

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
TUESDAY, MAY 6, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I am sure hon. members would like to join me in welcoming to the gallery today a delegation from the Royal Canadian Legion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be of interest to the House for me to make a statement with respect to offshore oil and gas developments. The statement is unfortunately not quite ready. It will be another fifteen or twenty minutes and I wonder if, by leave, I might have the time for making the statement extended?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat unusual, but if the hon. gentleman feels the statement ought not to wait until tomorrow - and I assume that is what he is saying - then we are certainly prepared to hear what the hon. the minister has to say.

MR. S. NEARY: We have to have a guarantee it is not a political speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, we would hope he will make a statement and not a speech, and then in return we will make a statement and not a speech in response thereto, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: So it is agreed that we will revert to Ministerial Statements at a later time.

I would also like to take this opportunity on behalf of hon. members to welcome to the gallery thirty students from

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): St. John High School, Burgeo from the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Lloyd Walters. We hope that they will enjoy their visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer), Sir. For about a year and a half to two years now, I have been trying to get some information on between \$2 million and \$3 million left in a bank account in Hamburg, Germany. When Labrador Linerboard mill was operating, they had a sales contract with a company in Hamburg, Germany; \$2 million or \$3 million was left in a bank account over there. This government have made no effort to collect that money and the money is still there. Would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what steps the government have taken to recover this money from a company called Schurfeld in Hamburg, Germany, money that belongs to the people of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman is referring in general to matters associated with the Labrador Linerboard mill, and the House will recall that there were allegations made in this House and perhaps other places with respect to alleged wrongdoings on the part of Labrador Linerboard mill. As a result of that a police inquiry was held into the transactions of Labrador Linerboard mill. On the completion of the police inquiry, they informed the Department of Justice that there was no evidence of wrongdoing and, upon reviewing the submission of the RCMP, the prosecutorial section of the Department of Justice was of the opinion that there was no evidence which would substantiate or recommend any prosecution. So we are not aware of any wrongdoing, nor has there been any prosecution.

MR. S. NEARY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. minister is not familiar with this matter. To my knowledge, Schurfeld has never been investigated by the RCMP, by the government or by anybody else. This company had a sales contract from Labrador Linerboard and when Labrador Linerboard closed there was \$2 million to \$3 million left in an account in Hamburg, Germany, belonging to the people of this Province. Why has the government not make any attempt to get that money transferred to Newfoundland where it rightfully belongs? That is the question I am asking. This company to my knowledge has never been investigated by anybody. What is the problem?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, unless there was any evidence of any wrongdoing or misappropriation of funds or fraud or theft or whatever, then obviously we would not attempt to recuperate any money. We are not aware of any evidence that money was stolen or misappropriated or fraudulently deposited or anything like that, so

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:                   there being no evidence of any wrongdoing, that is as far as we go. You know, the internal matters of Labrador Linerboard mill, when they were in existence, are not something that we watch on a daily basis but as a result of the police inquiry there is no evidence of any wrongdoing or of any money in Hamburg or elsewhere which is illegally or improperly there.

MR. S. NEARY:                         Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY:                         The money is not there illegally, Mr. Speaker, the money is there as a result of this company that had a contract with Labrador Linerboard, sold Labrador linerboard in the market place legally in a right a proper way, deposited the money in a bank account in Hamburg, Germany, and -

MR. SPEAKER:                         Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY:                         - the money is still there, why has the government not taken steps to get that money in Treasury of this Province? It belongs to Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please. The hon. member, I believe, has asked his question. He was beginning to debate. Further questions. The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if there is money there, you know, properly there, you know, if the hon. gentleman is not making a suggestion that it is illegally or improperly or criminally there just that it is there, then that is a different matter. That is a different matter. There I would assume that the successors, the present owners of the linerboard mill who I mean, if it is a part of the account of the Labrador Linerboard, whether it was transferred to them or not, but the hon. gentleman is perhaps suggesting that it was not, that it was not part of the mill or of the assets or of the operations, but that there is just an amount sitting there belonging to Labrador Linerboard mill, well, in that case, obviously, I will make inquiry to the minister who would have a direct connection, or would have had a direct connection with Labrador Linerboard and two, to see about it. But you know, if it is not there improperly or illegally, then obviously we would have no direct knowledge of it.

The hon. gentleman is suggesting that it is there probably quite properly and just what is being done with that account, so I will have to ask, I would presume, the Minister of Finance (J. Collins) in all likelihood, you know, what the amount is and if in fact it is there and what his intention is to do with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Pogo.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. And I suppose it concerns perhaps one of the worse problems that the minister has in this Province, namely the ferry services. It is my understanding from rumors that I have heard that CN Marine has perhaps expressed an interest in

MR. B. TULK: taking over the Provincial ferry services in the Province. I would like to ask the minister is this is the case and, if not, has the minister done any research into the idea and perhaps give us his reaction to the idea of CN Marine taking over those services?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. C. BRETT: The information that I have, Mr. Speaker, along these lines is strictly secondhand. I heard probably what the hon. member heard, a rumor that CN may be interested, but I have not been approached by CN and neither have we approached CN. So, at this point in time it is nothing more than a rumor.

MR. B. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. B. TULK: I wonder if the minister, then, perhaps would undertake to do some research into the idea as perhaps one of the ways out of the problems that we are experiencing with the ferry services in the Province. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as time had expired, I do not believe the minister stated whether in connection with the Fogo ferry service, that he was or was not going to build new landing facilities in Fogo district this year. I wonder if he would address himself to that question again?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the money is available and it is conceivable that we would build new landing facilities on Fogo Island this year, but in view of the idea that we have or the thoughts that we are having on moving the ferry terminal from Seldom up to Rogers Cove—is it?—this may mean some delay, not very much, but if we did decide to move the ferry landing, then there would have to be some engineering work done. I am not absolutely certain but I think that our engineers could be either in there now or will be going in there shortly to take a look at that particular site. And it is conceivable that we would start construction of a new ferry landing this year.

MR. B. TULK: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. B. TULK: Again referring to the Fogo Island ferry service, as I pointed out to the minister yesterday, and he agreed, the Fogo Isle is completely inadequate for the replacement ferry for Fogo Island while the Hamilton Sound is on dry dock.

My final question for the minister, then, is has he checked every possibility in getting another replacement other than the Fogo Isle, and, if not, will he undertake to do so?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. C. BRETT: I personally, Mr. Speaker, have not checked every avenue but I am reasonably certain that my staff has. The Fogo Isle is not adequate, but I think she is more adequate than the Prince Andrew and neither one of them are adequate. But she is a little bit better than the Prince Andrew. It is very, very



MR. C. BRETT:                   difficult to come up with ferries that size. There is nothing in the Province, I am sure of that, except the one that we wanted to send which we were not allowed to send. So this would mean going overseas and buying a new boat, which means millions of dollars, which we cannot get into. So I guess we are going to be stuck with the Fogo Isle.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):           The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING:               Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier and I find it surprising that on the day that this bill is being rushed into the House -

MR. SPEAKER:                   Order, please!  
Does the hon. member wish to direct this question to somebody?

MR. L. STIRLING:               Yes, I will ask the question to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). Could the President of the Council, who is the acting Premier, tell us why it was so necessary to rush this bill in the House today when it is the Premier's bill and the Premier normally would be here to answer questions about it? Can the President of the Council tell us why the big rush?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL:               Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that as far as the rush is concerned, the alleged rush as indicated by the hon. gentleman, there was a committee of this House, as the hon. gentleman is well aware, in his desperate attempt to make political hay out of a matter that should be a matter of one's own personal conviction,

MR. MARSHALL: there was a committee established six or seven or eight months ago in this House for the purpose of enquiring into a new flag for the Province. This Committee met diligently and visited all parts of the Province, and took the opinion of everybody who cared to bring forth their opinion to them. So in this sense it is not a case of rushing through this bill at all. The fact of the matter is the idea, or the possibility of a different flag has been known for a long period of time. There has been more notice, really, of this Bill than of any other bill on the Order Paper at present; that is number one.

And number two, the hon. gentleman, not having all that experience in the Legislature, must realize that when matters are brought before the House -

MR. NEARY: Do not be nasty.

MR. MARSHALL: - they are put through first reading, second reading, committee, and third reading. This has been brought before the House. The Committee, about a week ago, over a week ago, or ten days ago, has given its report to the House and the bill is now before the House so there is no haste, no haste whatsoever. As to the question of the Premier's situation with respect to it, and where the Premier is, as the hon. gentleman well knows, the Premier is up in Toronto on invitation to address the Economic Council of Canada on matters pertaining to the -

AN HON. MEMBER: The Conference Board.

MR. MARSHALL: - the Conference Board, on matters pertaining not just to provincial but to national issues. The bill will be introduced by a member of the ministry and put up for a free vote. We do not anticipate, because I know that everybody in the House is going to want to have a say, that this debate will be over today, because it is not our intention to rush it through.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: We want everybody, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity to speak and speak for as long as they possibly can, within the rules. So I guarantee the hon. member, if he is concerned about it -

MR. NEARY: It is a government bill.

MR. MARSHALL: - that the hon. the Premier will be back before the final deliberations on second reading have concluded and the hon. member, as well as everybody, will know the hon. Premier's position on it which will be a position taken in accordance with the free vote that he has indicated the government side would abide by.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) knows, the Premier met with a delegation from the Canadian Legion yesterday. Maybe the President can tell us why the Legion's request in the discussion that went on between the Premier and the Legion, the Premier felt that in time people would learn to like it and the Legion requested that in that case this be postponed for six months. Can the President tell us why that very reasonable request to now allow people to comment on the flag, why that six months could not be agreed to?

MR. NEARY: They are hoping to get off the topic of (inaudible).

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

MR. MARSHALL: In response to the hon. member's desire to make political a matter that has been deemed to be a free vote, I can inform the House that there is no government, and certainly no Premier, I daresay, who holds the Canadian Legion in as high a respect and esteem as this government and as the Premier does. The situation, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

May 6, 1980

Tape No. 1300

NM - 3

MR. MARSHALL:

- and I think that if the hon. gentleman would wish to enquire of members of the Legion, he would find that that is the position. But the position is this, that this matter

MR. MARSHALL: has been in effect before the people of this Province, the fact of a new flag, for a period of six months. Now I am not privy to any alleged conversation between the Premier and the Canadian Legion, but I do know from my own relationship with the Premier, and I know from the Canadian Legion's relationship with the Premier, that whatever conversation took place between the Legion and the Premier it was taken seriously, openly and all cards were laid on the table at the time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary. The hon. member for Bonavista North, followed by the hon. member for the Torngat Mountains.

MR. STIRLING: I would agree that the Legion went into that meeting expecting fair treatment. Can the President tell us why at eleven o'clock this hon. Premier that he is talking about told the Legion that he did not think the legislation was ready and would not be ready for about ten days or so, and then at three o'clock in the House introduced it to this House?

AN HON. MEMBER: A good question.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, sometimes bills are at the printers for a long period of time, for a week, ten days, two weeks. Let me tell the hon. gentleman and tell the members of the House that if he had been in his seat in the House the day before - I do not know whether he was here or not - he would have known that at the time, and I am sure it was on Friday morning before we adjourned, as is the wont and custom of this government, we informed the hon. gentlemen there opposite as well as the general public through the medium of this House, that on Monday we were going into the Budget debate and we would be bringing on the flag debate on Tuesday, depending upon whether or not the flag was ready from the printers. The flag was ready from the printers. It was circulated yesterday and that is why we are going ahead. I do not really feel, you know, that as much as the hon. gentleman might attempt to do, he can make a mountain out of a molehill, he can write whatever he wishes

May 6, 1980

Tape No. 1301

AH-2

MR. MARSHALL: to write in it in his attempt to make politics but the fact of the matter is there was not, there is not and there will be no attempt to hide or becloud anything with respect to the matter before the House today, and that is the flag bill.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, you are back at again, are you?

MR. SPEAKER: I indicated a final supplementary, and a new question.

MR. WARREN: Well, it is a question to the President that he may want to clarify before he leaves the impression that the Premier knew on Friday that this was going to be introduced today, when he told the Canadian Legion specifically yesterday that he did not

MR. L. STIRLING: think it was going to be ready for ten days. I did not accuse the Premier of misleading, and the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall) may want to correct that information. About his comments about our trying to make politics -

MR. S. NEARY: It is unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!  
The hon. member must put a question if he has a question, and not debate.

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you. I mean, you admit that the President is being very provocative in trying to get me to, but I will not enter into the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. STIRLING: Would the President like to clear up that question? If he is saying that the Premier knew on Friday that it was going to be introduced on Tuesday, but told the Canadian Legion yesterday that he did not know? because I think that the Worker's Compensation is much more important than this legislation and could be introduced today, the fishermen's Worker's Compensation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: When the Premier was speaking with the members of the Royal Canadian Legion, he had absolutely no idea for sure that the bill would be available before he left that day. The fact of the matter is that we indicated that if the bill was ready for circulation twenty-hours before second reading, that second reading would occur on Tuesday. Now, you know, the hon. gentleman can read anything in that he likes. The fact of the matter is that there are many times that the Queen's Printer is late for one reason or another - most times, pretty well all times, not due to his fault. We have a bill here which has a peculiar and particular design on it. We did not know for sure at the time whether the bill would, in fact, be ready for circulation, but it was always the intention and it was always indicated that when the bill was ready we would get on with the debate of the Committee's findings.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Belle Isle.

The hon. the member for the Strait of

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. G. Warren) will kindly pass his bid on the question and let me ask one of the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House) then, I wonder if the minister could tell us what steps he and the administration are taking to avert - and if they cannot avert, to alleviate - the crisis which I am told is about to break upon all of the hospitals in this Province with respect to a shortage of nurses?

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Torngat

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, of course we are very much aware of this. We have been having discussions with the Hospital Association. As a matter of fact - I do not know if I have some information here that I have had from the Newfoundland Hospital Association recently. There is a predicted shortage. As a matter of fact, there are some hospitals now that have shortages, but most are what they call in a stable state. But we have news from Corner Brook and Grand Falls, two of the major hospitals in the Province, who feel they will have a shortage of nurses. Corner Brook are saying they may be able to get by with part-time. In the meantime, we are graduating this current year 250 nurses. All the hospital boards and the department are busily trying to, of course, recruit nurses from abroad and from other Canadian provinces.

Mr. Speaker, of course we are very much

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Recruit nurses from abroad?

I am sorry, I did not hear the minister.

MR. W. HOUSE:

rest of Canada.

Recruit nurses from abroad and from the

MR. E. ROBERTS:

That is prohibited.

MR. L. THOMS:

That is illegal, boy.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

That is prohibited.

MR. W. HOUSE:

No, no.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

and Immigration together would stop this.

It certainly is. The ARNN and Manpower

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!



May 6, 1980

Tape 1302

EC - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, no. If you cannot obtain

nurses within the Province

MR. W. HOUSE:

and then within Canada, then there is a mechanism whereby you can get them from outside of the Province, the same as you can for doctors.

MR. E. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) free trips.

MR. W. HOUSE: No, there is not. These free trips we are just advertising, I guess. We do not have the free trips like they used to have one time when they were searching out for these people.

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, is that so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. HOUSE: So that is what is happening, Mr. Speaker; we are well aware of it. The other thing we have been doing, of course, for the last number of years, and one of the greatest shortages that we do have is in the specialized nursing, such as coronary, operating room and so on, we have been offering bursaries for upgrading for nurses to go and re-train or get further post-graduate training. That is still in effect.

One of the things the hon. member will want to bear in mind is the fact that, I think, it is all provinces in Canada with the exception of Prince Edward Island have a shortage of nurses at the present time and there are a lot of good reasons for it.

MR. E. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman. He will hear more of this and will hear more of free trips. And I think the hospitals would agree to finance the minister on a free trip provided it was one way. But let me come back and ask the minister how many beds -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. E. ROBERTS: I do not care if the member for Stephenville agrees with what I say or not as long as he keeps quiet when he does not have the floor.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister how many beds -

MR. F. STAGG: (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Sir, the hon. gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is not only out of order, he is noisily out of order and both are offensive to the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister how many beds he estimates will be closed this year because of the shortage of nurses?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, we are not anticipating any beds being closed this year. One of the hospitals has indicated that it may not be able to open a sixty bed unit, a chronic care unit in the Western Memorial if the situation does not improve. Now we have to bear in mind that it is Spring, there is graduation coming now with 140 new nurses graduating very soon.

The other thing, and I just mention it casually at the beginning, is that that while they are not able to recruit and obtain permanent employees, there is a lot of part-time nurses available which the hospitals in Corner Brook and Grand Falls will be able to avail of. There are other parts of the Province, of course, in the smaller hospitals, where we are just not able to attract them. I have not any indication yet whether there will be any beds closed as a result of a shortage of nurses.

MR. E. ROBERTS:  
Speaker.

A final supplementary, Mr.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A final supplementary, the  
hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can  
the minister give the House the assurance that he will be  
in touch with all of the hospitals throughout the Province  
with a view to ascertaining whether there is any likelihood  
that beds may be closed? And I understand from the infor-  
mation which I have that beds may well be closed in many  
of the hospitals in this Province and not

MR. E. ROBERTS: simply not opening the Chronic Care Unit in the old Fisher Division, I believe it is, of the Western Memorial in Corner Brook, and can he also give the House an assurance that any bed closures which may be done and there are many beds, the minister will agree, closed already because of budgetary restraints. Can the minister give us assurance that no Newfoundlander or no Labradorian will be denied access to the hospital care he or she may need when he or she needs it because of the shortage of nurses and, I may add, the administration's failure to do anything about it?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have a list here before me of the survey of the nursing shortage as of February 26th - the end of February, the first of March - and some surgical beds, for instance, had to be closed temporarily in one or two places but none permanently, obviously, and every effort is being made to ensure that there will be no closure and to ensure that we are able to get nurses. And I have a comment here from every hospital in the Province. I will give the information to the hon. member.

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member had indicated

a final supplementary. The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: I am rather surprised that the Minister of Health (W. House) actually says that if this is a shortage we will go back to England or we will go to the mainland and bring back nurses.

I would like to ask the question,

Does the Minister of Health (W. House) obviously, not in the past but with the new five year plan, have any plan to accelerate training for nurses throughout this Province and basically what is the minister going to do about it in the near future?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms) :

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE :

Mr. Speaker, as I just mentioned to the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (E. Roberts) , we have been in constant contact with the hospitals, with the Association of Registered Nurses, doing a survey, planning for what we can do as a result of the nursing shortage. One of the real problems we have is the fact, for instance, that two years ago, three years ago Ontario figured they had too many nurses and they, of course, cut out some of their nursing schools and as a result they are advertising all over Canada. And, of course, the nursing situation, you know, is very fluid; they go from province to province. So, we are certainly having discussions with the A.R.N.N. as to what our current needs are, as to what plans we should have in place for training more nurses, and studying the drop-out rate, because one of the things we are having now is a fairly substantial drop-out rate at these nursing schools.

So, certainly that is taken into consideration, and I believe within the last year there has been an acceleration of the number of places and within the

MR. W. HOUSE:

five year plan, of course, that obviously figures. So we will be looking at that and, of course, the other thing we are trying to do is make ourselves self-sufficient in nurses but we have not done it to this time and as a result we still have to go outside to look for nurses.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

The Minister of Health (Mr. W. House) just said that we have not provided ourselves with sufficient nurses and basically, obviously, because the nursing profession is not related to oil and that, this again is our training in Manpower whether it has to do with nurses, whether it has to do with any other thing our social problems is in this Province, we are going to find out as we go down the road that we are going to have a shortage of a lot of things because basically this government is only thinking oil, oil, oil!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member has a question.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

The question I want to ask the minister is one of the reasons why we have the shortage of nurses in this Province because of low pay? Is that why they are going to the Mainland and to the United States?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. E. HISCOCK:

And also the question, basically, if we have not provided ourselves with a sufficient number of nurses, what plans are we going to have to do about it in five years, six years, seven years down the line?

MR. S. NEARY:

Oil and flags are all they think about.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, if we could keep all the nurses in the Province, keep them all working, we have ample nurses trained and we have been trying enough for our use, but the peculiar situation is that, of course, we have a lot of nurses in

MR. W. HOUSE: the Province right now, and certain parts of the Province, who are not working and they will not go to certain other parts of the Province. That is one thing. And we can not determine when we train nurses and say, "Well now, are you going to work five or six or ten years?" We can not do that. So what we have got to try and do is encourage a substantial enough number.

I do not think it has that much to do with wages, although Max Smeaton from the Nurses' Union would disagree with me on that, I am sure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. W. HOUSE: But one of the greatest shortages we have now, now at this point in time, is because the nurses are fairly affluent, a lot of them and they will just take the Summer off. That does not indicate to me that we are not paying enough money. All that indicates to me is if we were paying more money, they would take off a month earlier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for St. Barbe.  
Order, please!

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. T. Hickey). I might add, Mr. Speaker, it is getting to be embarrassing, by asking the same question over and over, but the people of the district still continue to ask me the same question.

AN HON. MEMBER: And they are not getting any action.

MR. T. BENNETT: It relates to Parson's Pond, the resettlement there, and it is getting, I think, to be in the order of three years since the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing, I understand, did invest substantial dollars already - \$200,000 or \$300,000 - to provide water systems. The people are still on an island.



MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, if these people were on an iceberg adrift the department would spend a lot of money to bring them back to shore. And at this time, Mr. Speaker, the season is advancing and people would like to get the reaction from the minister's department, just a very few dollars, and I would like for the minister to tell the hon. House if indeed this programme, he is going to take a real hard look at it and make sure this programme does get completed during this Summer season?

MR. NEARY: If you can relate it to oil or the flag in some way, then you might get something done with it.

MR. TULK: Well, it is in Parsons Pond, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, is my hon. friend referring to the moving of the houses that I responded to last week? If that is the issue he is referring to, I gave him the answer last week and it is unchanged. And I said then, and it bears repeating, Mr. Speaker, that the government make a commitment of up to \$3,000, and that was a very generous commitment inasmuch as the majority of the people involved could not qualify for social assistance. As I said then, I am not suggesting they are wealthy people, but certainly they were far beyond the levels whereby they would have qualified for social assistance. The government certainly has no obligation, and had no obligation, and we are not doing anything under cost sharing formula, as I understand it, in making available an amount of \$3,000 purely on the basis that those people had been faced with some difficulty due to flooding. And in keeping with the government's very generous policy as determined in the Harbour Breton situation, we followed through and made some monies available to the people of Parsons Pond. Subsequent to our commitment, the people of Parsons Pond came back and requested an additional amount of money. The department's position then was we could not accede to their request. We called tenders for the relocation of the houses. There was no award because the contractor who bid, the only contractor, as

MR. HICKEY: I am told, who bid, wanted to perform the work under his conditions which were certainly not acceptable to the government. And since that time I am informed that all or most all the people who have moved their homes qualified for the \$3,000, have been paid. If there are any who have not been paid, it is simply a matter of them submitting the vouchers and they will be paid an amount of \$3,000. As far as the government is concerned, that closes the issue.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has expired. I believe there was agreement by leave to allow the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy to revert to Ministerial Statements.

MR. NEARY: Providing he is not going to (inaudible).

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

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: I will make my statement, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members opposite can respond.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: I want to announce today that Mobil Oil Canada Limited, as operator for a group of companies drilling off the East Coast of Canada, has encountered hydrocarbon shows at a depth of approximately 14,860 feet in Hibernia 0-35 well offshore Newfoundland. A 14 foot core taken in the interval 14,871 to 14,885 feet indicated the possible presence of oil. And note I said the possible presence of oil.

Drilling is proceeding to determine the extent and significance of the show after which electric logs will be run. Drilling and logging may be slowed due to bottom hole deflection.

MR. BARRY: At the same time, I would like to give a statement with respect to the other wells, the Hibernia B-08 appraisal well is drilling at a depth of 9,247 feet towards its projected total depth of 60,000 feet, and the Ben Nevis I-45 wildcat test on a separate structure is drilling at 13,951 feet towards its projected depth of 18,500 feet. And I have set out the various partners in the ventures, Mr. Speaker, and I point out that this is encouraging news but it should be treated again with cautious optimism.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this was a last minute announcement and it was not possible, presumably, to give us a copy of the statement ahead of time, it is obviously difficult to make any comments upon it. Listening to it, it appears to me to be a progress report and I assume that there was some reason, some particular reason, why that kind of progress report could have been made, had to be made, rather.

MR. D. JAMIESON: at this particular time. But insofar as the potential is concerned, I presume that all it does once again, as the minister was careful to point out, is to indicate that the prospects look good, but that there is nothing -

MR. L. BARRY: Hydrocarbon shows.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Hydrocarbon shows are present. But beyond that, I see no particular comment that we can make. It is not a bonanza.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries today on behalf of all hon. members the former member for Hermitage, Mr. A. C. Wornell.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the Social Services Estimates Committee have considered Head VI, Education, Head VII, Justice, Head VIII, Social Services, Head IX, Consumer Affairs and Environment, Head X, Health, and have passed them all with no amendment. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that a total of thirty hours of debate were consumed. Thank you.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: I beg leave today, Mr. Speaker, to present if not the largest, one of the largest petitions ever to be tabled in the House of Assembly. I am proud to do so on behalf of 8,500 fishermen from around the Province. The petition, Mr. Speaker, is in connection with the need for Workers' Compensation benefits to encompass fishermen in the Province, and the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is: "We, the undersigned, petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to amend Workers' Compensation legislation so that the fish buyers are declared the employers of fisherman who supply them with fish for the purpose of that legislation."

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in putting forward this petition, I will say that since I became Minister of Fisheries, over the past number of months a series of meetings have been held with the Fishermen's Union and today I would like to recognize, Mr. Speaker, somewhat out of order, today in the galleries are people I have been dealing with in the Fishermen's Union, people like Mr. Bill Short and other executive members who work with Mr. Short as a business agent of the union, and indeed, fishermen from different parts of the Province.

In meeting with the Fishermen's Union and discussing this problem, because it is a problem, right now it is virtually a nightmare for the Workers' Compensation Board to administer a benefit to fishermen in Workers' Compensation by dealing with individual fishermen around the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: So there has to be a resolution to the problem of how to collect the premiums from the fishermen and how to have these premiums paid into the Workers' Compensation Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN: The union is asking that not only a certain segment of the fisheries and the fishermen be covered by this Workers' Compensation benefit, they want all fishermen - for example, they want skippers, they want the partners and the sharemen all alike, to be brought under the Workers' Compensation programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: In other words, the same as fish plant workers are now encompassed in the Workers' Compensation benefits. So the question of how to collect the premiums and who to pay the premiums is a problem that has been put forward in this petition, and indeed, put forward by the fishermen through their union in recent meetings over the past two or three months. And the problem is now being dealt with in an active way, very actively dealt with by the Newfoundland Government. The matter is being discussed at the present time within government. We know that the legislation governing unemployment insurance premiums is now covered by

MR. J. MORGAN: means of the buyers being declared as the employers - the buyers of fish throughout the Province from all individual fishermen. It is working there. And in my view, Mr. Speaker, I will say that the fishermen are definitely in need of some kind of protection for disabilities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: They are definitely in that category of need.

May 6, 1980

Tape No. 1308

AH-1

MR. MORGAN: I would never want to see the day that a fisherman who got disabled in a fishing boat from causes beyond his control or her control in some cases; now we have fisherwomen that they would have to come back, divert back to a welfare or a social services programme; that would be the ultimate end result. So it is important to have protection for these fishermen and I say that sincerely as the Minister of Fisheries in the Province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I want to make note to the House of Assembly that I have signed the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: I have signed this petition pledging my full support behind the fishermen and I now ask this House of Assembly to have the petition tabled and have it referred to my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), the department to which it relates. And I am sure, as I mentioned, I have been working with my colleague the Minister of Labour and Manpower, had a series of meetings with the Fishermen's Union and, Mr. Speaker, the matter is actively being considered, being dealt with actively at the present time and a decision will be announced in the very near future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Trinity-Bay De Verde.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, first of all on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House, may I say that we wholeheartedly support and endorse the petition presented by the -

MR. FLIGHT: Not wishy-washy, but wholeheartedly!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: We wholeheartedly support and endorse the petition presented by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) although, Sir, I might add that I am not quite sure whether he supported the petition himself in presenting it in the House of Assembly here this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No! No!

MR. F. ROWE: He signed it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, it is a fundamental right, not just a privilege, for every fisherman, particularly the inshore fishermen in this Province, to have Workers' Compensation.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: All hon. members, I am sure, have received these little cards and they are continuing to come in and there is an important paragraph in that; "We fishermen are now operating under inadequate Workers' Compensation benefits that deny us the protection other workers in our society enjoy. I would like to see this injustice ended as soon as possible."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: I think that summarizes, Sir, basically, the petition that was presented by the minister. Now if the minister is really sincere and I do not question his sincerity, Mr. Speaker - if he is really sincere I would suggest that he get together with his colleague, the Minister for Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and his Cabinet and bring in immediate amending legislation to the Workers' Compensation Act -

MR. WARREN: Tomorrow morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: - instead of rushing through this rag bill or flag bill, which is far less important than this -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: - I would suggest, to the people of Newfoundland, bring in an amendment to the Workers' Compensation Act to enable particularly the inshore fishermen to avail of the right, not the privilege, the right, to receive Workers' Compensation. For the life of me, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see why it has not already been done. They are doing it, I believe, in BC. If you can collect UIC contributions, I cannot see why it cannot be done for the same purpose for Workers' Compensation. It was introduced by the Liberals in the late 60s for the deep-sea fishermen, and it is about time



May 6, 1980

Tape No. 1308

AH-3

MR. MORGAN: that the inshore fishermen received these same benefits. So, Sir, I would say that it should be a priority on the part of this administration to bring in the necessary amendment to the Workers' Compensation Board straight away in order to do some good for over 10,000 or so fishermen in our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Motion No. 39. Bill No. 44.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Adopt A Flag For The Province". (Bill No. 44.)

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): I believe I made reference earlier, and I would ask the hon. member to remove the drape over his desk as outlined to him earlier in Beauchesne. I would ask him now to remove it from his desk.

MR. NEARY: May I ask Your Honour to give me the quotation that is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh! Name him!

MR. NEARY: I should like to ask Your Honour for the reference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh! Name him!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I am entitled to have the reference.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Could Your Honour give me the reference for having -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. member fully understands that I gave the reference to him earlier in the day and it is quoted directly from Beauchesne. I do not believe I have to repeat it at this particular time. I would ask the hon. member to remove the drape over his desk.

MR. NEARY: Send down the page (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to remove it from his desk.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) send down the page.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry. If the hon. member is not prepared to accept the ruling of the Chair, then you are not going to allow the Chair any alternative.

MR. NEARY: I accept the ruling of the Chair but I would like to have the page come and remove it.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): My ruling was to ask you to remove it from your desk.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not removing it, Your Honour, I want the page to remove it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Name him.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not going to comply with the ruling from the Chair, is that what I understand?

MR. NEARY: I abide by the decision of the Chair. I ask to have somebody come and take it outside. I do not feel like going out myself.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The decision, if you are going to comply with the decision of the Chair, as you have said, is that you remove it from your desk. If you wish to have it taken out afterwards, then that is something you can arrange.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman may have removed it, but he has left it within the precincts of the House. This clearly, Mr. Speaker, this clearly constitutes, I would suggest, contempt for Your Honour's ruling, the way in which the hon. member received the ruling, the way in which he refused to, initially, comply and remove it himself and asked for the page. I suggest that the way in which the hon. member, if he possibly can repair the contempt to Your Honour, that he can deal with that, he should at least be required to remove it from the precincts of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): To the point of order. The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has complied with Your Honour's ruling. I think he indicated, and I think he indicated quite openly and manfully, that he did not particularly like Your Honour's ruling but he has accepted it without question and he has complied with it. He has removed the piece of black crepe from the desk; it is now on the floor of the House. As I recall it, I would say to my friend from, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), Mount Scio, that he was asked to remove it from his desk, as I understood the ruling, in which case my friend from LaPoile has complied.

Now, that puts it in the same category as any other piece of paper in this House and I would suggest that perhaps we ought to ask one of our pages to assist by removing it, if that is Your Honour's wish, and that we ought to get on with the debate and carry on without this kind of interruption.

This debate I suspect, Mr. Speaker, is going to be emotional enough without the kind of, I suggest, needless and without merit point of order raised by the gentleman from St. John's East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: 'Holy Willy'.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

With respect to the point of order, I will recess the Chamber for five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

Order, please!

Reference is made to the earlier ruling I gave during the earlier part of the day and I quote Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, Page 117, paragraph 333, which reads, "Speakers have consistently ruled that it is improper to produce exhibits of any sort in the Chamber." It goes on to say, "During the flag debate of 1964, the display of competing designs was prohibited."

I believe in this particular situation, that the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has clearly shown contempt for the ruling of the Chair, which I gave earlier, by placing the exhibit upon his desk again after I had ruled earlier in asking him to remove it from sight, and he, in fact, placed it back on his desk. I therefore have no alternative but to name the hon. the member for LaPoile and I say that it is my duty to name you, Mr. Stephen A. Neary, for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

MR. NEARY:

It is a sad day for

Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for

LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

They have turned her into

a dictatorship.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of

the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

In accordance with the precedents, I move that Mr. Neary, the member for LaPoile, be suspended for the balance of this sitting day.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have heard the motion.

All in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay', carried.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon.  
the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I think it would be fitting  
if I could ask Your Honour - I rise on a point of order -  
in view of the object which was the reason for the  
expulsion of the hon. member for a sitting day still  
being in the Assembly, and in view of the fact that the  
member would not remove it, we ask a page to.

MR. SPEAKER: That is done.

The hon. the Minister of  
Tourism, Recreation and Culture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is indeed for me today,  
as a Newfoundlander, a very proud moment. For a number  
of years now I have been a personal advocate for a  
distinctive Newfoundland flag. That is, notwithstanding,  
that my family heritage, my family background is deeply  
entrenched in this Province. The Dawe name, on my  
father's side, goes back to early Newfoundland history.  
It is among the first recorded names in this Province  
and it is a name of which I am very proud.

On my maternal side my  
family goes back to the Guys, which are another famous  
and distinguished and long-standing Newfoundland name,  
and also the Gilberts of Haystack in Placentia Bay. An  
involvement in Newfoundland, an involvement in our  
provincial heritage is something that my family, in all  
branches, have been very proud of.

MR. DAWE:

I am very proud to continue that tradition in a way that I think emphasizes my particular interest in this Province, my dedication to this Province, and my willingness to help and support its direction as much as I can.

A number of years ago a decision was taken to begin the adoption of a provincial flag that would be distinctive in some way and yet still represent the ideas and traditions that we all hold dear as Newfoundlanders.

The debate has been hot and cold over these numbers of years and it is only in the past six or seven months that the intention to introduce a new flag, a new provincial flag, in this Legislature was brought forward again.

Our traditions and our involvement in the Great Wars,

MR. R. DAWE: our involvement in things that have been important to Newfoundland, important to this Province, important when Newfoundland was a country and important to the Dominion of Canada, have been a long-standing tradition. And I think that Newfoundlanders who went to war held by a common bond of a flag, of an allegiance to a country, of an allegiance to a commonwealth is one that I too am very proud of, a great uncle having been a victim of the July Drive, again, a strong family tradition and responsibility to this Province.

The adoption of the provincial flag will in no way take away from our responsibilities and our allegiance to the Union Jack. There is no indication that people who wish to fly or display a Union Jack will be not permitted to do so. Indeed, I think they would be remiss if they did not honor that tradition.

SOME. HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. DAWE: I think what is important here today and what will be important throughout this debate is not that we are giving up or turning our back on a particular flag or symbol, it is that we are adding to and adopting an individual flag for this Province that will be in addition to any other flags or symbols that we may wish to have represent our past.

One of the things that our veterans of World Wars and different battles fought for was democracy, a democracy that we all share today. This democracy was shown probably more decisively this present sitting with the selection of a committee from this House to solicit the ideas, the opinions and the viewpoints of citizens, of children, of adults from all over this Province, this committee, made up of members of this hon. House, from both sides of this hon. House, having met with the committee from time to time, I realize that they took their responsibility, as I am sure we all believe they would, very seriously.



May 6, 1980

Tape No. 1311

EL - 2

MR. R. DAWE:

They took the time to travel to each and every part of our Province. When they went into communities or into areas, they received submissions; not only submissions of design but submissions of thought, submissions that represented the views, the considerations and the desires of Newfoundlanders from all parts of the Province. They returned, culminated all these ideas, brought together all the submissions, both the prepared written ones, both the designs and the ideas which are probably the most important aspects of their research. To bring back the ideas, the thoughts and the wishes of Newfoundlanders. They subsequently brought all this information together and asked a very distinguished Newfoundland artist if he would help them, assist them in putting these ideas and these opinions and these feelings

MR. R. DAWE: from Newfoundlanders into a single design that would ultimately represent a flag for this Province.

Mr. Speaker, this was done and the proposed flag presented to this hon. House. I would be remiss if I did not at this time congratulate the members of the Committee on the fine work and effort that they put forward for the past several months. It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, as can be witnessed by the opinions that have been expressed since the introduction of the proposed flag: How do you satisfy everyone? As elected representatives from the various areas of this Province, I am sure that hon. members on both sides can attest to the fact that it is virtually impossible, if not impossible in itself, to satisfy everyone. And I do not think this was the intention of the committee, or, in fact, is the intention of the flag. In my opinion there are several groups who have expressed displeasure with the proposed flag; one, there are people who have a flag a flag which they owe allegiance to or feel they owe allegiance to very genuinely in all cases, I am sure, whether that flag be the Union Jack or some other representation. There are people who, like many Newfoundlanders, like the majority of Newfoundlanders, wish to have a distinctive flag. In their own mind they conceived a thought, they conceived an idea of what they thought the Newfoundland flag should be. Should it represent wildlife? Should it represent our educational process? Should it represent a twig? Should it have a caribou on it, a moose, codfish? Various things were suggested. These people, because of their preconceived ideas of what they hoped or thought the flag should be, are in themselves initially opposed to it. And there are a number of people, I suppose, who just

MR. R. DAWE: find the look of the flag not very appealing to them.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these people, and I base this on a number of years of having contact with various organizations and various activities as it relates to this Province, participating in or competing against other provinces and other countries, that I think these people are in minority and the majority of people in this Province are willing and ready to accept and show allegiance to a new and distinctive Newfoundland flag.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. DAWE: The committee, Mr. Speaker, that was made up of the members of this hon. House, are to be trusted implicitly because they are, in fact, a delegation of this House, a delegation that this House unanimously supported. This committee in turn unanimously brought back to this hon. House a design, a suggested design for a new distinctive Newfoundland flag. And I think it is incumbent upon us, Mr. Speaker, to show our support and our appreciation for the work and the sincere effort that this committee placed into the design of that flag.

I am sure that from what has been suggested in the media, what has been suggested over coffee and what has been suggested in various places is that there is not unanimity within this hon. House as it relates to the adoption of this particular flag. And in keeping with the true democratic process, the hon. the Premier and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition have both indicated that members of their caucus will be free to vote as their conscience and their beliefs dictate.

MR. R. DAWE: I will be very interested, Mr. Speaker, in the debate that will follow. I will be very attentive and listen to the comments from all hon. members but I would like for each and every one of us to keep in mind the fact that we are not losing an existing flag, we are gaining a distinctive provincial flag to add to a collection, if you want, of flags that people fly because they owe allegiance to it, but it is our own distinctive Newfoundland flag. And I think Newfoundlanders of all ages, as expressed by a number of school classes that I have given the sample flag with its description to in my particular district, have indicated overwhelmingly their support. The young people, the people who will in the years to come proudly display this particular flag, are the ones we are building our future for and the future of this Province.

I think as we go forward with our individuality as Newfoundlanders we will also be proud to fly our own individual and independent flag.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve any further comments, if I would, for the conclusion of this debate.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt)

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that it is my personal intention to vote against this resolution. I do so with a great deal of regret and I hope that hon. members on both sides of the House will appreciate that it is very much a personal decision taken in conscience and after a great deal of thought. It is also one that I have taken without consultation with my colleagues on this side. I have no idea how they propose to vote nor indeed did I seek in any way, shape or form to pressure them. I want to say as well that with the exceptions to which I will make reference in a few moments, that I was not influenced in my decision by any representations that have been made either directly to me or in various other ways.

Another reason for my very deep regret

MR. D. JAMIESON: of having to vote against this resolution is that, as I said when the committee was established and as I am on record as having said over perhaps the last twenty-five years, I want very much to see Newfoundland have a distinctive flag. I have on numerous occasions, most recently, I emphasize, when this committee was set up, said that I would hope that out of this exercise would come something that members generally were able to accept. Basically, without going into a great deal of intricate argument as to what ought or ought not to be part of a particular design, my fundamental reason for the decision which I have taken and which I again emphasize as a personal one is that I can not accept this particular design.

Here once again I have to do it with a tremendous amount of reluctance, for two reasons; nobody, I suppose, is better aware than members of this House, and certainly no one more than I, of the complexity of the

MR. JAMIESON:                    problem which faced the Select Committee and, in a sense, to make a decision that is contrary to the views both of my own colleagues on the Committee, and members opposite, is not an easy thing to do, even in a free vote. And I would hope also that no members of the Committee would feel that either support or rejection by individual members is any reflection on them. I want to make it perfectly clear that I understand fully the tremendously difficult task they had. I understand also that regardless probably of the kind of design that was introduced or brought in, there would at least be some people who would find it objectionable. I am not among those. I believe that we could have had a distinctive flag which would have more closely adhered to the very wide range of representations that were made to the Committee.

Another reason why I take this stand with regret is that it is again a matter of record that there is no one in Newfoundland today who is more respectful of, and more proud of the accomplishments and achievements of a man whom I like to regard as my friend, namely, Mr. Chris Pratt. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, it is extraneous to this debate to recall that during the years when I was travelling widely through the world, and during the years when it was my pleasure to welcome many distinguished visitors to Canada, I arranged that all such visitors were provided with Newfoundland artists' work, and that one of the principle artists whose work was chosen for such presentations was that of Mr. Chris Pratt. Therefore it is doubly difficult from the standpoint of both my feelings towards members of the Committee, my colleagues on this side of the House, and my respect for Mr. Pratt, for me to have come to the conclusion that I have.

Let me go on to say, Mr. Speaker, that without recrimination in relation to the Committee, it seems to me that one of the problems that has been created here, and again I can understand

MR. JAMIESON: it, one of the problems has been that the artist indicated that he was not prepared to accept any modification to the design. It was, in a sense, a take it or leave it proposition. Consequently there are, I am quite certain, and I do not wish to anticipate what members opposite or members on this side are going to say, I am sure that there are those who would be quite willing to look seriously at this particular design if certain modifications were possible. But the truth of the matter is that you either have to take it as it is or there is no way in which you can, in a sense, accept it; either your aesthetic senses, or your patriotism, or whatever the case might be, does not permit you to do so.

Once again, as I say, I understand the difficulty of the problem. But it essentially boils down to saying in effect that either you take this particular design or you are in some way or other prohibited from looking at alternatives.

Now I have spent - the hon. the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) talked about the amount of time, and he is quite right of course, in terms of the amount of time taken up with hearings and the like, but it was only last Tuesday that we got our first look at this flag, just a week ago today. I would suspect that up to this moment there are a large number of people in Newfoundland who have not seen it, certainly have not seen it in colour, have seen in some cases rather poor reproductions in various publications and the like and it is only this day, one week subsequent to the introduction of the Committee report, that any effort is being made to put out, through the media, and that in a limited way I gather, The St. John's Evening Telegram, the total picture. But let that stand for the moment; what I am saying is that I for one have spent, I will not say that I have contemplated it for hours on end, but I have certainly in good conscience looked at it in every way that I possibly can, I have looked at it, if this is not demonstrating or breaking the rules of the House, I have looked at it in terms of the way it is to fly on a flagstaff, and particularly in the way it is to be draped when it is used for that

May 6, 1980

Tape No. 1314

NM - 3

MR. JAMIESON:                    purpose, and I really cannot in conscience, whether it is simply a matter of saying that I am not much of an artist, but I know what I like and I do not like, I simply cannot see this particular design as being one that is reflective of what I believe ought to be in a provincial flag.



MR. D. JAMIESON: Now let me on that say that in many respects, the artist, I feel certain, probably tried too hard. In other words, so many different representations were made, so many different ideas and designs were advanced that in the last analysis the artist was faced with a whole series of various representations, and the Committee also, and that, consequently, they sought in some way or other to include, to embrace as many of them as possible. And I suggest that the end result of this is that they lost, it seems to me, or the flag loses - let us put it that way - any real symbolism, anything immediately and universally identifiable with the Province. I do not intend, as I said, to try to upstage artists on this, but it seems to me, for example, that on the right hand side, a triangle on the top and a triangle on the bottom, said to represent Labrador on the one hand and Newfoundland on the other, is really stressing a very considerable distance in order to accommodate or accomplish one of the sort of prerequisites which I believe most people felt ought to be included. By the same token - and I think, for me, the most reprehensible, if you like, and perhaps that is too strong a word, because I am talking about it in terms of emotion, if you want - is, of course, what has come to be described - I am not sure whether it is an arrow, whether it is a missile, just exactly what it is. And I can see that particularly in the draped fashion, that it is open to all manner of misinterpretation and indeed, even, I would say, to derision. And consequently, since I must either accept it all or reject it all, then I have chosen from my personal judgement to say that I cannot support it. I say it with great and very deep regret. I think what has happened here once again is, of course, that one has the argument put constantly that it will grow on you, and maybe in some cases it will, I have no idea about that. But I do know that in the first instance, without making any reference to any particular groups or any particular pro or con faction, that the undoubted original reaction is, and indeed, already has been divisive. I am not prepared to say - I have not polled all five hundred and sixty-odd thousand, or whatever there are, Newfoundlanders - I do not know with any clarity whether a majority of people are for this flag or whether they are against this flag.

MR. D. JAMIESON: I do know that there is a very significant block of people who are certainly in opposition to it. I do know that those in opposition have certainly been more vocal, have made their views known more clearly. And here is where I come to something which I feel the President of the Privy Council (Mr. W. Marshall) did not adequately answer today, and that is the question of timing. It seems to me that on something as important as this, on something where each of us, the Premier as the Head of the Government and I as the Leader of the Opposition, had said that we wished and were prepared to have, and that we on this side in fact had made a decision to have a free vote - it seems to me that it would have been far more credible to allow a reasonable period of time to pass before bringing on this legislation, because it is not at all improbable that given a reasonable period of time - and I do not know what that would be - but given a reasonable period of time, that more people would have had a greater opportunity to look it over, more people would have had an opportunity to go through the various explanations and perhaps the end result might have been considerably different.

Now regardless of what the President of the Privy Council says, this is, by its very nature, of course, a government bill, and consequently, it was entirely within the government's hands to decide the timing. And I simply

May 6, 1980

Tape No. 1316

AH-1

MR. JAMIESON: do not understand why, when we have items on this Order Paper that have been there not only since the beginning of this session but which were revived from last Autumn and even before that, why in this particular case we wind up with a sequence of events where we saw the flag for the first time a week ago today, where notice was given on Friday, just three or four days later, of the government's intention to bring in first reading on Monday, yesterday, and where again we have the debate on second reading starting in less than twenty-four hours. Now in those circumstances, and given the Premier's assurance that though it was a government bill, that they were prepared to allow a free vote, I suggest that three or four or five days is not even long enough for most of us to get a reasonable feedback, a reasonable response from our constituents. We had today a minister of the government introducing a petition with 8,000 names on it which was clearly supported by both sides, but it took months, literally, to bring it to that particular stage and it is going to take many more weeks, I suspect, before, even with the best of intentions, the government is going to act on that particular petition. Now it is reasonable to ask, it is reasonable to ask, it seems to me, that if a petition, for example, containing 8,000 names opposing this flag, or by the same token 8,000 names supporting this flag, were to be brought in, would we not then soberly question the wisdom of rushing ahead, moving posthaste to bring it in when we knew that there was a substantial body of opinion out in the country which was either in favour or against? It makes no difference to the argument that I am putting forward.

I want finally to say that I do not accept the proposition, I do not really accept the proposition that by putting this flag in place and this particular design in place that in a sense we are going to have three flags, because the truth is that, presumably, I think we all agree that whether we like it or not that the official flag of Newfoundland today is the Union Jack, that is the official provincial flag, presumably it will have to be replaced in terms of the normal kind of usage by the new design. I assume that is the case.

May 6, 1980

Tape No. 1316

AH-2

MR. ROBERTS:

In fact, this act repeals the other act.

MR. JAMIESON:

Repeals the other act, so therefore it is not enough to say that it is still there in that sense. But again, I do not want to, I emphasize, get emotional about this whole issue in that context. I would have been prepared to vote for a design that I felt met the criteria. And while I am not privy to what went on in the committee other than knowing that there was unanimity, and consequently that is an important point to bear in mind, I think it is almost a sort of a prerequisite for the choice of an alternative flag to the Union Jack, it is almost a prerequisite that, to use the words of my hon. friend from the district of St. George's (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the minister, he says it is impossible to satisfy everyone, but I do suggest that for it to be successful it should at least satisfy a very significant majority. I think that is the key point. I think the test really in the long run has to be, and, incidentally, I am not even talking about satisfying them at first glance, but, you know, when you have to use six or eight lines in order to explain this flag, that if you looked at it minus any kind of explanation you simply would not know - and to this day, by the way, once again, someone has said there is a Maple Leaf there, I, for example, have never been able to find it regardless of anything else. Maybe my imagination is lacking, but seriously, though,

MR. JAMIESON: I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is incumbent upon all of us not to ram this bill through. The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) has said that there is no intention of doing so, and perhaps we will have over the ensuing days - I have no idea how long the debate is going to go on. He has reminded us there is also third reading and Committee stage and perhaps there will be some second thoughts - if the government is serious about it being a free vote, then all semblance of the fact that it is a government bill has got to be removed from it. And I hope that, and I am not going to, in this House, talk about what members on this side or members on the other side have said, but I do hope that people who are of a like mind to me will, in fact, make the same kind of decision that I have. And I would, by the way, respect those who make a contrary decision provided always that it is one of conscience. Because, let me end on this note, Mr. Speaker, you know, we are still only thirty-one years old as a Province of Canada and there are some of us, at least some of us, who can remember the quite indescribable bitterness which went on at that time of Confederation and which in some respects has lasted almost to, and perhaps in a few instances, to this very day. And when I hear, as we all have heard in these last days, some of the comments of very large and respectable and representative groups in this country who have expressed their rejection of this flag, it worries me deeply, worries me very much that instead of achieving the goals which the hon. the minister fed out, and which I share, that instead of achieving that we in this Province could conceivably go through

MR. JAMIESON: a very, very antagonistic and a very bitter period if there is not, not only, in a sense, to fall back on the cliché, justice done but that it appear to be done. And I think that appearance of justice is that everyone is satisfied that there has been a thorough airing, everyone is satisfied that this is the best alternative that we can have as a flag for this Province. I do not happen to believe that. But let us, in a spirit of understanding and a commitment to a unified Province in the future, let us be extremely careful that we do not either attribute motives or that we do not, in a sense, to use the vernacular again, appear to be ramming something down the throats of a great many people who are clearly and unmistakably opposed.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose to someone of my generation this issue is not, perhaps, in one sense, as important as it is to the younger people to whom the hon. minister referred. But at the same time, I believe that those people, and I hope I might be numbered among them, who have given the best that they know how to this Province of Newfoundland, in whatever field it might be, I would hope that our opposition to this flag would be understood for what it is, that our opinions and our conscience would be respected and that those who feel otherwise would take the position of ensuring that there is adequate time and there is adequate opportunity, which I again suggest there has not been up to now, for Newfoundlanders to express themselves, voice their views, not in the heat of the moment, which is the inevitable first reaction, but something, to quote one or two hon. members who have said it, that grows on you. I say it has not on me in the period of a week. Indeed, the more I look at it the more I am satisfied that it is not the solution to

MR. JAMIESON: what is a very deep-seated conviction on the part of a lot of Newfoundlanders.

We want, all of us, a distinctive flag for Newfoundland. I think the vast majority want something where, on events within Newfoundland but also events in other parts of Canada and around the world, we can look at it and identify with it and be proud of it and not have to spend a great deal of time in each and every case trying to explain the symbolism and the various things of that kind which, to say the least, are intricate and, at the very worst, in many respects, I say, also, are not really the kinds of things that I believe most of us would want to see on a provincial flag.

If I were to go any further I would have to get into a lot of other things with regard

MR. D. JAMIESON:

to symbolism, with regard to a whole series of things which might conceivably generate an emotional kind of response. I want to do my best to avoid that. So I end as I began by saying to you that I will vote against this flag. I have no control, certainly, insofar as this side of the House is concerned, because it is a free vote, I never did have insofar as the other side of the House is concerned. But like the - I am not sure if it is a biblical quotation, or whatever, but as for my house, and I mean it in the personal sense, this is not the flag that I am prepared to support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. member for St. John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. J. CARTER:

I thank the hon. gentlemen opposite for their applause.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. J. CARTER:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members of the Flag Committee and I would like to particularly name the members of the support staff, Mr. Neil Penney and Mr. Terry Connors for the tremendous assistance to us in all of our discussions and all of our efforts. Things could not have run smoothly without a good support staff and they were the very best.

It would be very hard, Mr. Speaker, to find seven people in Newfoundland who are less alike than the seven members of this committee but we worked as a team and we were able to be absolutely frank with one another in matters regarding the flag. We could say at any time of the day or night, "What do you think of this design, what do you think of this idea, what do you think of that idea?" And get a completely frank, truthful and useful answer from each other. None of the members of this committee went into it with any preconceived ideas. Insofar as was possible we emptied our minds of any particular designs or any particular favourite designs and we said, 'We will act as sponges, metaphorically, soaking up as much information as we possibly can



MR. J. CARTER: from the general public and then when we have finished all of our public hearings, when most of the mail has come in, and most of the submissions have been made, then we will sit down and start to discuss specifics.

Now, I need not add that our choice was unanimous and if it had not been, I would not have made a definitive report to the House.

I would like to, first of all, of course, deal with some of the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson). I am very, very sorry that he feels unable to support this flag at this time. I realize that he would probably like to support it, or there are two impulses warring within him but in this House of Assembly you can only vote for or against. I suppose you can abstain but it is very seldom done and I would not suggest that it should be done in this circumstance. But I do sense two impulses at war within his mind, shall we say, for the approval and disapproval of this flag.

I have to mention in passing that I think all during his remarks, since he was looking at the bill, he was looking at the black and white version. I would like to suggest to him that the coloured version is rather more attractive and this is the version that will be flying. We have no intention of bringing out a black and white version. I would like to say, too, that the Leader of the Opposition's general advice was very useful to us. I realize that he has widely travelled and has seen not only the flags of the world but has seen them in action, as it were, and one of the points he made to me was, "Look, whatever you do do not make it all stripes. So many of the flags of the world are all stripes. There are three horizontal stripes, three vertical stripes or four vertical stripes and when you realize that

MR. J. CARTER:

there are something like five hundred distinct countries in the world who follow the fly flags, there is a lot of room for confusion.

He, unfortunately does not like this design. Well, certainly, that is his prerogative. He would like to have seen some of the submitted elements incorporated and he pointed out that he deplored the fact that there are no modifications allowed in this design. Now, let me clear up this point once and for all.

The artist, Christopher Pratt said to us,

I will design the flag for you on three conditions. one, that I not be paid for it. Two, that you can reject it if you like. And, three, that if you accept it, you must accept it totally as it is designed. In other words, if you cannot accept it in total, then we all go back to the drawing board and we start again. He was prepared - he would have been prepared to go right through the exercise again - but

MR. STIRLING:

do that now?

Is he prepared to

MR. J. CARTER:

committee, we unanimously chose this design.

No, we are all satisfied. As a

MR. STIRLING:

Now ?

(Inaudible) Will you go back

MR. J. CARTER:

because -

Mr. Speaker, I asked for no interruptions

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please.

MR. J. CARTER:

to explain it as carefully as possible without any misunderstanding. He was perfectly prepared, or would have been perfectly prepared to have gone through the whole exercise again if we had said, 'Look we are not satisfied.' And for my part, I would have recommended that we go through the

MR. J. CARTER: the whole exercise again if even one of the members, at that time, had said, 'NO, I really cannot accept any of these designs, I do not like the theme, let us try something else.' But, of course, we were unanimous and I am very glad to report that we were able to bring in a unanimous report to this House.

So, part of my speech is going to be directed towards those two warring impulses that I feel are present in the Leader of the Opposition because I feel that there is - well, I believe him when he says he is going to vote against the flag but I would assure the House, I am absolutely certain in my mind that once this flag is official that there will be no stronger supporter of this flag than the hon. the Leader of the Opposition because, I think, there never was a better time to introduce a new flag. And I have three good reasons:

The first is that we have a good design. I am quite satisfied. Members of the Flag Committee are quite satisfied that we have a good design. We also have a determined and a courageous premier. He is prepared - this flag, the choice of a flag can be a tricky think and you need a very strong and courageous premier, or leader of the government to be prepared to bring in legislation that could be tricky.

Also, the Leader of the Opposition is a distinguished gentleman. He is a thorough gentleman. I do not agree with his feelings about the flag, but there will never come a time when I will say that he is not a gentleman because I firmly believe he is. I have known him now for, well, certainly over thirty years and I have always found him to be a gentleman in his dealings and, therefore, although there will be strong debate, possibly, there may be vigorous debate, there may even, unfortunately, be acrimonious debate, I am perfectly certain there will not be a filibuster. There will be no repetition of that

MR. J. CARTER: deplorable Federal situation where the flag debate dragged on and on and on until everyone was absolutely sick of it. So, people will have their say for or against and then that will be that. The vote will be taken and we will either have or not have a new flag.

So, I think that for those three reasons there never was a better time to choose a Provincial flag. I would also suggest that those three elements have not always been present on the provincial scene. But they are today and I am very happy to say that those three elements are present and this is what makes it such a good time to bring in a Provincial flag.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) the first one is a matter of judgement.

MR. J. CARTER: Well, it was a matter of seven people's unanimous judgement. Now, to get down to a little bit more detail, Mr. Speaker, the themes that were submitted were about, well, I am going to take the major themes that were submitted. There were a number of minor themes but the major themes, and I think the other members will agree with me. There was the fish and Maritime tradition. Flags were presented showing codfish or other species of fish on the flag. Labrador, the shape of Labrador, or the fact of Labrador, or map of Labrador or something to do with Labrador was also submitted. Both graphically and verbally our British and Commonwealth tradition

MR. J. CARTER:

was very strongly represented. Our native peoples were strongly represented and then there were a tremendous number of designs, submissions and suggestions for Newfoundland flora and fauna, that is to say, the pitcher plant, various recognizable Newfoundland animals and plants, and from this we felt that this was the urge to be distinctive, to positively identify the new flag as being Newfoundland.

The other major theme that was quite apparent was the sacrifice of the veterans in the two World Wars and the numerous other wars that they were engaged in and their sacrifice and that it should be remembered in this flag.

Now, this is how we tried to deal with it. In this particular design - and I do not need to hold up the coloured design, the leaflets have been distributed - every member, I think, is quite familiar, in living colour, with the design of this flag, it is relatively simple but not that simple. And, again, I am simplifying because there is not time to go into all the symbolism, and also, of course, in this leaflet we have given a capsule of the main points. But just to go over some of them again, the blue and the trident for the sea and the fishery; the trident is the historical weapon of the fishermen, if you like, and especially in -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What is the trident?

MR. J. CARTER:

The trident is a three pronged device, obviously a device to show -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. J. CARTER:

The red edged triangles, although somewhat elongated, are designed to represent the mainland and Island parts of our Province. Now both Newfoundland, the Island part of our Province, and Labrador, are roughly triangular in shape - that is an oversimplification, obviously, but you can recognize them on the map as being triangular. I realize they have been turned a bit; this is for symmetrical purposes, but they have also been elongated and you get these two triangles which

MR. J. CARTER: are supposed to represent both the mainland and Island parts of our Province.

To represent and remember and recall the British tradition, we have red, white and blue as well as the design theme. The design theme was a cross and then two diagonals and the various elements are placed within that framework, and this is the same framework as the Union Jack. Happily or luckily or by chance, both the Beothuck and Naskaupi ornamentation can be seen in this flag. All hon. members have to do is to take a very quick trip to the second floor of the Newfoundland Museum and take a quick tour of it and they will see that the Naskaupi ornamentation consisted of sometimes blue, sometimes blue and red triangles say around the collar or around the belt of their costume, blue and red being the only dyes or only pigments available to them, and that the whole flag, itself, looks something like a Beothuck pendant, the only difference being that where this is blue, it would be considerably smaller. But there is on display down at the Newfoundland Museum artifacts or pieces of ornamentation very similar to the outline of this flag if you allow that the blue is shrunk so that it is much smaller with a hole in it for putting through a necklace. And I think it is quite fitting that we recall and remember those very gentle people that inhabited this Island.

The veterans - well, I was going to - in the order of my notes. The distinctiveness that I think is vital is part and parcel of the whole design. There is no other flag like it. And hon. gentlemen probably across would certainly agree with me on this point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING: (Inaudible) unanimous agreement.

MR. J. CARTER: Well, we have some unanimous agreement.

There is no other flag in the whole wide world quite like this one, and I am very happy to be able to report that to the House.

For the veterans and their war sacrifice

MR. CARTER:

when the flag is hung as a banner, you can quite clearly see that the arrow assumes the aspect of a sword, the whole Christian cross is visible, and there is a 'V' for victory. But, in addition to that, if you look at the 'V' there is also the peace sign, so that whereas the veterans are remembered, we are also pointing out that we are at peace and hope to remain at peace, so that they have not been forgotten in this design. The artist and the Committee were very concerned that these elements should be incorporated into any flag. Now, there are many other symbols as well, and this was not the artist's intention but some -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: - but some - just a moment - some school children have said, well, the flag also reminds them of an oil drilling rig. Well, they are free to see that if they like, but certainly that is a very modern -

MR. STAGG: Hibernia oil rig.

MR. CARTER: I do not know if any hon. gentlemen have visited an oil rig, but the whole thing reminds them - it is abstract art. Flags are not supposed to be concrete. You do not put photographs on flags, those are for albums. You do not put faces on flags, that is for galleries.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) make a counter-suggestion if they wanted -

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I really must request some semblance of silence, although I do not mind a little bit of interruption.

Now, there are a number of opponents to this flag. I do not think the opposition is too serious for the following reasons. In the first place, those who oppose this flag are quite unable to agree among themselves. There is no substantial, not even a trace, of agreement among the opponents.

AN HON. MEMBER: What did you have the free vote for?

MR. CARTER: Many of the opponents - I am talking about in the general public, the opposition that has been -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: He means opposition in general (inaudible).

MR. CARTER: I am not especially speaking about the hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not know how many hon. gentlemen opposite oppose this flag, and I am hoping that as the debate progresses we may win over some of them, I do not know. That is possible, it may not be likely. But if this is as free a vote as hon. gentlemen hope it is, then there is hope, there is point, it is worthwhile debating and making some arguments. I believe -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CARTER: - I believe - sure, by all means, make your points, make them as well as you can, make them as strongly as you can, but listen when they are being made.

MR. HOLLETT: Would you be prepared to say that (inaudible). just as many different reasons, too.

MR. CARTER: Well, as a famous artist once said, "There are no wrong reasons for liking art, but there are many wrong reasons for not liking it", and it is worth thinking about that.

Many opponents are disgruntled because their particular design was not incorporated. They have not been forgotten by no means. The last few points I made pointed out how much we depended upon their submissions, but we cannot include everything. Can you imagine what the flag would look like if we tried to put in everything? You would have to have an enormous flag larger than this Chamber, and you would still leave something out. Also, no amount of changes, no amount of tinkering with any design, this one or any other design, would satisfy everyone. Also, the alternatives that were suggested were neither feasible nor acceptable to the Committee. So, although we tried to take from them the theme, the suggestion, the concern, we were not able to take the designs that they submitted in whole, only in part, and hon. gentlemen probably feel, perhaps, in too small a part. But we did try, we tried very hard, and I like to think we succeeded. In fact, I know we succeeded, but that is for this House to determine. Now, unfortunately, the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) is not here. I hope he is within hearing distance because I have a few



MR. CARTER: words I would like to address particularly to him. Now, hon. members of the press and hon. members opposite and members of the public may think that the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) is serious when he drapes the crepe over his desk or when he says, "Oh, it is tear down the Union Jack", or, "I do not like the flag", but I assure you I have known this hon. gentleman for a number of years, and I assure you he is not serious. He does not mean a word he says. Now, I do not know what he means when he says it. Perhaps, only his hairdresser knows for sure, I do not know, but certainly he does not mean what he says.

MR. STIRLING: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Point of order, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: In keeping with the spirit of the debate, and I think it has been a good one, I think it is most unfair for the speaker to be making comments and interpretations

MR. STIRLING:

implying that the person does not -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. STIRLING: By speaker I mean the last person on his feet - that the member unfortunately is no longer in the House and cannot defend himself and comments are being made which suggest that he has motives other than the straightforward, honest motives and some declarations have been very strong. And I am just suggesting that the member refrain from making these kinds of comments until at least the member is in his seat and can defend himself.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): To the point of order, the hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, on the second point raised by the hon. gentleman first, it would not be possible for the hon. member because he can only speak once in the debate so obviously, you know, he cannot speak again and the other hon. gentleman is not in the House today. But my interpretation of what the hon. member was saying, he stated that in his opinion the hon. gentleman did not mean what he was saying. And there was no allegation or insinuation of deception or anything whatsoever. He said, "In my opinion, he does not mean what he is saying." There is no attribution of motives or anything of any abusive nature at all in what the hon. gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) was saying. I really do not think it was unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry I was interrupted midway. Again I will not impute motives for the interruption. I was going to go on and say that the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is more gifted than most people in this Chamber and I only wish that he would use his considerable powers of persuasion to promote unity and calm instead of division and chaos. Because I do not believe he is serving the people of Newfoundland, I do not believe he is serving this House well

MR. J. CARTER:

by carrying on the way that he does. I do not think that he has served this debate one bit of good by his actions and by his attitude.

Now, a few general comments because I only have a few more minutes. I would say if we cannot pass a Flag Act after several months of hearings and a unanimous decision by the Committee, how can we possibly expect to deal with the problems of the future or the problems of the present that are very serious and very knotty and very difficult? So if we cannot handle a Flag Act within a week or ten days, the time that this debate is probably going to use up, if we cannot pass a relatively simple thing like a Flag Act in that period of time, then I suggest we are not able to pass anything.

Another general comment that I would like to make is that in my view it is the mark of a great artist that he has been able to take flag elements already familiar, ever so familiar to all of us and make them into something entirely new. I would suggest that there is enough symbolism in this flag design to do for several lifetimes. And, in fact, I think it is extremely popular because—let me give you some figures. Now they are rough figures and I do not wish to be nailed down to specific numbers but I will use rough figures for this leaflet. We started by putting out 100 leaflets just for the members of the House and the people immediately concerned with this House, we put out 100 of these leaflets and they lasted a few seconds. Then we put out 1,000 and they lasted a few minutes and then we put out some more and they just disappeared as fast as we could possibly make them. They switched to a larger press, one that could print four at a time instead of one at a time and they are still printing them. We have put them out in the Evening Telegram, I think it was 36,000. It is planned to put out even more. The demand for these leaflets is insatiable. Now, I know hon. members opposite, if they want to, can say, "Well that is because people are so curious. It is not because they like the flag it is because they are curious". But I would suggest that the demand for these leaflets is absolutely insatiable. There will probably

MR. J. CARTER:

have to be hundreds of thousands printed in order to satisfy the initial demand and that to me says something. I do not know whether it can be regarded as definitive but it certainly says something to me.

So I would suggest in closing, Mr.

Speaker, that we adopt this flag with affection for the past, understanding of the present and enthusiasm for the future. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr.

Speaker, I think it is probably well known that I was a member of the Flag Committee which recommended this design to the House of Assembly. Somebody described a committee as a group of the unprepared appointed by the unwilling and I think, probably, that is certainly applicable in this case.

MR. L. THOMS: We did a job that we were asked to do by this Legislature.

MR. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

MR. L. THOMS: Whether or not this House accepts the particular design that we introduced to the House is entirely up to the members of this House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I guess one can only reflect back to 1962 and another great flag debate. When it was announced that this bill was going to be introduced in this House sometime this week, I phoned Ottawa and I asked for the flag debate of Hansard. Yesterday or today I got another call back and I was informed that the flag debate in Ottawa consisted of over 9,000 pages - over 9,000 pages devoted to the debate on whether or not this nation should have the Maple Leaf as its flag. Of course, I told them to forget about it. There is no way that I could sift through 9,000 pages of the debate on the Canadian Maple Leaf. But, Mr. Speaker, the Committee went to some twenty-six communities in this Province. Not all the members of the Committee went to every community, but we went to twenty-six communities. We received a lot of written and oral briefs. I took it that the members of this House wished that Committee to come back to this House with a distinctive flag for this Province. You know, Mr. Speaker, the most beautiful flag of all the - if I may say in quotes - 'Newfoundland flags' that I saw during our Committee meetings - and to be quite honest with you, my own personal opinion, I would like to have taken that flag, adopted it and made it the provincial flag of this Province. But the people who had designed that particular flag did not want us to use that flag as a provincial flag. They came to the meeting and this was their only point. They said, 'We really do not care what flag is the provincial flag of this Province. We do not care. But please do not touch our flag. It is our flag, we want to keep it, we want to retain it.' And, Mr. Speaker, that was the flag of Labrador.

MR. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

MR. L. THOMS: So there is no way that the people of Labrador wanted us to holus-bolus take their flag and make it the flag of Newfoundland. And I respected their request. But that, Mr. Speaker, was

May 6, 1980

Tape 1323

EC - 2

MR. L. THOMS:

the most attractive, if I may say so,  
Newfoundland flag that I had seen.

There has been a fair amount of negative  
response to the flag. There are groups in this Province; they came, they  
gave their briefs, but it is not a question of their liking or disliking  
the design that we recommended to the House. Because

MR. THOMS:

they wanted a particular flag. There were those who wanted the Union Jack to remain the flag of Newfoundland and I respect their decision. There are those who want the Pink, White and Green to be the flag of Newfoundland. I respect their position. I think though that the Publisher of the Daily News should make that quite clear when he pushes the Pink, White and Green that he was the one who presented the brief to our Committee asking that the Pink, White and Green be the provincial flag of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, since last November I have seen a lot of flags. I have seen the flags of the territories of this country and I have seen the rest of the provincial flags. Mr. Speaker, there are two flags in this country that jump out at you. When the provincial flags are lined up there are two that stand out. One, of course, is the Union Jack which, I have been told, is the most perfectly designed flag in the world. And it is certainly one of the most beautiful flags in the world if not the most beautiful flag in the world and it is a flag that means an awful lot to an awful lot of Newfoundlanders. Mr. Speaker, it meant an awful lot to my father and it meant an awful lot to very close relatives of mine who died in both World Wars. And I, for one, would not want to take the Union Jack away from these people. But, Mr. Speaker, in a sense, and I am sure there are people on both sides of the House who will not agree with me on this, I think that having our own distinctive, Newfoundland flag raises the Union Jack to a level where it should be. The Union Jack is not a provincial flag, It just simply is not a provincial flag, It is the flag of the Monarch of England. It is the flag of the Commonwealth and for as long as this country is a part of the Commonwealth of Nations the Union Jack can be flown. And I would resist any attempt on behalf of the Premier of this Province or the Government of this Province to take the Union Jack down off the flagpole in front of this building and simply raise a new Newfoundland flag. I want to see three flags fly in front of all public buildings in this Province. I want to see the Union Jack, I want to see the Maple Leaf.

May 6, 1980

Tape No. 1324

IB-2

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS:

And I want to see a Newfoundland flag.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

That is the governments intention (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Three flags.

MR. THOMS:

Three flags.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please!

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, you know I, myself, I am too young to have grown up under any one flag. I knew very little about the Pink, White and Green before this particular Committee. I knew very little about the Red Ensign or the White Ensign and many of the flags that I saw and read about. But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that there is no one prouder, from St. John's to Victoria, of the Canadian Maple Leaf, a flag that in 1962 groups of people



MR. L. THOMS: in this country said that they would never fly. But, Mr. Speaker, they are flying the Maple Leaf and they are proud of the Maple Leaf.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. THOMS: And I give the late Mike Pearson every credit for having the fortitude and courage to do what he did back at that time and I, Mr. Speaker, for one, do not want to be the John Diefenbaker of this House when it comes to a flag debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, the Flag Committee had five conditions four of which have certainly been met, I believe, by this particular design. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) says, "This is not the flag that I am prepared to support." And I respect him for that decision. It happens to be a flag that I can support, I can support this flag. I find the flag attractive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. THOMS: But more important, Mr. Speaker, my friend from St. John's North (J. Carter) can get up, describe the symbolism, what this means and that means but to me it is just as important to be able to look at a flag and to be able to say, 'That is the flag of Quebec.' I believe that with this flag we will be able to say that that is the flag of Newfoundland. It will stand out. And I think that is very important, that this flag stands out.

There are flags in Canada that do not stand out. You can look at them - after all of the looking I have done at the Canadian flags and the provincial flags, since last November when this committee started, of all the times I have seen them, we had twenty-six committee meetings, the flags all lined up. I challenge any member of the Committee, almost, to sit down and to say, "That is the flag of New Brunswick, that is the flag of Manitoba, that is the flag of the Yukon, etc." because a lot of them really do look alike. But everybody can look at the Union Jack and recognize it, everybody can look at the flag of Quebec and say, "That is the flag of Quebec," and it is important that we have a flag that

MR. L. THOMS: you can point out and say, "That is the flag of Newfoundland," there will be no Newfoundlander who will have to say, "Which is the Newfoundland flag?"

There is one condition though, Mr. Speaker, that bothers me and that is, and these are all contained in the Committee report, where it says, "From its first meeting, the Committee had agreed that any provincial flag should fulfill the following conditions: It must be simple, attractive, distinctive, mirror our important traditions. These are the first four.

Now, I believe that it is simple. I believe it is attractive, I believe it is distinctive. But one of the conditions that we as a committee set down was that it would be accepted by the majority of the people of this Province. In the report to the House it said that it would be widely accepted. The question that I have to answer, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not this design is widely accepted, whether or not it is accepted by a majority of the people. If you listen to the open line shows, if you do, you can only but come to the conclusion

MR. THOMS:

that it is not accepted by a majority of the people of this Province. I can honestly say that at this point in time, from a district response, I have had neither a yea or an aye as far as the design for the flag is concerned. Maybe there is a disinterest. I did have one call, a call that, in this particular case, put everything in perspective as far as that particular person was concerned. The slipway was more important than the flag. As I said, that is the one thing that bothers me about the flag. This is a flag, as I have said, that I can support for all the reasons that I have given. I know that whatever I say is certainly not going to convince anybody on either side of the House. I think probably, at this point in time, every member of this House is something like the people of Canada, they had made up their minds in December how they were going to vote on February the 18th., and I do not think anybody from December to February the 18th. really changed their mind. I would like to see this flag adopted as the provincial flag. I have talked about it, I have talked to, not hundreds of people, but I have talked to quite a few people since the flag was introduced. One of the problems is - and this comes through loud and clear - all the people who are against this particular design are against that particular design, but you have 600,000 people in Newfoundland and you have 600,000 ideas of what a flag should be like. I do not believe that it is humanly possible for any committee, any committee, to bring a design for a flag into this House that would satisfy any six people, let alone satisfy any fifty-one people. I do not think that is humanly possible. We certainly cannot agree, the people that I have talked to. They want Newfoundland depicted on the flag; some want a caribou; some want a codfish; some want the Newfoundland dog; some want the bakeapple; some want the blueberry. I deliberately listened this morning to the Open Line Show because of the debate this afternoon, and every single person, without exception, who called in and gave what they believe the design for a flag should be, gave a different design. I rest assured, I look at the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), and I look at the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), I look at the Minister of Health (Mr. House), and I am quite sure that if I were to ask the three of you what you

May 6, 1980

Tape No. 1326

GH-2

MR. THOMS: would like to see in the flag, you would have three different opinions. I do not think on a matter such as the flag that you could ever be satisfied.

MR. L. THOMS: Having said that, having realized that I have probably convinced nobody on either side of the House to vote for or against the flag -

AN HON. MEMBER: Was that what you intended in the first place?

MR. L. THOMS: - certainly an impressive presentation, I have convinced nobody. And the funniest thing, I cannot convince my own family. They do not like the design. But then, my family is no different from any other family. I mean, if I asked a half dozen families, I would get a half dozen different designs, and what do you do? Confronted with this sort of thing, what do you do? What sort of a decision do you make?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is hard to know, boy.

MR. L. THOMS: I happen to believe that we do want a distinctive flag.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. L. THOMS: And there is one thing that has come through loud and clear in this Province and that is that the majority of people do want a distinctive flag.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. THOMS: A majority of people do want a distinctive flag. They may not want this one, but I do not believe that it is possible to get a flag that the majority of people would accept any more than they will accept this one in time. If I thought for a minute that there was anybody in this House or outside this House who could produce a flag that would be acceptable to the majority of people of this Province, I would vote against this bill now. But I do not happen to believe that there is anybody who can produce a design that would be accepted. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, and for the other reasons that I have mentioned, I am proud and happy and pleased to be able to support this particular piece of legislation. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) on his excellent presentation, and also the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). And although I disagree with the views of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I would congratulate him on his effort to rationalize his reasoning for not voting for this flag. I really believe that he put his finger on it when he said that he certainly would like to see a distinctive flag for the Province of Newfoundland, which almost everybody would like to see, but he could not say what that flag is. And that is the very position that the Flag Committee was in. We had the feeling when we started that we were going to get the flag for the Province of Newfoundland, and we hoped, as we held our twenty-five or twenty-six meetings throughout different areas of the Province, that probably somebody would come forward with the flag, the one that the seven of us thought would be the Newfoundland flag. But after working on this Committee as much as anyone - maybe the Chairman of our Committee (Mr. J. Carter) did more work - but I had the privilege of being the Secretary of this Committee, and I read and studied and went over every single proposal and answered every single proposal that was sent in, and I am firmly convinced that there is not a flag that anybody can produce that would satisfy the loud minority. Whatever flag you put forth - some time ago, I believe 1974, the Conservative Government in

MR. R. AYLWARD:

this Province tried to put a flag forth and the criticism you hear of our flag is that it should have something Newfoundland in it, but nobody knows what that something Newfoundland is. In 1974, I believe, there was a flag proposed and I only have a Daily News copy of it here. To describe it, as I remember it, it was a White Ensign type of flag, a Union Jack in the corner and the Newfoundland Crest in the fly. Now, this flag, I would have assumed, would be an acceptable flag to most of the people who are complaining about our flag today. But in reading editorials and comments on this flag, one such thing as a dirty flour sack and such other comments, I am convinced even more that there is no one flag that will satisfy everybody. I am quite happy and proud to support the design that the Flag Committee has presented to this House. I have given much thought to a symbol which would represent the Island and the Mainland part of our Province, one single symbol and I thought maybe the Pitcher Plant but the people in Labrador seemed to be more persuasive to a spruce tree or spruce twig so if you wanted one you had two. The Newfoundland dog some people suggested. If you want a Newfoundland dog in it maybe they would want a Labrador retriever, an Irishman might want an Irish setter and someone else might want something else. You cannot put in a flag pictures. It was not suitable to have pictures on the flag. When you look at the flags of the other provinces of Canada, as the hon. member from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) said, the distinctive flags from Canada, the distinctive flags that stand out when you look at them and you know who owns this flag; the flag for Quebec, certainly, you can pick it out anywhere, and the flag from Nova Scotia, which is a geometric type flag, also can be recognized quite easily. But when you see flags, some of them have floral or picturesque designs of trees out

MR. R. AYLWARD: in a meadow and some of them have all wavy lines and yellow sunrises and sunsets and that, it is not as easy to say that it belongs to a specific province. And if we tried to clutter up our flag with individual symbols, coats of arms or crests or any of these things, and if the Union Jack was in the corner, in my mind, that would take away from its distinctiveness because immediately you have Ontario and Manitoba with the Union Jack in the corner. If you put a Union Jack in the corner with our crest on it, certainly it would be distinctive if you were looking at it close but if you put that up a flagpole nobody knows which crest it is, it could be Manitoba's or Ontario's or any provincial crest. So that in itself would not make it distinctive. A lot of the feeling that I got when we were travelling around the Province and a lot of the people, not the ones that would be recorded in our letters and gave us the briefs or the presentations, a lot of the people- When we were in Goose Bay there was a full gymnasium- or a cafeteria we were in, it was completely blocked. Now, there were only four or five presentations actually given in Goose Bay but after the meeting when you talked to people and at our various meetings, they were concerned that we wanted a distinctive flag, something that we could say was our own distinctive flag. There was such great feeling and a lot of emotion and love shown for the Union Jack, and nobody on our committee wished to show any disrespect to the Union Jack, we considered that we were elevating the Union Jack or putting the Union Jack back in its proper place as the flag of the Commonwealth not as the flag of our Province. Rather than degrade the Union Jack we figured that we were putting the Union Jack in its proper place as the flag of the Commonwealth.



MR. R. AYLWARD: Because I was secretary of the committee, and some people might be wondering if some of the statistical information we have - one thing that I would like to point out in the submissions that we did get - talk about trying to find a flag to satisfy all of the population or the majority of the population - quite a few, almost half of our flags sent in by individuals had more than one design so one person could not decide amongst himself which one he would rather. So there was people here - some sent in four, three, two - one person sent in - I believe there was seventeen or twenty-three or something. So all the submissions we are getting, if some people who are submitting them could not make up their minds in their own mind for one distinctive flag, it certainly is hard to pick a flag. We had about 300 individuals make actual presentations to our committee, some 68 oral presentations in our meetings and 130, 140 individuals. But out of these 300 people a lot of the submissions were ideas they were not actually designs, people came up with an idea. Some people said to us, "We would like to see the union jack represented somehow". Other people said to us "We would like a distinctive flag." A lot of people said to us "We do not care what the design is as long as we can associate with it and it is distinctive and it will be our own flag". Now, of all the thought that I have given a flag since December - and I have been interested in flags, and a distinctive flag, ever since this first proposal by the former government, or by the Moores' government, the hon. Minister of Tourism at the time presented it, I would have supported this flag, or this one, because it is our own flag, something we can identify with. I have been interested for quite a while in trying to get some flag for our Province that would be distinctive. People, I guess, would be very interested in the cost. I would imagine there have been comments already of the squandering of public funds and the waste of money. I would say that I recall one hon. member. I think he put it in the vicinity of \$50,000 to \$70,000 that this flag would cost. The total cost of the flag, including the use of available government services which would

MR. R. AYLWARD: mean helicopter costs for helicopters that were paid for anyway, if we had used them or not, under contract and for the government air service. The complete absolute cost that is made up, and it is not - this is even more than the actual cost because some hon. members on the Committee have not made out their expense account yet. We had given them an expense account of \$500.00. And I have heard from one hon. member that he did not spend up to \$500.00 on it, so it would be a little less than this \$22,133.51, including helicopter, air fares, hotel, board and lodging, expenses, car rental, everything. The actual cost, excluding government air services, helicopter time that was already contracted and paid for, was \$10,690.51. That is not a waste of a big lot of money. I am certain there is no other committee that could travel this Province as much as we did and spend any less money. We were very aware of our budget and tried our very best to keep within it and below it. I understand that one of the television companies down in the United States when they prepared - they had a logo prepared within a year or so to get a logo that looked very good and it would have been very nice because of the N in it, it might have suited a flag for us even. But the N.B.C. spent I think it was \$1 million dollars or something like that on a logo.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. R. AYLWARD: Well, we were paying taxes and they wrote it off against taxes I guess.

MR. AYLWARD: Some people are concerned about the fact that they have seen that this is being rushed through, rushed unnecessarily fast. But, as I pointed out, in 1974 - this has been going on ever since - and there are members of the Newfoundland Flag Society who have been pushing and pushing and pushing for a flag - they had their own design in mind - but they have been pushing for ten years to have flag legislation introduced in the House, and they, certainly, I do not think, would say it is being rushed through.

Some of the criticism that I hear of our design, or the reasons that we picked this specific design, through Open Lines and through people who phoned me and talked to me, people asked us why did we pick Christopher Pratt to do the final design, why did we not take one of the designs that were submitted to the Committee? There was no one design that stuck out, maybe, or that came forward strong enough to say that this was the flag. We got all of the information we had, had meetings with Mr. Pratt, gave him everything we had, and asked him to look at it and get an interpretation of what the people are trying to tell us. He looked at it all and he came up with this design. Now, if we had not gone on these meetings, and Mr. Pratt told me, I asked him point-blank, if we had not given him the information that we collected from the meetings, would he give us a design like this, and he said it would not be any way like this design. This is the design of what we have from submissions from our meetings, an interpretation of what the submissions were. A lot of the people who are complaining about the design never bothered to come to a meeting, never sent us a letter, a proposal, an idea, most of the people who are complaining. Members of this House were quite confident that the Committee was going to represent their views, although they spoke to us privately. There was one member not on the Flag Committee, the member from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), who travelled with us in his district. He gave us some of his ideas. There was one other MHA who actually gave us a written proposal, the member for Port de Grave (Mr. R. Collins), and there was one member of the House who attended one of our public meetings.

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: Oh, sorry, there were two, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) also. The member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) attended one of our meetings. Maybe if we had gone to each individual person in the Province and asked each one to give us a design and not decide until they did give us a design, it would be obvious that we would never have a flag. If we started with the 600,000 in the Province and then started eliminating them, ask one person did they like this - and no - so we could get ten or twelve to agree on this one or we could get ten or twelve to agree on that one - never would there be a flag. I would suggest that there is not a specific flag, there is no design that can keep people from complaining or people from making a loud noise. I go back to, again, the Maple Leaf flag, the Canadian flag, there were many criticisms of it, many petitions sent in and, as far as I can see now, all of these people who complained about the flag or most of the large organizations, they fly it, they love it, they feel as attached to it as anyone. But the fact that you put a new design before anyone, before it is understood and before it is explained and before there is an affection towards it, before it is recognizable, people cannot associate with it, maybe, so they do not understand, they do not support it right off the bat.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned that he did not like the stipulation in our agreement with Christopher Pratt that we do not change his design. He suggested that he felt that the design should be open to change when it comes to the House. The Flag Committee's mandate or proposal or terms of reference were to come and present a flag to this House, and

MR. AYLWARD:

we have presented a flag. We were not asked to present ten flags or twenty flags or 120 flags. So we presented one flag as was requested. As for the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson), he also suggested that -

MR. MARSHALL:

Would the hon. member move the adjournment?

MR. AYLWARD:

Oh, I did not think - okay, I move for adjournment.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

- I would like to advise the House that tomorrow, no tonight, I am sorry, at seven-thirty the Resource Committee will meet in the Colonial Building and the estimates under consideration are Forestry, Resources and Lands.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday at three of the clock.