of gin in their hand, and all the problems of Newfoundland are solved, the tourists are going to start flocking to Newfoundland. I would like to know, Sir, and the honourable Minister of Tourism has not explained this yet,

how are they going to get across the gulf, there is a bottleneck there already?

MR. ROBERTS: George will get a boat.

AN HON. MEMBER: Thanks to the Minister of Transport in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: I understand from the Minister of Transport that we are going to get another boat now, which is a good thing. 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.

AN HON. MEMBER: Delighted.

MR. EVANS: It will not be like "Come Home Year" when they all left Newfoundland.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not enough that the honourable gentleman is still here.

MR. NEARY: So there it is, film strips. How much, Mr. Speaker, how much has the film which was done for the fisheries cost the taxpayers of this province? How much, Mr. Speaker? I ask the honourable minister to tell this House how much that film is costing the taxpayers of this province. I would hazard a guess, Sir, that it cost nothing under sixty thousand dollars, sixty thousand dollars, Sir, for a haphazard job, for a low quality job.

Incidentally, getting back to "Come and Paint and Photograph us," I understand, Sir, that that film was put together without a script. A photographer was hired to go around, shoot the film and then it was taken into Toronto, dumped on a desk in Toronto and said; "here, take this and do something with it." When it came back to the Director of Tourist Development, it was in battered cans. The cans were second hand picked up somewhere as scrap by this McLean outfit. The reels were not fit to use and that is a fact, Sir, and the Director of Tourist Development

refused to take delivery of the films, "Send it back to them," They did not want it in the first place, but if it was going to be foisted on them, Sir, it may as well be a half decent job. So said the Director of Tourist Development, "take it back."

In addition to the cost of shooting the film, Sir, the production costs done in a haphazard way, another firm in Toronto had to be paid to put the script to the film, put words to it. Then we had Sir Christopher Pratt narrate the film. I do not know whether he got paid for that or not, Sir. the honourable Premier might be able to tell us whether he got thirty dollars and hour for narrating that film. If he did, Sir, he was grossly overpaid, because his voice is not at all suited for that sort of thing no more than mine is suited for this microphone here, I have a raspy voice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You are not doing badly. You are doing wonderfully.

MR. NEARY: Then, Sir, the greatest revelation of all and I do not know if this was the purpose for making the film or not, it certainly will not get any tourists to Newfoundland, we come to the dying minutes of the film and we see the real purpose of making the film, the real purpose and that is going to be shown all over North America I suppose, at one time or another

Mr. Neary:

The last reports we had from New York, everything is booked solid and everybody wants to come to Newfoundland to paint and photograph the unemployed and the mothers of this province who did not get any financial help this year to fit out their children going to school. What a joke. Sir. What a joke. Why any member of this House who has photography for a hobby, any member who knows anything at all about photography could go out and take the slide projections that the hon. Minister of Education, the member for St. John's North when he was the minister told us that any photographer could go out and do it for \$25.00, \$50.00 at the most. I will double him, \$50.00 at the most. I have often made a slide presentation myself, Sir.

Then the hon. member for St. John's North, well I would take this, Sir, as a gross insult. Mr. McLean comes back and says, "You know why the hon. member for St. John's North was dirty with us. You know why he mentioned us, because he could not get his picture in all these slides." I do not believe that, Mr. Speaker. I know the hon. member is egoistical and I know members on that side are arrogant and a member is very photographic but I do not believe, Sir, that he insisted on having his "physiog" in everyone of these pictures. I do not think he did. One slide presentation, \$4,000. It could have been done for \$25.00 by any amateur photographer.

I made reference to this scruffy looking tourist booklet. I am looking at the Auditor General's Report in it, Sir. The hon. Minister of Finance might agree that that is kind of a scruffy document too, Sir, but it is a necessary document, if I can find it. As I said previously, Sir, 80,000 copies of this were dumped in Robin Hood Bay and fortunately for the people of this province they were dumped. Any tourist who picked this up on the mainland and looked at it, it would turn his stomach and he would say, "I am not going down there if that is the best they can do." Now we hear, Mr. Speaker, that

Mr. McLean is now getting another publication out on industrial development in Newfoundland. This is the one that prompted the Minister of Tourism to make the statement that he did not know anything about it, it had nothing to do with the government. "It was a McLean Enterprise," he said.

Well, Sir, we have agents of Mr. McLean going around St. John's trying to browbeat advertisers into buying the \$250.00 or \$500.00 advertisement in this publication on industrial development. Two weeks ago, Sir, I had a call personally from one of the biggest corporations in this province. I would say without fear of contradiction that it was the biggest, and brought to my attention that one of the leg men, one of the outfits hired by McLean to go and solicit advertising from potential advertisers. One of the leg men went to this firm, this co-operation. It is a giant in Newfoundland, Sir, and said, "We are back again looking for an ad for this industrial development publication that we are putting out. You remember last year we put out 'Newfoundland and Labrador 1972,' and this year the government have approved, have given us their blessing to put out another publication on industrial development." This great giant, Sir, this great corporation said, "No, we are not giving you any advertising," and sent the representative of a firm that was looking for the ad, sent him packing on his way. About a week or ten days later. Sir, he was back again. "I came back to see if you had changed your mind. Are you now going to take an ad?" "No, not going to take it. We were not a bit impressed with the last publication you put out. It accomplished no purpose, was not in the best interest of Newfoundland. No, we are not going to take the ad, no." So an argument developed with this representative and then he finally tipped his hand and said, "Well, what are you all? Are you all liberals here?" They were not. They were not all liberals but they have freedom of choice.

Then, Mr. Speaker, a representative of the corporation called me

because he knew that I had this firm under close surveillance, called me to inform me what was going on, of the political overtones. Yet, the Minister of Finance says no, he does not know anything at all about it. Give him the letter, give him the blessings but does not know anything at all about it.

Then we see, Mr. Speaker, on television, these commercials. They have new ones now I understand, in colour, from the Highways Department. We have all seen them. I would like to know, Sir, how much these are costing the taxpayers of this province. Could that money be better used in this province? What about the government that talked so much about priorities, establishing priorities? The hon. Minister of Highways made a grave error in judgement on doing away with the reflectorized license plates, substituting for them license plates made over in Nova Scotia, inferior quality plates. Now he has to try to make up for it and along comes Mr. McLean who thinks that Newfoundlanders are stupid, thinks the Premier is stupid. In case he does not know it, made the statement to his employees. "What are we worried about? They are all stupid down here anyway and the Premier is no better than the rest." Along comes Mr. McLean to the Minister of Highways and says, "Do not worry about a thing boy. We have the answer to your problem. A little public relations, that is the answer." So the Minister of Highways, thinking that Mr. McLean is the great expert on public relations, decides to take him on his word and the next thing we have commercials appearing on television as a result of a statement made by the Minister of Highways that we are going to use the savings, he said, "we are going to use the savings on just buying one year non-reflectorized license plates to run a safety programme on our highways." What savings, Mr. Speaker? What savings? We could have used the plates that we have for another two years or three years. The ones that we have now, the inferior quality ones are

costing \$60,000 or upwards of \$60,000 and the minister says there is a savings and we are going to pass that on to Mr. McLean, another safety programme for us. Has anybody seen these commercials. Sir? Do they remember what they are all about? I have observed them on a number of occasions and I do not remember today what it is all about. It did not impress me. It did not impress anybody. It is just another little goody for Mr. McLean.

MR. NEARY.

Throw them a very more goodies. How much more of this scandalous extravagance are we going to have, Sir? I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, who authorized Mr. McLean and his colleagues to go around this city and around this province, using high-handed tactics to try and sell advertising on this slovenly broadsheet they are using under the guise of industrial development, which is really only designed to suck money out of the advertisers and out of the government. I would like to know who authorized it, Sir. I would like to know who gave it their blessings.

AN HON. MEMBER: The former Department of Welfare.

MR. NEARY: Sir, the honourable members on the opposite side are real experts on kick back. They are the experts on kick backs. Well Mr. George McLean, Sir, is not beyond kick backs to whomever he feels necessary, Mr. Speaker, to strengthen his stranglehold on his quick buck wheeling and dealing in our province.

MR. MARSHALL: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Bell Island is imputing, impugning or making any references to anybody in this House, would he care to elucidate his comments, because if he is talking about an individual on kick backs and he is making any references or any hints, let him come out and say it directly. We will deal with it then.

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, my colleague is making exactly the sorts of references that the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Extern) has made at times and the hon. Minister of Finance has made on occasion. I did not hear him refer to any member of this House, unless Your Honour did. I submit he should be allowed to continue without these interruptions.

MR. CROSBIE: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition,

Mr. Crosbie.

in making his comments, referred to comments made by me on some occasion - what occasion and what comments? I have never made a statement in this House that I was not prepared to back up about kick backs or anything else or any one. If the hon. member for Bell Island has any allegations to make about kick backs, name the person over here who is receiving kick backs and make the charge.

AN HON. MEMBER: And do it now.

MR. CROSBIE: Then we will have another inquiry or make it outside the House and we will test it in the courts that way.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, point of order: May I reiterate the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance. The charges I made against any one in this House are now the subject of investigation and they will be proven.

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, the honourable gentleman has missed the point. Nobody referred -

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from the Extern has missed the point. Whether deliberately or negligently, I will leave it to others to judge. I made no reference to anything he said about any member of the House. I then said that that particular matter is subjudice. Mr. Justice Mifflin is enquiring into it and in due course, no doubt, will bring in a report and we shall see. The references I made were to the references made, I believe, yesterday, if not the day before in this House by the gentleman from St. John's East(Extern) when he referred to kick backs and so on. My colleague from Bell Island has not in my hearing (I have not heard all of the debate, but I have heard most of it) referred to kick backs to members of this House. The way I heard it was he said. "in his opinion, Mr. McLean is quite capable of making kick backs," so there.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the point raised by the hon.

MR. BARRY: Leader of the Opposition in pointing out the matters that may have been breaches of the rules of the House by members on this side or by members on the other side, is totally irrelevant.

The sole issue here is whether the member for Bell Island is in breach of the rules of the House by any statement that he has made. One of the statements that he made was, if I have it correctly, that the honourable members on the other side of the House have had experience with kickbacks. We will see whether these are the exact words, Mr. Speaker, the point is Mr. Speaker, that it was obvious that there were certain inferences and imputations attempted to be made by the honourable member for Bell Island. These are out of order.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the honourable gentleman's Point of Order -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would suggest that it is completely out of order for any honourable member to impute this to any other member and I caution the honourable member for Bell Island to be a little more careful of his phaseology.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour knows because you are following my debate very closely, that I did not infer in any way that members of the opposite side were involved, what I did say was that Mr. McLean - Mr. McLean, I said, is not above this matter of kickbacks to whomever he feels it is necessary, to strengthen his stranglehold on his quick-buck wheeling-dealing in our province.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, why does the honourable member not make that statement outside the House and give Mr. McLean a chance to test that?

MR. ROBERTS: Any more than the honourable the Minister of Finance did not make his statements about John Shaheen outside the House.

MR. CROSBIE: I made mine outside, inside the House. I have never hesitated and the honourable gentleman now is imputing, making a

MR. CROSBIE: charge against Mr. George McLean that he is afraid to make outside the House.

MR. ROBERTS: - we say what we believe, that is what the honourable gentleman has done.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I remind honourable members of this honourable House that the honourable gentleman has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, thank you Sir. Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear such hypocritical nonsense in your life? The honourable Minister of Finance, does anybody remember, Sir, the televised sessions of this honourable House?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member still has to observe the rule of relevancy.

MR. NEARY: Anyway, Sir, those who live in glass houses should never take a bath. Now, Sir, we were told by the honourable the Premier sometime ago when this matter of McLean's was raging in this province, we were told by the honourable the Premier sometime ago, before the House opened and the honourable Premier has had - incidentally, Mr. Speaker, talking about these charges or alleged charges that I made, Mr. Speaker, is this not the very point in having this select committee set up, is this not the very reason behind it? If the members and the ministers and the Premier and all that crowd on the other side have nothing to hide, Sir, would they not agree to have a select committee of the House set up to investigate this outfit? Would they not agree, Mr. Speaker?

If they do not agree with this resolution to set up a select committee, then obviously, Sir, they have something to hide. So what do they have to hide, Mr. Speaker? What do they have to hide?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: That is what they are discovering on the other side now.

MR. NEARY: So I was dealing with the Minister of Tourism down there. The minister announced several weeks ago that he had doubled his budget this year - doubled his budget or expenditure. "Going to double it," he said. He could not justify it when I challenged him publicly to state why he was doubling his expenditure this year. I said at the time that it appeared to be a calculated move to throw a few more dollars into the coffers of Mr. McLean, the statement went unchallenged by the Minister of Tourism.

Mothers could not get the Mothers Allowance to fit out their children going to school. Hungry children in this province, not enough fuel oil to keep houses warm in this frigid weather we are having - the Minister of Tourism doubles his budget, I challenged him to explain why. He did not see fit to do it. Now, Sir, it is all coming out and we know why,

to pay for this spectacle we see travelling across Canada and the United States today and shown before well lubricated audiences.

The minister should tell us in this debate how much is that going to cost the taxpayers of this province. How much of the budget of the honourable minister's department goes for advertising and mark-up in production costs to that carpetbagger from Toronto? The minister in this debate must be prepared to give us a complete breakdown on what has been done with that extra money and what he expects to gain by it, Mr. Speaker, because as I have said earlier, while the honourable minister's intentions may be honourable we have a bottleneck on the gulf. You can spend all the money you like going around trying to get tourists to come into Newfoundland, they will get down to North Sydney and they will get into a bottleneck and they will go away and give the place a bad name and they will never come back here again. I think the honourable minister should have dealt with that problem first before he employed the George McLean Public Relations Firm to take the famous Newfoundland cocktail party travelling all over North America.

The Premier told us when the controversy started to rage there a couple of weeks ago, a few weeks ago, "I will be making a statement. Do not worry. Do not worry the people of Newfoundland. Do not worry press and radio and television. Do not worry about what Neary is saying. I will make a statement." Everything is going to be under control. The honourable Premier leaves the province, comes back, the minister is in hot water. The Premier makes a statement, "Oh, I did not know anything about this. This is not government policy. The minister made a mistake of the heart." Came back this particular time, I think it was shortly after his sojourn to the West Indies for the Christmas holidays, came back and said, "I will be making a statement. I am going to ask all of the departments to give me the information." I think he said that the government as such is not doing business with Mr. McLean, it is only the departments.

It is only the departments that are doing business with - individual departments, individual ministers, not the government.

Mr. Speaker, I know the honourable Premier does not know very much about government. But, Sir, how can you separate the two? Are they all separate corporations going there own way? I say they are not. Sir. The Premier is responsible for every action of one of these ministers or one of his departments. But he says, he brushes it off by saying: "No, no, no, they are not doing business with the government as such. They are doing business with individual government departments and ministers," Sir, and I have spend days and days trying to figure that one out. I know I have puzzled since I came in politics in Newfoundland twelve or fifteen years ago. There are things that I have not been able to understand, Sir, maybe I am not the smartest

in the world.

MR. EVANS: It is taking the honourable member a long time to learn.

MR. NEARY: As one famous Newfoundlander said, I may have a heart as brilliant as the Southside Hills but he did not give me credit for being the smartest politician in Newfoundland. But, Sir, I do not think I am the dumbest either.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable minister is not very dumb. The honourable minister is not too stupid. Otherwise he would be sitting over here with us today.

MR. CROSBIE: He would be dumber in that case, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: There will be no ship named after the honourable gentleman if he keeps that up. There will never be a "John Crosbie".

MR. NEARY: The honourable minister has not got his picture in this publication. Maybe he will have it in the next one.

MR. CROSBIE: Mere discrimination.

MR. NEARY: Mere discrimination.

So the honourable Premier on his return to the province, this was the gem of wisdom that he had for the people of Newfoundland: "Do not worry about it. I am going to have it investigated and I am going to lay my cards on the table and all the information is going to be given out to the people of Newfoundland." Several weeks ago, Sir, that was after Christmas. This is now February 19.

AN HON. MEMBER: February 21.

MR. NEARY: February 21, pardon me. That is about two months ago, Sir, over two months ago. We have not seen nor heard tell of that statement since. We did hear, I think it was here in this article in the "Evening Telegram" -

MR. ROBERTS: The yellow rag.

MR. NEARY: "However Mr. McLean is known to meet frequently with Premier Moores. McLean has an apartment on the third floor of Elizabeth Towers and is visited by the Premier. There are suggestions that McLean has

written a number of speeches for Premier Moores. McLeans operations involve a number of government departments. He has put together slide presentations. The going price for these slides," there are no fire sales yet, "the going price is \$4,000." But I thought I saw it here, Mr. Speaker, where the honourable the Premier and Mr. McLean had gotten together to prepare a statement and I understand that the statement has been prepared and the Premier is safely guarding it over there. He has it in his drawer, rearing to go. He will have plenty of time. The statement that we will hear in this House, Mr. Speaker, the statement that we will hear from the honourable the Premier, the Leader of the Government, the Premier of Newfoundland, may or may not be a statement of the McLeans activities and involvement in certain government departments and in the Premier's office. It may be a whitewash job written by Mr. McLean. What else do you expect, Mr. McLean to do? It will be a whitewash job, Sir. Nothing will satisfy the people of this province now except a select committee of this House to investigate this McLean outfit. We are not going to be brushed off. We are not going to be brushed off by having the Premier stand in his place in this House and read a statement written by Mr. McLean. Are we that soft in this province? How about the independence of the Minister of Finance? Is he going to put up with that? The Minister of Justice who never wanted his hands soiled with politics of this House, too dirty for him, is he going to put up with it?

Mr. Speaker, I do not know, I do not know if I would go this far or not but if the Minister of Finance wanted to bolt his party on this issue, I might even agree to take him back on this side of the House and, Sir, that would be a desperation move.

But, Sir, the point I am making is that

there was a gentleman, Sir, there was a gentleman that went around this province bellwaching, moaning, chawing about all the misdemeanors of the former administration and here is a glaring example. Sir, the most glaring example we have ever seen in this province since confederation of political patronage. The honourable minister sits there calmly pretending he is reading the Auditor General's Report, sitting there, Sir. Went around the province crusading, conned the people in Newfoundland into voting for he and his party, said we were all dishonest over here, all crooks. They have been over there fourteen months, Sir. They have not taken many deep, dark secrets out of these closets of Confederation Building yet.

I have shown the honourable members this afternoon beyond any shadow of doubt the most blatant example of political patronage that we have ever seen in this province and the honourable minister who has ice water in his viens just sits there and takes it.

Sir, either the honourable minister was insincere when he went around this province campaigning, either he was sincere or he was the greatest hypocrite on the face of this earth, Sir.

The honourable Minister of Justice, oh no, he is not going to get involved. The honourable member for St. John's South behind there, the professional go-between, always waits for a situation to develop and then jams himself in the middle of it and comes out smelling of roses. Your luck can run out on that sort of thing to, Sir. Is the honourable member going to sit there and tolerate this scandalous example of political patronage? The honourable member is an honest man. Is he going to sit there and tolerate this?

And the honourable member for St John's East, the originator of all the witch hunts in this province, Sir, who believes that anybody who committed a misdemeanor in the past should be nailed to the cross, and the honourable member for St John's North agrees with him,

stood on this side of the House telling us, for the whole time he was here in this House, about how dishonest we were, what scoundrels and rogues we were, how corrupt we were.

HONOURABLE MEMBER: And you had to prove it.

MR. S. NEARY: What is the honourable minister going to do now on this resolution? Is he going to follow his leader and vote against it? Or is the honourable minister going to stand up like a man in this House, like an honest, decent Newfoundlander and separate the goats and the sheep and vote to have this resolution passed so that this outfit can be investigated? That is all we are asking, Mr. Speaker. We are merely asking for an investigation. If the government have nothing to hide, Sir, they will pass that resolution.

The honourable member for Placentia West is an honourable man, an honourable and decent Newfoundlander. Is he going to sit there and watch the taxpayers dollars being taken down, deposited in a bank and sent up to take care of Mr. McLean's creditors in Ontario.

Forget Liechtenstein, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister of Justice is dealing with that matter and if there is anybody guilty there the honourable minister knows what to do. They have not proven that yet. That crowd over there who talked about corruption, Sir, have not proven one thing yet. All they have done is conned the people of Newfoundland and persecuted the former premier of this province, drove the nails into his feet and into his hands but he will be back, Sir.

Fortunately, one thing that I will give the Premier for, as least I think I can if I can read between the lines, I will give the honourable Premier credit for calling off the dogs. I think it was the proper thing to do and if the honourable Premier never did anything else in the world get in my good books, Sir, that is one thing that he did and I congratulate him for it.

Here the honourable Premier has said to the honourable Minister of Finance and the honourable Minister without Portfolio and the honourable

Minister of Justice, "go and leap in the harbour, I am not paying any attention to your witch hunts." The honourable Premier is right and he is politically astute too, Sir, he is using his usual political astuteness in this case, because the people of Newfoundland were starting to rebel. Sir, if you want to get a laugh in any

district in Newfoundland stand on a platform and mention the name of the honourable Minister of Finance and everybody laughs. It is a great joke. What made him so unpopular, Sir? What made the Minister of Justice so unpopular? Witch hunts, charges and accusations that they could not substantiate. They conned the Newfoundland people and the people in Newfoundland realize today that they were conned. The honourable members will pay for that when the opportunity comes.

I do not want to repeat myself, Sir, but I was pleased that the honourable Premier called off the dogs and I give him all credit for that. The honourable member for St. John's North may not approve of it but he paid the penalty, he paid the price. I would suggest to the honourable the Premier that if the Minister of Finance who has to push his luck any further, that he meet the same fate as the member for St. John's North. This province is not interested in witch hunts. We are interested, Sir -

AN HON. MEMBER: What were you doing to poor George McLean?

MR NEARY: We are interested. Yes, poor George McLean, how are you. The Minister of Finance is on pretty shaky grounds right now. I tell you, it would not take very much to push the Premier over the hill. But the Premier is wise to him. He is wise to him.

I would say, Sir, that if the honourable Minister of Finance is in this honourable House next sitting, I will be the most surprised person in this world.

How can he, Sir, how can the minister in all conscience sit down and look the Newfoundland people straight in the eye, after what he said about Mr. Shaheen? The whole world knows that, Sir. The Premier and the government have gotten in bed with Mr. Shaheen and rightly so because I personally have always felt that Mr. Shaheen is an honourable man. An honourable man, Sir, who came to Newfoundland to do a job, to start a big industry here. The Minister of Finance became hostile to him. Not a part of the family compact, outsider, drive him back across

the gulf. The Premier is right. The honourable member for St. John's East Extern is right. We have a lot of money tied up there in Come by Chance. A lot of money and I think the honourable Premier is doing the right thing by protecting that investment and expanding that operation at Come by Chance. If we can get a petro-chemical complex there I would say more power to the Premier.

but how, how, Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Finance sit there and pay the bills after all he said, the crucifixion that he gave Mr. Shaheen when I have nothing but the highest regard for the man myself and the people of this province, Sir? How can he do it? What a gall. What a gall, Mr. Speaker. What a gall. Any ordinary person would go out and leap out a window or slash his wrists. But he sits there in his hard, callous, cold way, Sir, and just takes it but believe me, Mr. Speaker, believe me, Sir -

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to inform the hon. member that he has five minutes left.

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, surely the hon. gentleman has unlimited time. He is introducing a substantive motion, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Oh he has a limit but I mean we just adjourn until next Wednesday.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Of course. We will adjourn now if the hon. gentleman wants to.

MR. NEARY: I realize I strayed away a little bit that time, Mr. Speaker, but I could not resist it when I look, Sir, and hear the criticism level over at me as a member of the Liberal opposition about the former administration. When I look over at the hon. Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Public Works who are members of the cabinet, who negotiated the deals with Mr. Shaheen and Mr. Doyle when I was just an ordinary, lowly backbencher like the hon. member for Bonavista South down there.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: And they sit over there. Sir, the people of Newfoundland are wise to the hon. -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, I said the hon. gentleman we have is the hon. gentleman for Fortune Bay.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, eluding to Your Honour's statement to the hon. member for Bell Island to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition responded, Standing Order 49 reads, "No member except the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition or a minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister or a member making a motion of no-confidence in the government and a minister replying thereto shall speak for more than ninety minutes at a time in any debate." The only rationale by which the hon. the member for Bell Island could expend more than ninety minutes in the debate is if he is making a motion of no-confidence in the government. I submit, Your Honour, that this is not such a motion.

MR. ROBERTS: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that of course it is a motion of no-confidence in the administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course it is.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If I may speak on the point of order -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The resolution asks for the establishment of a select committee. It has absolutely nothing to do with confidence or nonconfidence in the government. We voted earlier today for another select committee that has neither confidence or nonconfidence in the government. It establishes a select committee to do something with denturists. This particular one, if passed, would (one could not anticipate of course the voice of the House) establish another select committee, having more, not to do with denturists but with weight-watchers or something. I would suggest, Sir, that there is no question of confidence or nonconfidence involved.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of order raised; of course, Sir, it is a motion of nonconfidence in the government by inference if by nothing else. If the government minister's, the Premier or any minister of the government gets up and takes the position on this resolution rather and that position is not subsequently supported by the House of Assembly, the majority of the members in this House of Assembly, then the government have no choice in that issue but to resign. Therefore, Sir, this resolution is a motion of no confidence in the government. Also, Sir, the whereas is a preamble to the resolution and goes out of its way to criticize and to undermine the present administration. On all those grounds, Sir, there is no doubt that it is a motion of no confidence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! I feel that if it were a motion of no confidence, it should have been phrased and placed in the resolution. I rule that it is not a motion of no confidence.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, with respect, may we appeal your ruling? It is not a procedure I like but I do feel Your Honour is wrong. May we appeal the ruling, Sir, for the record, if for nothing else?

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is that the Speaker's ruling be sustained.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour "aye." Those against "nay."

In my opinion the "aye's" have it.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, could we divide the House please on the point? It is an important question.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? Those in favour of the motion please rise: The hon. the Premier, the hon. Mr. Barry, the hon. Minister of Economic Development, the hon. Minister of Economic Development, the hon.

Minister of Health, the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources, the honourable the Minister of Labour, the honourable the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation, the honourable the Minister of Supply and Services, the honourable the Minister of Education, the honourable the Minister of Justice, the honourable Mr. Marshall, the honourable Minister of Finance, the honourable Minister of Fisheries, the honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the honourable the Minister of Highways, the honourable the Minister of Public Works, the honourable the Minister of Provincial Affairs, Mr. Stagg, Mr. Dunphy, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Wells, Mr. Brett, Mr. Peckford, Mr. Senior, Mr. Carter, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Young, Mr. Evans, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Howard.

Those against the motion: The honourable the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gillett, Mr. Woodward, Mr. W.N.Rowe, Mr. Neary, Mr. Thoms. Mr. Martin.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

It being now 6:00 p.m. I do leave the Chair until tomorrow Thursday, February 22, at 3:00 p.m.



