

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

10:00 p.m. - 1:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, MAY 23, 1980

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

First of all, I would like to make an apology to hon. members. The Order Papers have not yet arrived from the printers. Friday morning is usually a difficult problem but they are on the way and I trust they will be here shortly. I would like to welcome to the House and to the Galleries today on behalf of hon. members, forty-three grade seven students from Grant Collegiate of Springdale in the district of Green Bay along with their teachers, Mr. Jackman, Mr. Tremblett and Ms. Toms and their driver, Mr. Wells. We hope that they enjoy their visit today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I apologize to the hon. member opposite for not having a copy of the statement. He has had an opportunity to read it but I just had it done this morning. I had to have a check done this morning based on the controversy that has been happening with respect to the offshore and the supply vessels and various ads that have been appearing in the media and in other countries.

In response to concerns raised that the Crosbie OSA Group are advertising in countries other than Canada to fill positions of masters and chief engineers, the Crosbie OSA Group has advertised within the Province and across Canada in various publications. They also have a standing order in with Canada Manpower and Immigration, who in turn is checking across Canada with various groups such as unions.

The Provincial Department of Labour and Manpower is equally aware of the need for this type of people and ensures

MR. J. DINN: that any qualified residents seeking these positions will get them. Further, any non-Canadians hired in any positions on these supply vessels are hired on a temporary basis only. As soon as a qualified resident of the Province is available, the Provincial Department of Labour and Manpower demands the repatriation of the non-resident.

Any work visas granted these non-Canadians from Canada Immigration are short term.

The Crosbie/O.S.A Group are required to engage suitable qualified trainees for any positions they cannot fill from within the Province in accordance with the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Regulations.

The Crosbie/O.S.A. Group presently have ten vessels working in Newfoundland offshore operation. These vessels employ some 166 persons, of which 132 are Newfoundlanders.

And, Mr. Speaker, attached with the statement is a breakdown of each of the positions, matters, first mates, chief engineers, second engineers, oilers, seamen and cooks and wherever we have qualified people to fill these positions, we have Newfoundlanders working on the rigs.

MR. S. NEARY: Not so. They are gradually sneaking them in.

MR. BARRETT: You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. DINN: Name one.

MR. S. NEARY: There are three. I told you about three the other day.

MR. DINN: Name one. Name one.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!
Any further statements?
The hon. Minister of Forest,
Resources and Lands.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a very short statement although it is a very important one. I would like to inform this hon. House that after careful assessment of the forest fire situation in this Province, I have arranged to release a Canso water bomber to the Province of Manitoba following a request from them for the services of forest fire fighting equipment. The latest reports indicate 90 forest fires out of control in Manitoba with no immediate relief in sight from the weather which continues to be hot and dry in that Province.

In addition to a re-assessment of local conditions will be made within the next week or two, with the view of making a second water bomber available to that Western Province. It is my hope that our contribution to the fire fighting effort in Manitoba will help alleviate the very serious situation that they have there. I might also add, Mr. Speaker, this is one of seven water bombers that we have in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor -
Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, for this side I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues when I indicate to the minister that we understand this situation and we agree and support his decision. Obviously, if one listens to or watches the news these days, Manitoba seems to be almost an inferno, Manitoba and Northern Ontario. And just one word of caution, of course, the minister alluded to it, that we would have a day to day assessment on the situation in our own Province and not weaken our own capability to

MR. G. FLIGHT: protect our forests in the event of a high fire hazard occurring in this Province.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well said.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further statements?
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, despite the interruptions of the Opposition I will attempt to make a Ministerial Statement again today. The situation is with regard to questions asked by the concerned members of the Opposition last week and the last couple of weeks on the applications for assistance from fishermen to the Fisheries Loan Board.

I want to give an update of the situation and whereby to inform the House that all applications to the Fisheries Loan Board have now been processed. A total of 924 applications have gone through the screening process and the breakdown is as follows. A total of 924 applications underwent screening during the past number of weeks under the new regulations and guidelines. Three hundred and twenty-two of these have now been screened to be approved under the criteria set down in the new regulations and will now go before the Board over the next couple of meetings. One hundred and thirty-six applications have been returned to the fishermen for additional and further information, in other words, the applications did not contain sufficient information to enable complete screening. One hundred and seventy-one of these applications have been screened and recognized that they can be approved under the new regulations and have now been forwarded to the chartered banks whereby the chartered banks, commencing on June 1st., will be able to process these applications under the new Government Guaranteed Loan Programme through all the chartered banks throughout the Province. Two hundred and ninety-five of

May 23, 1980

Tape No. 1749

DW - 3

MR. J. MORGAN: the applications screened appear not to be eligible based on the new regulations and the new eligibility criteria. However, they will be screened a second time in case some of them can be recognized as being qualified under the new criteria.

MR. MORGAN:

So, Mr. Speaker, the new loan board has been quite active over the past few weeks under the new regulations,

whereby now all the applications they mentioned have been screened and a total of 138 applications have been approved since the beginning of the fiscal year, which came to a value of \$1.3 million. So the new loan is now in a situation whereby they can now notify all the applicants by letter, over the next few days, all the applicants, all the fishermen applying for assistance giving them the exact status of the applications that have been on file with the loan board. In other words, all applications have been dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, as I promised the House in my last statement on the loan board, I was then going to be publishing - the department would be publishing a brochure, giving the fishermen all details with regard to the fishing vessel assistance plan. So it is important for all fishermen to have this information available to them so they will know before making application what the regulations are and what the eligibility criteria are to obtain assistance. That brochure is now being published and I wish to table a copy of the brochure today in the Assembly herefor all members and it is now being mailed to all fishermen throughout the Province, and will be in the hands of the fishermen over the next couple of days. If any member of the House wishes additional copies of the brochure they can contact the Chairman of the loan board and obtain additional copies for their own constituents.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to have difficulty in replying to this because I have a thirteen page statement from the minister last week, an eight panel brochure from the minister this morning, and an additional three page statement from the minister this morning. But I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that of the total of 924 applications only 138, in fact, have been approved and the rest of them are under some sort of a screening process and have yet to - have been screened but have yet to

May 23, 1980

Tape no. 1750

NM - 2

MR. F. ROWE:

come before the Fisheries Loan Board.

So we are quite a distance away from actual approval or disapproval of these applications for the fishermen which puts them in a bit of an awkward situation because of the fact that we are already into the fishing season.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to get into some of the points of the rules and regulations pertaining to the Fisheries Loan Board.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE:

Well, Mr. Speaker can stop me when I obviously run out of time.

I would like to point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, that the interests to be paid directly to banks by the fishermen, after

MR. F. ROWE: verification of payment the fishermen will be refunded. I think this will cause quite a delay and a bit of a hardship in the case of the fishermen and I would suggest that some other mechanism should be found whereby probably the fishermen could, in fact, pay the Loan Board interest rate of 8 per cent and the bank, itself, is the one that gets reimbursed at a later date rather than the fishermen who after getting their receipt then have to apply to the Fisheries Loan Board to make up the difference.

Also, Mr. Speaker, this business of the maximum terms for any loans upon which a guarantee may apply may be twenty years for steel vessels, fifteen years in the case of fibreglass vessels and ten years in the case of wooden vessels. I cannot see why there is a differentiation between the length of time for steel and fibreglass vessels. I would think that fibreglass vessels probably have a greater longevity than, in fact, the steel vessels and should be put on the same twenty year term. There is no mention of aluminum boats when it comes to loans here although it is mentioned later on with respect to bounties.

With respect to eligibility requirements, Mr. Speaker, it says that a loan may be made to a fisherman who is of legal age, a Canadian citizen, and a resident of Newfoundland and Labrador. I think we have to have some definition of what a Canadian citizen is and what a resident of Newfoundland and Labrador is. Is it supposed to be something along the lines of the Elections Act or what? What happens if a guy happens to move away from the Province for a year for a job in Toronto because he lost his job or did not do that well in the fishery the year before? It also requires that a fisherman has to have two years of full-time fishing in a certain region. Again, I think this has to be defined. For example, if you look at Placentia Bay and Trinity Bay, you quite often have fishermen crossing over the isthmus and going from one bay to the other, and if Placentia Bay is considered to be one region and Trinity Bay is another region, we can see a situation where a

MR. F. ROWE: fisherman who say, for example, is living in Green's Harbour but who has fished in Placentia Bay across the isthmus for a couple of years will not be eligible to receive a loan. So we may have a problem there.

Again, the same thing applies with respect to the requirement for 75 per cent of his income having to come from the fishing sector. I know many fishermen who have spent quite a few months fishing and have had a bit of a failure during the fishing season, who have been lucky enough to latch on to a good construction job during the Winter and get more than 25 per cent of their income from the construction job although they are fishermen who really have spent much of their time in the fishery but do not get that 75 per cent requirement for their income.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. F. ROWE: May I just clue up, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

MR. F. ROWE: - by simply saying that there are many other questions that I could ask relating to this and I will undertake, as I indicated earlier, to

MR. F. ROWE: get these questions to the minister in the form of writing in order that he may be able to answer them at some point.

MR. ROBERTS: Well said.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further statements?

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform this hon. House of government's final decisions on the formula grants provided by the Secretary of State of the federal government -

MR. S. NEARY: He changed his mind again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS VERGE: - for special, additional bilingual programmes in education. I think it is appropriate that this statement is being made with so many students sitting in the galleries. I am pleased to announce that, in the 1980-81 fiscal year, the total amount of the formula grants will be spent on special bilingual programmes. Three hundred and seven thousand dollars will be made available for the following programmes; Bursaries of \$400 for Grade IX and X students to attend French Summer schools on Miquelin and in Quebec; grants for Grades IX and X students to make weekend field trips to St. Pierre during the school year; student exchange trips to Quebec; Summer institute for French teachers; teacher fellowships of \$4000 to study French at university; travel bursaries for French teachers to attend a course in France; French curriculum development; a grant to the Roman Catholic School Board for Labrador for French schooling for francophone students in Labrador West; bursaries for francophone students of Labrador West attending high school in Quebec following Grade X; audio-visual materials for French instruction; grants to school boards for extra instructional materials; Extra French readers for all grades; subscription to a French magazine, Vidéo-Pressé, for all schools; funding for Newfoundland Teachers Association Modern Languages Special Interest Council Conferences and the St. John's

May 23, 1980

Tape No. 1752

AH-2

MS VERGE:

Saturday morning French school for

children.

The balance of the formula grants , \$105,000, have been designated for salaries of consultants and staff in the Curriculum section of the Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to tell hon. members about the status of French education in our Province and of the tremendous advances made in recent years. Most of our students from Grades IV to XI now have access to regular French instruction. Many of our pupils begin learning French in kindergarten. In the French core programme available to most students, French is taught one period per day. The French core programme has expanded greatly during the past decade. For example, in 1970-71 only about sixteen per cent of Grade IV pupils had the opportunity to learn French.

MS. L. VERGE: By 1978-79, the last year for which statistics are available, the percentage had jumped to 62 per cent.

Not only is French now taught to more of our students than ever before, but the quality of the curriculum has improved significantly. In 1978-79, the Department of Education began the phase-in of a new French programme for Grades VIII through XI. In September 1980, a new elementary programme will be introduced in Grades IV and V. These new programmes, as second language teachers will attest, are excellent because they incorporate the most recent developments in language teaching and are designed to appeal to today's youth. The emphasis in these programmes is on the development of oral skills.

These regular French programmes have always been paid for directly by the Province. Considering teacher salaries and other expenses, the total cost to be borne by the Province this year will amount to several million dollars.

The Secretary of State of the federal government funds other French programmes in our Province through "federal annexes". Under this arrangement, the following support services are supplied with the total expenditure being reimbursed by the federal government: Travel bursaries for francophone students of Labrador West attending Cégap in Quebec; Bursaries for teachers to take summer French immersion courses at Canadian universities; Student fellowships for study at St. Pierre institute or French university; Part-time French courses for adults.

In addition, under the federal annexes, the following projects are cost-shared by the federal government: Salaries of French co-ordinators with about fifteen school boards throughout the Province; Avalon summer school, a mini-immersion programme for high school students; French immersion for St. John's: at Holy Cross Primary and St. Bonaventure's Schools - Kindergarten through Grade II, as well as late immersion for United Junior High School; French immersion for Gander - Kindergarten and Grade I; and French immersion for Port au Port - Kindergarten through Grade IV plus a remedial class.

MR. L. VERGE: In all, Mr. Speaker, our Province has made excellent progress in bilingual education. Our record is considered outstanding throughout Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I return to the matter of the formula grants from the Secretary of State. These grants originated a decade ago in response to the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism that the federal government provide financial assistance to the Provinces to meet the 'additional costs' of language programmes in education.

This Province has always applied the formula funds to special bilingual programmes, in addition to the regular French instruction. To the best of my knowledge, however, some other provinces have used the formula grants for regular, ongoing bilingual programmes or for other purposes.

MS. VERGE: The previous Federal Liberal Administration as of about one year ago, indicated to the officials of our Education Department its intention to gradually withdraw from formula grants, to eliminate them over the next few years. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the present federal administration will reconsider this matter and decide against lessening federal funding of bilingual programmes in education. I will be writing the Secretary of State, the hon. Francis Fox, expressing this view.

Mr. Speaker, the estimates of the Department of Education include only \$126,000 for some special programmes listed at the beginning of this statement. Final decisions on the programmes to be affected had not been made.

Over the past couple of weeks, I have received a large number of letters and submissions from teachers, students and parents throughout Newfoundland and Labrador expressing strong support for French programmes in education, and protesting any reduction in special programmes or support services. Their views were carefully considered by this government.

Mr. Speaker, I recently had to admit to Your Honour and hon. members that I cannot speak or understand spoken French. When I studied French in school, which was not very many years ago, oral skills were not taught. However, in recent days, my desire to learn to speak French has been renewed and intensified. And in closing this statement I would like to speak "En Francais".

Récemment, beaucoup de personnes de Terre-Neuve et du Labrador ont démontré grâce à leurs paroles et à leurs actions -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - que les gens de notre province tiennent à pouvoir apprendre le Francais et aussi à connaître la culture du Canada Francais et de la France. Je pense que ceci est de bonne augure en ce qui concerne les rapports à venir entre notre province et le Québec, étant donné que nos efforts se dirigent vers le même but, c'est-à-dire une constitution plus juste pour notre pays, le Canada. Merci.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. FLIGHT:

You have got a half hour 'Jim', a full half hour.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to try to upstage the minister on her French. My French is bad but I do not think hers is very much better. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe the federal MPs have some sort of a programme where there is a French immersion for those people who wish to -

MR. LUSH:

Six weeks.

MR. HODDER:

- take it, a six weeks immersion course. And perhaps the minister, and certainly if she does I would like to as well, and perhaps other members -

MR. F. ROWE:

Cozy, very cozy.

MR. HODDER:

- because we are a bilingual House, perhaps there should be a provision made for members of this House to be able to take this French immersion programme which the federal government provides for federal MPs.

MR. LUSH:

I suggest we do English first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

English.

MR. LUSH:

Many of the members need English first.

But, Mr. Speaker, I did - the minister told me this morning that she - she did call

MR. J. HODDER:

me and tell me but I had no idea that Ministerial Statement would be so long and I am not quite sure exactly what she has done except I do believe that she has reversed herself on her decision to take the-

MR. F.B. ROWE:

That is right.

MR. J. HODDER:

- money that was earmarked for bilingual programs and which was to go into general revenue, that these programs will now be ongoing. And, I believe the details which she listed there this morning are all of the programs which were in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Minister has reversed herself. I mean, she did -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) a great deal of (inaudible).

MR. J. HODDER:

- make a decision then sort of -

MR. FLIGHT

Backed down.

MR. HODDER:

-backed down a little bit and now finally she has recapitulated totally and I, for one, and the members of this side, are pleased that we did put some pressure on the Minister -

MR. FLIGHT:

Old Flip-Flop Lynn.

MR. HODDER:

- along with other groups -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please.

MR. HODDER:

- in the Province to change her decision. I think she has done the right thing and that the money is now going where it belongs and that the minister is acting in the honourable way and spending the money as it should have been spent.

I do wonder, Mr. Speaker, how the decision was taken? If the decision was taken by the Minister's officials, which

MR. J. HODDER:

I suspect, without her knowledge, then I think that perhaps the minister has learned her lesson from this. But, the minister's prior reasoning to the House, that if we continue to put the money that comes from the Federal Government into general revenue or if she put it in that the Federal Government would then withdraw it later, was bad reasoning and, basically, after checking the other provinces of Canada, most of the provinces of Canada, although they have different formulas and different ways of doing it, they do spend the money as it should be spent.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to say one other thing; that there is not enough money spent on French education for French Newfoundlanders. I feel very strongly that we should try and preserve both the French heritage and culture of those French Newfoundlanders and I do not exclude the French people who have come in from other provinces, but our own French Newfoundlanders at the present time, have one immersion course only serving the whole of the Port au Port area where a great number of the people there speak French and I do hope that the minister, very soon, will take a look at the French question in the Port au Port area and on the West Coast, the Stephenville - Port au Port area, and look at the problems where students from French speaking communities are being bused to English speaking schools and their language is constantly being eroded because there is no immersion program there. I would like the minister to do that.

As far as the minister's commitment to get in touch with the Federal Minister, Francis Fox;

MR. J. HODDER: that is kind of inconsistent with what she was doing before, but I think that the minister is now on the right track. She has seen the light and I am very glad she has.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Ordre s'il vous plait!

I would like to welcome to the galleries today a group of students from the secretarial science class from the College of Trades and Technology. We hope that they will enjoy their visit; and as well, a group of Grade X students from Cape John Collegiate of LaScie in the district of Baie Verte - White Bay, along with their teacher, Mr. Harvey and their driver, Mr. Short. We hope that they will enjoy their visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Any further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. It is, in a sense, a follow-up to one I asked him a couple of weeks ago. Given the rapidity with which the constitutional discussion proposals are now moving ahead, and given the fact that the Premier has proposed a meeting of Premiers, I believe, within a couple of weeks or so, plus the likelihood that it is conceivable, at least, that there will be a meeting of the heads of government, including federal and provincial, during the early part of the Summer - given all of these facts, what is the status now of the document to which he made reference - or whether it is one or more documents - on the Constitution, which in the Throne Speech of the last session it was indicated would become the subject of discussion among citizens of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, at the present moment the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer), through his department, and in consultation with his colleagues in Cabinet, is preparing that document. I would anticipate that within the next two or three weeks it will be

PREMIER PECKFORD: finalized and have debate at the Cabinet level and then be put forward as the position of Newfoundland on the important points to be discussed in the ongoing constitutional talks which will get underway very shortly. So that is the status of it.

Secondly, and in the same general context, but not the specific one, the other document as it relates to specific issues - federal/provincial issues - dealing between the two governments, the federal government and the Newfoundland Government, that document will be ready next week. So one will be published next week which deals with ongoing federal/provincial relationships, specific, with all the various departments and issues that we have between our two governments. The one concerning constitutional reform should be ready in the next two or three weeks.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Could the hon. the Premier tell me whether or not the - updated, I believe, is the appropriate word for it - bilateral issues document will, in fact, be made public when it has been completed? And simultaneously, will it be submitted to Ottawa or what is the timetable there? And so I can save a further supplementary,

MR. D. JAMIESON: is there a mechanism yet in place, given the fact that a number of statements by the Premier have been specific on which-is there a mechanism through which the public is, in a sense, going to have a chance to either (a) hear further exposition on the government's position or indeed argue with it if that turns out to be the case?

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, yes it was always my intention, Mr. Speaker, for example, on the document next week concerning bilateral issues between the two governments, to make it public and to table it in this House so that it can become available to everybody and be so reported. It is an update on the previous document and tries to encompass all of the major items of concern to both levels of government and what our position as a provincial government is on them and what we would like to see done in relation to them, co-operation between the two governments and the kind of funding and all of the rest of it that would be necessary in order to give reality to them. But, obviously, it will be tabled next week.

MR. D. JAMIESON: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: I am not sure that I am offering advice, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier or not. But the point is and I realize the delicacy of the situation, is this, in a sense, a negotiating document and is it appropriate for either side, in effect, to -

MR. D. JAMIESON: is this a paper in which the government is going to say, this is the basis for negotiation or is it going to be a sort of shopping list?

Because clearly in negotiation things are going to change and I am curious to know how the Premier or his ministers who may be dealing with it - what will happen if in the end something comes out that is somewhat different than what is in the shopping list, if he follows my line of reasoning.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, I understand that but most of the things that we are dealing with are pretty basic issues. They are not negotiation stanzas as such, they are broad principles of concern that we have and it is under those principles where you get into the details which will not be, obviously a part of the document, where there can be negotiation back and forth. But they are broad issues of principle that we have to deal with. For example, our ongoing - just for a very specific example - concern with the whole question of DREE and its mandate in Eastern Canada, for example, and how we support that concept and detail a number of areas where we want to - and it is a fairly reasonable kind of proposition. But once again it is a general principle one, the same way with ongoing transportation issues as it relates to Trans-Labrador Highway and so on. We do not argue over whether it should be 100 per cent federal funding or 75 per cent federal funding, that is part of the negotiations. But the principle and the direction must be clearly established and that is what this paper tries to do.

May 23, 1980

Tape No. 1757

DW - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: Secondly, as it relates to the constitutional issues and papers, the same kind of an approach will be taken,

PREMIER PECKFORD:

it will be in a direction, for example, but whether the Government of Newfoundland considers it important on the front end in constitutional discussions to talk about communications or whether it does not. Now your position on communications in detail must be, of course, the subject of some discussion between all of the First Ministers and so on. So, that is the kind of approach we will take.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture (Mr. R. Dawe) with regard to the park situation. There seems to be a fair amount of confusion as to what is really happening and what is going to happen in our park system this year, confusion amongst the general public who are looking at using the parks, the park operators, the workers, and even the people who are interested in looking at the possibility of leasing the parks as appeared to be what would be happening this year. Would the minister indicate at this point just what is happening with regard to the private management or the taking over of the parks by private industries?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture.

MR. R. DAWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware of any confusion that is existing especially as it relates to staff, employees, park employees and so on. If I understand the situation correctly, last year a statement was made that the leasing of the publicly owned parks in this Province was going to be taken under active consideration to provide an opportunity to look at the costs involved in maintaining and operating provincial parks and also recognizing the need that this Province needs additional campgrounds.

I believe I indicated not only in this House some time ago but also on several occasions to the media, that and internal assessment was being done of the campground situation in the Province to take into consideration three major aspects, I suppose, as they relate to campgrounds. The fact that 80 per cent of our campgrounds are publicly owned, owned and operated by government, that

MR. R. DAWE: only 20 per cent are owned and operated by private individuals and the fact that there is some considerable roadside camping going on as it relates to gravel pits and so on, the problem created in high concentration areas, that whole situation has been reviewed by staff of my department, a report is in my hands right now and I am in the process of reviewing it. Once I have completed this review I will be making recommendations to my colleagues in Cabinet as to how I think we should proceed or how this government should proceed, there are several options available to them, how we should proceed in developing and maintaining our existing campgrounds.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any confusion and, as I stated earlier, that as soon as this decision has been made it will be made public.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-- Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, indeed there is confusion and in the minister's answer I would say there is confusion in the minister's mind as to what is going to happen to the parks.

I would like to ask the minister, if he has the report in his hands, if contained in that report is a consideration, an opposition by small communities, communities living around those parks; that up to this point in time the spin-off business generated by the parks made a substantial contribution to the economy of those various town and I think of Badger, in the case of Catamaran, Windsor, Grand Falls, Beothuk Park and all the rest of the parks, and that there maybe, indeed, a lot of opposition from that sector of the economy, that they are concerned that the turning over of the parks to private industry will, indeed, have an adverse effect on the economy of the various communities that now draw a fair amount of income from the existence of those parks?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture.

MR. R. DAWE: The hon. member seems to think that there has already been a decision made to allow parks to be operated by private enterprise which is definitely not true at this point in time.

MR. R. DAWE: Our provincial parks are unique in North America in that they are basically nature parks. The amenities are not there that one would consider or expect in private parks, we have no laundromats or concession stands and so on.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Not yet.

MR. R. DAWE: Two reasons for this, basically, one is that the concept of our provincial park system in the past has been that we want to keep the parks that way - a natural setting, and our park system is recognized as probably the best of its kind in North America.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. R. DAWE: The second and the whole philosophy in the past has been that by not having the concessions in these parks that are in close proximity to communities, that it would

MR. DAWE: encourage people who are visiting the parks to travel to the communities to purchase ice cream for the children if they want to on a rainy day, to buy gas, to buy supplies and so essentially it was of a benefit. There has been no pressure, that has been a philosophy that has been in the department as it relates to provincial parks for sometime. If, in fact, parks were to be considered for private leasing, an evaluation of a particular park would have to be taken into consideration as it relates to a number of things and one of the things would be its proximity to a community.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary. The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: It would appear that there will be no leasing or turning over to private industry the operation of our public parks this year, it would appear from what the minister has said. Would the minister indicate whether or not there is a gross inadequacy in our parks? Every gravel pit from here to Port Aux Basques was filled over this long weekend and, Mr. Speaker, there is a lack of park campsites. Now, is the Province going to undertake a programme of upgrading, providing dumping facilities and that kind of thing in our parks this Summer and is there any thought towards increasing the number of campsites in our parks to take care of the kind of overflow that we know exists? And, Mr. Speaker, while the minister is up - he is giving some long-winded answers here - while he is up would he indicate as to whether or not that is in keeping, if we do indeed try to tackle the shortcomings of the parks, will that be in keeping with his statement last year that the government intends to turn over the parks to public leasing because we have to look at spending money - we prefer to spend it on hospitals as opposed to parks?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture.

MR. DAWE: A point of clarification, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAWE: I did not make that statement and I am not aware of anyone who did and if I can try to answer as briefly as I can the half a dozen questions that were asked in the final supplementary I will do so. There is an ongoing programme this year of maintenance and improvements to the existing facilities in the parks. Some of them relate to safety factors, basically, or the major consideration in this relates to fire access roads that would enable people to have safe access from provincial parks should an unfortunate forest fire occur. This will be ongoing in several parks. We are doing it on a priority basis, where the need is greatest. In a number of other parks there is regular maintenance going ahead that will improve the existing facilities. Unfortunately we are in a period of restraint and hold the line and there will be no expansion, specific expansion to existing provincial parks this coming year.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of what has happened now since our government here took the position, adopted a policy that they would back Alberta in trying to get Canadian oil up to world prices, does the hon. Premier now think that that was a mistake looking back on it? And what is the present position now of the Newfoundland government concerning this whole matter of Canadian oil being brought up to world prices?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am going to defer to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). We had a discussion on this again this morning, on this issue, and in light of the recent meeting between the Minister of Energy for Canada (Mr. Lalonde) and our own Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and the discussions which are ongoing on the matter, I will ask the minister to give in detail where we are concerning it. Just let me respond to the general thrust of the hon. member's question myself in the sense that, no, we believe and still support the position that we have taken all along on this and, I think, the events of recent days have proven us very, very right

May 23, 1980

Tape No. 1759

AH-3

PREMIER PECKFORD: on it but I have asked the minister to
further -

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A further supplementary. The hon.
member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: If the Premier cannot answer the
question and he has to pawn it off on the Minister of Mines and Energy
(Mr. Barry) perhaps I can be more specific. Does this government now
support the removal of the subsidy on oil for Eastern Canada as a
result of this government's backing Alberta in getting Canadian oil
up to world prices? Does this government agree with the removal of
the subsidy which will increase the cost of heating fuel in this
Province or are they now opposed to that concept of removing the
subsidy? Nova Scotia came out this morning strongly against it.
Is Nova Scotia going to have to fight Newfoundland's battle or will
this government here now take the position that they are fighting to
have that subsidy continued?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this government's position as enunciated at the most recent First Ministers Conference is that the price of Canadian oil, whether we like it or not, is going to have to move to world prices over a period of time. We qualify that position with the statement that it should be a phased and gradual increase recognizing the hardship that will be imposed upon the lower income, middle income earner who is going to be hit, particularly in Eastern Canada, by rising energy prices.

Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing in the Prime Minister's Statement is the recognition and a reversal in stand. The recognition that the energy position put forward by the Liberal administration, by the Liberal Party during the past federal election was an untenable one. They have reversed their position, their commitment not to have energy prices increase because they recognize that Canada will be bankrupt if they do not recognize the realities of life which is that the price of oil is being inexorably forced upward by circumstances beyond the control of any Canadian.

I would just like to make one more point, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. member refers to Nova Scotia, he should remember that this Province, fortunately, is in a much different energy position than is the Province of Nova Scotia or many other of our sister provinces in that we have a large undeveloped hydro electric resource, which, with the proper assistance from the Federal Government, we can see substitute for much of our present oil needs and which we can see ensure stable cost energy, forever into the future, once it is on stream, because it will not be forced upward by the decisions of the oil sheiks of the Middle East or wherever, as the price of oil is and as the price of oil will continue to be as long as we are importing from foreign countries who can call the shots because there is more oil in demand than is being supplied.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman just put his finger on the key to this whole matter when he mentioned undeveloped potential hydro resources. Undeveloped - they have been undeveloped now for eight years since this crowd took over, and that is precisely the point. And I asked the hon. gentleman in the beginning, or I hinted, probably he could anticipate what my supplementary might be, as long as these resources are undeveloped, the consumers in Canada's poorest province, where we have record unemployment, the second lowest income in Canada, what will it mean in terms once they blend the Canadian price with world prices, what will it mean in terms of increase in the cost of heating fuel and electricity in this Province? Surely, the minister must have taken a look at this. Looking down the road three, five, seven years, what will it mean, as long as these resources are undeveloped, and apparently they are not going to be developed with this crowd, what will it mean in terms of increases in electricity rates to the consumers of electricity and what will it mean in the way of increases in heating fuel in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, we find that the Government of Canada is still developing its energy policy. It has not yet put figures on the very, and I stress, very, general principles which it has communicated to this government and I assume to the other governments of Canada. It speaks about a blended price for oil which is to be made up of three different prices; a price for conventional oil, a price for synthetic and possibly frontier oil, they say, and the price of imported oil and somehow this is all going to be blended together to get one price and the subsidy on imports is going to be gradually, I

May 23, 1980

Tape No. 1760

EL - 3

MR. L. BARRY: understand, removed. So, we do not have sufficient information from the Federal Government with respect to their energy policy. It is unfortunate but when I got back from Ottawa and studied the document that had been delivered to me by Mr. LaLonde, I found a very general statement of principles and very little else contained in it.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that was contained in the statement, however, was that the Federal Government is committed to substituting

MR. L. BARRY: other sources of energy for foreign imports of crude oil. Now this is the point that we have to keep first and foremost in our minds, that if they are going to try to substitute other forms of energy, they cannot, they must not ignore the undeveloped hydro potential of Labrador. And they will, Mr. Speaker, have the same obligation to assist in the development of that resource as they have already adopted with respect to development of syncrude, Tar Sands, nuclear power plants -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Nelson River.

MR. L. BARRY: - the Nelson River project in Manitoba and other energy projects. They will have to face up to their obligation to Eastern Canada to number one, assist financially in getting this great resource developed, and number two, in taking action to make sure that no province can block the free movement of energy from Labrador to other parts of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. G. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I indicated a final supplementary to that question.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On a new - in a sense, new line, just one question. The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) assured the House quite some weeks ago, and indeed, I think in the last session as well, that we would be very soon seeing some of the work of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. I think some of it was supposed to have been available in April and some more of it in May. We are now up to the 23rd of May, as I recall -

MR. L. BARRY: Lower Churchill.

MR. D. JAMIESON: On the Lower Churchill - did I - I am sorry, the Lower Churchill Development Corporation. Given the proposition which he has just stated and which it is not hard to agree with with regard to the necessity to develop undeveloped resources but I presume, and if my presumption is correct then my question is,

MR. D. JAMIESON: When will the studies be completed so that we can see just exactly where we are likely to be going with regard to the Lower Churchill Development?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I think just to get the record straight, I said that we would be seeing, the government would be seeing these reports, and the decision as to when this information will be available to the House or to the public is going to have to be a Cabinet decision once the reports are in. But at the present time the reports appear to be, as I understand, on schedule. I have seen preliminary reports. They will first go to the Board of Directors of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and that corporation will in turn make recommendations to government, and I expect that by the end of this month we should be in receipt of recommendations from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Obviously, Question Period is not the appropriate place to get the kinds of answers that I am looking for. I am a little puzzled as to why they would go to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro first. This is an arrangement between governments, that is a federal/provincial corporation. Would they not under normal circumstances go to government first as opposed to the government getting recommendations from Newfoundland Hydro? What is the rationale behind that particular route? I do not understand why, for example, the Lower Churchill Corporation should not submit its findings or its conclusions to the Government of Canada and of Newfoundland, and out of that then, would flow some kind of communication to Newfoundland Hydro. Why is it the other way around?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Lower Churchill Development Corporation is an affiliate of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and the Province's 51 per cent ownership of that corporation is held by

MR. BARRY: and the strategy with respect to the Lower Churchill development has to be co-ordinated with the overall provincial energy strategy, and that is why we will want to have the report assessed by the Hydro Corporation and recommendations from the Hydro Corporation in turn brought to government. But I do not anticipate any lengthy delay in that assessment because Hydro has been moving with LCDC and has been involved in the course of the preparation of the report.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have been trying to make an effort to get this question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I understand the hon. Minister of Rural Development will be in the area in which this question is so all important and it will undoubtedly come up, I would like for the minister to tell the House- relating to the fish plant at Cow Head where we have everything in place, I think the minister is well aware of the problem without my elaborating, we need a water supply to the fish plant that presently exists and we have hundreds of people unemployed. We have many longliners in there. We are led to believe, or we understand from T.J. Hardy that he is prepared, willing and able to create a cash flow of something in the order of \$4 million and to me it is a big opportunity. Mr. Speaker, at present there is a study being done, I understand, by the federal department for major harbour development, I am not quite sure of the areas they are looking at, probably Parsons Pond, Cow Head, and as the minister must be aware, if we do not have this upgrading in operation this year then we are afraid that the Feds will say, "You did not produce fish last year, you did not have enough fish to justify our investment, a major investment, millions of dollars for major harbour facilities in that general area," and I am wondering if the minister would have emergency funds available to activate to, indeed, put this problem to rest?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, yes we are certainly very well aware of the problem in Cow Head. We have a report that was completed recently by some consultants on the situation there, a very exhaustive report, I might say, a very thorough one that went into not only the provision of a water supply for Cow Head, and for the fish plant that is being built there, but also, in fact, looked at some potential for the fisheries there and what potential there might be for expansion of that fish plant and other fish plants in future. The reason for that was to compile the data that was required to make a proper recommendation on the type and size of the water system that would be required for Cow Head.

We are now looking at it and my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and I are considering ways and means of overcoming this problem. The fish plant is being built by private enterprise and I am not sure that it is the municipality's responsibility to provide a water supply to the fish plant. Obviously, there is some responsibility there because the municipal system needs some substantial upgrading in order to be able to provide a supply sufficient to meet the demands of this fish plant which is now far in excess of the plant that was there previously. Previously, the plant used a temporary plastic waterline system that went across the beach and now they are going to be requiring, I think, a four or six inch waterline which uses a tremendous amount more water than was available previously and that is, indeed, available from the existing system.

We are looking at it. I do not think it is going to be possible to put in a complete system for this year. Certainly it would not be possible to get it there in time anyway, simply because of the time construction. However, we will be looking at ways and means of providing some sort of temporary relief this year if we can at all.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. John's West.

MR. BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the hon. the Premier, There has been a great deal of concern expressed in the

MR. BARRETT: City of St. John's the last few days concerning an announcement by the hon. William Rompkey, Newfoundland's only representative in the Federal Cabinet in Ottawa. Can the Premier enlighten us as to what the present position is with respect to the decision on the synchrolift. The synchrolift in the City of St. John's was basically agreed to -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) away.

MR. BARRETT: - I am sorry - some time ago and there seems to be, now, some hedging on the federal government's part as to whether or not they intend to proceed with this?

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) for the first time.

MR. CARTER: Order!

MR. NEARY: What about the intended -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely -

MR. NEARY: Crosbie is going to get the contract.

MR. CARTER: Order!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: -I am extremely concerned about that whole synchrolift situation and after the announcement, or the statement I should say, by the Minister of National Revenue, Mr. Rompkey, I immediately wired his office to express my concern and shock at the statement

PREMIER PECKFORD: in the sense that it seemed like the whole project was being re-assessed. One can understand a cost escalation being re-assessed because a whole bunch of things had changed in the sense of the location and the dimensions of the yard but it still has a lot of viability to it. So we have expressed our concern to Mr. Rompkey and to the Federal Government and we are eager for them now to move on towards calling tenders and getting the first phase of that synchrolift started this year. And we will leave no stone untuned to ensure that that project becomes a reality.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

I would like to welcome to the galleries on behalf of all hon. members a group of students from the Grade Eight Civics class from the Integrated Elementary School in Norris Arm, in the district of Lewisporte, along with their teacher Mr. Pleman Menchenton and we hope that they will enjoy their visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I would also like to welcome to the gallery today the newly elected President of the Labrador Inuit Association, Miss Fran McIntosh accompanied by the Advisor Mary Sillett.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Generic Dispensing Prescription Drug Act".

MR. SPEAKER: Any further notices?

The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Attachment Of Wages Act". And also an "Act To Amend The Landlord And Tenant Residential Tenancies Act of 1973".

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further notices?
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Fisheries I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills, "An Act To Amend The Fishing Ship Bounties Act"; "An Act To Amend The Fishing and Coastal Vessels Rebuilding And Repairs Bounties Act"; and; "An Act To Amend The Fisheries Loan Act".

MR. SPEAKER: Any further notices?

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I will not take too much time of the House. I have a petition signed by 406 teachers and students of Mary Queen of the World High School on the issue of the French Education Programme and since the hon. minister has clarified that I simply table it for the information of the House.

MR. E. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) you mean she straightened it out.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I am very pleased with it.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further petitions?
The hon. Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture.

MR. P. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by 674 residents of Codroy Valley. The prayer of the petition, "We the undersigned residents of Codroy Valley humbly request that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador undertake at the earliest possible date the construction of a new and permanent bridge spanning the Grand Codroy River at the same site of the old structure at Upper Ferry. Realizing the economic change in Codroy Valley and in Codroy in particular we further request that the existing bridge at Millville be maintained on a permanent basis".

In 1923, Mr. Speaker, the construction on the bridge at Upper Ferry began and continued for three years, a lot of the work being done by hand, concrete being mixed in wheel barrows and so on. The bridge spanned 1,144 feet across the Grand Codroy River and in terms of today's traffic was a single lane bridge. It served the communities of the Codroy Valley well over that period of time until 1978, when a sudden ~~thaw~~ in January of 1978 caused part of the bridge to collapse and subsequently the rest of the bridge soon ~~fol-~~
~~lowed~~ over a twenty-four hour period. Over that period of time the communities centred around the bridge as if it were the hub of a wheel; churches were built, schools were built, the co-operative store was built, doctors offices were established, all basically with the bridge being the centre of activity. The loss of the bridge caused some considerable ~~discomfort~~ would probably be a very mild word. It affected not only the social activities of Codroy Valley, it also affected the economics. And I am sure that if any hon. members care to speak to any of my colleagues, either in Cabinet or private members, they will realize that they are probably as familiar

MR. R. DAWE: with the bridge and the problems it has created in the Codroy Valley as anyone. The work was undertaken to propose a design to replace the bridge in the same site. These engineering studies, however, revealed that the type of ground, the sand conditions of the river were very similar to those experienced in the construction of the North West River Bridge in that it was virtually impossible to construct a bridge based on normal procedures and that very special requirements would have to be met in order to build this bridge because of the sand conditions in the river bottom.

The cost estimates on the bridge have risen to the vicinity of about \$8 million to replace the bridge in that present site. And subsequently, government has prepared a submission to DREE which is now in the process of going through the necessary channels in order to have DREE funding to put the bridge back in the same place as it was before.

Mr. Speaker, I would add my support to this petition and ask that it be referred to the department concerned.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, the district that my hon. friend represents, who just presented the petition, it borders on the great district of LaPoile and everytime I go down to my district, go down to Port aux Basque and I hold member's clinics in Port aux Basque I get as many people coming from the Codroy Valley to see me as come from my own district of LaPoile. They are very concerned about this matter, Mr. Speaker, and very concerned about the lack of action on the part of the government. This bridge was promised to the people of the Codroy Valley

AN HON. MEMBER: Three years ago.

MR. S. NEARY: Three years ago they were told that the bridge would be replaced by the provincial government, that they would ask for no federal input in this bridge. Now the minister has disclosed today, in presenting a petition on behalf of his constituents, that the thing is going to be stalled and held up because now they have to make

MR. S. NEARY: an application to DREE because of the escalation of the cost. Before the member was elected in that district of St. George's, ministers went down there, flew down in helicopters and told the people that that bridge was going to be replaced.

The people are very concerned now, Mr. Speaker, that the bridge is going to be, if it ever is built, relocated which will cause a tremendous inconvenience to the people who live in that area because, as the hon. gentleman has said, "everything is centered around the old bridge. The people are satisfied for the moment with the bridge that is there, they would like, also, to have that bridge kept in place in case of emergencies after the new bridge is built. But the people are no wiser now than they were when the hon. gentleman presented the petition. The government are now reneging on their commitment to build that bridge. I can see what is going to happen down the road, Mr. Speaker, they are going to pawn the blame off now on DREE in Ottawa and in another six months or a year they will say, well, we asked DREE, they would not give us any money."

But let me reiterate what I just said, that when the commitment was made by the Tory administration in this Province, the people in that district were told the bridge would be replaced, would be replaced as quickly as possible, that it would be replaced by the provincial government and that they would ask for no federal money to put the bridge there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Are there any further petitions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance
to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting An Increase Of Certain Pensions".
Carried. (Bill No. 42)

On motion, Bill No. 42 read a first time,
ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance
to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act,
1973". Carried. (Bill No. 49)

On motion, Bill No. 49 read a first time,
ordered read a second time on tomorrow

May 23, 1980

Tape No. 1765

AH-1

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act To Incorporate The Newfoundland And Labrador Petroleum Corporation;" carried. (Bill No. 50)

On motion, Bill No. 50 read a first time ordered read a second time tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Act," carried. (Bill No. 54)

On motion, Bill No. 54 read a first time ordered read a second time tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend Certain Taxation Statutes," carried. (Bill No. 53)

On motion, Bill No. 53 read a first time ordered read a second time tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Electrical Power Control Act," carried. (Bill No. 55)

On motion, Bill No. 55 read a first time ordered read a second time tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 5. Bill No. 13.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Protect The Environment Of the Province By Providing For Environmental Assessment," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 13)

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 6 Bill No. 16.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting

The Establishment Of A Newfoundland And Labrador Arts Council," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

(Bill No. 16)

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 7 Bill No. 12.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Provide For Natural Areas In The Province To Be Set Aside For The Benefit, Education And Enjoyment Of Present And Future Generations In The Province," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 12)

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 8 Bill No. 46.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 46)

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 9 Bill No. 44.

On motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on said Bill, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt): Order, please! Bill No. 44.
Shall Clause 2 carry. The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on the design. I think that is what we are on right now as it relates to the flag. And in so doing, I would just like to make a few general comments, if I may be allowed, if I have the permission of the members of the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we have no objection, as long as we can make a few general comments too.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, I will - Mr. Chairman, if the hon. members think I am out of order anytime, there is a procedure that can be followed and that is-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh !

PREMIER PECKFORD: - through point of orders and - . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that the hon. the Premier -

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, if we can have a few general comments too.

MR. MARSHALL: We do not need leave. We do not speak by (inaudible) to the Opposition.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I intend to speak on the design and I think that is the matter that is applicable right now. And, therefore, I am completely in order and completely relevant.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So, I wish to speak on the design. I think that is the section that we are under now under the Act and I will so do. In so doing, Mr. Chairman, in talking about this design and my

PREMIER PECKFORD: support for this design, I would like to make it clear to hon. members, some of whom who have taken the opportunity on a number of occasions, especially on the other side of the House, and other people in the public to try to accuse me of not supporting the design or somehow not being in favor of the design by the mere fact that up to this point in time, I had not spoken in the debate in the House of Assembly. And the primary reason for that, of course, Mr. Chairman, was because I wished to hear, seeing it is in my name, from most of the hon. members in the House, before so speaking, so that when I did speak I would have the benefit of the discussion and debate by many of the hon. members.

It is a very, very important piece of legislation, it is a very very important topic and, therefore, I thought it best to do it this way. I do apologize, Mr. Chairman, to the House, that I was not present the other day, on Tuesday. I had organized to be here and to leave late Tuesday night to go to Ottawa. Primarily, because one of the best friends I had in the world suddenly dropped dead. I thought it important that I attend a funeral for a friend of mine in my constituency and hence why I was not here to speak on it on Tuesday. I got back yesterday from Ottawa.

Now, the design, Mr. Chairman, and the whole question of some of the things that have been said about this whole flag debate and this particular design. I find it very very, what shall I say, unusual to say the least, that so many hon. members have tried to accuse this side of the House and the Government and myself of trying to push through this particular design. Not only to try to push it through, Mr. Chairman, but that the whole process has been somehow unseemly; that the whole process has been somehow autocratic, that the whole process has been somehow undemocratic, that the whole issue of this design -

May 23, 1980

Tape No. 1766

EL - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh !

MR. S. NEARY:

You finally got the (Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, Mr.Chairman, I reject that

completely -

MR. S. NEARY:

You finally got (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- categorically. I reject that completely.

Mr. Chairman, this design -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh !

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- this design came about after this

hon. House, every single member of this hon. House voting in favor of the establishment of a Select Committee to bring in a specific design. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. the member for LaPoile (S. Neary), the hon. member for St. Barbe (T. Bennett), all members of this House, all the members on this side, all the members on that side agreed to this procedure, agreed to it wholeheartedly, knowing full-well, Mr. Chairman, that at the end of the day, which happened to be at the end of April, 1980, there would come before this hon. Chamber a specific design-

MR. CHAIRMAN:

A point of Order. Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- a specific design and that is the

design that we have at the present moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! A point of order, the

hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

I merely rise to point out -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! I cannot hear the hon.

member's point of order. Would you please start again.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, the Premier is not being relevant.

But, I do not mind, Mr. Chairman, because I understand that we have agreement that we can be as general as the Premier when we are replying to him. Is that correct??

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

No, that is not correct.

MR. NEARY:

Well, if it is not correct, the hon.

gentleman is out of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To the point of order, the hon. the

President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, this is not a point of

order. The hon. the Premier is talking about the design and making remarks with respect to design. He is perfectly in order. Now, the hon. the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) has been continually, both here in committee and in the House, from time to time, getting up on what are obviously specious points of order for the purpose of being able -

MR. THOMS:

(Inaudible) your side.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

- for the purpose of being able to inject his ideas from the point of view of debate and this is causing, in itself, a disorder in the Committee when people get up on obviously spurious

MR. MARSHALL: points of order, this type of thing. You just cannot conduct -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: You cannot conduct a debate in a rational fashion and Your Honour will find authority in Beauchesne that I have quoted before, that it is a violation of the privileges of the House to rise up on spurious points of order because - for obvious reasons.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of order, I would rule there is no point of order. In referring you to the relevancy rule, 299 on page 98 in Beauchesne, "Relevancy is not easy to define. In borderline cases the member should be given the benefit of the doubt." In this particular case I will give the hon. the Premier the benefit of the doubt.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, I am talking about the design and how we arrived at this particular design which is important, because there has been a lot of discussion concerning the procedure used to have the particular design now under discussion. And what I am trying to point out and to contend and to submit to this hon. Committee is that the process and the procedure that was used was extremely democratic and free. And not only that, Mr. Chairman, this administration stands by not only the Select Committee as it related to the flag but other select committees and advisory councils which are being established through legislation almost daily here in this hon. House, to demonstrate the desire of this government to ensure that the things that it does have the proper and legitimate public input that is necessary for major public policy developments to come about. And it was done in this case.

So it was not undemocratic, it was free and democratic. And not only that, it was done by all members of this House of Assembly knowing full well that a specific design would be coming forward. And hence we all have to share our own parts of that responsibility and I gladly accept it and am happy that it happened that way, that procedure was free, it was democratic and it was done in a great way.

PREMIER PECKFORD: A second point on the design and on the whole debate, Mr. Chairman, would simply be I find it somewhat disturbing that hon. members, those who have spoken and that I have heard, most of whom I have heard, I find it somewhat disturbing because the debate on this particular bill, and on some other bills that we have had, but particularly now on this bill and on this design, I do not know if hon. members fully realize what we are doing here.

MR. FLIGHT: No, we do not.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Because a lot of the comments that have been made seem to suggest to me that we are just dealing with another ordinary, mundane piece of legislation, a very small little amendment or something to some existing legislation, housekeeping legislation almost. I do not get the sense, from a lot of the speeches by hon. members, that we are making history here, that we are talking about something that is going to be permanent for all time, not just for the hon. member for Bonavista North's (Mr. Stirling) time, not just for my time, not just for the member for Grand Bank's (Mr. Thoms), not just for the member for Windsor-Buchans' (Mr. Flight) time, but for all time, for perpetuity, for eternity. And yet we look upon some of these things and place upon this kind of concept a very particular personal preference, as if the hon. gentlemen so proposing it is going to be here to enjoy or to dislike that particular symbol for all time. What a narrow and rather less than elevated concept or approach to take to such a very important matter. And I find it on both sides. I find that the debate on this particular piece of legislation should be most -

MR. STIRLING: You should consult everybody.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - most elevated, because we are dealing with something which is of such importance for the long-term, and that is not the right phraseology, because long-term is usually now applied to things that are for a life time. We are talking about eternity. We are talking about perpetuity. We are talking about all time. And hence when one has to look at trying -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

May 23, 1980

Tape No. 1767

NM ~ 3

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Chairman, if I can speak without being interrupted.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please! The hon. Premier wishes to be heard in silence.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If we are looking at something for all time then surely, surely it behooves us to look at things that can be appreciated one hundred years from now, to use our best efforts, our best vision, to use our best imagination, to use our best creativity, to look at another 600,000 or 700,000 Newfoundlanders in the year 2080 and how they will feel about a particular symbol which is called a

PREMIER PECKFORD: flag. And I always think of every time when I read a letter to the editor or hear somebody commenting either in this House or outside on the flag the first thing that hits my mind is, 'When sunrays crown thy pine clad hills' - our pine clad hills which are no more. One can have a great comment on why they are no more, but the fact of the matter is, is it an anachronism, it has sort of outlived its usefulness only from the point of view -

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): A point of order, the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Yesterday the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) rose on numerous occasions when my friend from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) was speaking on a point of order, accusing the member for LaPoile of speaking on the principle of the bill and not addressing himself entirely to the particular clause in the bill under discussion. Now, since the last point of order was raised, the hon. the Premier has not mentioned, except the word, anything with reference to the design of the flag. Now, I personally do not mind the Premier speaking on the principle of this bill. He has mentioned the procedures, the methodology that has been used, he has talked about the nature of the debate up to this point in time, he has talked about the symbolism in the flag and all other kinds of things except the design. Now, I personally do not mind the Premier talking about the principle of the bill in this Committee of the Whole, but yesterday, we on this side were ruled out of order on numerous occasions for carrying on with exactly the same type of debate the Premier is carrying on with now. And I find it a little bit disturbing, Mr. Chairman - and I am not throwing accusations at the Chair on this particular point - but I find it particularly disturbing when on one day members on this side are muzzled from deviating from the exact design of the flag, because we are dealing with a clause, and the very next morning, the Premier is allowed to carry on on basically what surely must be interpreted as debate on the principle

MR. F. ROWE: of the bill. Now, you cannot have your cake and eat it too. We either have to widen the debate during this Committee stage or keep the debate narrow as we had it yesterday. We cannot have it both ways. That is the point that disturbs me and that is the point of order that I am trying to make, that if the Premier is allowed to carry on in the way he is carrying on now, that members on this side be allowed to do exactly the same thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. MARSHALL: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I shall try to make a comment on it briefly, Mr. Chairman. I heard the hon. the Premier. All the hon. the Premier is doing is talking about the design.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, yes.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Oh, yes, well, that is fine. But, you know, the hon. gentleman - now I will just say this, the hon. gentleman may have been out of the Chamber at the time, but the fact of the matter is that this has already been dealt with. The hon. the Premier is addressing himself to the matter of the design. I would point out that the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) when he was speaking, was one of the people over on the other side who was complaining and casting somewhat semi-insulting language - because the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde does not cast insulting language - towards the Premier when he was speaking, about his not speaking in the debate. Now, if the hon. gentleman wishes to hear the views of the Premier, if he is sincere that he really wishes the Premier to express his views on the flag where he was unavoidably absent at the time for a very -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: - for a very rational reason, that is fine. But, I mean, we can see the extent really, of the sincerity -

MR. W. MARSHALL: sincerity is probably not the word - but the desire of the hon. member to hear the Premier speak. He is going to hear the Premier speak and now he rises on a point of order against it.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): I have heard enough to rule on this particular point of order.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, may I say a word?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I want simply to respond to the points made by the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall). We are delighted to hear the Premier speak on this or any other occasion. With respect to this matter, the point on which Your Honour will rule when I finish in just a moment or two, is the type of debate permitted at Committee stage. I would simply point out two things, number one, that the Premier had ample opportunity to speak during second reading and there is a third reading debate during which he will be invited to speak along with some of us, perhaps, and

MR. ROBERTS: secondly, that whatever latitude the Premier is allowed, of course, we know Your Honour and the Chair will allow us precisely the same latitude at Committee stage and I venture to say several -

MR. THOMS: No, he will not do it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I venture to say the Chair will have no choice, the Chair will be impartial and fair, and we will be allowed precisely the same latitude as the Premier is allowed and I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that there are quite a number of my colleagues who will take advantage of that and enjoy with Your Honour's blessing, I am sure, because Your Honour is impartial, the same latitude that will be allowed to the Premier. We look forward to that, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please! The principle of the bill was debated in great detail during second reading. I would rule there is a legitimate point of order and I would ask the hon. the Premier to confine his remarks to Clause 2 of this particular bill which deals with the design.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize to the Chair and I apologize to hon. members opposite. I will sum up my remarks on the design by simply saying that there are three basic principles which are operative here which I think should be considered in talking about the design. One has to do with the distinctiveness of the design and I think in this particular one we do have that kind of distinctiveness that is needed. Secondly, I think it must be representative, and contrary to a lot of opinions that have been made by hon. gentleman opposite and other people who have opposed this particular design, I believe it is extremely representative when one looks at it in the broadest way that one does. And thirdly, the concept of permanence must be there and that is the concept that I was talking on before I was interrupted and before the point of order. The whole question of permanence is extremely operative here. We are dealing

PREMIER PECKFORD: with a design that is for all time and in looking at it that way we must look at Labrador, we must - and nobody, very much in the debates to date, talked about the design in relation to Labrador. When one looks at different kinds of objects that you can put on a design surely the best one for all time and for permanence - unless we have another glacial age, would be the question of a triangle for both geographic parts of the Province because that is, perhaps, the most permanent kind of symbol that one can get. So I would just address my remarks, Mr. Chairman, given your ruling, to three major concepts which should be operative here and which should take priority over particular personal preferences because we are dealing with something that is so substantial and so permanent and so long-lasting and perpetual that, therefore, it must take a fourth or fifth place to it and that is its distinctiveness, number one, number two, how it is representative of the Province and number three, its permanence. And when one looks at those three things, I think, in this particular design these three concepts stand out and the representation is there, the permanence is there, its distinctiveness is there and by the same token there is enough of our past and our history to make this both a design of our heritage and, also, one looking forward and trying to put in it symbols which are for all time. And I think that is what you have to try to do with a flag, and then you can enter into the picture, after those three or four concepts are put in, you can enter into the picture, to some degree, your own personal dislike or like. But it must be tempered with the more long-lasting concepts which are not necessarily important from my personal preference point of view or somebody else's, because we are not going to be here either to enjoy or to laud or to stand up for that particular symbol in the hundreds and hundreds of years which will follow us, hopefully, if the world continues to be, and that is what we have to remember. The whole question of Labrador which has not been identified, and sadly, in talking about a design, to somehow

PREMIER PECKFORD: put in there a reference or a reflection to the native peoples of this part of the world, I think that is very, very important. I was rather saddened, in the debate, public and otherwise, to hear very little said about some reflection of the native people of this Province. And that that is now a part and a symbol in this flag, because that is important and they are very, very much a part not only of our past, Mr. Chairman, I hasten to add, but a very, very viable part of our present and our future because there are a lot of dealings that have to go on in this country from the Arctic Circle to the golden triangle, to resolve a whole bunch of things dealing with native peoples and the kind of roles that they have already played both in art and everything else to do with civilization, but they will play in the future. And I think when we are looking at this design we must

PREMIER PECKFORD: remember that. How do you reflect two geographic regions, Labrador and the Island? How do you reflect your real heritage which happens to be the native peoples who inhabited this here land centuries and centuries ago and yet project that into the future? And that is done very, very adequately in this particular design.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take a great deal of time. I said everything that I wanted to say initially when the bill was brought in and I will clearly and unmistakably confine my remarks to your ruling with regard to the design of the flag. In the case of the design I said at the outset that my only problem and my overwhelming and irresistible problem was that I simply could not, as the Premier has apparently been able to do, accept this particular design as really being meaningful in any sense of the word in terms of the mandate that was given to the Committee.

In terms of what the Committee's mandate was, I do not have the exact wording here in front of me, but there is no question that the Premier was correct when he said that it was unanimously agreed in this House that there would be a design brought in. But there are other things which the Premier said also, today which I could not have said better myself. I would like to compliment him on the first part of what he said. Because what he said was that this is something for all time, for generations, for hundreds of years. This is what we are going to have as our flag in this Province. This is the gut issue, if you wish. That design standing on the flagpole is going to be the thing which will reflect Newfoundland for centuries to come.

Now, I agree totally with the Premier in that regard. I think he has come to the root of the matter and yet although it is so permanent, it is so irrevocable, in his concept at least, although I do not believe, incidentally, that it is that irrevocable, another government

MR. JAMIESON: presumably could change it, as my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said yesterday. But let us go on the premise, let us go on the premise of its permanency. That is precisely why, precisely why it is scandalous to have it rushed through this House without giving the people of this Province an adequate opportunity to express themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: I fail to see how on things which have substantially less permanency, which are as passing as you could possibly imagine, things that do not last for more than two or three or four years at the most, there is a profound wish on the part of members of this House to have the public consulted. There are other issues which we are studying into the ground, not just in the current administration, the previous administration was studying them. When we ask now what it is going to happen on x item or y item of great significance, in terms of the economy of the Province and the like, it is still being studied. On matters which, although important, are far less important than this, such as the bilingualism that we talked about this morning, the government over a period of two or three weeks, received substantially less representations than it has received against this design and, yet, it has decided to change its mind. And so what can we conclude other than the fact that at least the majority of members opposite have decided to dig in on this particular design and to say, "This is the one we are going to have and we are not going to have any other and there is no point in talking about it any further with the people of Newfoundland."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, it is not inconceivable, let me say this in all sincerity, it is not inconceivable that if we had six months or so, and if -

DR. COLLINS: Where are the 10,000 people?

MR. JAMIESON: I beg your pardon?

DR. COLLINS: Where are the 10,000 people that the hon. member talked about yesterday?

MR. JAMIESON: I am not referring - that would be entirely out of order as the hon. gentleman pointed out yesterday when he was sitting in for the House Leader to talk about demonstrations or anything of that kind. It would be out of order as, I have to remind the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), he himself pointed out yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: So, therefore, I am doing my level best, doing my level best to respect - .

MR. NEARY: Early senility.

MR. JAMIESON: - I am doing my level best to keep within what the Minister of Finance was insisting upon.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. JAMIESON: Yes. I am being entirely relevant.

DR. COLLINS: I am sorry I embarrassed you.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister embarrasses himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. D. JAMIESON: When the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) embarrasses me, it will only be when he has to stand up and speak for Newfoundland and I am ashamed of the way in which he speaks out of both sides of his mouth at the same time!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON: And I would be ashamed -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

I would ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to confine his remarks to the design of the flag.

MR. D. JAMIESON: With the greatest of respect and, Sir, can I appeal for the protection of the Chair against the inanities of the Minister of Finance?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: By all means. The Leader of the Opposition wishes to be heard in silence and that is his right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON: I was also hopeful that I could be heard in a modest and a moderate kind of way, because I do not believe that this is the kind of issue on which we need or ought to, at this moment in time, be arousing the passions of the public of this Province. It seems to me that this is an issue which, given the entire list of things with which we have to concern ourselves - that this is something that we ought to be able to deal with sensibly and as Newfoundlanders who certainly give second place to no one when it comes - certainly, we on this side of the House, and I feel the same for members opposite, in terms of our wish and our desire for a reassertion of and the strengthening of our distinctive identity as Newfoundlanders. And it is precisely for that reason that I want to see a flag which I can relate to. The design should be one that I can say, 'Yes, it is one that I can understand, that I can say is something that I can be proud of when I see it flying.' And I tell you quite honestly and quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, that I simply cannot do that.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Now, I have read the description which was put on the printed symbol or whatever one calls it, of the flag that was distributed, and quite honestly, it is so remote and so vague that I doubt very much, indeed, if it is going to be of any real meaning or any real significance to anyone. However, let that be as it may. Let us assume, first of all, that it will 'grow' on us. That is the word that has been used, I think, by the member for St. John's West (Mr. H. Barrett). Let us assume that that is so. And I, for one, certainly will do everything in my power, regardless of what others may say, that if this flag is approved, I will certainly expect it to get the respect that a democratically approved flag deserves. That is a basic and fundamental point with me, that this is a democratic assembly, that we are sitting in here in the Province of Newfoundland. This is the law making organization for the Province of Newfoundland. To do other than give respect to that flag if it is approved by this House is, in effect, to be going against the most fundamental, basic democratic institution in the country. And that is why the onus on the majority is so great. It is, I suggest, surely grossly unfair to members on this side of the House whose patriotism, whose loyalty to this Province is, I hope, not in question, to say to us that we are going to move to pass this flag in what has to be regarded as a very short period of time, in legislative terms, and then expect that we give it the loyalty which we are finding it extremely difficult now to imagine because of our particular positions. I am not speaking for all members on this side, there may be differences of view, so let me talk about it in purely personal terms, in terms of this design.

Now, let me go back, Mr. Speaker, to what I said a few moments ago, that this government, and particularly since this administration - because one has to apparently make a distinction these days between the government and the current administration. This administration has said repeatedly and on innumerable occasions that it wishes to be open, that it wishes to have the most complete input possible from the people of Newfoundland before it makes decisions affecting the future of those people.

MR. D. JAMIESON: On some of those actions they have the commendation of members here on this side. There are environmental questions we were talking about yesterday in which much opportunity has been provided and more will be provided to the people.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Inaudible) absolutely as a human being, regardless of as a member of this Assembly, I must stand on my rights and my privileges as a member of this House and say that I find the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition - and I will sit here until 6:00 P.M. and hear him on anything - but fair is fair and unfair is no man's game

PREMIER PECKFORD:

and I think that I, in my speech a few minutes ago, was being just as relevant as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson). I point out to this hon. House that I have no objections and it was not a matter of giving special of anything for the Leader of the Opposition to continue with his remarks, but I must point out in just common decency that in my humble opinion, for whatever it is worth to anybody here, that I was just as relevant in my comments a few minutes ago as the Leader of the Opposition is in his right now.

MR. D. JAMIESON: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): To the point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: I have no problem, Mr. Chairman, unless you wish to rule, I -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I do.

MR. D. JAMIESON: - accept the word of the Premier. I perhaps had wandered afield, I was seeking to make a point but I will accept the necessity to stay on the design.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a legitimate point of order here and I would ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to confine his remarks to Clause 2 which deals with the design of this flag.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Thank you very much, Sir. We are speaking about the design and the acceptability of it to the people of Newfoundland.

I think the one point which is overlooked, by all of those who talk about the procedure of hearings and the like around the Province, is that, of course, those had to be to a degree representations from various groups indicating what kind of a design they wanted. The fact of the matter is that there has not been an opportunity for the people of Newfoundland to express themselves on the design itself and I believe that to be an extremely key and important point.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. D. JAMIESON: There is no question in my mind with regard to the necessity of having the flag, I believe the record will show that I was supportive of that idea. And I can understand the difficulties, as I said in my initial remarks at the opening of this debate, what a problem the Committee had with regard to the various designs which were presented to them. But what has really taken place here is perhaps something which none of us anticipated, perhaps we ought to have given more time in the initial debate on establishing the Committee and then we might not be in the quandary which some of us find ourselves in today, and that is if we had asked ourselves at that time what happens if the Committee having brought in a design, it is not one which is acceptable to the majority of Newfoundlanders or to significant numbers of Newfoundlanders or whatever was there?

MR. S. NEARY: The Committee decided themselves.

MR. D. JAMIESON: I understand that it was one of their rules at the time but I was not privy to the discussions within the Committee. But the point of the matter, I believe, is this,-

MR. S. NEARY: It is in the report.

MR. D. JAMIESON: - I understand it is in the report but it is watered down, as the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) said, in the report from something having to say that the design had to be acceptable to the majority, there is a different kind of wording.

MR. S. NEARY: Widely -

MR. D. JAMIESON: Widely acceptable - so widely acceptable

design is perhaps something different than a majority design or whatever. But that is not my point. It seems to me that given our concern for the design, given the fact that many of us and I think not only members on this side but some members opposite, certainly large numbers of the general public, have real reservations let alone a total dislike of this particular design, then given those circumstances that it is illogical and inconsistent with the attitude adopted by this government not to have more time elapse during which the people can, indeed, express themselves on the design, not on the idea of having a distinctive flag but on the design itself, for the life of me, I can

MR. D. JAMIESON: not see what is to be gained by having this flag which the Premier has said, "That design will fly over Newfoundland for perhaps centuries to come", given that fact that we must, for some reason which I do not understand, now move immediately and instantly to putting it through when, indeed, if there was an opportunity for a longer period of reflection, and I am not speaking of years, I am not speaking of anything other than a few months, that it is not entirely out of the question that there might very well be a realization that the flag was acceptable. But as things stand at the moment; first of all, we do not know, secondly, what we do know is that there is a very significant and a very large element which does not like it: Now, that is the proposition. I do not know whether it is relevant or irrelevant to talk about what generations in the future will come to think of this but, you know, in all such cases, Mr. Chairman, a design of this kind

MR. D. JAMIESON: has to begin with the approval of some generation. It has to start somewhere with some generation, some living group of people have to say, 'Yes, we like it'. Now that has not been answered by the people of Newfoundland.

I will come back and end as I began by saying that I have the design - it is, of course, the work of a very good friend of mine. It is with profound regret that I have to say that in this particular case I do not especially like his design. I think, with regard to the design, that the symbolism is too obscure, with regard to the design, that it has nothing in it that is clearly and unequivocally related to Newfoundland as those of us in this generation understand Newfoundland. Maybe there are those who will see these rather esoteric symbols more clearly than I. But I say for my part that I want to be able to support and will support, I emphasize once again, I will support a flag that is democratically passed by this House. As a democrat, as a Newfoundlander I have no choice in the matter. But I wish I could make that choice more satisfied that what I was doing was in line with what the majority of the people of this Province feel and that there had been a reasonable period of time after the design became public for the people of this Province to express themselves in a way which I suggest they have not had up to the present time.

And, therefore, I appeal once again to those who have the responsibility in these matters to think twice before moving along to the point where we make an irrevocable decision here and something which far from being the kind of shining design example for the future that has been talked about, may be a reminder for years to come of the divisiveness with which this particular and historic measure was introduced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Chairman, just let me respond for two or three minutes to that. I do not think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) was here was present in the Province, I think he was serving with the Federal Government at the time that the last process of the flag came up in this hon. House. And I think one thing that we have all forgotten about that happened at that time which has not happened at this time - I will point this out because it is very important. There are - and let me just say it very generally as it relates to this particular design and what we had a few years ago - innumerable organizations around this Province this hour, this moment who are saying very little about this design. I would suggest to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that if any additional process is done to either change this design or to bring in something different that not only would you have one organization, the Royal Canadian Legion, arguing you would have quite a few.

MR. S. NEARY:

I cannot believe that.

BREMIER PECKFORD:

I say that humbly and I believe that to be true. Number two, I will just go back to the democracy and the Leader of the Opposition tries to attack the government as it relates to procedure and democracy, This was done by this whole House - I will reiterate it again - through a Select Committee, through briefs and everything. And as far as time since then, we have made every opportunity to get out to the people of Newfoundland and I am sure there are not very many settlements in Newfoundland which have not seen this design because we have sent it out by leaflet to all the newspapers, it has been out to all of the schools and it has been there now for a couple of weeks. And that design has been well covered in the last while.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And the particular organization which is the most vociferous and really the only organization which is most vociferous in opposition to this particular design, is the Royal Canadian Legion which is very supportive of the Union Jack which the government has said will continue to fly because we do recognize this jurisdiction as having uniqueness in the world in the sense that we are both a member of a country, the Maple Leaf, we are a member of a Commonwealth, the Union Jack, and we are a member of 43,000 square miles on the Island of Newfoundland and 110,000 square miles of Labrador, we are members of that Newfoundland and Labrador land mass which, therefore, is reflected in this particular design.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Batt): The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I will be relatively brief. I wanted to say a word or two on the design. I gather that is the particular clause we are on. I think the Premier mis-spoke when he said the Legion wanted the Union Jack. That is not what I understand the Legion to have said publicly. I am not going to speak for or against the Legion -

MR. L. THOMS: Did you see the flag last night on television?

MR. E. ROBERTS: No, I am sorry I did not see it last night on television

MR. L. THOMS: They showed one with just a small Union Jack on top of the Coat of Arms, you know a flag that is green, white and red.

MR. S. NEARY: It is a beautiful flag.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I see, I did not see that, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to get into a particular design and I do not want to get into the Canadian Legion, I mean they are quite capable of speaking for themselves. I just wanted

May 23, 1980

Tape No. 1773

DW - 4

MR. E. ROBERTS: to say that I think the
Premier mis-spoke the Legion's position and I am sure
he would not want to

MR. E. ROBERTS: do that, when he said that they want the Union Jack. That is not my reading. Let me simply tell the House, we speak of design and we speak of acceptability and we are talking of a particular design and the Chairman of the Flag Committee, the member for St. John's North (J. Carter) sent across a letter which came to him from - does he mind if I read it?

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible) read it.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, he sent it across to my friend, the Leader of the Opposition. It is from a Ms. Bragg of the Academic Department of the College of Trades and Technology here in the city and she says, 'I, as well, as the majority of my students, liked the design, once we had looked at it for a while and studied the symbolism in it. We especially saw the combination of traditional and progressive elements as being very effective!' And I think the hon. gentleman will agree that is the gist of that particular letter.

Let me tell the Committee, Mr. Chairman, of an experience I had this past weekend. I was in St. Barbe in my constituency and we had a public meeting. It was called to discuss a fisheries question and we talked about that. Some are present in the Gallery, some gentleman who, I believe, were at that meeting. And they can verify not by speaking, obviously, in the House but they can verify what went on, if anybody is interested. It was probably as large a meeting, Mr. Chairman, as has ever been held on the St. Barbe Coast. There were I would say, there was no exact count, and I am not trying to warrant the count, between 350 and 400 people who came from quite a large area.

The matter, the question of the fish plant at St. Barbe was of considerable interest and concern to these people and they came to a meeting on Saturday night and absolutely filled the hall. When we had finished speaking about the fishery question and everybody who wanted to have his say, had had his say or her say, I then said, Now, ladies and gentlemen and my friends, since we have got such a large

MR. E. ROBERTS: group of people here, let me ask you what you think of the flag, the design of our flag. And I said to them, first of all, how many of the people here, how many of you have seen the new flag? And just about every hand went up. Just about everybody there had seen on the television, possibly in the newspaper.- there is a local newspaper with a wide circulation called The Northern Pen, a new publication, a very good one, but I suspect most people had seen it through the CBC television which, of course, has shown the design on occasion. And just about everybody said that he or she had seen it.- the particular design that now is right before the Committee. And then I said, 'How many of you wish to see a new flag for Newfoundland and Labrador?' Just about every hand went up. And I was not making precise count, you know, it was not a poll. It was not a vote. It was not an election. Just about every hand went up.

And then I said, 'How many here like the new flag?' And there were five hands went up out of about 400 people. Now, I did not want to assume that everybody who did not put ~~his~~ hand up did not like it so I then asked the next question. I said how many of you here, do not like the new flag? And just about every hand went up. And, you know, that is my recollection. East Saturday evening there were several hundred people there. Each of them can give his or her own recollection. And then I said, just to top it off, 'How many here would like, ~~the Union Jack to be in a flag and relatively~~ few hands went up. I do not think the Union Jack, as such, has a great deal of support. I think the people who want a new flag feel as most of us, I think, in the House who have spoken on this matter do, that the design of the new flag should not include the Union Jack, it should include references or symbolism or, you know, it should capture the Union Jack.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Now, I recount the episode simply because it seems to me that it is a very revealing, very revealing indication of the feeling of people in one part of this Province but I do not think the feeling of people in that part of our Province is any different than the feeling anywhere else as to what they think of this particular design.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many people?

MR. ROBERTS: How many people? I will say that was more people, Sir, than the Select Committee heard from in all of their travels. And furthermore, and this is an important point when we come to talk of this design, I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, the Committee came up with a design on their own. It is not Mr. Pratt's design. Mr.

MR. ROBERTS: Pratt may have been the mind that conceived it but it is the Committee's design, the Committee's report, the Committee's recommendation and it stands for what it is and that is what it is and I have no problem with accepting it as the Committee's recommendation. I am not prepared to vote for it, for the reasons which I gave, but it is not anybody's design except the Committee's. But they can hardly say that that design came out of the result of their public meetings. That design was never shown to a soul other than the Committee members and possibly somebody who made the flag, whoever the people were who actually created the physical artifact itself. That design was shown to nobody, as I understand it, until here in the House the day that the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) presented the report and our two pages unraveled or unveiled, or whatever the phrase is -

MR. THOMS: Unfurled.

MR. ROBERTS: - unfurled. I am sorry. I thank my friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) - unfurled the flag. So I do not think we need feel that this design was the product of any public hearings, it was the product of a group of men, seven of them, each of them a member of the House, a group of men who went through a process of public hearings at which I would suggest they heard from far fewer people than at one meeting in St. Barbe. I know what happened in St. Anthony, they went to St. Anthony and do you know who they saw?

MR. CARTER: Your brother.

MR. ROBERTS: My brother. You know, my brother who works in St. Anthony. He has made his home there. He is living there, working there as a doctor. My brother was the only person -

MR. NEARY: They went to Bell Island and saw nobody.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: My brother? Well I can tell my brother thinks in polite terms the flag ought never to be adopted. And my brother I would say has artistic talents as well as considerable medical talents. He is actually not a bad print maker. But that is neither here nor there. The

MR. ROBERTS: important point is the Flag Committee, you know, it went around, it advertised its hearings - what happened in St. Anthony was they did not advertise them. People may or may not have come if they had known, they did not know. But whether they knew or not they did not come. And the point I am making is that this particular design has not been tested by wide public exposure. And if the government really wanted to talk about democratic process they would not push this design any further. The House is not going to prorogue. The House is going to adjourn, I understand, one of these fine days when we get around to it, and come back presumably in the Fall to resume this session. So simply letting this bill stand on the Order Paper at this stage, at this clause, would not mean that it died on the Order Paper, it could be revived when the session comes back again later in the Fall.

I think that is worth looking at. There has been no public exposure of this design other than the last two or three weeks. And as my friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) said in a most eloquent speech, and a most heartfelt speech, when he spoke in this Committee earlier this morning, Mr. Chairman, you know the design is - the feeling of many is that it is being foisted on us, it is being forced through. And I think that is a very bad way for a flag to start.

The merits of the design - you know one man's design is another man's design. But we should not think, Sir, that this design is the product of anything except seven men on a committee, and I do not fault them, they made their own decision and they have explained it and I have no problem at all with that. The mere fact I do not agree with them does not mean anything except we do not agree. And when the Premier says, as he did just before I came into the debate, Mr. Chairman, when the Premier says that the creation of the Committee was a democratic act, well of course it was. I mean it was done with the unanimous support of the House, that does not pledge us to the results. The Premier I would have thought is an intelligent enough fellow, and a well-read enough fellow not to fall into the philosophical trap of thinking that somehow either the

MR. ROBERTS: means justify the end, or the end justifies the means. And in this case, Mr. Chairman, the means do not justify the end. The means by which the design in this clause 2 has come into being do not in themselves justify the end. The means were perfectly acceptable. That does not mean that the end is. And the Premier is being casuistical, to say the least. He is indulging in a form of intellectual sophistry which I am sure is due to the fact that he is obviously in a very tender mood this morning, for whatever reason. You know it is not like him. He has got intellectual capacities beyond that. I would expect that from some other gentlemen opposite and I could name some of them, but I will not because that would simply provoke it. Those who feel the cap fits can wear it. And those who feel the cap does not fit will not.

But on this design, Mr. Chairman, you know the fact remains that I have found no public acceptance of it. I really have not. I have not pretended to have surveyed everything. I have certainly had people come up to me, about one out of ten and say,

MR. ROBERTS: "We like the flag." And I have had the experience, which I recounted in some detail, but I will stand by it, it was an accurate recounting of a meeting, a large meeting, and 400 is not a large assembly but it is a large number of people, Mr. Chairman, in that part of our Province on a Saturday night to come together and I have said, for what it was worth, the people at that meeting, almost all of whom were familiar with the design set forth in this particular - Your Honour will note I am trying strenuously to keep to the point of the design. I hope I have not strayed from that very narrow but very proper line Your Honour has laid down with ruthless impartiality, as Your Honour is always impartial and sometimes even ruthless. Sometimes I venture to say even toothless on that kind of matter. But, Sir, that particular design - and nearly everybody there was familiar with it to some extent, they had seen it on the television. It is not a topic of conversation, the matter is of no importance in the Province as a whole when weighed against three thousand other items that are of concern. This design is not as important as paving roads or building fish plants or water and sewer systems or property tax or the kind of bilingualism problem that the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) got herself into and hopefully has now gotten herself out of. The question of the flag is of no import against those standards but if we are going to have a flag this design has not commended itself to people in Newfoundland, it has not, and that is why on our part, for me and those of my colleagues who agree with me, it is a free vote, we have no party whips on it just as they do not on the other side, that is why we appeal to the government, as we have throughout, not to push it. If the design has merit, if hon. gentlemen opposite believe and they say they do and I do not doubt that they do, if they believe the design has the merit that they advocate for it, that they claim it has, then it will stand the test of time and that is why the very least that they ought to do is to let this bill stand, not force it

MR. ROBERTS: through, we are not going to filibuster it. I assure Your Honour and Your Honour I do not think needs assurance that if we wanted to filibuster this bill there are sufficient of us on this side with sufficient grasp of the rules of relevancy and of debate and so forth to have kept this thing going for months and months and months and months. We would not have moved the six month hoist with our seventeenth of our eighteen speakers, we would have moved the six month hoist on the first of our speakers, would have had a round of debate then and then when that was knocked down, if it were, we would have had a five month and twenty-nine day hoist.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt) Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: That is a little far from the design I know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The remarks now are straying.

MR. ROBERTS: I am grateful, Your Honour, is being ruthless again and I am grateful to Your Honour. It is important that the Chair not only be impartial as Your Honour is but that it appear to be impartial as Your Honour always appears. And the appearance, Sir, supports the reality and the reality supports the appearance. The point I am making is that this design, in my view, in my opinion and I have given my evidence, it is not just a personal feeling, whether I like it or not I will accept the design if it goes through and I will fly the flag, you know, I am a Newfoundlander. Once it is done it is done. If this is the design then I assume I will have the opportunity to buy a flag - and by the way, at some point I want to raise this question of whether somebody is going to make a killing on this design, I do not think the hon. gentleman is, I am not suggesting that, but I would hope this design is copyrighted and that the copyright rests with the government of the Province. I am not against private enterprise but I do not want to see somebody make a killing -

MR. THOMS: You cannot copyright a flag.

MR.ROBERTS: I am sorry. You cannot copyright a flag?

MR. THOMS: I do not think so.

MR.ROBERTS: It is available to anyone. I do not know if you can copyright a flag or not. I mean there are a lot of legal opinions being flung about here.

MR.WHITE: I suppose you could seal it if you were in private enterprise.

MR.ROBERTS: Well,I just want to make sure that nobody - will the government design their own? Maybe the government should take this design and make the flags and sell them and maybe put the proceeds into some charitable or worthwhile endeavour because the fact remains that with this design, the magic word, this design, Mr. Chairman -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible)

MR.ROBERTS: That is what I am talking about, this design, some private entrepreneur is presumedly going to make up several thousand of these because the government are going to need to buy several thousand of them not to mention several thousand new flagpoles on which to fly them. I just do not want to see somebody make a profit out of what surely ought to be above profit. And this design, like any Newfoundlander if it is the law I will follow it and adhere to it as best I can but I will say again in closing, Sir, in closing at least at this stage, that this Legislature can adopt a law and if the majority who sit to Your Honour's left insist upon this being the law then it will be the law. They are the majority and they will have their way, fair enough, but as my friend the Leader of the Opposition says,there is a very great responsibility on the majority not to trample, not to use their power to impose a design, Sir, It is easier to lead by example than by force and the government on this one, Sir, the government and their

MR. E. ROBERTS: supporters can force through the design. They can make this design into law. But only the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, Sir, can make this our flag. The Legislature can pass laws until we are blue, green, pink and yellow in the face or polka dotted, but only the people of Newfoundland and Labrador can make this our flag. And I will say, Sir, that this design now as of today, as of what has gone on in the last two or three weeks, the government's actions, Sir, this design has not become the flag and it is headed for a lack of acceptance. So I would say to the government that what they ought to do is to let this matter stand at Committee stage, let the design percolate and let people come to like it or dislike it. If the supporters of this design feel that it will commend itself and win a place in the hearts of our people, then let time have it. But if they do not do that, Sir, not only are they taking a risk of poisoning the very thing they hold dear, the very design they tell us they hold dear, but they are taking a grave risk, Sir, of foisting upon the people of this Province a design for a flag that is not one that the people want. And, Sir, while the Legislature could adopt a law, only the people can adopt a flag, Sir. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I had not originally intended getting into the Committee stage in this, but I do welcome the opportunity to do so. One of the things I wanted to do, and this is related to the design - because I made a remark when the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was standing and when he was talking on the design, my remark interdigitated with his remarks; therefore, that remark was on the design. And my remark at that time was 'Where are the ten thousand'? Now, I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition really misunderstood the intent of my remark, I am quite convinced of that, and the reason why I am convinced of it is that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition did something which was most uncharacteristic of him, he really was unparliamentary - I will not

DR. J. COLLINS: indicate in which way - there is no point to it. But it was quite uncharacteristic of him to do it and therefore, I think he misunderstood me. The point I want to make is this, that I want to congratulate the Opposition. In particular, I want to congratulate the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) who has been so much against the design of this flag. He has come out tooth and nail. I will use words that perhaps may not be totally parliamentary just to make my point. He ranted and he roared about the opposition to the design of this flag. In addition to this, the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush) spoke a number of times and I think that he was very much against the design of this flag. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition very forcibly made his point that he was very strongly against the design of this flag and he had grave misgivings about it - quite sincere, I am quite sure. But just not to labour it too much - from the opposite side of the House, the design of this flag was held up in unmistakable terms. No one could misunderstand that the design of the flag was the issue. And that went out from this House, through the relatively few people who gathered in the gallery, it went out through radio, it went out through the media, I suspect it even went out through various members contacting people, that the design of this flag was the big question that was at issue in this debate. Now, I congratulate the Opposition for having done that, because I think it was their duty to do so. I think the design of the flag is the issue in this debate, and I think if they had not held it up to question they would have let down the whole process, the whole democratic, the whole legislative, the whole parliamentary, I should say, the whole parliamentary process. This had to be tested in fire, this design, and I think the Opposition did a magnificent job on it. I think that we did a pretty good job ourselves. I think we defended the design and the reason why the design came about and so on and so forth and we defended the process whereby the design arose. So we did our part too. I think both sides of this House did an excellent job.

May 23, 1980

Tape 1777

EC - 3

DR. J. COLLINS:

Now, the reason why I want to emphasize what a good job the Opposition did and why I congratulate them is that if this had struck a really deep-felt chord in the public I should have had an avalanche of response in my office. And quite frankly, knowing what a flag means to many people and knowing what a flag debate can engender - and we saw that on the national scene - knowing what that can

DR. J. COLLINS:

engender, I thought that before we got to a vote on this issue we would be bogged down, to use a rather colloquial expression, we would have been bogged down in mail, we would have had people come in here demonstrating these large bags of mail saying, "Look, this is the response I got from the people in my constituency", we would have had petition after petition after petition in this House about this flag, such as we had it in the past about the mothers' allowance, such as we had it in this House about rising electricity rates and so on and so forth. And I think the point is that even though the Opposition did such an excellent job of holding this design up to question, a job that I congratulate them over and I am glad they did, they did their part in this debate, despite the fact that they did that the public out there did not respond. And the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) said yesterday what he should have said, and again he is to be commended for this, he said, "Let the people rise up, let them come in and stand in front of this building, let 10,000 of them come in," now one would not hold him to 10,000, one would perhaps be satisfied with a couple of hundred even or 1,000 or whatever, but he said, "Let 10,000 come in here and show that this design should not be accepted". And I think that that was a very brave thing for him to do because clearly he could have been ridiculed on it and I think that this is where the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) misunderstood really when I made the remark. He sort of thought I was ridiculing him. That is why I said, I am sorry if I have embarrassed you because I did not mean to do so. I meant to make the point that the people out there have not responded, they really have not responded against this design.

Now, what are the people telling us therefore?

Are the people telling us, we do not care, that it is of no concern to us, we are sort of a heartless type people, we are sort of a cold type of people, we are not like other types of people who do care about symbols, who feel that we should have something distinctive to put forth for our Province? I do not believe that is so. Are they telling us that they are madly in love with this design? I do not think they are telling

DR. J. COLLINS: us that either. If they were madly in love with this design I think I would have had an avalanche of letters saying that also.

I will wind up my remarks, in case others want to speak to it, but I will just say this. that I think the people out there are telling us this, we want a flag, we want our own flag, we want a distinctive flag, we want a flag that we can live with, and that is why they have not picked up the challenge which the Opposition has very rightly put before them and said, 'Reject this'. They have not picked up that challenge and they are now indicating to us that they are accepting this flag. And I think that the Opposition is to be congratulated for bringing this out so forcibly and I am not saying that in any cynical way, I think that this is very important, I think the Opposition is to be congratulated for having brought this out. And I go back to that phase, I think they tested this design in fire and I think the design will accordingly stand up for that because of that very necessary measure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I think first when the debate began on the main motion I guess the Chairman of the Committee was the first to mention the five conditions that were set down as far as the acceptability of the design of this flag was concerned. And this is the one thing, in my first speech, on the main motion, that I was very uncomfortable with, the acceptability of this particular design.

MR. H. BARRETT: Which speech (inaudible)

MR. L. THOMS: Does the hon. member for St. John's West wish to speak on third?

MR. H. BARRETT: I was just trying to get into context the speech you were talking about. Was that when you were going to vote for the flag or against it?

MR. L. THOMS: Well, if you listen you might learn something, you know, just listen, that is all.

May 23, 1980

Tape No. 1778

SD - 3

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the one thing that bothered me and if you can get an inflection out of Hansard and you read the first speech that I made you would have gotten it,

MR. THOMS: and that was the acceptability of this design. This Committee, of which I was a member, set down five conditions, five conditions involving the design of this flag. The first four conditions, uniqueness, attractiveness, etc., as I have said, I felt that the flag covered. Now since the debate started, since I have had an opportunity to speak to some of the people in this Province, I certainly have come to the conclusion that as far as the design is concerned, there is one thing that can be said about it - two things that can be said about it. One is that I think it is universal in this Province today, even those who like the design of the flag, it is universal that they do not like the shaft. They do not like the arrow. They do not like whatever that gold or yellow thing is. I have said I have no particular problems at all, personally, with the design of the flag. But since the debate has started I have changed my mind on that.

MR. WHITE: So have I.

MR. THOMS: And I would remind the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) -

MR. WHITE: I did too.

MR. THOMS: - that one must have a mind before one can change one's mind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Unfortunately, in this particular debate we have a bunch of mindless individuals on the government side of the House. That is the problem with the debate.

MR. NEARY: Just keep quiet and we will -

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, as I said, this debate and what I can gather from speaking to the people of this Province, it is pretty well universally the opinion of the people of this Province that the yellow shaft, or yellow arrow, has no place in the flag. It is universally disliked. It is disliked by members on the government side of this House.

MR. THOMS: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, it is awfully difficult when you have this sort of a conversation - they can talk all they want to at that end or that end, but when it is going through you it is difficult to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Bairá): Order, please! When the member for Grand Bank is interrupting would you please be quiet.

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying there is one thing that is universally disliked about this particular design and that is the arrow. And, Mr. Chairman, the other one, of course, is, and it has come out in various forms while speaking of the arrow - as a matter of fact, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) stood in this House in support of the flag and said that he was uncomfortable with the yellow shaft. He was uncomfortable with the arrow. I have spoken privately with a number of members of this House. They would rather see something else there. They would rather see something else there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Get the Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. THOMS: So it is universal, including the House of Assembly. And, Mr. Speaker, the other thing and I have to go back to it, is the condition set down by the Flag Committee at its very first meeting, which I have not heard refuted by any other member of the Flag Committee. And with all due respect, my friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) has not addressed himself at all to this particular question. But the condition that we as a Committee set down, the original one was that it be accepted by a majority of the people of this Province. That was the original condition that was set down. That was later changed to read, "That it be widely accepted."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I guess widely accepted, really, is saying that there should be a majority of the people of this Province who approve of this particular design. And that condition has not been met. That condition has not been met and was not met and is still not

May 23, 1980

Tape No. 1779

NM - 3

MR. THOMS: met. As a matter of fact, it is a condition involving the design of this flag that could not be met prior to the unfurling of this design in the House of Assembly. Because that is the first opportunity that the members of this House, and the people of this Province, had to actually see what the Flag Committee was recommending.

MR. L. THOMS: Now, Mr. Chairman, every indication that I have is that the vast majority of people in this Province do not like the design of this particular flag. That is the reading that I get. It is certainly the reading in my district. It was the reading that I received where I spoke to the many people at the Fisheries Conference in Salt Pond, Burin a couple of weekends ago. It is the feeling you get when you talk to people in St. John's. You will find, I venture, for every one who says they actually like the design of this flag you will find 100 - it is not four to one that is not what I found, I found it to be much higher than that.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much higher ?

MR. L. THOMS: Much higher. And I do not think it is going to change a vote in any next election at all. But the point is that this committee set themselves certain conditions and the conditions were not met. They broke their own mandate, their own rules that they had set down for themselves. You know, I would like to see other members of the Committee justify that particular position.

Mr. Chairman, what should happen - and I think the Committee, including myself, is to blame in this matter, that we should not only have had these five conditions but we should have also devised some mechanism whereby the conditions could have been met. Maybe the flag can be returned to the Committee and say, 'Look, this is one of your conditions, that the flag be acceptable to the majority of people of this Province, now, go and find out if that condition is met'. I have no

MR. L. THOMS: evidence, none whatsoever that this particular condition has been met. And I question really the right of this administration to bring in this particular design without first attempting to determine - and I do not mean by turning on the Open Line programmes, I do not mean by listening only to the Royal Canadian Legion or only to the Monarchist League or only to this organization or that organization. There has got to be, maybe even short of a referendum, there has to be a way so that evidence can be produced to me and to other members of the Flag Committee and to members of this House that this particular design is acceptable to the people of this Province. I would even go so far as to say, 'Let us canvass fairly accurately our schools in this Province -

MR. G. WARREN: How about this building?

MR. L. THOMS: Just our schools. Let us say, 'It does not matter what Les Thoms or anybody of his generation or the next generation says about the flag, to heck with them! In another five years, or twenty years I could be dead and gone. I will not have to live with this particular design, most members of this House may not have to live to any great extent with this particular design. Let us go out,

MR. L. THOMS: let us have a fairly scientific poll of the schools of this Province.

MR. STIRLING: Get Devine Advertising. That could be under the contract.

MR. THOMS: Yes. Maybe we should get Devine Advertising to conduct a poll.

MR. BENNETT: No more points of view on that one 'Les'.

MR. THOMS: But, at least we would get some indication some evidence. We do not have even any circumstantial evidence that this is acceptable to - look, I do not really have any evidence that deep down the people who voted for this design actually like it.

But, let us go out. Let us find out. Really, what is the rush? The Premier of this Province said this morning and other people said it, that we are going to have to live with this flag now for six hundred years. Maybe a thousand years, I do not know how long we are going to have to live with it.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible) then.

MR. THOMS: But if we have to live with this flag now for the next six hundred years, what is wrong with waiting for another six months? What is wrong with waiting until November? Why the indecent haste? Why the indecent haste?

MR. PATTERSON: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. THOMS: Of course.

MR. PATTERSON: Did you make any decent proposals to the Committee you were a member of?

MR. THOMS: I could not make any proposals in connection with the acceptability of this flag until this flag was exposed to the people of this Province. It was impossible.

MR. PATTERSON: Were you looking for -

MR. THOMS: No, I just finished saying -

MR. THOMS: the hon. member is asleep again - I just finished saying a few moments ago to this House that I would take the criticism with the rest of the Committee in that we did not - it was something that we did not think about.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, why did you not think about it?

MR. STIRLING: They are not perfect like you.

MR. WARREN: For the same reason that you -

MR. CHAIRMAN:(Butt): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: But we should have. We should have created some sort of a mechanism, between the time that we agreed on a recommended design for a flag and the time that it was recommended to this House, to get a feeling of the pulse of this Province in connection with this particular design.

MR. WHITE: (Inaudible) 'Bill'?

MR. THOMS: Do not ever think either that this is the only design that would have been acceptable to the people of this Province. We had some absolutely magnificent designs presented to this Committee all over this island. The member for Kilbride (B. Alyward) I do not think, will deny that. We had some absolutely beautiful designs.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) then why did you not vote for (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: So, I mean we were not devoid of alternatives to the present design. We were not devoid of alternatives to the present design at all. So if this design had been rejected by this House, if it had, the Committee would have had no problems going back and picking out one or a dozen designs.

Labrador Collegiate, in Labrador City, presented a magnificent design for a flag, magnificent design. And many others.

MR. J. CARTER: I did not hear you argue about any designs

MR. THOMS: Oh, I think if you had had your ears open, if you had had your ears open, you would have heard me speak many times. As a matter of fact, as a matter of fact, the hon. member for Kilbride (R. Aylward) can confirm that I asked the Chairman of the Committee to take the design presented by the Labrador City Collegiate to Chris Pratt and ask him to do it in a - put the artistic touch on it so that we could see it. It was never done. It was never done.

MR. L. STIRLING: The best presentation.

MR. THOMS: But I requested in Miss Duff's office right here at a meeting -

MR. L. STIRLING: The best presentation of them all.

MR. P. WALSH: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: I asked specifically that the design from Labrador City be presented -

MR. P. WALSH: (Inaudible) that

MR. THOMS: - it may have been in a bundle but I asked that this specific design be given to Christopher Pratt -

MR. D. HOLLETT: You will speak after.

MR. THOMS: - but I never saw a finished product. Oh, could not improve on it. It was nothing -

MR. J. DINN: He could not improve on it.

MR. THOMS: Okay, so this proves my point. What I am saving is that if this particular design had been refused by this House, there were other designs that were lovely designs.

MR. THOMS: So, Mr. Speaker, you know, it is not fair - it is not fair to give the impression that this particular design was the only one that the Committee had. We had many many designs and many many absolutely beautiful designs. A lot of work had gone into them by young, middle aged and the older people of this Province.

MR. THOMS: There is no question at all, Mr. Chairman, that the overwhelming desire in this Province is that Newfoundland have a distinctive flag. There is no question at all

MR. THOMS: from the meetings that I attended, from the people whom I have talked to since this particular design was introduced. No question in my mind at all and maybe this design will grow on them. Maybe it will. I am sure once it becomes the official flag that the people of Newfoundland will accept it. They have every right, of course, in three years time, or two years time or whenever the case might be, to come back to the politicians and say, "Give us a different design." They have every right to do that. You cannot deny them that right. Whether or not a new administration, or a new premier, or a new government would accede to those wishes is another thing. But they would have every right. They do want a distinctive flag. And the one thing that bothers me above anything else, though, is that this Committee, that the Flag Committee, of which I was a member, and which I am prepared to take full responsibility for, we did not have the foresight to create a mechanism whereby the pulse of the Province could be tested.

MR. STIRLING: You are prepared to recommend something that -

MR. THOMS: And that is the one thing - maybe give this particular design to the Committee and say, "Look, go out and visit all the twenty-six communities that you visited and get a feeling." Okay? "Come back and then say whether the majority of the people accept it."

MR. STIRLING: It is still not too late.

MR. THOMS: If that is the means of doing it I would be only too happy to visit the twenty-six communities, or twenty-five or whatever it was, and get a feeling. Let us take this design down to Grand Bank and see what they have to say about it. Let us take it out to Kilbride. Let us take it out to Kilbride. Let us take it down to Labrador City. And, as a matter of fact, I am so confident about this one I would say let us take it down to St. John's East. They would obviously accept almost anything in St. John's East.

MR. G. WARREN: Look what they got, anyhow.

MR. THOMS:

But I doubt very much if they would accept this one.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am quite serious.

I am quite serious and I think if you take the first speech that I made on the main motion you will see that this is the one thing that bothered me about this whole flag exercise, its acceptability. And if that particular condition had not been one of the conditions set down by the Committee itself, if it had not been there, then I would have had no real qualms about it. But we did set down that condition. And then we threw the condition out the window, and it is a condition that we all felt should be there. But we completely ignored that particular condition set down by the Committee and basically said, "We do not care what the people of this Province think about the design. We do not care." Well, Mr. Chairman, I hope, I am not going to - obviously, I mean, twenty-eight members of this House have already voted in favour of this particular design. I hope that down the line the people of this Province learn to like the flag, as well they might. But I am extremely sorry that the people of this Province, in effect, in real effect, had no choice, had absolutely no choice in the kind of flag they were going to get. And that is where we as a Committee fell down. We abdicated our responsibilities. And I am ashamed of it. And I apologize to the people of this Province for it. But the Committee did abdicate its responsibility.

MR. L. THOMS: That is the way I feel about it, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry. I really do apologize to the people of this Province. They may come to like the flag I sincerely hope they do. But the people of this Province have had no input in spite of the Select Committee of this House, the people of this Province have had no input into the design of the flag. There is not one, single, solitary person in this Province, there is not one, single, solitary member of this House of Assembly who had any idea that this particular design was the one that was going to be unfurled. No one! But I think they should have had more input into it than they did.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can get on with this, we can finish up the comments on this flag Act today and get on to the other business of the Province. And like I say, I sincerely hope that the people of this Province will end up being very, very proud of the flag although at the moment I do have my doubts.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Shall clause 2 carry?

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I will not take too long, probably five or six minutes. Yesterday when the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) spoke he said that throughout the Province there was not very much objection to the flag. He said the reason there was not at that time was there was nothing for the people of this Province to react to. When the Committee went around and had twenty-six hearings throughout the Province the Committee did not show the people this design so, therefore, how could the member for St. John's North get up and say that the people did not react? Because they did not see this design until it was revealed in the House of Assembly?

MR. G. WARREN: I believe that listening to the Farris Report last night, when the member for Port de Grave (Mr. R. Collins) was on and the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and a member from the Royal Canadian Legion, the member for Port de Grave made, I think, two very worthwhile comments. The first comment he made was, "Why not several selections and why not several designs and let the Committee work until they come up with a design?" But the second comment he made and more so the most important one, and I believe it would really show whether the fifty-two members of this House like this flag or not, have a secret ballot in this House. He was just wondering - now, this is a member from the government side, twenty-seven strong who voted for this flag, who said, 'I am just wondering where would they mark their X if there was a secret ballot.' And I am convinced from what the member for Port au Grave said that there would not be twenty-seven for this flag, there would definitely, probably, be twenty-seven against it.

Yesterday, in talking about the design, the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook) said that she loved the arrow, you know, she is right tore up about the arrow.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

Who is this?

MR. G. WARREN:

The Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment. And she said it really turns her on. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think her comments were that the Indians - it represents the Indians, they lived and they died by the arrow. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I can speak for the Indians up in Labrador. They did not live and die by this arrow but I have a feeling if this flag is passed they are going to die by this arrow because this arrow is really going to go right into the heart of them.

MR. G. WARREN: because it does not represent any -
thing at all about the Indian heritage.

The Premier said this morning
that the two triangles represent Newfoundland and Labrador.
I agree that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador
do resemble two triangles. But if we look at them on the
map I am sure they do not represent two triangles in that
angle,

MR. F. WHITE: The hypotenuse.

MR. G. WARREN: - the hypotenuse. And not only
that,

MR. WARREN: I was talking to a fisherman from Forteau yesterday, a Mr. Flynn from Forteau, and he came up with a good comment, he said, "Those two triangles represent _____, the Island of Newfoundland and the Mainland portion of Labrador." And he said, "You know what is happening," he said, "That arrow", he said, "should be called a wedge, it should be called a wedge because what it is doing," he said, "this government is doing if putting a wedge between the Island and Labrador." And that is exactly what it is doing it and it is prizing them further apart. I have to agree. If a fellow really takes that picture of the flag and really seriously looks at it, it really does look like that there is a wedge gone between - it is almost like a hunk of wood, a wedge gone right between it and got the wood split open and there is the wedge just going on through and the further it goes through, naturally the further apart the two pieces of wood become. And this shows the attitude of this government towards the Mainland part of this Province, towards Labrador. It keeps you further apart and that is exactly what is happening, it keeps you further apart and the heck with you.

And, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how the Premier of this Province could get up and say that those two triangles really represent the Island of Newfoundland and the Mainland part of Newfoundland when we can see this wedge. The least thing we could have done was have that arrow with a larger tail that could be joining the two wedges together. The least thing we could have done was have a larger tail on the end of the arrow that would join the two parts of the Province together but we are just pushing them further apart. So I think that if the arrow does turn the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs Newhook) on and as she said, the Indians lived and died by the arrow, surely goodness if that is what she is saying we should definitely get rid of it altogether. Why have more of us living and dying by this arrow? We do not need to die by this arrow. Mr. Chairman, this flag that is going to be proclaimed very

May 23, 1980

Tape No. 1784

AH-3

MR. HICKEY: he want a solution or does he not?
Does he just want me to go on a joy ride to Davis Inlet? Make up
your mind want you want, man.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt): Order, please! To the point of
order. I think there is a legitimate point of order because the
hon. member is discussing some correspondence between him and the
minister and is not confining his remarks, that I quite specifically
set out this morning, to Clause 2 of this bill which deals with the
design and I will ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to
Clause 2.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will confine my remarks to the design
which I illustrated is the arrow and the arrow is trying to separate
this Province, the Island portion of the Province and the Mainland of
this Province, Labrador, and this is what this government is doing
and the example is the minister. Mr. Chairman,

MR. G. WARREN: I believe that this arrow in this design should be replaced. Now, I am not going to give any ideas what should go in place of this arrow but to me, I believe the Committee should have gone out similar samples of flag designs and let the people of the Province, and agree with the fifth condition that the Committee down, let the reactions of the people come back to determine what design or what kind of a flag we should have for this Province but not a flag that will separate instead of unite the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.
On motion, clauses 1 through 3 carried, on division.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Shall the title carry?

MR. ROBERTS: On division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Three members.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order, the hon. member for the Strait of Bella Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: The words 'on division' simply mean that the Clerk enters in the records that not everybody was unanimous. It is not a matter of dividing the House, that would require the three members but -

MR. J. OTTENHEIMER: It is noted in the minutes.

MR. E. ROBERTS: - it should be noted on each clause that there is not unanimity, that is all we are saying.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried. (Bill No. 44).

On motion, that the Committee rise, report Bill 44 and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed bill no. 44, "An Act To Adopt A Flag For The Province", without amendment, and ask leave to sit again. 3

On motion, report received and adopted, bill ordered read a third time on tomorrow, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, May . 26, at 3:00 and the House do now adjourn.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the House Leader could indicate the menu for Monday's collation?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: We will be getting into the Concurrence debates and the Budget Speech on Monday.

MR. E. ROBERTS: In other words, we are not going to call the flag Monday.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Oh, yes, third reading on the flag. Monday.

MR. E. ROBERTS: We may not be getting into anything else.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I just assume that the universe will unfurl and unfurl simply, Mr. Speaker.

MR. E. ROBERTS: The universe will unfold as it should and the flag might not.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to call it 1:00 P.M.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, at 3:00 P.M.