



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND**

---

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 8

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1974**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL**

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like to welcome to the galleries today thirty-five grade eight students from St. Patrick's Girls School here in St. John's with their teacher Mrs. Meaney. I trust that your visit here will be most interesting and informative.

PETITIONS:

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of some 507 residents of the Straits of Belle Isle Area and the District of Labrador South who live in the communities between Red Bay and L'Anse-au-Clair inclusive. The petition represents eighty-five per cent of the electorate in these communities.

The prayer reads: "We, the undersigned residents of the Labrador section of the Straits of Belle Isle request that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador work within their guidelines of electoral boundaries redistribution and give Labrador four electoral districts instead of three-and-one-half as presently recommended by the electoral boundaries commission. It should be noted, Sir, that this will necessitate the adjusting or causing to be readjusted the census figures upon which the guidelines were based. The figures as supplied by Statistics Canada are incorrect by as much as 10,000. This can be proven to be incorrect by comparing figures for the same time period which were compiled by the various municipal governments and school boards in Labrador."

I support this petition, Mr. Speaker. I sincerely hope that it will be supported by other members of the House, particularly those from Labrador, because it does mean a great deal to us. I ask that the petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the petition presented by the member for Labrador South. I too agree

as the members of the Straits Area, the Red Bay, L'Anse-au-Clair do, that, Labrador rightfully should have four seats. I would like to bring it to the attention of the House that when the bill is passed for electoral boundaries, that it will be amended to give Labrador four seats. There has been sufficient evidence to prove that Statistics Canada - the number of the population in Labrador was greatly understated. We now have in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley Area census that were taken for the municipal election which proved Statistics Canada to be wrong in their statistics. I think it was in 1971.

Sir, I speak in support of the petition and trust that when the bill is brought into the House that there will be an amendment to the effect that Labrador should have four seats.

HON. W. W. MARSHALL (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Phillip's Head, Point of Bay, Cottle's Cove and Fortune Harbour, in Your Honour's district, with respect to the highway, numbered forty-two, from Northern Arm North, Botwood to Fortune Harbour, linking these settlements; that is the settlements of Phillip's Head, Point of Bay, Cottle's Cove and Fortune Harbour.

It is signed, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, by some 440 voters, all of whom point out that there were a few improvements within the past couple of years in the road, which were the first improvements, how are you, since World War II. They earnestly desire that these improvements continue and that the road be upgraded.

I would heartily support this petition and ask that it be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour would be very pleased to know that we on this side of the honourable House of Assembly support the petition presented on behalf of 440 odd of Your Honour's constituents in the District of Lewisporte who are seeking road improvements.

It was noted by the Government House Leader, Mr. Speaker, when he introduced this petition in the House, that there have been no noticeable improvements in roads in the area since World War II.

Well, Sir, my only comment on that is that unless we change the government of this province, World War III will be over before they get any improvements.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I move that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act."

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by my colleague the Hon. member for Twillingate, that the House be adjourned, that the regular order of business of the House be adjourned for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance; namely, Sir, the all-time high of 36,000 people who are, according to Statistics Canada figures, presently unemployed in Newfoundland and Labrador -

a simple, factual preamble leading up to his question.

MR. WM. MARSHALL: On that Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, if you want to read it, all it says; "...but the member may not make even a short speech." That is what the honourable the member for Bell Island was doing and the Point of Order I submit is well taken.

MR. NEARY: May I proceed to ask the question?

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure that all honourable members are aware that questions should not be prefaced by speeches and I shall rule on the questions, on the facts; if they are not speeches they are not, accordingly

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I beg to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Sir, I would like to ask the minister if what his government's stand is on the federal government's warranty scheme announced last Monday by Urban Affairs Minister Ron Basford in Halifax during the Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada's annual meeting?

MR. H. R. V. EARLE, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing: Mr. Speaker, quite frankly I welcome this question. Unlike most questions from the honourable member for Bell Island, it gives me an opportunity to clarify a statement which I made to the press.

Actually the press called me on Sunday afternoon and asked for my opinion on this particular matter. I had not at the time had an opportunity to discuss it with my representatives who had been at the conference but what I did say was essentially what I would have said had I had proper consultation with those who attended the conference.

I am afraid that quite unintentionally probably the person who took the message from me was somewhat mixed up because he did not say what I intended should be conveyed.

MR. NEARY: That is the reporter's fault.

MR. EARLE: Well the fact is, and I should like to clarify it now, that on this warranty on house building and house purchases which was mentioned in Halifax the other day, I am informed that the Home Builders Association of Canada was somewhat opposed, that is the

while I am sure the unemployment statistics of the province are of interest and concern to many people, I do not feel that it warrants the adjournment of the regular business of this House to get involved in a debate on that particular subject just now, so I cannot accept this motion as such. Any other notices of motion?

MR. NEARY: We are on Orders of the Day I think, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. NEARY: That is right. That is what we are on, Orders of the Day. Pay attention to what is happening in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Are we on Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: We are on Orders of the Day.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing is on public record as stating there is no great need for a home warranty plan.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what is order?

Mr. Speaker, as it was pointed out by my colleague the other day, the rules of this House state you are allowed to give a short summary of the question that you are going to ask, a preamble, Sir, a preamble to the question?

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, Sir, has stated publicly there is no need for a home warranty plan in this province.

MR. J. CROSBIE, Minister of Finance: Point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is not a question. The honourable gentleman is attempting to make a speech.

MR. WM. ROWE: On page 22, of the Standing Orders of this House, it states quite clearly, on the procedure, on the commentary to Standing Orders: "The facts on which a question is based may be briefly set out, provided the member so doing makes himself responsible for the accuracy." Accuracy as reported, I would imagine. I am sure that is only purely and simply what my friend and colleague the member for Bell Island was doing

national association was somewhat opposed to this warranty system for the simple reason that they felt it might not be workable, that it might involve too much red tape to be carried out successfully and they ask clarification of the minister who suggested the warranty.

My own officials who reported to me also said that the position of a warranty as such is acceptable to us but they would like to have further details of how this system would work. At the same time I expressed to the reporter that the local trade felt that they were quite capable of policing their own warranties on construction and I also reported that the experience we have had with the local construction trade in public housing did indicate that they were quite capable of looking after

their own construction policing. Therefore, unless the whole question were explained to me in more detail as to just how this system would work I could not at the moment see that there was an immediate need of it. I am pending further explanation from the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct an urgent question to the Hon. the Premier. Would the Hon. the Premier inform the House if the government have been officially informed of the very disturbing news coming out of Labrador West that the mining operations in Labrador City are losing substantial amounts of money? What co-operation can the mining town expect from the government to stabilize the industry and restore a sense of security to that mining community?

HON. F.D. MOORES (PREMIER): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like a little more clarification of the question if I may. I mean if we are talking about the Iron Ore Company of Canada -

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. MOORES: Does the honourable member mean generally as far as their earnings are concerned or is it specifically regarding the fuel or -

MR. NEARY: No, no, production.

MR. MOORES: Production. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, I have been in touch with Mr. Bennett the President of I.O.C. who has informed us that they are having problems getting their expansion into full gear. It is an internal matter with the company, even though the possibly last administration thought they could come up with the answer to a pelletizing plant, we do not have that wisdom on this side of the House.

The situation is that the company I believe are doing everything possible to try and rectify the situation. Certainly if there is anything we can do we would be only too glad to make whatever expertise or co-operation we have available to them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this honourable House the Premier was good enough to let us have some details on the Mount Scio House. Would the Premier now inform the House, Mr. Speaker, if the property is



liable for municipal taxes? And if so, who will pay the property tax and the water and sewerage assessment?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I have no idea. I think that could be placed on the Order Paper as I promised the member I would give him all the details I have. If he has a list of questions, which undoubtedly he does, he has very few answers but if he would give me a list of his questions I will gladly answer them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Sir, this is a rather urgent matter. Would the minister inform the House as to what steps his department intends to take to provide better landing facilities and instrumentation for the so-called third level air carries in this province? Does the government have any plans to subsidize bush operations in Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. MOORES: That is not urgent, put it on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: That is not urgent? Mr. Speaker, it is an urgent question. A well-known pilot in Newfoundland said, Sir, "We are going to have a tragedy sooner or later in this province." That is what makes it urgent.

MR. MOORES: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MOORES: We have -

MR. SPEAKER: I think that question could be very well placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: We could have a tragedy while we are waiting for the answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable the member for Bonavista South.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise at the first opportune time on a point of privilege, personal privilege and maybe a point of privilege of this Assembly. I refer in particular to comments made this morning on an "Open Line Show" by an honourable member of this Assembly. Disparaging, derogatory comments about honourable colleagues in this Assembly

and myself. I want to go on record as being strongly opposed these kind of comments being made now and in the future.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could we have more specific information?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the comments made on the "Open Line Show" by the newest member of this Assembly, who has not yet spoken in the Assembly, the honourable the Member for Hermitage.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. W. N. ROWE: On a point of order arising from this so-called point of privilege. What does the member want to do about it? I mean what is he - is he going to suggest a remedy? Does he want the House itself to decide it and suggest a remedy? What is he talking about? What does he want to do about the whole situation?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege is this, that the statements made this morning about honourable ministers and honourable members of this Assembly were disparaging and derogatory. For example, like labeling a minister of the Crown, "A Corner Bum" That is one statement, which is to me intolerable, for honourable members of this Assembly to use these kinds of statements outside of this Assembly.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Well what -

MR. MORGAN: Show some good example.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: I -

MR. NEARY: Let the Hon. Speaker rule.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member rise to say something in relation -

MR. NEARY: No, go ahead. Let the Speaker rule.

MR. SPEAKER: I also find the comments made by the honourable member for Bonavista South a little vague as to facts. He did not mention what particular radio station, what particular "Talk Show".

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Just exactly what the honourable gentleman for Hermitage

said. Of course, I have not heard the tapes and I have no idea what is it but I think the point of privileges is a little vague.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. W. M. ROWE: .... tapes from the radio station and we hear them in a public session in this honourable House. That might be the way to deal with it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. J. MORGAN: The comments were made in the form of political statements, I assume made by the honourable gentleman from Hermitage on the open line show on radio station CJON and the statements were of a nature that the honourable member for Bonavista South was a cracky in the House of Assembly. The honourable member from St. John's Centre, the Minister of Social Services was a corner bum. The honourable member from Placentia East -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I Inaudible.

MR. J. MORGAN: Corner bum.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that these statements were derogatory and disparaging and reflecting upon the character and the dignity of this honourable Assembly.

MR. ROWE: Obviously, we cannot make a decision in the House or rise on a point of order in respect to this point of privilege. We can make a decision in the House as to what to do about the situation merely by the heresay evidence presented by the honourable member for Bonavista South. Now, what I would suggest, Sir, is if the House leader would like to make a motion to that effect is that we have the tape subpoenaed or merely gotten from CJON, that we hear them in this honourable House in order to see whether in fact there was a real breach of the privileges of this honourable House. If the honourable Leader of the Government does not want to make a motion to that effect then I suggest, Sir, respectfully, that we drop the whole matter

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Ten seconds now, ten seconds.

MR. SPEAKER: Of course, I cannot rule on the point of privilege unless I hear the tapes in question and if they are presented to me, then

I will know if the member has risen out of a point of privilege.

I have instructed to obtain the tapes or if they are brought to me to hear exactly what was said, then maybe I would be in a position to rule on this point of privilege.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member from Bonavista North.

MR. P. S. THOMS ( Bonavista North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture: Is the minister or anyone in the minister's department or in his government planning on aiding the dairy producers in the Province who at this time are experiencing serious financial difficulty.

MR. E. MAYNARD ( Minister of Agriculture and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I think I answered much the same question last week some time. I indicated at that time that the dairy producers across Canada are having several problems because of rising feed costs and this sort of thing. There is nothing whatsoever that the Provincial Government can do to aid the dairy farmers who are consumers or anyone else because this is a national problem and one over which the Provincial Government has absolutely no control. The honourable member, if he were using the small bit of brains that he has got, should realize that.

MR. THOMS: , Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable minister for realizing that I do use a little bit of brain that I have got. It is too bad that he does not use a little bit either.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: I only replied to the minister's insinuation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

The honourable member from Bonavista North was commencing to make a speech and if he intend to ask a question, I suggest he get on with it

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I abide by your ruling.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct another question to the

Minister of Forestry and Agriculture: Does the minimum wage scale, which is effective now in Newfoundland apply to the dairy producing farmers of this Province?

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, in relation to the minimum wage scale, it is a question that should be directed to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, not to me.

MR. THOMS: He does not hire the dairy men.

MR. MAYNARD: I do not hire the dairy men.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Premier of the Province: Could the Premier inform this honourable House if the minimum wage scale which applies to this Province at the present time applies to dairy-producing farmers in the Province?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: None.

MR. F. MOORES (Premier): Mr. Speaker, that question is properly asked to Manpower and Industrial Relations, although to my knowledge, I think the agricultural industry is exempt from it until a further report is brought in. It is undergoing study by the Minimum Wage Board Group that brought in the original recommendation. This month, I think two or three other categories were outlined as needing further study and this, as I understand, is commissioned right now, and they are bringing in a report -

full-time agricultural workers are now

AN HON. MEMBER: They are included?

MR. MOORES: Full-time workers are included now and there is a report coming in on the others.

MR. THOMS: They are included?

MR. MOORES: Full-time workers. Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Fogo:

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing: Can the minister tell the House whether he has been able to work out an arrangement with the Clean Air and Water Authority so that council at Fogo can go ahead and install the water and sewer there?

AN HON. MEMBER: Good question.

MR. H.R.V.EARLE (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that question is of immediate urgency and I ask that it be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador South:

MR. M.MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I had a question which I wanted to direct to the Minister of Health but in his absence I would redirect it to the honourable the Premier: Would the honourable gentleman undertake to inform the House what has happened to the money or the plans for a clinic which was authorized for Port Hope Simpson last year and which cannot now be found anywhere?

MR. MOORES: Yes I will, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism: Would the minister inform the House if his department has entered into a contract with a Toronto based public relations firm called; "Horizon Communications?"

MR. DOYLE (Minister of Tourism): No we have not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is "Horizon Communications" doing any work for the minister's department in connection with the Silver Anniversary Celebrations?

MR. DOYLE: No it is not, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday, I think, the honourable member for Trinity North adjourned the debate and I assume he wishes to continue presently.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, to recap what I said yesterday, very briefly, on my district. I have divided it into three areas: First the area from Billiard's Cove to Melrose that I pointed out was a small industrial area largely dependent on the fish plant in the Community of Catalina. I also pointed out that there was an extreme need for housing, land development and further government services in the form of water and sewerage.

In the second area that I mentioned, the area from English Harbour to Bonaventure, again I pointed out, Sir, that this was a non-industrial area. There is no industry whatsoever. I went on to say that it was a scenic area which has tourist potential that should be developed. I said that while this would create much needed employment the seasonal aspect would have to be considered, and still would not be sufficient in the way of industrialization. I went on to say, Sir, that while a lot of public services have gone into this area in the last two years, there is still a great need for more road construction and paving and as in the case of the first area, a need for more public services and industry.

In the third and final area that I talked about was the area from Burgoyne's Cove to Southport which includes Random Island. I pointed out that Clarendville was the center and I stated that it was an industrial area with almost full employment but also the area with the greatest need for public services. I listed the roads that needed to be upgraded and paved. I think there is in excess of one hundred miles. I also said there was a great need for water and sewerage services and certainly in the Clarendville Area, a tremendous need for land development and housing. I also made mention, Sir, that the people of the area are looking

forward with anticipation to a start on the hospital in the foreseeable future.

Now, Sir, in cluing up my remarks on my district, I would like to say that the people of the District of Trinity North are a patient lot. At least I believe they are. For twenty-two years they received very little from government except perhaps promises and a few miles of blacktop on the eve of elections. I do not think the member was seen very much, again, except on the eve of elections. I suppose they learned to live with this but I do not believe that they are willing to accept this sort of treatment any longer. I believe that they want government action but, at the same time, I do not think they expect this government to accomplish in two years what



the previous administration could not accomplish in twenty-two.

If I may, Sir, I would like to speak for a few more minutes on generalities concerning some things that have been brought to my attention by some of my constituents. I would also like to make some remarks in reply to the criticism of the opposition.

First of all, a word for the honourable member for Bell Island: I notice he has the curtesy to stay and listen to me. In his address a few days ago he made mention - I suppose I should say repeated mention - of political appointments by our government. It seems to be a pet peeve of his. It was rather amusing for this side of the House to sit and listen to him. I am sure that we all know, as the Newfoundland people know, that he was once part and parcel of an administration that certainly mastered the art of political appointments and patronage.

Sir, it is also amusing to hear the opposition talk about the fisheries and our lack of action in this respect. I would like to ask them, Sir, not looking for a answer immediately but certainly ask the question, what was their programme and their policies during the twenty odd years of their administration? Just what did they do for the fishery other than to tell Newfoundlanders to burn their boats? We all know, Sir, that it is very easy to condemn but their must be an alternative. I for one, Sir, would like to know just what their suggestions are. I assume that they have some answers in view of their criticism.

I cannot recall, Sir, at any time every hearing any member of the opposition, either the leader or the honourable member from Bell Island ever making any suggestions regarding the 200 mile limit off our shores. I do not think they ever did. The 200 mile limit is a policy of this government, Sir. It is a policy that we have adopted and we are going to push for it. That is right. We have reason to think that or to believe that it will be recognized by the Federal Government, by all the provinces of the Dominion and also by the fishing nations of the world.

Another question for the opposition: In their twenty odd years

of rule did they put forward any policy to increase our annual yield? I do not think they did, Sir. I am talking about the fisheries of course. This administration has, Sir. We will spend over \$40 million to build trawlers so that we can increase our catch.

Another question, Sir, is did the past administration build any long liner service stations. That is good terminology for them. Again I think the answer is no, but this administration is planning to build ten at the cost of \$10 million.

So, I am here to reiterate, Sir, that it is easy to criticize. I think that on this side of the house we are strong enough to accept any criticism that they can throw at us. However, both the government and the people of the province, Sir, that we represent want constructive criticism. So far, I think the opposition have been lacking in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, as a political novice there is one thing that comes across very strongly, when travelling in my district and throughout the province. I think this has been mentioned before. I might have even mentioned it last year and this is the new-found freedom in the people of this province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A new-found freedom?

MR. BRETT: Yes, a new freedom, something that they did not experience for twenty years.

I stated yesterday that I was a civil servant for over ten years and I know what I am talking about.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They will not lose their licenses now.

MR. BRETT: I can recall, Sir, during that time there was one thing that you never ever did and that was speak against the government or the Premier of the day. That, drastic action, Sir - we were all scared, possibly

the point that we thought we just might be dismissed if we dared open our mouths. So I say here, Sir, that if we have not accomplished one single solitary iota in the past two years, even though we have, other than to do away with this system, this complete domination of civil servants and people, then if we have not done anything else, Sir, then I think that that alone justifies our existence for the past two years.

Sir, opposition members are surprised and they hasten to make political hay when some one on this side of the House, Sir, gets up and disagrees with government policy. They cannot believe it, Sir. Of course, the reason is simple because when they were over here, with their leader, they were not permitted to speak. It is quite simple, is it not? Very often they were told to sit down and shut up.

Sir, I am very happy to be a part of a government or a party or a group where we are not told to sit down and shut up. We have some freedom. We can express our views.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. BRETT: Another thing that comes to mind, speaking of freedom in our province, during the reign of the Liberal Administration -

MR. PECKFORD: Reign of terror!

MR. BRETT: All right, the reign of terror. That is pretty good.

Unions could not, Sir, they dared not come to government. I know what I am talking about when I say that this is not so today because I saw more union leaders and union members on the eighth floor of this building this past twelve months than I could count.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. BRETT: Was he there? I do not remember seeing him on the eighth floor.

MR. NEARY: I was there one day when the Citizens' Rights were thrown off their feet.

MR. PECKFORD: The honourable member was there to get his mug in the paper. That is the only reason he was there.

MR. BRETT: The honourable member was there causing a lot of the trouble. That is what the honourable member was doing. That is exactly what he was doing.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. BRETT: Rabble Rouser!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. BRETT: Sir, the labour problems of last year certainly cannot be attributed to a lack of co-operation on the part of government. There existed an open door to government. Again I say this as a new-found freedom and it looks like they took advantage of it last year, when we consider the number of strikes we had.

Again, Sir, as a political novice, I am very happy to say that this administration have seen fit to put an end to the days of cost-plus.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BRETT: Oh, yes, we have.

At last, Sir, after twenty odd years, we see every company in the province being given a chance to bid on projects being carried out by our government. Cost-plus, Sir, has gone out the window, thanks to this administration. Public tenders have taken its place. The public, Sir, is aware that this administration have restored this democratic right to the people of the province. They are aware that the small contractor now has a chance of survival. I would like to quote a typical example to prove that I do know what I am talking about.

This government, Sir, have agreed to construct at no cost to the Town of Clareville, a west access road into the town, at a cost of \$300,000. A few days ago I was talking to one of the engineers in the Department of Transportation and Communications and I asked the question as to whether or not paving was included in the contract. He said that it was not. When I asked him why he said that if it were, the small contractor would probably not tender,

it would be more interesting to the larger contractor, some of the millionaires that were made over the last twenty years. This, Sir, is some proof of what I am saying, that this tender has brought back the part of our democratic right that was taken away from us for so long.

Sir, I know the people of this province must be thoroughly fed up and disgusted with the antics of the Hon. member for Bell Island as he continues to criticize the Hon. Minister of Social Services. The behaviour, Sir, of the opposition, both in this honourable House and outside, is nauseating to say the least, Sir. It is unworthy of them; it is unworthy of their position. The Hon. member for St. John's Centre (I hope I have it correct) is a very sincere gentleman. He is dedicated to serving the people of his district in particular and I think, Sir, the people of the province in general. Sir, I make this statement in all sincerity. I believe that a large percentage of the people of this province, regardless of their political affiliations, will agree with me when I say that. I think he is a very honourable gentleman. The honourable gentleman, Sir, has dedicated many, many years of his life to this province and to the people of this province. Sir, I am not one bit ashamed to say that I am proud to be an associate of his. Sir, I am reasonably certain that the Hon. member for St. John's Centre, the Minister of Social Services, has done far more for this province than a dozen Peter Harringtons are going to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. BRETT: Now, I do not know too much about this Peter Harrington but I certainly heard some fantastic stories. The latest one, Sir, is that he is drawing unemployment insurance. Now I stand to be corrected on this. I am not absolutely certain that it is true. If he is not, I would like to know who is paying his salary. If he has all the qualifications that he states he has, why, in the name of Heavens! is he drawing unemployment insurance. Maybe the minister, Sir, should offer him a job. Then he will not be living off the taxpayers of this province of the Dominion.

Sir, I hope the press will take note of that. They have not been taking very much notice of what has been said over here. My honourable colleague stood up here for ninety minutes and delivered a very worthwhile address the other day and he failed to get his name in the paper. I guess the same thing will happen to me. Probably they might decide to print something about Mr. Harrington.

Mr. Speaker, at least two members of this honourable House have mentioned at some length the decorum of certain members. I would also like to make reference to the subject, particularly as it pertains to some members of the opposition and more particularly as it pertains to the Leader of the Opposition. Well, he has made a mockery of the House, to put it in simple language. He has made an attack on the Speaker. He has attacked the Deputy Speaker and Sir, he has even made remarks that could be construed, certainly it is uncomplimentary towards His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor. Sir, I wonder how low some members of this House will stoop in their remarks. I feel very strongly, Sir, that if this honourable gentleman, this so-called leader (I do not know how long he is going to be leader. I think probably he is a bit worried about it) hopes to win the favour of the people of the province, then I am sure he is going to have to change his tactics. I do not think the Newfoundland people appreciate the way that he is carrying on.

Sir, I think he has succeeded in lowering the dignity of this House to an unprecedented level. I find it very difficult - now, you can laugh - I find it very difficult that all of you people over there agree with his tactics.

MR. W. ROWE: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I realize that the honourable gentleman is being sincere in what he says. Probably he is not completely aware of the rules against making disparaging remarks about a member of the House.

MR. BRETT: I am not making disparaging remarks. I am not.

MR. W. ROWE: Sir, I would suggest -

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): Order please! The honourable member has a right to make his point.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the point is, as I say, members of this House are obviously permitted to criticize one another on matters of policy and sometimes it even gets to personalities but Beauchesne and the Standing Orders are quite clear, that no member may be permitted in the House to make disparaging comments about another member in his conduct as a member of this House. I would ask Your Honour to draw this to the attention of the honourable member now speaking.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order: The honourable member is not making disparaging comments but really comments which are statements of fact.

MR. MARSHALL: The honourable Leader of the Opposition has in this address, "with impunities," it is too bad he is not here today, but "with impunities," hurled such adjectives as "unscrupulous" to describe the deputy chairman, somebody as being unworthy of office, accusing him of misleading, with impunity and what have you, so it is a little bit unusual for me to hear from the honourable member for White Bay South such sanctimonious pratings after what we had to listen to from his honourable Leader when he was addressing in the Address in Reply.

MR. WM. ROWE: On the Point of Order, Sir, may I remind the House Leader, while making the Point of Order, that if the Leader of the Opposition did anything out of order or which affected the privileges of any member of this House or this House itself, there are remedies available. He can make motions if the privileges of this House are affected. What the Leader of the Opposition did or did not do is irrelevant for the purposes of the Point of Order. The honourable member is not permitted to make disparaging comments about the conduct of another member of the House in his capacity as a member, Mr. Speaker. It is a simple rule.

MR. WM. MARSHALL: On those comments, Mr. Speaker, the only remedy we have against the Leader of the Opposition, the ultimate remedy is for the purpose of bringing in a motion for ultimate expulsion from the House, and we on this side do not choose to make this House of Assembly another Newfie joke between Halifax and British Columbia because the members on the other side of the House have attempted to do it. So we, because of his position, are forced not to be able to bring in the ultimate sanction that we would dearly love to bring against him.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. STAGG): The points of both honourable members are well taken. The member for Trinity North is making a speech and he is giving his thoughts about the decorum of the House and how honourable members are deporting themselves in that role.

Now, by doing so he has to confine himself to certain requirements which have grown up over the years. However, there



is nothing wrong with his remarks with regard to the decorum of the House and how honourable members, in his view, honourable members should deport themselves. However he must do so within the bounds of good taste and parliamentary practice. So I ask the honourable member to keep this mind as he continues with his speech.

MR. BRETT: Sir, during my tenure as a civil servant, I witnessed, through no choice of my own, I was actively involved in the resettlement policy of the past administration. This resettlement, under the guidance of the Department of Community and Social Development, had to be one of the most cruel deeds ever committed against the people.

I am not suggesting, Sir, that resettlement is bad or that some of the people who are resettled are not better off today but what I am saying, Sir, is that the programme was carried out in such a manner that many were forced to move against their will. They were allowed to resettle in areas where there was no employment and living conditions were unbearable. Whole communities were broken and customs and cultures were changed.

Sir, I was particularly involved in the resettlement of two or three islands in Bonavista Bay. I saw what happened to these people and their way of life. I saw a grown man cry, Sir, because their lives would never be the same again. Their means of making a living was taken away from them. Their schools and their churches, which in many cases they built themselves, were left behind to be destroyed by vandals.

Sir, it was sad and I feel in many cases unwarranted. Our government has a resettlement programme as well. We have a new name put on it. But I am happy to say that it is not our intention to destroy whole communities because eight per cent of the people may want to move. What we believe in is orderly, planned centralization.

Sir, we will set up receiving areas where land is available for house construction, where employment is available and it will not be necessary for a whole community to move in order for a person to qualify for assistance. We will, Sir, assist any person in moving if that person

has employment and if he has a desire to relocate his home and his family.

I think, Sir, that this policy of ours is good. I think it is well planned and I do believe that many Newfoundlanders will take advantage of it.

Very little has been said so far, certainly nothing said on the other side of the House, not too much on this side in connection with this government's action in increasing the minimum wage. The past administration, Sir, after twenty-two years could boast of a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour for men and \$1.00 per hour for women.

Now shortly after this government took office, the minimum wage was increased to \$1.25 for men.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$1.40.

MR. BRETT: No, \$1.25 first for men and women, and a little later on it was further increased to \$1.40. We have since increased the minimum wage to \$1.80 per hour and this is to be increased to \$2.00 by July month and then to \$2.20 by January of 1975.

So that, Sir, is an increase of ninety-five cents per hour for men and \$1.20 for women over a period of three years. So, Sir, I do not think that is too bad for a do-nothing government.

Talking of long-winded speeches and people who are very eloquent in delivering them, we sat through many painful hours here and listened to the honourable member for Bell Island expound and extol, again I say very eloquently, the virtues of his party and I have been wondering, Sir, as a political novice, just what the past administration ever did for Bell Island except have a contract on somebody's desk that never did get signed.

The mines were closed. The people were forced to leave our province. I do not know if they did anything about it. They did not to the best of my knowledge. The ferry service - according to what I have heard in the past two years, has been poor, was poor all during the reign of his government. I wonder did they negotiate with the federal government for improvement or did they not? I do not

know. I know that we did and I believe that there have been some improvements in the service.

Since we took office, not only have we been responsible for some changes in the ferry service but because of our representations to the federal government and I suppose representations by the people also to the federal government, a study is presently being carried out to study the feasibility of using the mines on Bell Island for oil storage.

I might add, Sir, that a few rural development loans have helped, maybe in no great big way, we have not created thousands of jobs or anything, I mean in Bell Island, but I am sure that in a small way some people on Bell Island have benefited from our rural development programme. It is really too bad because the opposition does not agree with that programme.

Again, getting back to long-winded speeches, we were forced to sit in this honourable House, Sir, for five hours, somewhere between five and six and listen to a barrage of utter trash and nonsense and to use the honourable gentleman's own words, "The stuff that covers the funks," for the honourable Leader of the Opposition for five-and-a-half hours we sat here and listened. You talk about wasting the time of the House, Sir, well that will have to go down in history as the greatest waste of time that was ever experienced here, although probably his former leader might have been a little bit better at it. Of course it was the most nonsensical speech that I have ever heard here in the last two years as well.

Now the honourable gentlemen

over there what is left of them they keeping saying they do not want to hear about the past. If that is so why, In the Name of Heavens! did he spent over two hours flogging a dead horse on Thursday, Friday and Monday?

I do not think the people of this province are concerned as to whether or not Mr. Saunders received a payoff? I say he should have, if he did not. Not only that but he should get a medal because, Sir, he did this province a great service. I think he should go down in history as a great Newfoundlander. But for his courage to resign you know some of that honourable group could still be hanging on by the fingernails, it is even possible we might still have a Liberal Government and just imagine what a mess this province would be in if we had to go another four years under that crowd.

Again whenever mention is made of the past there are three or four of them over there who will pipe up and say "Oh, we were in the cabinet. We did not know what was going on. You have them over here who are in the cabinet and they know all about it." I wonder about the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I understand that he was the parliamentary assistant of the former Premier, Mr. Smallwood.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Vardy was on the other side.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Vardy was on the other side that is right. I understand that he occupied the office on the right of the Premier. Now certainly goodness he must have known something of what was going on in government, or did he just hold a title of parliamentary assistant? Was he a messenger boy? Or what?

MR. ROWE, W.N.: What does the honourable member mean "What does he know?"

MR. BRETT: Well he claims he does not know what was going on as soon as something comes up, as soon as we bring up something about the past. He says "Well I do not know what was going on, I was not in the cabinet. I had no idea." So I am just wondering what was he doing up there. As I said, he probably was a messenger boy.

AN HON. MEMBER: He wants to know what was going on "Charlie" things

like the renting of the Philip Place Building, the liquor stores -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker,

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition wants the people of Newfoundland to know what happened to Mr. Saunders. I wish the people of Newfoundland knew why we cannot get Mr. Vardy out of the United States.

Sir, we do not want to refer to the past, I can assure you, the last thing that we want to do is to talk about the past.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the honourable member talking about?

MR. BRETT: We want to get on with the job, Sir, of planning this province in a sufficient manner, a manner that will benefit -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. BRETT: or be beneficial to every single Newfoundlander. Sir, there are times when we are forced to think about the past, because I think the Liberal Administration is still an albatross around our neck and is going to be for the next four, five or maybe eight or ten years. They left the country in such a mess that there is no way that it can be cleared up any less than four to eight years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: The Leader of the Opposition spoke for a few minutes or maybe a half an hour, I do not know how long, on the needs of his district. I was rather surprised that there is anything left to do up in his district. After all his party were in power for twenty-two years, certainly goodness every road that is up there should be paved, every community should have water and sewerage. Certainly he should have all the facilities.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: I am wondering if all these needs occurred over the last two years or since we took office. Or did they exist all during the

twenty-two years and if they did, how come that he could not get anything done about it under his government?

AN HON. MEMBER: Because he did not get up until ten o'clock in the morning. That is why.

MR. CROSBIE: He is no good in the afternoons.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is no good in the afternoons.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BRETT: Sir, if I may to get away from the Opposition for a while, I would just for a few more minutes like to make some reference to the Redistribution Bill which is to come before this session of the House. Certainly the setting up of this independent committee has to be an example of the democratic way that this government operates.

AN HON. MEMBER: No gerrymandering.

MR. BRETT: I am sure that the opposition and the public expected us to do some gerrymandering.

MR. CROSBIE: "Joeymandering" they used to call it.

MR. BRETT: "Joeymandering" they used to call it.

There is one thing I am sure of, Sir, I do not know how they arrived at the district boundaries but I can assure you that they are not set up along political lines.

While I agree with the report in general there are certain aspects of it with which I do not agree. It appears that there was no, or very little anyway, consideration given to geographic, historic or cultural factors. I would like to quote some examples. I will take the two districts that are nearest to me, the first one is the District of Bonavista South. Somebody drew a line across the peninsula from below Summerville up to Bonaventure, which means that one half of the district is in Bonavista Bay and the other half is in Trinity Bay. It is split almost evenly. Certainly in these two areas there are vast social, historical and geographical differences. In spite of the fact that the district is in two bays, they are still calling it Bonavista South. I do not know how that is going to work.

Another one is my own, I suppose it will be my own, I hope so, the new District of Clarendville. Again the boundaries extend from Trinity Bay right on out into Placentia Bay. There are certainly many differences there. The amusing part of course is that they chose to call this district, the District of Clarendville. You do not have to be very intelligent to see that this is not going to be accepted by the people.

However, Sir, generally speaking I approve of an increase in the number of districts. However I would have liked to see some differences in the terms of reference that were given to the commission. I look forward to speaking on this again when it is presented to the House.

There are a couple of other points, Sir, one that has been brought to my attention on several occasions and I am sure it is a matter of concern for every member of the House, on both sides, is absentee landlords. There must be literally thousands of acres of land in this province that are tied up, nobody knows who owns them and there is no way that we can find out.

Again I would like to quote an example that some constituents of mind went after a parcel of land on the Random Island end of the Mefferton Causeway. They were going to develop this land for commercial purposes. When they made application to the Crown Lands Division of the Department of Agriculture and Forestry, they discovered that it was deeded to a doctor, somebody, back in the late 1800's, an English doctor. Now obviously the man is dead. Nobody can find any living relative. They would have had to go through more bureaucracy and red tape to get that piece of land. Well of course they came to the point where they said; "We will forget it and we will go somewhere else."

Now I know this must be the case in the whole province. I hope and I sincerely hope, Sir, that this government will take some action to see that this problem does not exist too much longer. Maybe we should start taxing people if we can find them.

There is another item that has been brought to my attention repeatedly not by a large number of people but by some people. It is rather ironic

that even before I decided to mention it in my address that I received a letter and probably all of you did, again on both sides of the House, from one of the M.P.'s in Ottawa, regarding the cost of ambulance service in the rural parts of the Dominion. Apparently a gentleman, I do not remember his name, I do not even know if I can pronounce it or not, but he has made a survey right across the Dominion. He has come to the conclusion that while the ambulance service in the urban areas of the Dominion may be good, in the rural areas it is extremely bad.

Again I would like to use my district as an example. It costs \$170 to get an ambulance to travel from the extreme end of my district, say the Elliston Area, to St. John's. Now certainly every member here can understand that the average worker, say the man in the fish plant or the fishermen, the ordinary labourer or the logger just cannot put his hand in his pocket at any given time and find \$170.

MR. ROWE, W.N. They are private ambulance?

MR. BRETT: Oh, yes.

The result is that they do not get the ambulance, I suppose in most cases they do. This then means that the person who owns the ambulance has a very large accounts receivable. Now there is in Clarenville at the present time one of - I will not say best but certainly one of the better ambulance services in this province. They have three extremely well-equipped vehicles. Over the last two years they have operated at a loss of \$25,000. Now there is no way that anybody can expect



these or this company to carry on. They obviously will go bankrupt if they keep it up and this means there will be no service. I suppose the responsibility will fall back into the lap of the government.

I am not suggesting for one moment that this province can afford to subsidize the cost of ambulance service. I go back to Clarenville. There are two ambulance services there. They have existed up to this point because there is more to their business than the ambulance service. I suppose they are robbing Peter to pay Paul. I do believe, Sir, that this government should certainly make an investigation, probably negotiate with the Federal Government to have some kind of a programme. I do not know the answer. I do not know if it can be included in the medicare programme or some other cost-sharing programme but certainly this is a very, very serious matter. It is going to be dumped back in our laps sooner or later and I think that we should be ready for it.

In closing, Sir, I would like to say that the future looks bright in my district, reasonably bright because of Come By Chance, because of Catalina, because of Clarenville, because of the Moore's Administration. I know, Sir, I feel reasonably certain that we will receive our share of government funds. I have no doubt that we will continue to grow and to prosper.

HON. A.J. MURPHY (MINISTER OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE): Mr. Speaker, I would like to avail of the next short while to say a few words on behalf not only of my district, the district I so proudly represent, but also the department, a much maligned department, a very human department, a department that deals with some 60,000 or 70,000 of our fellow Newfoundlanders to try to render to the best of our ability and to the best of our finances, to make their lot a bit easier while they are with us.

Mr. Speaker, I think first of all I should offer my congratulations to the two gentlemen who so ably moved and seconded the motion for the Address in Reply and particularly I would say the member for Bonavista South. I think he made a very splendid speech. To me he is one of the

new breed, if you like, of politicians that come to sit in this House. After sitting here - I think this is my thirteenth sitting - and watching from over there the actions, the conduct and behaviour of those who were then a part of the yo-yos, the Liberal Administration, it is refreshing indeed, Sir, to see this type of young man that I speak about, stand up, deliver himself of what is on his mind, speak out, I think basically, in the first instance, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those who sent him here, not the Premier of the province but the people of the district he represents.

I think, Sir, that we have reached a new high as far as politics are concerned in Newfoundland and I think we have reached a new low, Sir, as far as this House of Assembly is concerned.

Before I get into that, I think I should extend a very sincere welcome to this honourable House to the newest member of the House, the member for Hermitage who, in my opinion - I have not known him very well but I have known him fairly well. I think he is typical also of the young Newfoundlander that we have looked forward to and looked up to to do something for our province. He is a highly educated young man, I think a very sensible young man and perhaps comes into this House under more pressure or more of a strain than any of us have. He has taken his seat with the opposition, Sir. I notice that he is sitting, observing, trying to figure out what it is all about.

I understand today - I do not get too much chance to listen to open line programmes - that he paid me a compliment. He called me a corner boy, I think he says, and I will accept this. We are very proud to be corner boys. There are very few of us left in the City of St. John's because there are mostly outport people living in St. John's now; the new affluence, the new moving around of people. I know that as he sits there day after day, elected by a district that was so long in the shadows, if you wish - I took part, Sir, in the campaign in Hermitage district. I had only been there once in recent years and that was a part of my duties as Minister of Social Services, when the Harbour Breton disaster took place, a very sad

affair indeed. Last time I had visited previous to that, Sir, was back in 1933 I think when I was a travelling salesman. At that time, if somebody had told me, as we beat our way in and out the various harbours by coastal boat, that one day we would be able to drive right from the City of St. John's into Hermitage, Harbour Breton, you name them, you know you would say, "You are just off your rocker."

I was very happy, Sir, and very pleased to see the people emerge from the shadows, if you like, into modern living. I am very happy, Sir, that our government in its short period in office, had been able to do what we did, notwithstanding what motives were attributed to the bit of pavement went in there and the great amount went in there. I am sure that the honourable member, as being member for the district, too is very happy to see his people and they are his people now and will be, get what few benefits that they had been crying for for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, when I came into this House in 1962, elected by the people of St. John's Centre, a known historical district, the older part, I have two different parts of my district. I have the lower part below LaMarchant Road, if you like, and we have the newer area, what we call the housing area or as the late Andrew G. Carnell used to call it, The New Jerusalem. When I came into this House I was like, I think, so many others, very proud, very honoured to be elected to this, which at the time I thought was a very, very select place. I think it was a touch of awe if you like or deference if you want attached to this noble House. We sat over there - there were seven of us that year. The government were on this side and under Mr. Smallwood. Mr. Smallwood sat right there where Premier Moores now sits. I marvelled, I really marvelled at what control one man could exercise over so many other men.

Now, when I say this I say it with a purpose because I perhaps might have been one of the ones that were seated right there behind Mr. Smallwood. I had been made a very handsome offer by a couple of high ranking cabinet ministers. As a matter of fact I would say that the price I was offered to run in St. John's Centre and at the time

it was said to me, quietly on the side, to bring some respectability to the Liberal Party. It was a great tribute to me. I do not know just what was meant by it but the party at that time was a party of one-man rule in a sense. I just say again here; we do not use the term dictatorship. I do not at this time.

We sat over there and when I look now at what has been happening in this House, particularly the past few weeks, the attitude of the same people who sat here and scoffed and laughed and sneered and booed and hissed and completely ignored an elected opposition. I would say there has been a miracle some time. Somewhere in the gospel there is a story of a miracle where the tongue was unleashed and the person spoke. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that has

happened in this honourable House in the past two years. I remember on many occasions we stood up and asked questions. Mr. Jim Chalker who was Minister of Public Works at the time was seated right here and the Premier was right there and the honourable W.J. Browne who was nothing less than an assiduous member of the House of Assembly, a very thorough member, would ask: "How much did that extension to the university cost us?" and Mr. Smallwood say: "Ah! tell him \$27, 897.10." That is the type of answer we were getting, Sir. That is the type of answer we were getting.

Now we are all worked up. A member stormed out the other day because he asked the same question about seventy-five times in two years and the honourable Minister of Education just said: "Look! I am just about browned off answering this question." He stormed out as if democracy had come to an end. It brings back a thought to me, Sir, of a parliamentary conference I attended in Fredericton accompanied by the now member for Fogo and a former member for Burgeo-LaPoile and Dr. Frecker. We discussed various items dealing with proceedings in Houses, our Provincial Houses. The topic under discussion at this particular time was the question period. I had been delegated to say a few words on this because if there was anyone familiar with asking questions it was I as a member of the Opposition. The chairman said to me; "Mr. Murphy, do you have any problem with the question department back in Newfoundland?" I said; "Not a bit, Sir. It is the answer period we have the trouble with, no trouble with questions."

I believe, Sir, that we came in here (and I say we, the P.C. Government on this side. You can call them a P.C. Government I think we are more or less a cosmopolitan group composed of disgruntled Liberals, other people who wanted to straighten the province out and a few of us who were the hardened P.C.'s. I see my old colleague there from St. Mary's and my other colleague who is

not in the House now, from St. John's East Extern, who in 1966 were the only ones returned, with thirty-four percent of the vote at the time, Sir. We had thirty-four percent of the vote and we elected three members to this honourable House. Whoever talks about Joeymandering or dipsydoodling or anything else with votes, whoever was in the past government was some kind of an expert.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can brush a lot of yesterday and yesteryear under the carpet. I think now we have adopted that programme of new horizons. We are living in an age now, Sir, in this province and I am very happy and very proud to be a part of the Moores Administration, that was elected some two years ago, that came in and started to do or endeavour to do things that we said we would do. It is going to take time, It is going to take time.

I have a few words set out here that I will read because it is very important, Mr. Speaker, to get the facts on the floor. It is all typed in here and I have passed it to the press who I hope will give me the same courtesy as they do to the friends of the member from Bell Island.

Mr. Speaker, to carry on: Many years ago, back in the thirties, as a matter of fact, I attended a meeting in Pitt's Memorial Hall. There was a gentleman visiting the province at that time who delivered an address entitled; "Can It Happen Here?" It dealt with a surge, if you like, of new philosophies that were happening throughout the world. They were called "Isms" at that time. Communism, fascism, a little later on we had Hitlerism. He spoke then of what was happening in the great United States of America, where the little cells were being planted in little areas. little groups, protest groups, this group here, little cells. Anybody who reads the growth of communism, of course, will know that

they all grow from little cells.

As I look back, Mr. Speaker, since we had the pleasure and the honour, Sir, to bring to this province the greatest social welfare programme ever known, my mind throws back, what is happening with these little groups? The press for example; and I will not quote it here - I have a clipping from the "Evening Telegram" the editor - Mr. Harrington - written - branding pretty well every welfare officer in this province as a tyrant, a hard-hearted group of people who have no use for human feelings. I wrote Mr. Harrington on this, protesting this and asking him to be decent enough to come out and name these welfare officers for me because, as minister of a department, I will not tolerate any welfare officer who is not a human being. I do not care what his education is but one basic principle he must have and that is humanity, compassion. He can have all the degrees he likes but if he is not compassionate to these less privileged people there is no place for him in our welfare system. I received no answer. This was the "Evening Telegram" and I presume Mr. Harrington as the editor, he must accept responsibility.

Then appears another Mr. Harrington. Not Michael the Editor of the "Evening Telegram" but Peter an emigrant from Toronto, (I do not know if there is any relation, I do not know if there is any connection) and Peter goes throughout the province spreading the good word about the Minister of Social Services.

Then we have another beautiful article by a Mr. Collins describing my utter hatred, if you like, for welfare people. Only on Sunday I had heard the fact, only on Sunday and of course, notwithstanding, the Leader of the Opposition and the honourable member for Bell Island come out and say our programme was a fraud, it was dishonest, it was this, it was everything else. Of course, anything different from these two gentlemen and I would get the surprise of my life. I had heard the story that this Mr. Harrington, this great

crusader was living on unemployment insurance. On Sunday on a programme he confirmed this. Now, what I am trying to find out, to get back to what I heard forty years ago about the seed being sown, the cells, the isms, who is financing Mr. Harrington in this province? Any of these gentlemen I have mentioned? Are any of them financing him? How can any man, and I say this, Mr. Speaker, how can any man getting unemployment insurance travel this province and live the way that man is living? And I understand he drives a big, black car. Where is the money coming from? Where is the money coming from? Very lightly it can be treated by the two opposite, but, Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very serious matter, in my opinion a very serious matter.

We have these little groups whoever they are - the member for Bell Island decides to accompany a group to the Premier's Eight Floor, up there encouraging them to destroy that place. another disregard, Mr. Speaker, for any authority. God help us! What have we reached? We talk about education. Let us forget it if that is education. What kind of a state have we reached in this province, Sir, when a member of this House goes to the eight floor and says more or less, if not in words in actions; "Beat her down!"

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable Minister whether he knows it or not is violating the privileges of a member of this House and the House itself as Your Honour well knows. Now



I would request, I would request the minister, he has accused a member of this House, twice. I let the first opportunity go by. The second time I felt duty-bound to rise, Sir, because I thought he was carried away the first time in the heat of debate. The honourable minister has accused a member of this House of perpetrating a crime or encouraging the perpetration of a crime.

Now, Sir, I ask that the honourable minister withdraw his remarks or that the Speaker take whatever action is necessary under the standing orders.

HON. ANK MURPHY:(Minister of Social Assistance): Mr. Speaker, to that point of order: May I say the very presence of that gentleman on that floor that day was an encouragement and I ask this House to side with me or disagree with me. The very presence with this group of people, he was encouraging them to do this type of thing and it is an actual fact, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the point of order, Sir? I agree with what my colleague has just said, Sir and I would like to point out for the information of the honourable members of the House that I did at no time accompany anyone to the Eight Floor. I was going up in the elevator one day and I heard a fuss on the eighth floor and I stepped off the elevator to see what was going on.

So, Mr. Speaker, the point of order, as far as I am concerned, Sir, is in order and the gentleman should withdraw his statements and apologize to the House.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Interruption inaudible.

MR NEARY: Listen to the valedictorian, the schoolboy debater.

MR SPEAKER: Order please!

I had just returned to the Chair at the point of order in this debate and I am certainly not familiar with the speech or words which lead up to this. I shall have to await the copy of the verbatim report to look at the whole thing and rule on it later.

MR MURPHY: These are some of the things, Mr. Speaker, that this House

as elected responsible, if we are responsible representatives, must take into our view very carefully. This past few days in this House the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Bell Island, particularly, have made accusations and made remarks on the floor of this House, Sir, my honourable colleague referred to; never, never would they be heard or tolerated, Sir and this may be a criticism of you, the Speaker. Mr. Speaker. I think, Sir, that we have reached the stage now and that is why when I think of the honourable member for Hermitage who today, I understand - as I said earlier on, I am a bit too busy to listen open-line programmes - who more or less slated me today for interrupting certain speakers or perhaps harassing or whatever you would like to call it in this honourable House, Mr. Speaker.

But, Sir, of a few, Mr. Speaker and the honourable member had sat in this House for the past twelve or thirteen years as some of us have and then listen to the mealy-mouths that stand up and try to say otherwise, Sir. It is absolutely, to me absolutely disgusting, Sir, when I look at the progress made in this beautiful Province of ours, not only in the past two years; we are not fools. We have come a long way, Sir, the past twenty-five years since 1949. We have come a long ways in many things, Sir and when I look at the strides made in education, Sir, I think - but I look at the member from Bell Island - what a great blessing it must be, and I look at the Leader of the Opposition and I say; what a disgraceful waste of money.

We are here, Sir, supposed to be here as examples to the people who sent us here. True. Perhaps I am as bad as any when I get the little bit of harassing and this type of thing in, Sir, but I will say this, I will say this; I never yet destroy a man, his reputation, by character assassination like has been happening in this House. I can repeat many things, Sir, but what do I say? "So-and-so said this to me, this one said that to me". How can I corroborate this? How can I prove it? I have walked that corridor there, Sir with the former Premier of this Province, when these same two gentlemen were there. He said: "Mr.

Murphy, look." He said, "Look what we have to put up with. Is this what I have to leave?" He said this. I cannot prove that because the gentleman said it to me. But I can see how he felt. I can see how he felt. We can see it now.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who would not feel that way? He is well known for .... (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: Let us, Mr. Speaker, before I get into my few words on behalf of my department as a defence, Sir, as a defence, if I must say it on this floor. I can say it. I can preach it. I was on a programme with the honourable Premier, "Issues and Answers". We had spent literally thousands of dollars, Sir, thousands of dollars to advertise in newspapers, you have it, full pages, and do you know what one of the panels said, "How do you plan to let the people of this Province know about this programme?" This was from one of the news media on a special event for a special affairs programme. "How do you plan it?" After literally spending thousands of dollars to let people know. How can we do it? It is hard. It is hard.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we can, we can do something with Newfoundland. We can, Sir if people, the members of this honourable House, no matter what stripe or party they represent - they were elected by the same type of Newfoundlander that I was or someone else. For heaven sake! for heaven sake! and I look forward to the honourable member for Hermitage, the new member, to find out what his speech is going to say. Will he find a water haul in the Speech from the Throne? Is he against our forestry programme? Is he against rural development? Is he against what we are trying to do for the fisheries? Do not tell me about fisheries because we have talked a fishery budget for eighteen, nineteen, twenty years in this House and there was not enough spent to supply worms for you to go winter fishing, on fishery, and now we are trying to do something with it.

Mr. Speaker, it is much harder to rebuild over an old house than it is to build a new one. We came in under a handicap, Sir. It is like the old gentleman said to me about the barn. He said, "Mr. Murphy, there

is no trouble to paint her and put the windows in, but cleaning out the manure was my big problem."

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: That is what we inherited, Sir, my own department down there, the Department of Social Services, and my honourable colleague from St. John's East Extern should get the Victoria Cross for what he did in that department after taking over from the member from Bell Island. He had destroyed everything in that department, the moral fibre of the people, Sir. That "Old "B" across the hall, "The Dirty Son of a B out there" - we all read it in the paper. You know, I am not telling you people now. We read that enquiry, what had happened in that department. You know, is there anything criminal in what this gentleman did, in the enquiry? If there was not there was something darn well unethical wrong with it, Sir. And if we have any guts, if we have any guts, and I speak to the Member for White Bay South, if we have any guts, when that reports reaches this House, Sir, when this report reaches this House, let us look at the contents, Sir, with his co-minister down there; giving away refrigerators and everything else to people.

Let us be gentlemen, have guts enough to look at what is and say, can we afford to sit with the type of person that is talked about? I have no qualms, Sir. I refused this department four times. I did not want to take Social Services, Sir. I think it is the toughest department in government, Sir. I am not looking for it. I would make a lot more friends in other departments than I do in this. But there is one thing that I will tell this honourable House, if the law is there I will obey the law. I will not give anyone in St. John's Centre five dollars extra or ten dollars extra or a new stove or a washer or a refrigerator to get their vote. I do not have to do that.

Mr. Speaker, in December this government introduced the Social Assistance Programme. It became effective January 1, and I am now reading this here with the permission of the House, because I want to get this on the record. The press have it. I have tables here to show just what I am speaking of. I challenge anybody, but anybody in this House, Sir, to object to anything that is in this programme. This took many months, Sir. This was not thought up like Mr. Harrington's, who had to stay up until five o'clock in the morning to finish his. No, Sir! Anybody, but anybody, can take this and multiply it by two and come up with a new programme. There will be some \$10 million to \$12 million of the people's money going into this programme, not \$30 million like the Hon. member for Bell Island suggested that I should read the other brief.

The first thing this government set out to do, Sir, was to give social assistance recipients an increase in their allowances. This was a matter of urgency because very little had been done for these recipients in over seven years, Sir, and that is apart from the increased benefits that my former colleague, the former minister gave in 1972, Sir. It is a matter of record. It is not hearsay. This is nothing but a matter of record. In seven years, from 1967 to 1973, Sir, there was a seven per cent increase in the benefits given by the former Liberal Administration to these people and the cost of living had been documented as increasing thirty per cent. There are the great humanitarians. There is the group who say we are not doing anything for anybody. That is them - the mealy mouth again - the whited sepulchers. They gave them practically nothing, Sir, in the last five and one half years they were in power.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: Laugh boys! Laugh! Tell the widows, tell the poor people you laughed! It is a pity television is not here.

They did introduce one worthwhile change and that was the pay by cheque rather than the old voucher system. I will give

them credit for that, Sir. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that because they changed from the voucher to the cheque, it did not put any more foods there, no more food into the bellies of these people, no more clothes on their back, no more anything. They had money for everything else, Sir, everything else. If you want me to, Sir, I can go back and talk for many hours on who were the recipients, who were the beneficiaries, Sir, of the millions of dollars that the former government spent but none for that poor widow, none for her. Yet, Sir, now they have the gall and the brass (I better not, the doctor said to take it easy) to criticize our administration for giving increases. I will come to them now in a minute. What we did for the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, 15,000 long-term recipients received little or nothing in the last six years of the great big-hearted Liberal Administration. Many people did get big money out of it, Sir. The Phillip Place, I think, was a good example of someone getting a bit of money. That could have put a lot of stomach into -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: Sir, ninety-one per cent of these 15,000 people received an increase in their allowance. I am talking about the 15,000 long-term. Ninety-one per cent of the sick, Sir, the handicapped, the widow with dependent children, received a raise and some of these were most substantial, fifty dollars to sixty dollars a month, Sir. Five per cent received no increase nor no decrease. Four per cent, (this great mob that we are talking about, the people we are trying to starve to death, Sir) took a decrease in their allowances. We did not try to hide it. I suppose if the Premier said it once, he said it one hundred times, as I did, because of the fact that this programme is a planned programme, planned with the minimum wage and the cost of living. We will say now and I will say it again that our government states the fact that nobody but nobody should be better off on welfare

than is the working man who is out earning his living. Now anybody who wants to disagree with that, please stand up and be identified.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: Just let me give an example of that. We pegged Mr. Speaker, our rates at two adults, plus seven children. We pegged our rates at \$320 per month because above that, as we said, they would be receiving more than the man that was working in the fish plant or working on the water front or working anywhere else. All right here is an illustration.

I have a welfare person, with two, plus seven children. We give them \$320 per month as a cheque. This is to cover food, so on and so forth. That is \$3,840 per year. We pay rent at \$175 a month, up to that. We can pay that and that by twelve is \$2,100. From the third floor of this building, Sir, that person receives \$5,940 in actual cash benefits. Because they have seven children, Sir, they will receive (not from us, not from the provincial government, not from Frank Moores, Ank Murphy - no) from the federal government, from Mark LaLonde, a cheque every month, as we have been telling them all, for \$140, multiplied by twelve is \$1,680 per year. That family has a total income of \$7,620 and perhaps it is not enough. I am not saying it is. Let us look, Mr. Speaker. There are no Unemployment Insurance deductions, no Workmen's Compensation deductions, no C.P. deductions, no nothing deductions. This is net money. Every cent goes to that family.

AN HON. MEMBER: No taxes.

MR. MURPHY: I had the same instance in my department. A man working, his wife and they have seven children, to use an example. He earns the same amount of money. He pays to the federal government, \$498.20 in income tax. What is discrimination? What is it? Are we trying to starve people to death? Is that fair, Sir? Is there someone, some day, going to rise up and say, what about the people who are working, Mr. Murphy? What about us? Is someone going to look at us, for God's sake? Is the member for Bell Island

going to carry a placard and say, look, what about these poor people who are working. Are they going to do something for them? You know, this is the kind of guff, Sir, that the air lines are filled with, that you read in the papers about. This is all. This is a story. Who starts it? Who is financing it? Again I come back: Where is Peter Harrington getting his money? Where is he getting it? The civil servants here have complained, Sir, about travelling and they only getting an allowance of so much a day, when they are on government business. They say that they do not have enough. They get an allowance. I think they are getting slightly better than unemployment insurance. What is happening? I could go on, Sir, and give examples where the poor guy who is down there working his guts out



it is literally being screwed to the wall in this life we are living in today with the cost of living. You know, this is not a secret in St. John's Centre. My people are not different. I think we have got them in White Bay South. We have got them in Labrador North. We have them everywhere. But please do not anybody say that Frank Moores and Ank Murphy are out to bury alive the welfare people. Please do not say it again because these are some examples of what they meant. I could go on and on.

You know the opposition, Mr. Speaker - fraud, it is a disaster. You should not be allowed to use the family allowances income. What will we use it for? I consider that dollar in the family allowance cheque is just as good as the dollar that I get from the provincial government. What is wrong with it? It is not play money. That is actual cash. It may not be worth one hundred cents here in Newfoundland, it may only be worth sixty-five, I do not know. What is the objection to the family income dollar? What is wrong with it? Will someone tell me?

You go on up and I will bet you that if we had carried the old plan under the new rates, that two plus twelve will be getting more money than any member of this House of Assembly with their family allowance. You know but still you hear it, the big cry. Wick Collins (oh his heart is broken), "Murphy, the dirty so and so, the Beast of Belsen. Look what he is doing to the welfare people," poor Wick, you know. God help us Almighty, what do you have to put up with, Sir? How do you defend yourself against this type of thing? How do you do it? Have you any answer, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell it like it is.

MR. MURPHY: Tell it like it is. That is what I am trying to do.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: That is what they are, Sir. I never touched them. I never did any such thing. I just quoted you here, look, a man and his wife and seven children, \$320 per month. \$320 a month in his welfare cheque, right, for food you know, by twelve it is \$3,840 a year. We pay his rent, \$175 a month. That is \$2,100 a year.

That is \$5,940 he has gotten from the provincial government, from the Department of Social Assistance, Right?

AN HON. MEMBER: Plus drugs.

MR. MURPHY: He gets a drug card. I do not know how much that would be. I could not value it. It might be \$10, \$20, \$30, \$40 a month.

I just heard the member for Trinity North talk about mandarins. I ran into a case in Harbour Breton when I was down. The honourable member does a tremendous job down there, got elected. A gentleman came over to me, he worked in the fish plant, he said; "Mr. Murphy, can you help me?" I said; "What is the problem?" He said; "I had to bring my wife to Grand Falls, put her in the hospital. I had to get an ambulance." \$125 he had to pay out of whatever he was getting. I do not know what he was getting in the fish plant. He might have been getting a good - But it cost him \$125.

AN HON. MEMBER: \$190 from Bonavista.

MR. MURPHY: But the lady across the street, God bless her, on welfare - free, you know. I am only making the point that we spend \$3 million on behalf of welfare clients, just about, on prescription drugs. I wonder how many fathers or parents working in this building today are seriously hurt by having to pay the cost of drugs.

We look at ourselves, the affluent, here, you know, big deal, getting nearly as much as the plumbers and now the sheet metal workers and the electricians. We get nearly as much as them. We can brag here. But let any of us strike illness in our families, brothers. It is no joke with anybody with five or six children today.

Stop me now but I am trying to be perfectly honest and frank. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to put the case before this honourable House of Assembly. The press as I say have everything up there. If they want a special edition, run it out, put my picture on the front page, not on the joke page. I do not worry, Mr. Speaker. The Premier

gives me a job to do. If I had my choice there are forty other. I could do Crosbie's job far better but the Premier says no.

You know, we talk about increases, we have, and just a statistic here, I am not going to read through all this, I am just picking it out but I gave it to the press so that they could pick it out and everything else. I do not plan to go right through this. The gentlemen of the press have it up there. Some of you people, or some of us people or some other people have a little bit of difficulty with their homes. You know they need a little repair here, perhaps to fix the roof or something like this, to give you some idea that we did not talk about in the rates, Mr. Speaker. We did not set them out in the rates.

Take building materials for 1973. In the month of January we had 203 cases that we assisted to the value of eighty-five thousand, six hundred odd dollars. That was building materials. We would go in there and help someone to make their, you know - I suppose if there is one thing we get criticism on above everything else, it is trying to help people with homes. We had an average of some, I would say we had a total of about 2,600 cases that we helped people with building materials. We spent \$943,000, Mr. Speaker. \$943,000 to assist these people to make their homes, and under the law this is the way it reads.

MR. NEARY: How many homes?

MR. MURPHY: About 2,600 cases altogether for the year, about 220 cases a month, the average, but \$943,000. The law states, under The Canada Assistance Plan; "to make the home water proof or water tight." That is what we can do. We have had them, you know, to put french windows in with box seats, to build in interior cupboards. We cannot do that under the Act, just as long as that roof is tight -

I know there are people, Sir, no one can tell me about housing, I have a mind to get off because if you get me on housing I am liable to be here for six months. Because I have been talking

since 1962 about it. But there is \$943, just about \$1 million, Mr. Speaker, that we give to people to upgrade their houses somewhat, at least to try to make them livable.

I know there are people today living in hovels but that did not happen since March 1972, Sir. No house deteriorates that much in that time so it goes back a long while before our government came in and before I became Minister of Welfare, but we try to help them all.

We are trying to get special welfare officers freed for to get into this housing area, to try to make an expert in assessing the value of homes, what is needed.

Let us take rents - what we pay for some of the rabbit warrens people are living in in this province. Yes, let us take it. Short-term assistance - \$1,124,000 we paid rent for, average cases per month 1,062; average cost per month - this is to pay rent on behalf of these poor people who cannot afford to pay their own rent. 1,062 monthly average, and the cost \$93,700, that is the average monthly cost. \$93,700 that is paid to someone for rent, whether it is a home, a dive, a den, you call it what you like but it is what is there. The other choice is - take them out and hang them up on the tree.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or gas them.

MR. MURPHY: As I said to the woman who said to me; "Madam," I said, "What are they trying to do? Do they expect you to jump in the harbour or be gassed?" She said, "Mr. Murphy said he was going to gas me."

Big deal again, the opposition have quoted that so many times and now the new member is - God help us, Mr. Member, look try to get a little bit of sense. I know the bad apple in the barrel and this kind of stuff you know, and tell me with whom you go and I will tell you what you are, but try to get a -

All right, long-term assistance - an average monthly case load of 1,451 and the average cost per rent - \$82,000, with a

total cost of rent we pay on behalf of some, average of 2,100 -  
\$2 million, that is for rent alone.

Now, I will speak, Sir, and I have not got a note  
of it because it is only lately passed.

As with reference to what they used to call in the old days the "pauper's burial". Not an earthshaking thing you know but a very, very sensitive thing I think, Mr. Speaker, they used to have that box and go along there. This year we have increased that very substantially so that it does not matter if there is anybody in the world belong to this poor creature whoever it is, relatives, at least they will get a half decent casket. What is the total amount of this? I do not know off hand. It is something like \$390 for a decent burial for our fellow creatures.

Just to give you a breakdown, Mr. Speaker, of the number of persons affected by this programme, one person units, that would be widows, perhaps older people, disabled, the handicapped, whatever they might be. There were 3,386 cases received an increase of \$50 per month. They were getting, Sir, under the great Liberal Regime, under the great big-hearted Minister of Welfare for Bell Island \$95 per month. Is not that something?

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame! Shame!

MR. MURPHY: Ninety-five dollars per month. There the honourable member stands up in all his brass and all his gall and says "What about the big family who you cut off?" What gall! What hypocrisy! God Bless us! One person units, they are unfortunates, in a lot of cases who are in boarding houses. There are 4,000 of these, Mr. Speaker, on our case load. They received the \$10 increase which is for the purpose of giving \$10. pocket money to get a little bit of tobacco or a little bit of something for themselves. Two person units - most of those maintaining their own homes - 4,285 cases, Sir. That is two person units - 4,285 cases received an increase of \$50 a month. How terrible! How I hate the welfare people! I wish the associate editor were here today so that I could speak to them right directly from my heart. I ask that the message be passed on to him as this announcement was made today.

Four person units - 1,775 - \$30 per month, five persons an increase of \$20 a month. It goes on down to the family of nine. Here the line crosses. The minimum wages, social assistance, two plus seven - \$320 a month. Three hundred and twenty dollars a month plus rent up to \$175 a month, plus prescription drug cards. I do not know how much, it could be \$10, it could be \$5, it could be \$50, it could be \$60, I do not know. Plus free transportation, ambulance service as necessary for any emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House if they care to stand up and be counted? Were we the answer? Are we being unfair to the people in Twillingate? To the people of White Bay South? My honourable friend and colleague for Fogo? Bell Island, no need to ask, the answer is there.

AN HON. MEMBER: No liquor when you are on welfare.

MR. MURPHY: The answer - what is that one "Written In The Wind" or something or whatever it is?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Absolutely! Come to St. John's Centre, I would love to have you down there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Another statistic, Sir, with all the talk of dollars and cents: Here we are, the poor little province, as Mr. Smallwood would say "Living on this rock, but we lived hard and we will die hard." That is what we will. Here we are away out there somewhere off the coast of England as compared to British Columbia as I tell them at the federal meetings: Percentage of provincial expenditures on social assistance as a percentage of personal income. The latest figures ever: Ontario 1.3 per cent; Alberta 1.5 per cent; British Columbia 1.7 per cent; Saskatchewan 1.9 per cent; Nova Scotia - Nova Scotia just across the gap there - 2 per cent; Manitoba 2.2 per cent; New Brunswick 2.4 per cent; Quebec 2.8 per cent; Prince Edward Island 3.3 per cent; Newfoundland 4.2 per cent of our income dollar is given to these poor people on welfare, the poor deserving people. God Help us! Is that any indication,

Sir, that we are trying to deprive them? 4.2 per cent of every earned dollar goes into welfare payment for this little province. Is that any indication that we are trying to gas these people? We are trying to throw them into the harbour? These are statistics. These are facts.

Short-term case load - For the month of December 1973: 4,617 persons short-term assistance.. The number of persons 22,048 -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Four thousand six hundred and seventeen cases; 22,048 persons, a cost of \$644,482. December 1971; Remember when? Cases 9,628 persons December 1971 that was the end before "Moores". December this year just about half, 4,600. Do not tell me, we know. We know all about it, LIP programmes, Unemployment Insurance. We know that and not for one moment did we deny that. I will say this that we have a couple of projects going; employment projects where we have at Harvey Road, where we are hit with the energy crisis too the same as everybody else - that is half of our trouble at Harvey Road, the energy crisis.

AN HON. MEMBER: No the energy crisis is over there.

MR. MURPHY: The honourable member for Bell Island's friends too tired to work. We mentioned work to a fellow one day and we had to bring in a doctor to revive him. Five years a veteran. He got an honorary membership card from the Liberal Party. Five years of heavy talk, then he dares talk about welfare. He said, "If Steve Neary were here right now I could get it." I said, "You are right brother," I said, "But Thanks be to God he is not."

Right on right down through, Mr. Speaker, gradual but very apparent increases in benefits. I have about eighty or ninety pages here if I wanted to read it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Keep her going! Keep her going!

MR. MURPHY: It has been mentioned about family allowances, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable member is comparing 1972, is he not?

MR. MURPHY: The assistant deputy minister and the chief administrator and the Director of Social Assistance -

MR. W. N. ROWE: All the people that the honourable the member for Bell Island knows.



MR. W. N. ROWE: All the people that the honourable member for Bell Island knows.

MR. MURPHY: All the honourable member's buddies.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: No, Sir, the minister is not an expert on anything. No, Siree! I do not intend to be. I do not pretend to be an expert, I am just trying to be a very human person. I take sixty or seventy phone calls a day. I try and see everybody who comes to my office. Perhaps that is the difference in me and the great expert on the other side of the House. I hope Please God that I will not need \$25,000 to spend on my campaign, for building materials in St. John's Centre this year. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that.

Now let us just think now about the ablebodied man who has to seek social assistance occasionally during the year. This is the guy who works a few months and he gets laid off. He maybe might be working at any kind of seasonal work.

MR. NEARY: Does he get unemployment insurance?

In other words, let us look now at the second fundamental principle that underlies the new social assistance programme. The principle is that need must be the only criteria, not where you live, not if you are a good friend, not if you voted for Ank-Murphy, it is the need of the family. That is what counts in this programme, Sir.

We will use the typical Newfoundland family of five, a man and his wife and three children. Now, under the old regime if the man of the house was sick -he was sick, he could not work, he was sick - he was given \$215 a month. That is what he got because he was sick. Now, if the man was out of work through no fault of his own, with the same size family, he worked perhaps for fifteen years and was out of work but he was able-bodied, he went up and they gave him \$130 a month. Now, in my opinion, that is rank discrimination because I assert here, Sir, that the man, even though he is not sick, has his wife and three children and his need is just as great as the man, even though he is sick and cannot work, with the same size family.

We have cured that, Sir. There is no longer short-term assistance. There is no longer long-term assistance. You come into your welfare office and whatever your need is you will receive it if you deserve it.

Also, under the old regime, we had this question of competitive employment where a lot of people, through no fault of their own again, there were many family men, Sir, who tried to prove that they were sick in order to get the more attractive long-term assistance. Could you blame them? Could you blame a man, to go in and say, "I got this bad back everybody talks about." Because he is going to get eighty-five dollars a month or more, not to go to the beer parlours and spend it but to feed and clothe that three children that he owns and that wife.

And once they got on long term, they clung to it because they did not want to return to short-term with far less attractive rates. There were thousands literally, Mr. Speaker, thousands in the opinion of the officials of my department, thousands of productive, able-bodied men or so called sick men who were able-bodied, who were retired to lives of inactivity on long-term social assistance. This was nothing

short, Sir, of sinful, in my opinion. Yet, the great brain allowed it to continue. They fostered it, Sir, they encouraged it.

I think, Sir, this, in my opinion, was the most glaring piece of discriminatory legislation that was ever put forward. I think it was discrimination right from the word go. We do not discriminate, Sir, against needy persons for any reason. If they are needy, if they have the family, if they have the wife and children, as I say, need is going to be the only criteria. The one who emphasized this, Sir, was not me nor my deputy minister but our Premier, Sir. This is the one term of reference that was given my officials, that we look at the need of every person no matter where they live, whether it was in Labrador, White Bay, Green Bay, you name it. Every Newfoundlander, Sir, every Newfoundlander deserves the best that we can give them.

Mr. Speaker, I would like for these honourable gentlemen who are now on the other side of the House to stand up and tell the people these 3,886 widows, these 4,200 families, two people trying to exist, these other 4,000 people that are boarding, Sir, and the several other thousand who received increases of twenty-five and thirty dollars from this government, stand up and tell them it was a disaster, but have guts enough to tell them, guts enough, if you are going to an election say, we are cancelling that, "We are going back to the ninety-five dollars a month not the \$145." There is political bait for you, instead of this sneaky, snarly, slimy way they are trying to beat this programme. Be honest. Give credit where credit is due.

We talk about, Mr. Speaker, our work incentives programme. This is an incentive to work not an incentive to go on welfare. That is the difference in our programme and the former administration again. Under the old regime you could earn sixty dollars a month or ninety dollars a month and that was it. So, what was happening, in a great many cases they earned the maximum and then quit. They earned the maximum in both cases and then quit. We want them to continue working, Sir. We want them to continue working.

Welfare means many things, Sir. Welfare does not have to mean dole. It does not have to mean handouts. We look after the welfare of thousands of people, literally, Sir, of infants, young children, abandoned cases by their parents. It is a great part of our programme, Sir, our adoption programme, and I would like to give the credit here, although he is not in the assembly, to the member for Bell Island for introducing that adoption programme three or four years ago. I think, Sir, it was a tremendous thing and I would like any member in this honourable House, Sir, at any time, to feel free to come down to my department and check with Mr. Simms or any of the group and chat about this programme. I think it is a very human programme, tremendous. What the end result of these things will be, Sir, we will never know. Literally there are thousands in the past five or six years.

Now that the member is back, I will say to him that I think it was a tremendous programme, a tremendous propaganda that was used for the adoption programme. I think it was tremendous. I think it created a whole new horizon for these children that might have gone on, Sir, living in almost complete darkness, stowed away somewhere in homes. Now, they occupy their place in society, Sir, and Lord only knows but some of these same children might be sitting in this House ten or fifteen years or twenty years from now. It is tremendous, Sir.

Many other facets of life in this province are touched by our department. We are just trying to get into these things, Sir, but as I said the first couple of years we are trying to get our heads above water, trying to clean out, trying to restore the dignity, Sir, the moral of the people in my department, Sir. What are we thinking of now? What is the big question now? Day-care for children. We have literally hundreds, Sir, hundreds of mothers who could be working who are on welfare, perhaps because the husband is disabled. We have got the mother with a bit of some ability but can that mother go out working somewhere and leave her child with no supervision?

The honourable member for White Bay South, I think his wife is deep in it, right up to her ears in this thing. I have met with the group and I think they call theirs the "Early Childhood Group" if I am not mistaken. I have met with them, Sir, and my officials have met with them on many occasions. I think it is a tremendous thing where that child can allow the mother to work. I am not talking about the mother that wants to put her child in one of these boxes like you find in the station, basically, with no objection to the career mother or anything else, but I do not just want the child just stowed away at nine o'clock in the morning and back again at six in the evening and taken out of this parcel box, locked with a key.

I am referring to these mothers who can augment the income of the family by going out to work, which they cannot do because of small children in the house. We have got to find money somewhere, Mr. Speaker, to fund these programmes. Some of them can be self-supporting

and we have to set up day-care-centers where these children can be left and perhaps their education carried on. They might be of tender age, I do not know. They might need baby-sitters - one, two, three, four, five, you know, you can cover a whole area of children but I think, Sir, very, very important, and only now, Sir, as the result of a general meeting with this group I refer to, the Early Childhood Group, we have another one a day-care-center that is operating here in St. John's, and Mrs. Sharpe, I think, at Wesley Church, is doing a tremendous job. Not all welfare, sir, some are not welfare, well, you know, they pay their way some. I think it is doing a tremendous job, Sir, and I think it looks after the social side.

We can talk about dollars and cents and everything else but our greatest problem is the social problem, the breakdown of the family. That is the problem that we deal with in a great many cases, Sir. I wish we had fifty groups, fifty groups like the Early Childhood Groups and all the rest of them. Forget about Citizen's Rights and Tenants Associations, forget about it. Begin with these types of people, like Mrs. Rowe and the rest of these groups. Perhaps I cannot name them all but I know Mrs. Rowe personally and that is why I mentioned her name. She is a very active member of that thing. Literally we could get thousands of people like that. I think of these social things and the times come back again where the need for this type of voluntary organization is so apparent, so needed today, because we are in a very complex society, Sir.

Another programme we must undertake is homemakers based on much of the same thing, only now we try to get someone to go into the homes, Sir, to help the mother to do what she should be doing economically in the home. Perhaps she is not a good house-keeper, perhaps we can help her along to upgrade her education a little bit without taking her out and sending her to school.

I visited Prince Edward Island's office this summer Sir. I spent a day there, in New Brunswick and many others, to find out what is happening outside our own office. I think today, Sir, we can no longer live within the four walls or the confines of our own province. We have to go outside and learn. They have a very successful homemakers plan there. The deputy minister told me that the most successful one they had is a former welfare client, a lady in her forties who goes around and visits homes. She walks right in there, right into the kitchen. She has no bachelor degrees or anything else but she has gone through the mill. She knows what is needed. We have families and we have FAMILIES. The family over here you give five hundred dollars a month and you will end up - nothing. Over here give them two hundred dollars a month and with good house-keeping and all the rest - I think these are the things, Sir, that we have to try to instill into our people. We have to bring them up, Sir, bring them up from the level which they are forced to enjoy unfortunately, through the economic system, bring them up into the light.

We talk about the parents, Sir. The great tragedy is not the parent today in his fifties or forty-fives, Sir, it is that young fellow seven, eight or nine years old, Sir. There is going to be the tragedy in the next ten, twelve, fifteen years. We all have them, in every district, I do not care where you go. You might find more in the older part of St. John's because of the greater number in population but we have and we have our problems.

One thing I have been talking on in this House since 1962, two things actually, housing and recreation. I speak of recreation - I am not talking of million dollar stadiums if you do not have that. The danger time for young children is not winter time. There is school ninety percent of the time and they go out to their stadiums. It is that summer holiday where you have eight to ten weeks, Sir, where we have these young people adrift on the

streets. In my own district in the Center of St. John's they go to Bannerman Park in the east end or to Victoria Park in the west end. Pretty well every bit of land - and I fought - notwithstanding the member for St. John's West, at the time and this is an old story I am resurrecting - I fought the erection of subsidized housing in Buckmaster's Field in the Center of St. John's. I thought it was the greatest crime that ever happened to take a playground right in the heart, where literally I would say eighty percent of the population lived within a-half mile. To take that and put houses on it but as I say that is gone.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The Minister of Finance does -

MR. MURPHY: The Minister of Finance was not the man at the time it was the honourable B.J. Abbott. Mr. Adams was the member at the time. Do not blame everything on - I know he takes a lot of blame but I cannot be too hard on the poor old fellow.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the social problems. Well we are Social Services now, we are not the Department of Welfare anymore confined in that little - as welfare was as I said earlier, the dole, the six cents a day crowd no longer. No longer, Sir. It is an obligation whether it is members on that side, members on this side or members in the center. We all have our obligations to create a better Newfoundland.

How do we do that, Sir? How do we do it? Not, not, Sir, by coming out with releases and calling a programme like that a fraud, a shame. I will say; "Criminal," Sir, "Criminal." That is the best programme from here to British Columbia considering the money we have to put into it. Not because I happen to be the minister, not because the member for Bell Island told the truth - Ank Murphy knew no more about framing the amendments or anything else than did "Mr. Neary," or the member for Bell Island. It is the officials of that department and I will say here now, Mr. Speaker,



and before this House that the finest civil servants we have anywhere to be found are to be found in the Department of Social Services. We get more abuse, we get more phone calls, we get - look and let me say this now, ninety-nine point nine percent of the honourable members of this House can write my department, they can write a nice letter, they can bring to the attention of my office what the trouble is and I will say this and if I am wrong - they get their answers back, we try to do as best we can. I think we have done that except for one miserable member in this House. One miserable member.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you looking at me?

MR. MURPHY: No, Sir, I would not look at you I am looking at the miserable member, who says - I would like to have the letters here. Who writes a letter, Sir - I do not mind; "You know what the P.C. Government is, they are too busy having cocktail parties. They are too busy having anniversaries." This is the type of stinker, Sir, the stinker type of letters that I get from the member from Bell Island. What do I do with them? Tear them up and throw them in the waste paper basket. I acknowledge the letters from the honourable members from White Bay South, from Twillingate and from everybody else but a letter - No siree! It stinks up the place. It smells.

These are personal observations and anything I cannot stand - in all my life I have been asked, or urged or taught to try to be decent to people. There is not one streak of decency within that member for Bell Island, Sir. I am saying it, sir. I am saying it, Sir. Throw me out if you like but if you shoot me for telling the truth, I am a martyr. I am a myrtyr. I just say to all honourable gentlemen in this House; "You honourable gentlemen, and I use the word gentlemen, at any time there is a problem in your districts and if there is no attention given to it feel free to come immediately to the minister and we will straighten things out.

MR. NEARY: But not Bell Island.

MR. MURPHY: We cannot do it all.

MR. NEARY: But not Bell Island.

MR. MURPHY: Bell Island or anywhere else is looked after, Sir, only there is no acknowledgement to the member for Bell Island. If he wants to act as a gentleman, Sir, I will treat him as a gentleman, but I do not get down to the level of that type of miserable, slimy politics. I will say that here, Mr. Speaker, throw me out if you like. I have respect, a little respect for my personal person, my own person. Anybody, I would say, the person that is written about gets the same attention as any other honourable member, but there will be no acknowledgement of any letters from the member for Bell Island. If he wants to deal as a

gentlemen, with my department we deal with him as a gentleman but any other member, I do not care, Hermitage, any, what rights my department, everything will be done and acknowledgment will be given and when we write the person concerned, Sir, and I want to make this clear, we say - and we send copies of the letters and you know, anybody can deny this, we had been asked by your representative or your member, Mr. whoever it is, to look into your case. I think we try to do this, Sir, and I think it is no more than we should do because the honourable member is given a job to do. At least we can let his constituents know that he is asking on their behalf and I say this and if there is anybody that is not getting that treatment from my department, feel free, Sir, to come to me but we want to be decent to everybody. After all, they are Newfoundlanders, whether they are in White Bay South, St John's Centre or St. John's South.

That is my job, Sir, that is what I swore to do and I will do it to the best of my ability but I absolutely refuse, Sir, to be treated as scum by anybody. I simply refuse that, right or wrong.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR MURPHY: Old Bill Worthman had him. Bill Worthman had him - in the 1962 election - if there ever was a description of a man, that was it.

But, Mr. Speaker, as I say, I gave this to the - and I have a copy here, if the Opposition Office would like it just for information. They can burn it, if they like. But the facts are set out in this on anything, any question, any time, as I say; that is what we are there for, Sir. We are servants of the people. We are servants of the people. We are paid for doing a job for them, for the unfortunate people of this province, Mr. Speaker. But please, let us be decent and honest, whether it is the media or whatever it is. Let us, you know, take things at their face value, please! I am not looking for favours. I do not care if my picture is ever in the paper. I do not care if my picture is e-v-e-r in the paper or any great, profound statements. I do not care if my picture is ever in

the paper or any great, profound statements. My background is St. Patrick's Hall, graduated 1929 from the sixth book. I do not profess to have any great knowledge of anything, but I am a part of this team here that is elected, Mr. Speaker, to try to help the people of the Province; to do otherwise, I should get the heck out of here. I should get out of here and -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No way.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad the member for Bell Island is going to do that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Brother, you and forty others will come to St. John's Centre and I will give you a head start of one thousand votes and I will beat you two to one.

Mr. Smallwood said to me one time, he said, "Mr. Murphy, there is one thing I will say about the people from St. John's Centre. They could never be bought." He was right. He was right and as far as my district is concerned, Sir, I think the usual expenditures were put out last year in the budget. I said not long ago there were not seven dollars spent in St. John's Centre in the past twenty-three years and I believe I am right.

When I hear people, you know, bringing in petitions and talk about a blind hill there and a something there and a something there and expect the Minister of Highways to take right off with his tricycle and get down and do this hill - "And you do nothing for my district, John's gets everything." There has never been any money spent in St. John's Centre. Do you recall Mr. Finance Minister? I mean - all the fishflakes are in good condition, the breastworks are perfect, forestry down there, you know. Then we hear everybody say; "St John's got it all. We got the police force, we got the fire department." The fire department spent more time on the Southern Shore in the past year than they did in St John's. You know But what are we going to do for St John's Centre this year? Anything coming up? Any new projects? What about Dree? Do we come under that?

I might mention DREE, that at last we have done away again with another great area of discrimination, where selected areas of this Province were picked out under it. I can hear him, the honourable

member. How I used to love that word "infrastructure". I would hear that about forty-seven times a day, the infrastructure under here. There were only certain people in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, who would hear that you know. I do not know what it was. - I do not think it was religion. I do not know whether they were Liberals or P.Cs or what it was but there were certain people set aside. I think this province should now thank this government for sitting down with Mr. Jamieson, a perfect gentleman, a tremendous Newfoundlander - a lot of admiration for him. Don has agreed that every Newfoundlander now - every Newfoundland even if he lives in St. John's Centre, can come under DREE.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: The Throne Speech and I have not referred to it yet and this is the Address in Reply. I am so happy, Sir, to be a part of this province here that they are planning at last to do something. We had a gentleman one time connected with a certain association and he was drilling us into this association and the most important stage of the organization was the talking up stage as some of you can remember.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Well I sat in this House since 1962 and went through that exercise of the talking up stage until our government took over in 1972. Someone referred to the forestry - look that is our plan. We were here, Sir, for two years, we were blinded with maps, brought it out to sun, if this environment crowd were here they would have burned the maps. Here is the big forest you know, we are going to take that one on for about two years. Am I right on that?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: We would talk about this - then another mysterious thing, you own. Anyhow the blood pressure is a bit better than what it was last week, Thanks be to God. Ha Boy! It gets you, you know!

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the same over here.

MR. MURPHY: I enjoy life, that is one thing about it.

There are so many other things, Sir, I am glad to see that someone realized that there is a fishing industry here in this province. It is nice. Some of the most successful fishermen in Newfoundland lived on

Livingstone Street in the centre of St. John's, you know, who had a heritage of years of fishing out of Steers Cove and supplied St. John's pretty well with their fresh fish, four or five families. We can remember now a ten cent fish when you could go down on, of a Wednesday and Friday and you would put the two fingers up under the gills and you would lay him over your shoulder and spell him up over Flower Hill, ten cents, that is the fish. A ten cent fish now is \$3. These people maintained that fish market in Steers Cove for years, a tremendous family of fishermen.

DREE schools - The member for St. Barbe North is not here, I will not discuss education. I was going to get up today and ask a question to the minister because it has been asked everyday I think since the honourable member came in, the honourable member for St. Barbe North - a couple of years back - I suppose I should not get into it. The Great Magna Charta of Education came from right about there where the member for Trinity North is standing, I think, another Mr. Rowe, Senator Fred. This is the beginning and the end of education in Newfoundland. I have heard more criticism in the early stages in this Assembly than of anything else, the education programme.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this forestry is going to be one of the biggest things that ever hit this province, quite honestly. When I look around at my honourable colleague, the Minister of Rural Development, what have we been talking about in the past twenty-five years? Twenty-three? Twenty-four? Twenty-five? Rural Development - not to go into the outport and take the fellow by the hair of the head and throw him out. No, let him stay there. He has things to do. I cannot cut any birch on Flower Hill, birch wood. I cannot cut any pit props. Someone has to do it. They have to do it in the areas they live.

The lineboard mill - look what the honourable Minister of Finance inherited - the linerboard mill. Then we get criticism, this that and the other thing. We go back now to this great chip mill which

was going into Goose Bay and Labrador. What happened to it? Would it have been better for us to have the chip mill there? I think so, quite frankly. I have been pretty close to this thing in a sort of way, as the honourable member for Labrador. I know his worries there, Sir. I would say, please God, that within the next couple of years, if all plans come, that he will have one of the most viable and busiest treasures in this province, Happy Valley-Goose Bay. It is there. Every thing is there, this Labrador Road that my honourable colleague was talking about. The Hon. member for Labrador South apparently does not want. He said something to that effect, that he does not.

I do not know why or what the route is going to be. I am sure it is going to do what so many of my friends in Goose Bay want, as the honourable member wanted. Let the people get out. The very fact that even if they do not go out, let them have a means of getting out. Right? If the honourable gentleman treated this thing as I have treated it, when we sat down - I think we are all trying to do the same thing, working the same way. What is it, seventy to seventy-five miles where this development will be? Can you see Goose Bay-Happy Valley accommodating another 8,000 to 10,000 people, instead of going up and putting up trailers and homes? Let us build up the Goose Bay-Happy Valley Area. Let us make it permanent now. I imagine that is in the planning. Why spend a fortune on erecting places that you are going to tear down? Whereas we are in a bus ride tonight - I think that is performance, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, what we have done in two years. Performance!

Someone says, "My God, you are in two years already and you have not done this and you have not done something else!"

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: Here we are, we will have the budget in a few weeks time and the first thing we have to find is approximately \$70 million right there, to carry out our debts. It is \$65 million to \$70 million, before we even touch a cent. There are 514,000 souls - before we touch



a cent or put it into education. Everybody wants a new school. Everybody wants water and sewers. If a petition is presented, up they jump and say, yes I think they should do it.

Mr. Speaker, this reminds me of the story of the lady who went into the butcher shop, the old story. She said, "How much is your steaks?" He said, "Two dollars a pound." She said, "It is only \$1.70 across the street, over to Dominion Stores." He said, "Why did you not get it there?" She said, "They do not have any." He said, "If I did not have it, I would sell it for \$1.20." You know this is the way it is today.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: I have to make a note of that. It is the only decent thing that the gentleman did in about four years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am just about finished. We have I think a very serious year ahead of us. I think we are on the verge - I will not get into offshore rights or what Ottawa should do or what anybody else should do. I am telling you this that when I attend conferences, I do not crawl in on my hands and knees and slide in on my belly. I do not care who is there. For too many years, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland, has been a suburb of Ottawa. Now I think the situation is that we can stand on our own feet.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MURPHY: Remember Walter Carter's great speeches: "Let us be Newfoundlanders. Let us stand straight and walk tall." Is that not right? We can do that, Sir. We can do it, but we will not do it, if the opposition and others (just for - I do not know why) criticize something and try to find fault with something that there is no fault in. It is not Ank Murphy's programme. I will not go down in history for bringing this in. I will tell you that the 60,000 people, Sir, who receive benefits, they are not against it. You can talk about your "Open Line." You can go down to that poor creature on George's Street with a camera, Sir.

Go down, have a look at her. Put her on exhibition before the world. Eight years she is living in that hovel, Sir. Not since March, 1972. Come to Harvey Road, I will bring you to 900 such homes. That this government is being nailed to the wall - no wonder we are paying millions of dollars in rent, Sir. What is happening? I say this, Sir - I am not trying to sneak out from under anything. I have no obligation to provide homes for anybody as Minister of Social Services but I will provide, my department will provide the rent for these homes. I am being nailed continuously, not by people wanting homes but by landlords who say they are going to sue my department for damage caused by clients.

We had to get a ruling the other day, Mr. Minister, from your department on it, from your deputy minister, that we are not accountable. These are some of the things you have to put up with, Sir.

When I get a man in this town, Sir, a landlord who tells a poor creature with eight children; "Go up and tell Ank Murphy! I will have you to (so-and-so) out of here by Friday, out on the sidewalk!"

Can we deal with an animal like that, Sir? Is there not some law somewhere? Is not the municipal council, in the end, Sir, the one responsible to see to all the laws pertaining to zoning regulations and everything else? Do they need help? Let us sit down. Mr. Minister, here, I do not know how many homes he is after buying for our clients this year but he is after spending \$3 million or \$4 million. Am I right on that, Sir?

Requests to buy homes, under the act, since 1972, Sir, our department is no longer, under this Canada assistance plan, permitted to buy homes or build homes for clients. That does not cure the problem, Sir. That problem is there. I listened to the honourable Leader of the Opposition tell us about housing. He does not have to tell me about housing or tell anybody in this House about housing. We have had it with us for twenty years, Sir, the most scandalous conditions in the world. I have said it not once but a thousand times, if we had a society for the

protection of human beings, Sir, there would be someone in jail but we have not got it, only for animals.

I have cases documented where certain people in this town, Sir, have bought homes and their mortgage payment was forty-one dollars and thirty cents a month for these homes. The Department of Social Services pay them \$140 a month rent. What do we do about it? Who can do something about it? People, human beings, Christians, God's creatures? No. Animals, Sir, is what a lot of these people are being treated as.

Thanks be to God, Mr. Premier, and I say this with all the sincerity in my heart, that your government took over, our honourable government to have a look at some of the things that were happening to these people. That poor widow, ninety-five dollars a month to survive on - thanks be to God she did not smoke! Ninety-five dollars a month and we bring them up to a \$145 and the member stands up and says fraud.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Shame, shame, shame.

MR. MURPHY: I can accept criticisms from anybody but this stuff, I think it is criminal, Sir. It is a criminal act to try to lead these poor people astray, a criminal act. You get them on open lines. You get them all over the place. I go down to City Hall - I am not afraid to go anywhere, Sir - I went down to City Hall last weekend - the member for Bonavista South, vice-president of the Human Rights Association - to discuss things and I am faced with a tribe that insults me. I could have been anywhere that day, Sir, I could have been anywhere. "That I was trying to do the people." God help us! Now what are we? Elected members? We have come now, with the way that this House is going, that any member, that no member has any dignity - and I looked around the House, and I looked at the Member for St John's South and I bet you he gets calls that would sometimes raise the hair on you head because he is in much the same position - and any other member.

You know, how could we have an air of respectability, Sir, if

we are the ones to destroy ourselves? That is all that I ask this  
honourable House, Sir.

Everything happens to the flag, a picture of someone having a drink. How low. How scummy can you get, Sir? How scummy can you get? How far down do we reach to come to the level of a type of a person like that?

MR. NEARY: No personalities in this House.

MR. MURPHY: How far down, Mr. Speaker, I ask you? There is one thing I will say, Sir, I have had my run-ins with the former Premier of this House, we have argued but we could argue toe to toe but a statement like that, Sir, in this honourable House, never. He would not dare say it, would not dare say it. What do you do, Sir? As I said earlier, education, we talk about the millions we spend on education, are we living proof, Sir?

What is education? The reading of books, the getting of degrees, because you are good to study or is it, Sir, that we have been trained, full trained as gentlemen, Sir? I look around this House at people who worked their hearts out for years. I looked at the member for Labrador North if I may, Sir, a man who has worked and worked all his life, has made a success of his life and I have yet - the member for Twillingate, to have a nasty or an uncouth word from him as far as we are concerned. Is it the nature of the beast, Sir? Is it true that you cannot make a silk purse from a sow's ear. Is this still true? I ask these questions, Sir.

I am waiting with bated breath, Sir, to hear the tack that will be taken by the member for Hermitage, Sir, with a hope, Sir, a sincere hope that he will deal with what we are all trying to deal with, Sir, not some slimy character assassination. No trouble, no trouble at all, no trouble to destroy a fellow, Sir.

I remember many years ago, Sir, there was a mission service going on, I think I told the story before, and this lady told her confessor, "I said bad things, nasty things, I said false things about my neighbour." She said; "What do I do to cure it?" He said; "You get a bag of feathers, go out there on the step and throw them up in the wind," he said, "When

you catch every feather back, you will have undone the damage."

Now what is happening in this House, Sir, the word is going out and the rougher you make it the bigger the print you get on the headlines of the paper, Sir. I am not calling anybody yellow rags, I am just trying to deal with it. That is what is happening today, Sir. I have thousands and thousands of good decent people on Welfare who never make the headlines but I have had two or three, Sir, that have been front page news, because they were a little bit different.

You know, what can you say bad about someone. We are anxious to get something spectacular. That is not the stuff people read anymore. Can we educate? I will ask the Minister of Education, can we get into our - you know, that it is all right to be decent to people? It is all right to say something nice about your neighbour. It is not gone entirely. We are, I hope, using that degree of charity if you like, towards our human beings. We are all here, God help us Almighty, we did not come in here to clean out the country. I worked more hours a week now than I ever worked in my life for half what I could make selling life insurance.

You talk about the big deal you are getting - \$12,000 a year, before you look at it the federal government is after taking \$7,000 for income tax. Are we crazy?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Well that is an admission. I knew that. I did not want to confess in public, but this is the kind of stuff. Then you get up and you get the Leader of the Opposition there yesterday you know, he will let her go. His background you know, I suppose he came from a poor working family, had all kinds of jobs like the rest of us. I suppose the fellow never had a job in his life outside of sitting next to Smallwood and patting him on the back.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was a job.

MR. MURPHY: This is the ype of thing you are getting. Oh you know,

the humility of the man, it overpowers me, quite frankly.

MR. WM. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Throw him out. Do not worry, you are coming on.

Now if the Minister of Finance approves you, we will carry on,  
but once you get his dander up you have had it.

Mr. Speaker, again and to finish up on a serious note, you know as I say, there were a lot of words in this thing and a lot of philosophy that I did not -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: There are copies. Does the honourable member want a copy to bring back to Labrador?

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable minister has another five or six minutes.

MR. MURPHY: Have I? Good! Good!

So, Sir, again I say that this programme is the betterment for all our people I think. Perhaps one or two incidents since this programme came in - I did not get the exact number of cases but I hope to after January. There were many, many cases of people who were working - what we call the working force here - who since this programme came in have visited our welfare offices and availed of a supplement to what they are already earning. I think this is a tremendous step forward because of the rates up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell them about Mr. Harrington who did not expect ... Goose Bay tomorrow.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, that was good. Was it not? Yes, perhaps the energy crisis at Harvey Road. Just a couple of minutes on that. We had - I had some of these instances here somewhere. I should for the benefit of the Assembly just read these here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: I should have actually. Oh, yes, here we are. Here are some of the problems that we contend with and the member for Bell Island is all for it. Single ablebodied should still continue to get \$70. a month pocket money. A young woman came to the office on Harvey Road, these are some actual cases I have left out the names, referred to a job at a local downtown store but did not go for an interview because she figured she would not like to work there anyhow. Another one had a job on Kenmount Road but it was too far to go into work. A young lady got a job at the Home Improvement Project but quit after one month to go hitch-hiking and she came looking for her welfare.



This thirty-five year old lady separated, no dependents, refused nine jobs between January 1, 1973 and July 5, 1973. A young man applies for employment at a local chicken take-outs, stayed three days, he said there was too much noise there, so he quit.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: A young man refused labour work at \$1.90 an hour. He said he would not work for anything less than \$2.50 an hour." A young man offered a weekend's work at a local bakery. He offered endlessly excuses, saying he would not take shift work, he refused to work at the car wash because he said he is being used for slave labour. A young lady referred to job as counter girl at local take-out - not interested, not interested in babysitting, housekeeping or any other profession, not registered at Canada Manpower, her mother came to the office with her and said she thought her daughter would at least get a few dollars for Christmas. A young man referred to local store - he refused to complete application form. Client's mother called personnel manager and called him everything under the sun. In addition, client's mother interpreted workers helping her son to gain employment as trying to take his money away. He is going to give him a job in order to take away his welfare money. A young man is a musician and he wants to live his own life style. He refused to take a job as dishwasher because it is beneath him. A young man did not want a job, he was touring the province and wanted his file transferred to Clarenville for his next stop over. A young man referred to a job at a local restaurant - he did not go for an interview because he thought the boss was queer. I do not think he meant in the - A young man did not look for work because he was helping his parents who were in the process of moving house. They must have moved from St. John's to Vancouver. A young man quit job in local hotel for no reason, he had an excellent chance of a job at Marystown but would not go there because he would have to stay with parents who would make him go to bed every night at midnight. A young lady quit her job at a local hotel and

Mr. Speaker, again and to finish up on a serious note, you know as I say, there were a lot of words in this thing and a lot of philosophy that I did not -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: There are copies. Does the honourable member want a copy to bring back to Labrador?

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable minister has another five or six minutes.

MR. MURPHY: Have I? Good! Good!

So, Sir, again I say that this programme is the betterment for all our people I think. Perhaps one or two incidents since this programme came in - I did not get the exact number of cases but I hope to after January. There were many, many cases of people who were working - what we call the working force here - who since this programme came in have visited our welfare offices and availed of a supplement to what they are already earning. I think this is a tremendous step forward because of the rates up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell them about Mr. Harrington who did not expect ... Goose Bay tomorrow.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, that was good. Was it not? Yes, perhaps the energy crisis at Harvey Road. Just a couple of minutes on that. We had - I had some of these instances here somewhere. I should for the benefit of the Assembly just read these here..

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: I should have actually. Oh, yes, here we are. Here are some of the problems that we contend with and the member for Bell Island is all for it. Single ablebodied should still continue to get \$70. a month pocket money. A young woman came to the office on Harvey Road, these are some actual cases I have left out the names, referred to a job at a local downtown store but did not go for an interview because she figured she would not like to work there anyhow. Another one had a job on Kenmount Road but it was too far to go into work. A young lady got a job at the Home Improvement Project but quit after one month to go hitch-hiking and she came looking for her welfare.

This thirty-five year old lady separated, no dependents, refused nine jobs between January 1, 1973 and July 5, 1973. A young man applies for employment at a local chicken take-outs, stayed three days, he said there was too much noise there, so he quit.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: A young man refused labour work at \$1.90 an hour. He said he would not work for anything less than \$2.50 an hour." A young man offered a weekend's work at a local bakery. He offered endlessly excuses, saying he would not take shift work, he refused to work at the car wash because he said He is being used for slave labour.

A young lady referred to job as counter girl at local take-out - not interested, not interested in babysitting, housekeeping or any other profession, not registered at Canada Manpower, her mother came to the office with her and said she thought her daughter would at least get a few dollars for Christmas. A young man referred to local store - he refused to complete application form. Client's mother called personnel manager and called him everything under the sun. In addition, client's mother interpreted workers helping her son to gain employment as trying to take his money away. He is going to give him a job in order to take away his welfare money. A young man is a musician and he wants to live his own life style. He refused to take a job as dishwasher because it is beneath him. A young man did not want a job, he was touring the province and wanted his file transferred to Clarendville for his next stop over. A young man referred to a job at a local restaurant - he did not go for an interview because he thought the boss was queer. I do not think he meant in the - A young man did not look for work because he was helping his parents who were in the process of moving house. They must have moved from St. John's to Vancouver. A young man quit job in local hotel for no reason, he had an excellent chance of a job at Marystown but would not go there because he would have to stay with parents who would make him go to bed every night at midnight. A young lady quit her job at a local hotel and

look for one job in six months, not registered with Canada Manpower.

A young man said

said she could not go to work because her shoes were tight and they hurt her feet. Now these are some of the great actual cases. So, you know, this is the type of thing, Sir, that we have been trying to deal with. We are trying to get people into work and any co-operation we can get, from any member of this House, that department down there, it is wide open for everybody because you are all going the one way whether you are a Liberal, M.H.A. or P.C. or N.L.P., whatever you are and I just ask you, my friends, my colleagues, all the members in the House: Let us dig in and make this thing worthwhile, you know, this will only last - in another thirty or forty years if the Liberals do get back in they can bring up a programme to improve on this one.

Thank you for your attention and Good afternoon.

MR. P. S. THOMS (Bonavista North):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Let it be noted that the honourable member for Bonavista North has adjourned the debate. He has the first opportunity on tomorrow, Thursday, I guess, to resume.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 13, 1974, at 3:00 of the clock.