

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
TUESDAY, MAY 13, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of hon. members to welcome to the galleries today a delegation from the town of Grand Falls, in the district of Grand Falls, consisting of the Deputy Mayor, Paul Hennessey, and Councillor Tom Arkley and the Town Manager, Wilf Maloney. I trust their visit will be fruitful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn). In view of the publication of Statistics Canada monthly report relating to employment throughout Canada or unemployment, I wonder if the minister could give to the House some breakdown in terms of the employment sector-wise in Newfoundland. In other words, what is the level of employment, the numbers of people employed in the fisheries, forestry and the like?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have received the statistics from Statistics Canada; unfortunately, this morning I was only in my office for about five minutes. I was into some serious negotiations, plus reviewing some legislation and have not had a chance to do a complete review on the statistics that are available. I will have that done and inform the hon. House probably tomorrow.

MR. T. LUSH:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to know that the minister did not have that information for us today in view of the

MR. T. LUSH: fact that a lot of people follow these statistics and certainly one would have thought the minister would have come prepared to give us that information. But, nevertheless, this was an excellent year in terms of reducing the unemployment in so much as that the labour force only grew by 1,000, and that is certainly unusual because normally the labour force will grow between 5,000 and 8,000. I think it has done that over a number of years. So by virtue of the fact that it just grew by 1,000 this year, I wonder if the minister could explain the reason for the, if you will, lack of growth in the labour force?

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, to say that the labour force only grew by 1,000 is to say something that is not quite accurate. On a month to month basis, from April to April, it is true to say that the labour force grew by only 1,000 this year. The fact of the matter is that there are fish plants open, there are things that, for example, the labour force last month improved quite substantially and, on a month to month basis while it may be true that the labour force increased by only 1,000, the actual figures for 1978, month to month -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. J. DINN: The hon. members cannot wait for all this. I heard the hon. member on the media this morning saying about the sluggish economy. The only thing that is sluggish in this Province is the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. DINN: Everything else seems to be moving, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lies, lies!

MR. DINN: The fact of the matter is that -

AN HON. MEMBER: They have lost (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms): Order, please.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are down (inaudible).

MR. J. DINN: Sluggish and falling down, yes. The fact of the matter is that from a month to month basis, April to April

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. DINN: - 1979 versus 1980, we had a one thousand increase in the labour force. And the fact of the matter is that employment wise, from April '79 to April '80, we had six thousand more people employed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. DINN: Now, that is the kind of figure that we have to look at. We should also have a look at the participation rate that is going up. The participation rate has gone from 49.6 to 50.5 from March to April. Over the year the participation rate has gone up one percentage point. So the fact of the matter is we have increased in jobs, month to month, April last year to April this year, by 6000 jobs. I think that is quite an improvement, and not only that, but I think that that will continue and hon. members should also note that last month the increase in employment was well over what it was last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. DINN: Our employment rate increased.

MR. J. DINN: The unemployment last month went from 20.1 to 15.7 and that was a drastic increase and it was attributed to things that are going on over and above what normally would happen. The Linerboard mill, the new newsprint mill in Corner Brook, the fisheries, the plants that are open -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please.

MR. J. DINN: -over and above what they would normally be open, the fish plants on the Northeast coast, in St. Anthony and on the St. Barbe coast, and this trend will continue. Now, I told the hon. member last month when he asked me the same question that I did not think that we would increase by five per cent every month. But the fact of the matter is, year over year, month over month, from last year to this year, we are still better than last year. We are better by quite a percentage -

MR. THOMS: We will soon have to bring them in (inaudible)

MR. J. DINN: - we got six thousand more jobs and the hon. member should be, I think, looking at comparing apples with apples.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. T. LUSH: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, we are certainly pleased that the unemployment rate is down, no question about that, but certainly one has to look into and study the ramifications and when one understands that the labour force only grew by 1,000 and we created

MR. T. LUSH: 6,000 jobs, which is a normal growth rate, and in view of the fact that the Premier just about a year ago in an election promised 40,500 jobs over the next five years, and in view of the fact when one studies the results or the reports from Statistic Canada today we find out that there is no increase at all in the primary industries, none at all, whereas again the Premier announced the jobs that were going to be in each sector - 6,000 in the forestry, for example; so many thousand in this and so many thousand in that - the question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is how close is the government to realizing that objective of 40,500 jobs over the five year period as promised by the Premier? We are already a year into that now and there have not been 8,000 jobs created, which would have to be created in a year, so are we now going to start seeing more jobs - 10,000 - to realize this objective of 40,500 jobs when none have been created in the primary sector?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is obviously confused -

MR. F. STAGG: Still.

MR. J. DINN: -still. At this point in time last year, our unemployment rate was 18.2 per cent; this year it is 15.6. We had an improvement. We had 6,000 jobs created year over year, including the number of people that the labour force increased of 1,000, we have created 6,000 new jobs. Now they are not new jobs with respect to - they are not jobs building new fences around cemeteries. They are new jobs in primary and secondary industry and the labour force, particularly in the fishery has increased, as I have indicated before, and I will do a complete analysis between now and tomorrow and present a report to the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). Yesterday the minister tabled a contract between Labrador Linerboard and Schurfeld in Hamburg, Germany, and in tabling this document the minister said that the company, who were under contract to market Labrador linerboard, the company refused to pay the government \$2.7 million that has been in a bank account in Hamburg, Germany, belonging to the people of this Province for several years. Now what I want to ask the minister is why is this money being withheld by Schurfeld when they marketed the linerboard, they put the money in a bank account that belonged to Labrador Linerboard, the people of this Province, because Labrador Linerboard was a Crown company, why is the money being withheld and what steps because the minister left the impression that the government had taken steps to recover, to get this money brought to Newfoundland where it rightfully belongs - what steps have the government taken to try to get this money in the Newfoundland Exchequer Account?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the reason that the company has not paid it- obviously it will be the company itself that would be in the best position to answer that - but the only answer I can give is that the company disputes that that amount is owing. That is in fact what the company disputes, I am not defending the company. The company disputes that the amount is owing.

There have been negotiations with respect to that dispute, as I said yesterday, which so far have not resulted in the company's agreement to pay the amount. One further attempt at negotiation is to be made, and if that is not successful then obviously the government will have to pursue the arbitration route which is indicated in the contract or recourse to the courts.

I do not know that I can say a great deal more than that, because if the matter is going to be subject to further negotiation and then possibly to arbitration and/or determination by the court, then obviously I do not wish to say anything which would prejudice the government's position during those particular proceedings.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

I was quite right in my assumption, when the hon. gentleman was interviewed on television last night, that neither the interviewer nor the hon. gentleman knew what they were talking about, and now I am more convinced of that than ever. This money was collected for linerboard that was sold by a company that was under contract to Labrador Linerboard, a Crown company, and that money should have been put into the account of Labrador Linerboard several years ago.

Now let me ask the hon. gentleman this - the dispute is not the fact that they do not owe the money, that is not the



MR. NEARY: dispute at all, they know they owe the money. Let me ask the hon. gentleman this; when did the government take the steps that the hon. gentleman is talking about to try to get this company to put the money in the public treasury of this Province where it rightfully belongs? When did the government start their move? When did they take steps to try to get this money brought from Hamburg, Germany, in a bank over there, to the Newfoundland Exchequer Account? Could the hon. gentleman tell me that?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, originally, of course, the money was owed to Labrador Linerboard, and it was Labrador Linerboard and its solicitors which made those attempts. I know that they were made. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the date or the specific day, but originally, of course, the money was owed to Labrador Linerboard and the dispute was between Labrador Linerboard and the company in West Germany. Now that Labrador Linerboard is now longer in operation, then it is the Crown which has taken over, and it is now that the Crown is directly involved with the matter.

With respect to the period during which Labrador Linerboard was in operation and the money owed directly to them, all I know is that they and their solicitors made attempts to get the money over and carried on some negotiation which did not result in the desired result.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The situation now, of course, with Labrador Linerboard no longer in operation, is that it is the Province directly which wishes to have the money paid to it and now it is the Province directly which will make one further attempt at negotiation, and, if that is not successful, followed by the procedures which I mentioned a few minutes ago.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister talks about Labrador Linerboard, Sir, as if it was some private company when in actual fact it was a company owned by the people of this Province. It was set up by the government of which the hon. gentleman is a member. It was the people's company so you cannot separate the two, government and Labrador Linerboard. But what I want to ask the hon. gentleman, this contract is a ten year contract dating back to May 1975 and in this contract is an arbitration clause. If a dispute arose with Schurfeld, why did not Labrador Linerboard or the Newfoundland government call into play the arbitration clause of this agreement in the last five years? Why did they wait until today? I know the reason why the hon. gentleman waited until today, because the government did not know - It is \$2.9 million, by the way, according to the Auditor's Report that I read on Labrador Linerboard, not \$2.7 million, \$2.9 million over there.

MR. BARRY: Is the hon. member asking a question or giving an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The government did not know about it until I brought it to their attention. Why was not the arbitration clause of this agreement used before to try and get that \$2.9 million brought to Newfoundland for the benefit of the people of this Province where it rightfully belongs?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

In answer to the self-appointed attorney general, arbitrator and judge in this matter, I would point out that yesterday I stated \$2.7 million approximately, approximately \$2.7 million. The exact amount is indeed the matter which is specifically in dispute, or one of the matters which are specifically in dispute, so I certainly, after having said approximately \$2.7 million and having given the hon. gentleman all of the information with respect to the matter, take offence at his saying that it is \$2.9 and it is not \$2.7. Maybe it is \$2.8, maybe it is \$3, maybe it is \$2.6 or \$2.5. We would not need to negotiate, we would not need an arbitrator, we would not need a court if the hon member were going to settle it himself, but he is not in a position to so do. So I really do not know that there is anything further that I can add to the matter rather than what I already said. Why Labrador Linerboard mill five years ago, or four years ago, or three and a half years ago, or whatever number of years ago pursued the matter the way they did is a matter that certainly I cannot answer for. I was not Minister of Justice, I was not in the Cabinet and obviously I had nothing actually to do with Labrador Linerboard mill at all during that period of time. All I can say is that now we are taking measures to have the money recovered. The hon. member says why not go to arbitration right away. Well, obviously if the matter can be settled by negotiation, then that is the way to do it. If it cannot be settled by negotiation, then obviously we shall go by the way of arbitration.

MR. NEARY:

There is nothing to negotiate. The money is there.

May 13, 1980

Tape No. 1485

SD - 1

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition

MR. S. NEARY:

There is nothing to negotiate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier. It is really a follow-on in a sense to the exchange between the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) and my colleague, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush).

The news over the past twenty-four hours or so, and it has been building for some considerable time, with regard to the very, very severe cutbacks in the automobile industry - and I was advised today that in the steel industry in the United States, on this single day some 16,000 steelworkers are being laid off - I wonder if the intelligence of the Premier, and I do not mean that in terms of his cerebral qualities but the information available to him, is such that he can indicate if and when this is likely to have an impact on particularly the Labrador mining operations, or perhaps some other mining operations in the Province as well?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any specific information available at the present moment to indicate that the lay-offs in the United States will have any effect upon the iron ore mines in Labrador. We are monitoring the situation and I am aware of the information the same way as the Leader of the Opposition is as it relates to the cutbacks in the car industry and the automotive industry in the United States and Canada and the steel industry. It is difficult to say whether it is a momentary thing or whether it is long term. One also has to look at the European situation and the Japanese situation, where we have some markets established or where companies who are doing work in this Province have some markets, so it is difficult to say right now and I do not have any particular, specific information to indicate that our markets are in any way jeopardized. But obviously we will have to monitor it very closely to see whether in fact it might have some effect down the road.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)  
of the Opposition.

Supplementary, the hon. the Leader

MR. D. JAMIESON:

I would like to refer the Premier to the document that was tabled simultaneously with the budget called, as I recall, Outlook '80 and while I am quoting from memory I believe my recollections are accurate, namely, that the assessment of what the iron ore sector was going to be doing in 1980 was very much dependent on the United States steel market because I believe that is where the bulk of it goes.

I am wondering if this information is not at the fingertips of the government now. I believe it to be of sufficient importance and seriousness that it is worth something by way of a very special kind of inquiry to determine what is happening, because private information reaching me, and I do not want to attribute it obviously to anyone in particular, is that in fact if this downturn continues for even a comparatively short period of time, that stockpiling will have to begin and lay-offs and the like may very well be in the near future in terms of the output. And that, of course, would have, as I am sure the Premier would agree, an overall impact on the general economy and the forecasts made at budget time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, I agree with everything that the Leader of the Opposition said, Mr. Speaker, and obviously the government and the ministry are monitoring the situation as closely as we can and keeping in touch with the respective companies. We are also very concerned,

PREMIER PECKFORD: as I mentioned to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) last week, and a number of the ministers have on various occasions over the last week mentioned it as well, in talking about the economic performance of the Province over the next couple of months or over the next year or two, we continue to voice our concerns both in response to questions asked opposite and just publicly, generally about the continuing problem that we are having in signing very substantial DREE agreements which have to do with resource development, and which in the long term that money of course will be recovered by the respective jurisdictions, federally and provincially. So as we zero in on one particular industry, which is the steel industry and the impact it might have on the Newfoundland economy, and which we will monitor and try to keep this House up-to-date on, and the people of this Province up-to-date on, we would also be remiss if we did not at the same time highlight again the serious situation that we are facing as it relates to the forest industry in particular, as it relates to ongoing fisheries development and transportation development in Labrador and the Province, as it results from DREE agreements for which we have our share of the money.

MR. JAMIESON: A final supplementary.

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

MR. JAMIESON: I do not want to say that that is mixing apples and oranges; I can only say this, that the information I have with regard to the DREE agreement is that in large measures it is unfortunate but true that I gather that there was a lengthy freeze imposed and it is only now that these funds are starting to be sprung loose. But that is a different issue. I would assume that the Premier was counting upon these DREE agreements to supplement what was said in the Outlook '80' document as being in effect full time employment in the iron ore industry. In other words, I do not imagine that he would be content to say, "Well, we are going to have lay-offs in the iron ore industry and DREE is in effect going to pick

MR. JAMIESON: up the slack." Because we are back to this business of how we continue to increase jobs. I do urge him, in the form of a question, to ask him whether or not it would be possible for him to make immediate enquiries because I again repeat my point that this matter is extremely serious. I was speaking only last night to some industrialists who advised me that this decline in the automobile industry, and the impact as far as steel is concerned, is going to have a ripple effect throughout the entire economy, and particularly primary producers. So all I am simply asking at the moment is can we get an update because clearly what looks to be the figure in the Outlook '80 document certainly I suggest probably will have to be revised.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition's questions - we are speaking to industrialists every day and we are enquiring every day of the industries in the Province to see whether there is any change, meeting every day with people who are intimately either involved now, want to be involved in the industrial and economic life of the Province, and we will continue to monitor it and if we see any problems we will highlight them and inform this hon. House and inform the Leader of the Opposition. The extent of the recession in the United States as it affects

PREMIER PECKFORD: the automobile industry as it affects the steel industry, is not clearly known and I may remind the Leader of the Opposition that I have had a number of very, very expert analyses done by people around the world as it relates to the economic projections over a three to six month period of the Canadian economy, the Newfoundland economy and the American economy, and may I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition, which would be no surprise to him or to anybody else, that one group of experts said one thing and another group of equally reputable experts said exactly the opposite, and neither one were right.

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education (L. Verge) and it is with respect to the seats available at vocational schools for offshore development related jobs. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, and the minister can tell me whether I am right or wrong, that most of those seats have been taken up by Canada Manpower, which could mean that since Canada Manpower requires that students be out of school for a year before they go under the Canada Manpower program, that no grade eleven student graduating this year could get into an offshore oil and gas related job this year?

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

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, depending on the course or program offered at any one of the Province's fifteen vocational schools, there are seats bought or purchased by the Federal Government through Canada Employment, which, as the hon. member indicated, are given to only those people who have been out of high school for more than a year. There are, however, other seats which are available to students coming directly out of high school. I cannot be any more specific than that off the top of my head, but if the hon. member would like to inquire about any particular course at any -

MR. HISCOCK: Get to know your department, my dear.



MS. L. VERGE: - particular school, I would be happy to provide the information tomorrow.

MR. F. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. WHITE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am told by a couple of guidance counsellors in my district that they have been trying to get a great number of grade eleven students into various courses and one in particular, marine steel work, is all bought up by the Federal Government, so I am wondering if the minister could look into this matter. You know, in all due respect, Mr. Speaker, the minister should already know about those things when we are dealing with a major project like offshore oil and gas.

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

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to check on that particular course. I would remind the hon. member that there are a multitude of course which are now being offered in the many schools in the Province, others which are under consideration and in the planning stages for next year and subsequent years, and unless he is more specific I cannot rattle numbers off the top of my head but I will be quite happy to get that information for him tomorrow.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell us whether or not she has received a request from the Lewisporte area Development Association to try and establish offshore oil related courses at the Lewisporte District Vocational School, and whether she plans to follow up on that?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, that particular request has not come to my personal attention. I can check with the officials of the department to see if it has been received by them and I can again provide that information to the hon. member tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: My question is also to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) with regard to the French language programme question yesterday that we brought into the House and the minister passed it on to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). This programme itself where we get \$300,000 from the Federal Government and \$120,000 is being used by this government and the other money is going into general treasury, whether it is being used in recreation, sports, highways, studies or whatever but still it is being used, I would like to give the minister some background information with regard to this programme that we have instituted at Memorial University -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member should ask his question with very little preamble.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Okay. Then the question I want to ask is with the N.T.A. and the various teachers throughout this Province who have taken use of this programme and gone to Memorial and then on to St. Pierre and then on to University of Laval, and we have people over in France studying instead of always being in the situation that we have to bring in people and train our people, here is a programme funded by the Federal Government to send our own people away and then bring them back, with regard to the

MR. E. HISCOCK: N.T.A. and with regard to the -  
pressure that is being put on by parents, and I notice the  
minister made a press release today of funding the N.T.A. -  
the Parent - Teachers Association -

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!  
Has the hon. member a question  
to ask because -

MR. E. HISCOCK: Yes, I have a question to ask.

MR. SPEAKER: - you have about twenty seconds  
to do it and get an answer.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Well, that is why I am doing it  
because I know I have twenty seconds. My question to the  
minister is is the minister re-considering of taking this  
money out of general revenue and putting it into it? If not,  
the minister has stated that the Federal Government is going  
to wind down this programme in five years. Will this pro-  
gramme now be wound down this year?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The time for Oral Questions has  
expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal  
with a question raised yesterday by the hon. member for Port  
au Port (Mr. Hodder) on the subject -

MR. J. HODDER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon.  
member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER:

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that when a member asks a question of the minister, the minister gives an answer. If the minister takes it under advisement, then she can bring it up in this particular forum. But in this case, the questions I asked yesterday the minister answered and did not in any way say that she would be

May 13, 1980

Tape No. 1489

AH-1

MR. HODDER:  
information back to the House.

raising it or would be bringing further

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please! To that point of order.

The hon. member for Lapolle.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the Answers to Questions, when Your Honour asks for Answers to Questions, these are, generally speaking, questions that are placed on the Order Paper, questions that are asked in writing. Now yesterday my hon. friend asked some questions of the Minister of Education (Ms Verge). My hon. friend has a procedure that he can use in the event that he is dissatisfied with the answers, but the minister did give the answers and now, then, what the minister is asking for is a second crack at it, a second bite at the apple because the hon. minister feels she did not give satisfactory answers or she made a bit of a fool of herself yesterday and so she wants a second crack at it and I think that is an abuse of the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
to the point of order?

Anybody else wish to address himself

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this is a little bit ridiculous. The hon. gentleman raised a question yesterday that the hon. minister did not answer in its entirety and she now wishes, under Answers to Questions For Which Notice Has Been Given, to give a response. Now if the hon. gentlemen are truly interested in getting the information and the answer to questions which they raise, they will not raise spurious and foolish points of order like this. Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order in respect to this. The question was raised and the hon. minister is now elaborating on her answer and, if memory serves me correct, I believe yesterday she did indicate in the course of her answer that

MR. MARSHALL: there were certain points that she wished to give further information on. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is the question was first posed and it is certainly in order for the hon. minister to give an answer.

MR. ROBERTS: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final submission on the point of order. The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to say first of all that the contribution by the House Leader really is of no value in that all he did was say the point of order was spurious, but neglected - and I leave Your Honour to draw the reason why my learned friend neglected to cite any of the authorities he had open, I would suggest the reason was that of course the authorities go counter to the point he was attempting to make. Sir, I think the matter is summed up quite simply by the order which is established by our Standing Orders which says Answers To Questions For Which Notice Has Been Given. These are the words Your Honour reads. Now, Sir, yesterday a question was asked in the Oral Question Period, the minister made an answer. That is normally where the matter ends.

MR. E. ROBERTS: There are two other steps which are possible within our procedure: One is the minister may make a Ministerial Statement, to which a response may be made in keeping with the rules of the House. If the minister feels it incumbent either to correct the answer she has given or to add to the information which she has given, the appropriate way to do it, I would suggest, is in a Ministerial Statement. Or alternately, if a minister chooses not to answer a question, he or she may simply take it as notice, at which stage this is the time at which it is given. But, Sir, it is not appropriate to do what the minister, unwittingly and inadvertently, I would suggest, is trying to do, which is to get up today and have a second bite at a question. That is not permitted under our rules, Sir, and certainly not under this particular heading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

With respect to the point of order raised, obviously the Chair would have great difficulty in remembering every question that was asked the day before or from a prior day. So I am assuming that the minister, in rising under this particular part of the proceedings, is responding in the appropriate way. She has answers to a question for which notice has been given. I have no idea what transpired yesterday, whether or not there was notice. So with respect to the Standing Orders, replies can be given if they have been taken as notice as well as oral questions as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) mentioned in his comments. I will allow the hon. minister to respond, and then I will have to check Hansard later on.

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) asked me whether any of the bilingual programmes, which have in the past been funded by money from the federal government, will be reduced or changed next year. I indicated that I did not have the information off the top of my head, that I would answer today, and I am rather surprised at the response today of the hon. member and his colleagues since it appeared that he, and indeed his colleague -

MR. E. HISCOCK:  
a question (Inaudible)

That is not what I mean. When I ask

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

MS. L. VERGE:

- for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) were interested in getting this information. I will say now simply that this question of bilingual programmes is under review and I am unable to say with certainty whether any of the programmes will be affected next year or indeed which ones and to what extent. When this becomes certain, I will supply the information in the form of a Ministerial Statement.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

I have a petition to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) but seeing he is not here I will address it to the Premier who is in the chair of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

My petition is with regard to the road from Lodge Bay to Mary's Harbour on the South Coast of Labrador. The Premier has referred to it, and through experience in social work down there, he has referred to it as a twilight zone. This is a community of about 100 people who in the Spring all move out to Cape Charles. Before they were serviced for oil by the CN Coastal Marine, by Labrador Airways and also by Woodward. As of now, none of these services are provided and they have to go, in the Winter, six miles on skidoo to Mary's Harbour to get their mail. They have to go six miles on skidoo to go to the health clinic in Mary's Harbour. They have to go six miles on skidoo to get supplies in the stores and whatever. And also in the Spring and in the Fall and Summer they have to go by boat. The students themselves after Grade IX have to live in Mary's Harbour and here they are only six miles away. They are not asking for pavement. They are asking for a gravel road. They are not asking for a standard gravel road, but just something



MR. E. HISCOCK: that they can get by on. This petition has been presented for the past seventeen years. Under this PC administration, four ministers of Transportation and Communications have had it come across their desk and they were the former members - Mr. Maynard, Mr. Doody, Mr. Morgan and now Mr. Brett. Seventeen years they have been trying to get this road and the main excuse is that it costs too much to demobilize the equipment, put it on CN and bring it in and mobilize it. Now there is an airstrip being built in Mary's Harbour by Pentagon Construction and the people feel that saving the taxpayers money through government, Canadian and Federal, and particularly the roads, a provincial responsibility, and I hope the Premier will get up and turn around and say yes, it is under Dree, it is under the Coast of Labrador Dree Agreement. We should be very lucky we have the Federal Government because basically there would be nothing done down in Labrador. So I ask this House to support this petition for a road from Lodge Bay to Mary's Harbour.

MR. HISCOCK: I am a little bit upset from time to time when I speak on areas of Labrador and because of the press wanting to cover the St. John's Municipal Council or some other areas, we do not get very much -

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - press in the area.

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

The hon. member's comments should relate to the prayer of the petition.

MR. HISCOCK: So the prayer of the petition is basically that a road be built from Lodge Bay to Mary's Harbour to provide transportation and also, basically, to give them the proper services that they are entitled to in this Province. I ask the Premier to respond to this.

MR. SPEAKER: Further petitions?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to speak on the petition presented by my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). I gather that no minister wishes to speak, or nobody on the other side; it is not confined to ministers.

MR. NEARY: They are not interested in Labrador.

MR. ROBERTS: I think that is the moral that one would draw from it, they are not interested at all in the Labrador and I regret that. Because if there is any part of this Province that is most deserving of the kind of facility, kind of public service requested by this petition, it is this particular part of the Labrador portion of this Province, and I say that even though there are crying needs in my own constituency and

MR. ROBERTS: in many others throughout the Island portion of the Province. But I do not think there is any part of this Province, to my knowledge, and it is as extensive, I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, as that of most members of this House, there is no part of this Province that is as neglected, no part of this Province that is as needy of this kind of public service.

The mere fact that in 1980 the people in the community are petitioning for the construction of a road, not the more usual petition we see in this House for the upgrading or the paving of a road, or the twinning of a road, or the building of a new road, but rather for the building of any road, a road.

Now, I was not in the House during the Question Period yesterday, but apparently the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) got off a very cheap shot against Bill Rompkey in Ottawa. I am not allowed to debate and so I will not, but let me say quite simply that the construction of this road is not the responsibility of the Government of Canada; the construction of this road is the responsibility of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and if we can get help from the Government of Canada through the DREE programme, well and good. But we are quite ready in this Province, and I fully support our being quite ready, to put forth our constitutional requests and to say we want more power, we want more of the ability to maintain, to regulate the fisheries and what have you and that is fine, but, Mr. Speaker, before we are too quick to seize too much more power from the totality of governmental power in Canada, let us do that which is already clearly within our responsibility and that includes building a road

MR. ROBERTS: where a road needs to be built. And, Sir, if ever there was a place where a road needs to be built in this Province, it is a road along the Eastern coast of Labrador, or the Eastern shore of Labrador, and particularly the one that is asked for in this petition, the one that hooks up Lodge Bay to Mary's Harbour and the one which we saw in the petition one day last week, I believe between Mary's Harbour and Port Hope Simpson, the next community up the coast.

It is something that ought to be done, Sir, and if the government really have any concern at all - we hear a lot of words about Labrador, we hear a lot of words, that the Premier once slept there. Like George Washington the Premier seems to have slept everywhere. Well, if the Premier once slept there and did his work there, all I say, Mr. Speaker, is let us see some action to follow upon those pious platitudes, let us turn those platitudes into reality, let us see the road built and see it started this year, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Second reading of a bill entitled, "An Act To Adopt A Flag For The Province".

The hon. the member for  
Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I got up at fourteen minutes to six yesterday, which is not the most inspiring time to get up to speak, but when I did get up to speak to this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, I was subjected to a number of interjections, interruptions, catcalls, giggling, laughter and outright hysteria, Mr. Speaker, and although I found it personally irritating, I thought it was rather an insult to the

MR. F.B. ROWE: people whom I have the honour to represent, I thought it was a teeny bit disrespectful of the House and degrading to the debate under discussion here at the present time, and, although I cannot tell the Speaker what to do, I would hope that I could request that I have the protection of the Chair in the remaining fourteen or fifteen minutes that I have left.

Mr. Speaker, I had personally hoped that I would be able to get up in this House and support a provincial flag when it was brought before the House. However, Sir, when it was brought before the House I personally found the flag

May 13, 1980

Tape No. 1492

NM - 1

MR. F. ROWE: quite mind baffling, quite confusing, too symbolic, confusingly symbolic, too abstract, and for some peculiar reason really distasteful, and I was wondering how in fact my constituents would react if I came -

MR. STAGG: Tell us how you are going to vote.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: - I already said how I was going to vote - how my constituents would react, and other people would react if I had to get up and personally say that I was not going to vote for this particular flag.

Since that time my anxieties are somewhat reduced because I have had numerous phone calls, and in fact letters from my district indicating, without exception, a negative reaction to the particular design of the flag, with all due respect to the artist concerned and the members serving on the Committee. The people in my district, who have made representation to me in one way or the other, without exception have said that they do not like the design of the flag, they cannot see the symbolism in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I conducted a little independent survey of my own and when I conducted that survey a lot of people sort of did not care kind of an attitude, did not care, but there was no positive response to this particular flag. So if I am to represent my constituents, which I intend to do in this particular case, I cannot in all conscience vote for this particular flag.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned yesterday that the Committee had set down five conditions for themselves with respect to the design of this particular flag, and I will skip over the first four of them because they are open to interpretation, but the fifth condition, Sir, was that the flag be widely acceptable. Now, Sir, therein lies the basic and fundamental problem with the design of this flag. Because the Committee had twenty-seven hearings throughout the Province, they then had

MR. F. ROWE: a number of designs made by Mr. Pratt, and it was the unanimous consent, second time round, for this particular design. That was the second choice, a unanimous decision made by the members of the Flag Committee.

And, Sir, the fact that one of the conditions said that it had to be widely accepted presents a basic, fundamental problem here. Because there were only seven members, presumably representing the people of this Province, who had to make the decision as to whether this flag was widely acceptable or not.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, to hon. members opposite that the only way to find out whether this flag is widely acceptable to the people of this Province is to show the flag that is presented to this House, show it to the people of this Province, to find out indeed whether it is widely acceptable. Nothing from my district and nothing that I have heard through the media or from reactions from all groups of life have indicated that this flag is widely acceptable. And it is only because of the persistence of the Premier that apparently this flag is likely to go through. And we honestly do not know in this House today, Mr. Speaker, whether this flag is widely acceptable to the people of this Province, and I would go further and say that I do not think it is in fact widely acceptable to the people of this Province and therefore unless we have positive proof that it is widely acceptable we should not be voting for this particular flag.

MR. STAGG: Ask your colleagues.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I ask for the protection of the Chair, if you will, please.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! The hon. the

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): member from Trinity - Bay de Verde  
(Mr. F. Rowe) wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. HODDER: The member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) just cannot shut up.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I respect any member who votes for or against this particular flag. I have the highest respect for the Committee and for the artist. Therein lies another problem, Mr. Speaker, as one hon. member mentioned, that probably another fundamental mistake was selecting one artist; probably we could have had a number of artists.

MR. HODDER: We did.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, the hon. member can speak to that if he wishes to afterwards. An artist was selected who had a very narrow discipline within the artistic world and therefore, you know, there was a very narrow range from which the Committee had to make a selection. So I find the flag just a little bit too abstract. I do not mind symbolism but as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the symbolism has to be meaningful and we do not have meaningful symbolism in this particular flag. It is open to all kinds of interpretation and there is trouble with the interpretation, and I indicated yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that the explanatory notes that came with this flag have in fact been amended, have changed, one whole sentence has been taken out of it because even the explanatory note in this particular case was open to all kinds of different interpretation and therefore the explanatory note itself has been taken out of the latest edition of the explanatory notes; however, we are still left with the same design of the flag which can be open to all kinds of interpretation. So, Sir, I will just simply say that I find it a little bit complex as do the majority of the people whom I have spoken with in this particular instance on the flag. And I submit that, if the flag is to be meaningful, it should be simply meaningful, if it is to be symbolic it should be meaningfully symbolic, it should be simple in its symbolism which it is not and it does not reflect in any way whatsoever,



MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, that I can see, it does not reflect in any way the marine traditions, the marine history or the marine environment of this Province. In fact, I understand from people at sea that it does not fly well at sea. And it is ironic, Mr. Speaker, and I will repeat it again, it is ironic that in a Province with such a marine tradition and a marine history that this flag can not express a distress call. And I would submit that many pleasure boats, many fishing boats - not the Canadian Navy, it will not be flying the Newfoundland flag - but there will be many boats and vessels flying this particular flag and my understanding of it is that in order to show distress at sea you simply -

MR. CARTER:

Can you distinguish the Union Jack upside down?

MR. F. ROWE:

Yes, I can because the hon. -

MR. CARTER:

(Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt)

Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE:

The Union Jack, as the hon. member well knows, the white band in the top left-hand corner is wider, and the Union Jack, when it is flown upside down, is shown

MR. F. ROWE: as a distress signal. And I might add that there are sixteen nations, I understand, that have a flag that is so geometrically perfect that if the flag is flown upside down, you know, you do not know whether it is right side up or upside down. Now, you know, it is a bit ironical and almost farcical, that in a Province that is so dependent upon the sea and has such a marine tradition of history about it, that this aspect of the flag was not eliminated, it was just an oversight.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will permit a question.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: If the hon. member were really shipwrecked or in trouble at sea, surely he would want something a bit more immediate than flying any flag upside down. You could shout for help or do something.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is absolutely right, but it is the hon. members opposite who were trying to talk about the flag representing tradition, the flag representing our past, the flag representing our history and one of the greatest symbolisms, one of the greatest traditions is the very thing that I am talking about, that a flag can be inverted to show the distress call. Now, obviously we are living in the jet age, the space age and there are more rapid ways of showing distress than simply flying the flag, but it is hon. members opposite who have been talking about tradition and hon. members on this side who have been talking about tradition so you cannot, you know, have your cake and eat it too, in that particular respect.

MR. F. STAGG: Get on to your next point.

MR. SPEAKER:(Butt) Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am simply going to ask the member to be named or request that the Speaker give some consideration to naming the member because he has been persistently and consistently defying the Chair, yesterday and again today.

MR. S. NEARY:

This is not funny, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The hon. member wishes to be heard in silence. If hon. members on either side continue to interrupt him, then I will have to take more drastic measures. The hon. the member for Trinity Bay de Verde.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Name him! Name him!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. STAGG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down, boy. Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order. The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker, it is a tradition in this House that reparté back and forth across the floor is allowed and this sort of thing is certainly an honoured tradition. Now, it is not correct that an hon. member can stand up and demand that the Speaker enforce the rules for him that are allowed to be flexible or whatever for other members. So, if the Chair is directing its attention at me, I think that we have to have consistency on that throughout and there will be no reparté whatsoever in this House.

MR. S. NEARY:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, Your Honour, I believe is well aware that what the member for Stephenville (F. Stagg) did was disguise a point of order actually as a challenge to the ruling of the Chair. And I would submit, Your Honour, that that is completely unparliamentary, completely out of order and that Your Honour ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his remarks because it is indirectly a challenge to the Chair - or name the member for Stephenville.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): I would rule there is no point of order and I would ask all hon. members if they would raise the level of debate here in this House and allow the hon. gentleman to be heard in silence.

The hon. member for Trinity -  
Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, nobody was looking forward with pride more than I was to be able to stand up and support what I consider to be a flag that was representative of this particular Province, to represent the Province itself, to fly along side of it the Union Jack to represent the Commonwealth and to fly on the other side of it the Maple Leaf, to represent the nation. But I have a very strong conviction, Mr. Speaker, that somehow or other there should have been a little more symbolism shown in the flag with respect to the Union Jack. I am not submitting that the Union Jack should have been the flag; the Royal Canadian Legion is not asking to have the Union Jack as the provincial flag.

But, Mr. Speaker, even the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) indicated that he found the design of the flag to be personally a bit discomforting, I believe a personal discomfort to him, he did not like it, a personal discomfort. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that some years ago when I was first prescribed castor oil, I found the same personal discomfort and I am afraid here what we have is a situation where the Premier of this Province is prescribing the same kind of personal discomfort on the people of Newfoundland without allowing them to express their opinions and put this design to the proper acid test. I go back to my original fundamental point about the fundamental problem that we have here, that the flag has to be widely acceptable and, in order

MR. F. ROWE: to find out whether the flag is widely acceptable, we have to put it to the acid test and the only acid test is to now show that flag widely throughout the Province, get substantial feedback from the people of this Province with respect to the flag. If it is widely acceptable that condition would have been fulfilled and we could accept the flag.

But at the present time, Mr. Speaker, we have no idea in the world whether this particular flag is widely acceptable or not. And all of the feedback that I have had so far, Mr. Speaker, has been unfortunately negative. And personally I find the design of the flag to be displeasing and I would have liked to have seen a flag wherein I could appreciate the simplicity and the symbolism to a greater extent. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have to, in all conscience, vote against this particular design. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak very long. I just want to make a few penetrating, intelligent, cogent, apropos remarks on this debate which will put the whole thing in perspective.

Mr. Speaker, I should first, like so many others before me, offer my congratulations to the committee who had the responsibility for holding hearings throughout the Province and gathering together a composite of all the opinions of the people of our Province in coming forward with the design that we are debating today. I think they did an excellent job. I think the fact that both sides of the House were represented on the committee and they came to an unanimous decision about it says something about this House and I think it says something very good about this House. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that

May 13, 1980

Tape No. 1495

DW - 3

DR. J. COLLINS:

I find a little bit distressing, quite honestly, and a little bit strange that the work of the committee was not more accepted by some members. Because we have heard, especially in the last few weeks, a fair bit of comment upon the value of having Select Committees. As a matter of fact, the government has been criticized for its

DR. COLLINS: reluctance in agreeing to setting up certain select committees on subjects of importance and I find it a little bit distressing that when we set up a select committee that that mechanism then seems to not please anyone. The findings of such a mechanism are not found to fulfill the purpose for which it was set up and I find that a little strange. But nevertheless I do not myself, and I do not wish my remarks in any way to derogate the work of this particular select committee. I think it was an excellent select committee and I think the work they produced is very, very commendable.

Mr. Speaker, I was extremely pleased when I heard that the flag was going to come forward. I cannot say I am personally a great flag waver. I suppose I have put up a flag in front of my house two or three times in my life type of thing, but nevertheless I really felt that the Province needed its own flag and I was extremely pleased when government decided to initiate a flag debate. I think it was a brave thing to do because, of course, this has been suggested before and it did not come off and there might have been some hesitancy on that score to bring it forward again. But it was brought forward and I think it is an extremely good thing to have been brought forward. Now when I heard this, I tended to have a few preconceptions myself, and the preconceptions I had of the flag we should have are quite different from what the committee came up with. I do not mind saying that, and I do not think in any way that that remark is unusual. I doubt if anyone in this House actually preconceived what this flag would be after the committee had gotten through with its work. The preconception I had, quite honestly, was that we would have a much plainer type of flag, that we would perhaps have a plain background and I would have favoured, myself, just two symbols on it. I was thinking really of two triangles, just representing the two geographic areas of the Province and that would seem to me quite a good flag. Now I drew a lesson from that myself because, and I would like to reiterate that, that seemed to me an excellent flag. I was really very pleased with it. The hon. Minister of Mines and

BR COLLINS: Energy (Mr. Barry) has already mentioned this, we discussed this together and we sort of both came to the same conclusion and as a result of that we actually went to Christopher Pratt and we put it to him that would he draw that type of flag so we could see how it was. Now this is where I got my first lesson on it. He was not enthusiastic about it. He sort of said, yes, I see what you mean, I think that would be quite good, but he was not actually enthusiastic and I do not believe he ever did do it. I was a little bit surprised at that. I showed the same design to a few other people and they also, again, did not show any great enthusiasm for it. So the lesson I got out of it was that an individual can have very fixed ideas on what he himself likes but that is by no means what other people like. It by no means goes to presuppose what other people will like and I think that this is what we are seeing in this debate. We all have certain preconceived ideas about what the flag should be but they are by no means shared by many others in most cases.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like just to make a few comments on what I have heard outside about the flag. First, in my own constituency, the great and historic district of St. John's South, one of the great fishing districts of this Province and one of the earliest settled areas of this Province, well, my constituents in the numbers that have contacted me - and a great number have not contacted me, so I take from that that my constituents by and large are not riled up by any means about this flag. I think my constituents are accepting of this flag - but of the numbers that have contacted me, the majority have been in favour of the flag. I was amazed at this. Some people have taken the trouble to phone me and say, 'I want to say that I am in favour of the flag and I hope you vote for it.' Of course, I have said I will. I have made no secret that I would support this flag. I thought that that was rather remarkable because in most instances if you put something forward usually you get the negative reactions coming back. You do not very often get the positive reactions. I suppose it is the great





DR. J. COLLINS: a rather remarkable thing that people did take the trouble, and there was a majority in my instance. Now, I do not know what happens in other constituencies but in my particular case a majority of the people who contacted me said yes. Now this majority was just recent, just in the last day or so as a matter of fact, and I suspect that the debate in this House is being followed quite closely and there is this feeling that the negative response that has been so played up, shall we say, needs to be counteracted and I think this is why one's constituents are now coming forward to say, "Do not listen to all of the negativity, there is some positivity out here also."

The other matter that perhaps comes forward to my ears anyway outside is that what about the traditional emblem of Newfoundland; you know, is that at fault in this flag? Should it not have a traditional emblem of Newfoundland? And when one asks what is the traditional emblem, that is where you get the hesitation.

Now, I just made a little list of the things that - and it is not a unique list, I am sure anyone can compile it - but some people say there should be a fish on it. Now, that is only natural, we are a great fishing Province. Before we were a Province we were a great fishing nation but, on the other hand also, why not a seal? Some people, I suppose, have mentioned the seal. Certainly, I suppose, in the recent controversy over the seal hunt, Newfoundland is more equated with the seal hunt than it is the fishery in some people's views. Other people have mentioned a caribou and, of course, the caribou was the great emblem in the First World War. I suppose Newfoundlanders in the First World War did not fight so much under the Union Jack, their emblem was the caribou. They carried the caribou on their shoulder tabs and this is what was distinctive about our regiment in the First World War. If one mentions the caribou, why not the moose? There are more moose in this country than the caribou. I suppose the moose is more distinctive, if one is looking for large wildlife. It is not native, it was introduced in this country where the caribou was not, I grant that, but we are living in the present context and certainly in the present context the moose is the much more plentiful, large wildlife game.

DR. J. COLLINS: Then there is the dog - the Newfoundland dog. What can be more typical of Newfoundland? Should that not be the emblem, then? And as someone mentioned in this House a little while ago, if we are talking about a dog, why not a Labrador dog? Why confine it to the Island of Newfoundland? So you can have a couple of dogs on it, I suppose. Then there is the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Labrador retriever.

DR. J. COLLINS: Labrador retriever, or a husky, I suppose a husky would be more typical of Labrador.

Then there is the flower, the pitcher plant, that is in many respects, I suppose, more traditional than any of the others I have mentioned. More recently, then, if one wants to get into growing things, there is the branch, the branch of a tree which is on the so-called Labrador flag. Well, it is a local flag, it is not a provincial flag. It is a regional flag, the flag for Labrador, a very attractive flag, I might admit, but it is a regional flag.

Then it has been mentioned that a ship should be the traditional emblem. And I think one can justify that in many ways. We are a great fishing nation and therefore ships are part of our heritage and part of our tradition, but in addition to that, Newfoundlanders are great seamen; Newfoundlanders have ranged all over the world, I suppose. In previous days, small little ships going down to Spain or going down to the Caribbean was almost second nature to captains, to skippers who came out of small little communities, very little education, in many cases, almost no formal navigation instruction, and they would range all over the Atlantic - North and South - so a ship would be very appropriate. And then, of course, the Coat of Arms of Newfoundland, that could be an emblem. So how is one going to pick one out of all of those? You certainly can not put them all on it, that would look like a dog's breakfast, although it has been suggested that perhaps we should have a Newfoundland dog chasing a seal, with a pitcher plant in his mouth and running through the trees or something or other like that, but clearly that would be a facitious thing to do.

So I think that when people say, "We should have a traditional emblem on the flag," I think the

DR. COLLINS:                    problem arises, what is the traditional emblem? And I think you would get as much debate on that as you would get on this present flag.

Now, that is the comment outside. I did not have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to attend all the debate in this House, I missed the first few days, and there may have been a different tone there than I heard since I have been in the House during this continuing debate. But I find this debate is a little strange, actually.

Firstly, when I first entered the debate, when I first listened to the debate last Friday, many of the comments had a rather hysterical nature, I thought, they were quite outside what was called for in terms of what the flag was. It was called a dishrag, it was called a disgrace, it was called many derogatory things which clearly could not be so. I think if one just looked at the flag as something to be presented, there is no reason to call it by those terms. But as the days have gone by there has been less hysteria. As a matter of fact, for those who felt they could not vote for the flag, who cannot vote for the flag, you can almost now hear a note of sorrow in their voices as though - you know, 'I wish I could vote for it'. There is a feeling of acceptance even in those few short days. In that regard I think that this debate has been good.

But there are another few points about the debate that I find rather strange and that is there seems to be a desire to equate the flag, in some people's minds, almost totally with the wars. Well, now, I do not quite understand that. One realizes that flags and armed forces go together but even if you

DR. COLLINS: take the Union Jack, the Union Jack was never evolved as a war flag, the Union Jack was essentially evolved as a means of bringing together three disparate nations into one. There was a combination of the Cross of St. George with the Cross of St. Andrew and the Cross of St. Patrick and they were all brought together into the one flag. It was not set up to stimulate war although the wars may have and, I suppose, disputes may have come out of that union, but, nevertheless, essentially to show that these three nations were now being brought back together into a united kingdom. I do not, in my own mind, like to associate flags with wars and I think that the war ethic in terms of flags is quietly going away.

The same way with the United States flag. It is not really related to war as such, it is related, again, to the original three States of the Union and then the increasing numbers of States that came into the Union.

Even the Russian flag, I suppose, you could say it is dedicated to work; it is not dedicated to war with the hammer and sickle on it. I regret in some respects that in many people's comments they say that this flag is not acceptable because it does not remind us of the wars our people have partaken in, and I think that is almost beside the point.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that I think - this is in regard to the Union Jack and I can understand why some people would want the Union Jack very strikingly in there. The Union Jack is in there to some extent. There are certain aspects of this new flag which would remind one of the Union Jack. But to put the Union Jack in there in a very prominent

DR. COLLINS: way would seem to me to suggest that we are a small part of a big whole. Now, I think that is not the modern idiom, the modern idiom now is that small is beautiful. So we should have a flag that relates to us. We are a small nation, a small Province but, nevertheless, we should not have our flag reminding us that we are just a, shall we say, a pimple on the back of the frog; it should remind us that we ourselves are an entity unto ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, I do not intend to speak for very long on this, I just wish to bring forward the point of view why I feel that the comments that have been made in many respects against the flag do not seem to have very much validity for me and, on a more positive note, I think that we have a very distinctive flag here. I must admit when I first saw it I liked it but I did not love it. But I think now that I see more and more of it, I am beginning to love it, I think it is a really good flag.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: One particular aspect of the flag I did not like, but even that, now, I am beginning to get a certain fondness for it and I think as time goes on this will become a very lovable flag.

DR. COLLINS: Certainly it gives me the impression that it is a Northern Flag. You know, I can see, shall we say, Iceland flying this flag, or Norway flying this flag. But we will fly the flag. And I think it is appropriate that it has a sort of Northern flavour because we are a Northern people, and Northern people are used to putting up with hardships and I think this portrays our shall we say fighting against adverse elements. It seems to me in that respect a very appropriate flag.

And finally I think it is a very artistic flag. Not just because say one of the more prominent artists of our Province was behind it, but just in its own right I think it is a very artistic flag. The fact that it is not divided totally, equally both sides, but there is a little - the part near the pole is smaller than the other part, there is an artistic element in this flag which I find is very pleasing and I think it will be accepted as an artistic distinctive, appropriate flag for Newfoundland in the very near future and throughout the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time I have ever stood in the House of Assembly and spoke in a different manner than my colleagues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: I, for one, who am, I think, considered a very partisan figure in this House at this particular time feel that I cannot support the majority of my colleagues but must vote with my conscience I suppose for this flag.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the criticism that has been levelled at this flag over the past days, and I have been listening both here in the House and to the open-line programmes and through various comments that have come to me from people I have met, I find that the criticisms come from all types of people but for all different

MR. HODDER: reasons, and I believe that whatever the committee which I served on, had brought in, whichever design, whatever type of design we had brought in, because of these divergent views in the Province we would have had a great deal of criticism.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think if we are to have a distinctive provincial flag for this Province that a referendum would do the trick, because referendums, if we look at the situation in Quebec, are fought and very many extraneous issues come into referendums and I do not think even then that we would come up with a flag. I think the answer would be that we would again fail to bring a distinctive flag into the Province and I have noted that on both sides of this House that there has been a desire for a distinctive flag although some members, and that is up to them, and I respect them for it, some members have decided that they do not like the flag because of the design. But even amongst the members of this House of Assembly we have given a number of reasons why we do not support the flag and I believe that anything that may have come to this House, or the committee would have brought to this House, would have raised the same type of furor I suppose the word is, in the press.

Mr. Speaker, many of the members here who have spoken have talked about polls they have done with their constituents. Now I always understand that the best type of poll was one that is conducted yourself, that the telephone poll is not nearly as accurate as the type of an enquiry which a person makes in a sort of nondescript manner in just asking how do you feel the flag - what do you think of the flag? You know, whenever I have been in a restaurant or in a store and I happen to be chatting with the person serving, I have said to them, "Do you like the flag?" And do you know, Mr. Speaker, at the present time, outside of certain interest groups in the Province, I am running about eighty per cent. Last week I was running ninety-five per cent for the flag. I am down to about eighty per cent, perhaps seventy-five per cent now. But the majority of the people I talked to say they like the design.

Now as far as calls from my district, I have



MR. HODDER: had three. One was a person who said they did not like the flag. Another one was a very good friend of mine who is a member of the Canadian Legion and when I explained to him my reasons for voting for the flag he said, "Yes, go ahead with it, boy. Now I have something else to talk to you about, that was only one of the reasons I called you."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the issue may have been blown out of proportion and that basically if we were to do a poll now of the Province we might be surprised because there is a silent majority on this issue, we might be surprised at what the poll

MR. J. HODDER: would show, Not only that, but if we did a poll now and one two years down the road, I have no doubt in my mind that people would, once it starts to fly in the Province, once if it is passed here in this House, then down the road the Newfoundlanders will become very proud of that flag.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say a word at the beginning about something I read in The Daily News this morning, and I am quite aware that newspapers sometimes report inaccurately but I saw there that the Canadian Legion had said that they would go out and try to defeat - now, I do not know if they said it or not, but it was attributed to them, that they would try to defeat the members of the House of Assembly who vote for this flag. Now, Mr. Speaker, all I can say to the Canadian Legion, whom I respect deeply, and I might say and I hate to bring in, you know, personal and family things into this matter, although other members have done it and I suppose I have a right to do it as well, But, you know, Mr. Speaker, I am named after an uncle of mine who I was very close to who was at Dunkirk. I still hold a commission in the Canadian Army or at least I suppose I do. I have a plaque or a scroll which is signed by Douglas Harkness, who was then the Minister of National Defense, which says that I am a 2nd Lieutenant and I have seen the inside of a Centurion tank when I worked with the Lord Strothcona House in Calgary from Sarcee Barracks, and I have not been dis-associated with the Legion. As a matter of fact, it was only by accident that I am not a member of the Stephenville Legion because I was invited to join and I just did not get around to paying my fee, and had full intentions of doing so, although they may not care to have me at the present time from some of the statements that they have made.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Canadian Legion wants to go out and try to defeat my in the next election because I am voting for the flag, well, then so be it. I will continue to try and represent my district in the best way possible. And if they are successful in that,

MR. J. HODDER: well then, I am not sure that they would not have done me a favour. I certainly made as good a living before I got in here as I have made since I have been in here, and if anything, threats of that nature, if I were voting the other way, I think, would force me to vote for the flag if I had been intending to vote against it. I think that is a very ill-advised tactic and somewhat against the principles of the Legion, I think when they talk about freedom of democracy and one thing and the other and they talk about going down and trying to defeat members indiscriminately whether they are good members in their district or poor members in their district or whatever they are, I think they get elected on their performance not whether they supported a particular issue in this House of Assembly or not.

But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the design is sound. It is a sound design. I believe that we will be proud of it down the road and I believe that it will stand with the other provinces, the flags of the other provinces of Canada. When I look at the other provinces of Canada I see two flags, the one from Ontario and Manitoba which you cannot tell on a flagpole, I would challenge anybody, if they were flown down there and we looked through that window, you would not be able to distinguish one from the other.

Also, the flags of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories are very much the same. One of the nice designs that came to our committee from a gentleman in Corner Brook was almost identical to another provincial flag. We felt that we must bring in a distinctive flag.

But, one thing, Mr. Speaker, we have been members of this committee or the committee members have been wrestling with this issue for some six months and I think all of us were quite aware that there would be a great deal of criticism. As a matter of fact, I thought there would be more criticism, I would have thought that the criticism would have been even greater because I think that most of the criticisms

MR. J. HODDER: are coming from certain groups rather than from the general public and I talk about the - and each one of those groups have had a different approach to why they feel the flag is wrong.

But, Mr. Speaker, we found as we went around the Province that everyone had their own design in their head. Every flag that came to us was a different flag and very many of them had very little in common. I will say that there were a good number but not the majority that in some way the Union Jack was represented. But in an awful lot of them, the Union Jack was no better represented than it is in the flag which we have submitted to this House.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Not as well represented.

MR. J. HODDER: Not as well represented, that is quite right. But, we did find that everyone had their own design. We had three groups who had specific designs: one was the Union Jack, the other was the Pink, White and Green and then, at the last meeting, we had the Legion flag.

We decided , and it was a committee decision, to come in with a geometric design. We decided on a geometric design because we believe that all Newfoundlanders down the road could associate with an abstract design, a geometric design more so than if we had come in with many of the things that have been mentioned by members here, the Newfoundland dog, the Pitcher Plant

MR. J. HODDER:

or whatever have you; there has been many weird and wonderful things suggested and there were many weird and wonderful flags that came before us and there were many, many good ones that before us and some of them that I liked greatly and some of them had the Union Jack incorporated in them and some did not.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have in this Province many groups and we have many representatives of the nationalities and we should not forget that. Some are more interested in flags than others. We have many founding peoples. I suppose if we started from the beginning we would have the Inuit, the Naskaupi, the Micmac, the French, the English, the Irish, the Scottish, the Welsh, representatives of the Commonwealth countries, representatives of Asian countries and the Near East, the Far East and I suppose we may even have some representatives in this Province of the South American countries and of our neighbour, the United States. But, Mr. Speaker, if we are to bring in a flag that all people could be proud of down the road then what better than a geometric design because a flag is a thing of the mind and it is a thing that we have to come to accept. We found, to give one example, that while we were - I suppose I should not even say the Avalon Peninsula - in St. John's we found that the Pink, White and Green was acceptable to a great number of people, but at the same time we found there was a religious antagonism to it. I do not believe there should be; I particularly thought that the Pink, White and Green was quite a nice flag, but there were religious antagonisms outside of St. John's. Why should this be? I think it should not be, but nevertheless it is there. And by going the geometric route I think we went the right one. Now, I believe that the decision was sound and that in the future this flag will be a more unifying

MR. J. HODDER: force than any other decision we could have made. It is a symbol to other provinces and other countries of the world. If you look at them, the great ones are geometric. The Union Jack, it is geometric. People have stood in this House and said, 'Mr. Speaker, my mind is not abstract, Newfoundlanders' minds are not abstract,' but, Mr. Speaker, if the Union Jack had never been a flag and Britain had some other flag and we had brought in the Union Jack, I am sure that the same criticism could be levelled at it, it is an abstract flag. If we look at the great ones, the Union Jack is a great flag, the Stars and Stripes, the flag of Norway and Finland, both of these I like particularly. the flag of France - by the way, the flag of France does not have the Fleur de Lys, as I heard someone on Open Line say, it is a tri-colour. You know, all of the great flags of the world are made up of stripes or stars or geometric designs. Some have half moons, some have stars, you know, but basically all the flags of the world, and the Committee looked at them all, all the flags of the world are flags which do not symbolize anything in those countries. Maybe the colours on them mean something, but the colours, as being levelled at this one, could be taken, and this flag - someone I heard say that this flag could be taken and given to any country and you could rationalize it, but any of the flags of the world the same thing can happen. What we need, Mr. Speaker, is a flag that we can identify with in the future, and a geometric design is certainly the best thing that all groups and all areas of this Province can identify with.

The question of the Labrador flag has been raised. It has been raised throughout the Province. There is nothing to represent Labrador. Now, the Labrador flag, by request of the Labrador delegation that came to the Flag Committee and said, "We would like to keep

MR. HODDER:

our own flag". In case hon.

members do not know that, any area of this Province has the right to fly their own flag, and the Labrador flag is a very beautiful flag. It was one that all the Committee members liked. As a matter of fact, I think that most of us would have liked to have brought it in and adopted it as our provincial flag, but Labrador would like to have it as their own. There is no separatism in that. I represent the district of Port au Port. They have every right to fly a flag if they so wish. There is no great feeling for it out there. They are more concerned about more pressing matters, perhaps, but they have every right to bring in a flag to represent their area just as any school or any corporation has a right to bring in its flag.

Well, Mr. Speaker, unlike many others and unlike much of the criticism I have heard, I feel that Newfoundlanders are ready to accept the new flag, although it is an emotional thing. I feel, also, that if emotion had not been expressed in this and the flag had just come in and nobody had said anything about it, I think it would have been very poor indeed. If nothing else

MR. J. HODDER: has happened, that the people of the Province have become very aware of their new flag and I think that down the road, down the road, Mr. Speaker, once they have seen it flying it will be a matter of pride to all Newfoundlanders. I feel that this flag represents our past and it looks forward to a bright future. I believe it, I believe in it but I respect those who disagree with it. But basically I have to follow my own conscience in this matter. But I will say this that I, in five years time, will be proven right, that this flag, in five years time, the issue will have died and we will be all proud of it as Newfoundlanders. So whether I stand against or for my colleagues, whether I can an independent stand or not I feel that sometime some of them will come along and say to me, boy you are right, that is not a bad flag. Mr. Speaker, the flag has been called a bunch of triangles. I think I have referred to this before, but the Union Jack is such a flag. And when I remember the flag debate, the debate over the Canadian Flag, and I do remember it because I remember I was a student here at the University, and it was flying on Kenmount Road, someone had put the flag there for everyone to see it and the types of comments that I heard at that particular time about that flag were very very reminiscent of the types of comments we are hearing now. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we have in this Province now great pride for that flag and while some may still not like the design but everyone who sees it, particularly if you are in a foreign country, I think they realize that that represents something and that is a little bit of Canada there, or a Canadian lives there, or that is the Canadian Embassy or whatever.

Another issue about this flag that keeps popping up on the Open Lines is Mr. Pratt's statement that he would not modify the flag. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that has to be straightened out. I was at his home when he made that statement and his statement was this. He did not rule out that this was the only flag or that if we did not accept this flag that he would tear up his designs and would have nothing else to do with the Committee. He just said to us simply, and he



MR. J. HODDER: said it before we saw the flag, he said, "If you do not like the flag, fine. If you do not like the various designs, if none of them please you, that is fine. It will not hurt me in the least. I have put some work into it. I have worked very hard at it but I do not expect that everything I do is going to please everybody and, please, if you do not like it tell me so." But he said, "If you do like it, I would like this, I would like you to take it in its entirety." He said, "If I do a painting and I put it on the market, I do not expect people to take their paint brushes and change it." That is an artist's prerogative. It was said in only that way. He did not say take this flag or leave it as has been bandied about. What he said was what any artist or any designer. If I had been commissioned to design that flag I would have said exactly the same thing, if you do not like this particular design, I have worked on it for some time, tell me, I will scrap it, let me do another one. Why this issue has become such a great one that it is being shoved down our throats and that sort of thing I do not see it, Mr. Speaker, I do not see it at all.

Now, another argument that has been put forward in the House. Why was it that we only had one artist? Well, that is totally untrue. Other artists were solicited and as we travelled across the Province many artists and designers--One of the designs came in almost sold me. I am not sure if I did not like it better than the new flag. But I must say that I did not. But we had people who were professional designers, professional artists, who submitted flags to our Committee and they were quite good ones. And Mr. Pratt did only what the other artists had done, he had

MR. J. HODDER:

offered his services to help us in any way he could. And we sat down with him, had a long meeting, at one point we even got to looking at the various flags of the world to try to come - because you are dealing with an abstract thing - to some consensus as to what the Committee wanted and what we expected that he would do. And, you know, certainly the principles under which we had decided, the principles that the Committee had decided which have been mentioned in the House before, but these, I think, were carried out by the artist in as good a way and as well as anything that I have ever seen. And when I saw the flag, I liked it. There were variations of the design, the flag, as has been said, was not everyone's second choice but the basic designs were much the same and I would say that had either one of the designs come before the House, the other designs, we would have had the same type of arguments.

Mr. Speaker, before I finish I want to address myself to comments that rude remarks can be made about the flag. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, there is not a flag in this world that rude remarks can not be made about. I am sure that if you were to ask a group of Iranians what they thought of the American flag or vice versa that you would find many rude remarks. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that a flag is something that is in the eyes of the beholder but I would say that if there are rude remarks that are being made about the flag then I have not heard any and if hon. members in this House have heard them I think they should stand up and tell us what they were because I have not. I have heard criticism, we do not like the design, there is too much blue at the back, there is not enough red at the front or this sort of thing or the Union Jack is not there but I have not heard any rude remarks. I would sincerely say if there are rude remarks let us not just allude to them, why not bring them out because this is a very important issue for the Province.

MR. J. HODDER:

But anyhow, Mr. Speaker, a flag is an emotional issue and perhaps it should be born in controversy, as I said before. And maybe it does or maybe it does not represent the majority

MR. J. HODDER: of Newfoundlanders' feelings but we will not know that until we have, perhaps - as I have said before, if we do a poll that would yield some results but I would say that might surprise us as well but down the road we might not find that the same thing would hold maybe even five or six months down the road.

But, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I feel that the overwhelming feeling of the silent majority, which is the great majority on this issue in this Province, is to quit talking about the flag and let us get on with the business of the Province.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. HODDER: I called one of my good supporters who I think to be a kind of a populist who talks to people and I said to him, what do you think of the flag? He said, "Boy, I do not see much wrong with it but I had a chat with a group of people the other night, there was a bunch of us playing poker," and he said, "the general feeling was that -

MR. F.B. ROWE: A gamblers' association.

MR. J. HODDER: - I did not say that I was playing, Mr. Speaker, but he said, "The general feeling was get off the flag," and if you realize, Mr. Speaker, that I represent the highest unemployment area in the Province, although nobody will give me statistics on it except we have school children go door to door and get those statistics, but I represent the highest unemployment area in the Province and I think it is time that we voted against it or for it, whichever way the hon. members of this House have decided to go, and then let us get down to the Province's business.

And my final remark is if only, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment issue in this Province could raise as much emotion as this flag issue has raised I think that we would have a Legislature here struggling to try to overcome that particular problem. And I hope for an early end to this particular debate and -

MR. FLIGHT: You will not get it.

MR. HODDER: Whether I get it or not I hope for it.

And I think that the longer we

MR. HODDER:

stay in this House, the more time we spend on this issue, the less time we are spending on the Province's business and, for one, I would like to get into the Budget Speech because I have an awful lot to say.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say except that again I will re-emphasize that the design is sound, we are going to be proud of it and it will stand with the other provinces of Canada and it will stand with the other countries of the world. And, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for it and I am going to vote for it proudly. And whatever consequences come -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

- whether they be from

the Legion - if they want to come out and they want to defeat me, well, that is their prerogative, I will have to fight them when the time comes. But, Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the flag and I will be proud to fly it. I told my wife that I want a flagpole put - we were going to build a fence around our house but I have now said that the fence is going to include a flagpole and that flag if passed will be flying in front of my house which is in the centre of Stepehville, seen by all, this coming Summer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. the member for

St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Like the rest of the members

I would like to get my two cents in on this flag issue too. To be honest with you, I stood up here but I still do not know if I am going to support it or not. It is

MR. HANCOCK: starting to grow on me.  
I am like the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins),  
he said he liked it a first and now he loves it,  
because I hated the bloody thing when I saw it but now  
I am beginning to like it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: But I am still not  
convinced I like it enough to vote for it.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: The one flag I would vote  
for is if we could get the member for Stephenville (Mr.  
Stagg) flat enough to take a picture of him and put him  
on a flag, then I would vote for it. There would be  
no problem there. I had to get that dig in.

I commend the Committee  
on the job they have done. They have done an excellent  
job going around the Province. It is not an easy task  
to come up with a flag that is going to suit everybody.  
As a matter of fact, I think it is impossible for any-  
body to do it. They did an excellent job and they are  
to be commended for it, but just because they did not  
come to my district is why a lot of people are upset  
and they felt that they should have come to St. Mary's -  
The Capes and had a meeting, which they did not do,  
A lot of people out there are upset, they are going  
against the flag for no other reason than that. To  
have twenty-six meetings around the Province and not to  
come to two or three districts I think leaves something  
to be desired.

This flag issue, the  
thing which disturbs me about this is we are trying to  
get it through the House of Assembly too quick, Mr.  
Speaker. There are a lot of people in my district who  
would like to see this flag in colour. We have a lot  
of people out there who, through no neglect of their

MR. HANCOCK: own, cannot afford a colour T.V. and, therefore, they have not seen this flag in colour they have only seen it in black and white.

MR. WARREN: That is good enough.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, it may be good enough for some people but it is not good enough for the people in my district, Mr. Speaker. At least we should put this thing off and get on to the serious issues that face this Province. I would rather stand up here today and support legislation to have inshore fishermen covered by compensation rather than get up and express my disapproval, or approval, for that flag.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: I think it is about time to get on, as the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) said, with the serious problems which face this Province.

I live right nextdoor, by the way, to the designer of this flag and that is why I with a great deal of reluctance, held off until now to have a few words to say. The only thing that disturbs me in this flag is the arrow. I guess the Premier likes it because if you turn it up this way and have a look at it, the blue would represent the sky, this would be the oil rig and the drill going down into the sea. That is probably why the Premier likes it and probably rightly so, because we are taken up with oil so bloody much these days, it is ridiculous.

MR. NEARY: It does look like an oil rig though.

MR. HANCOCK: It does. If you look at it this way it does look like an oil rig.

Having lived nextdoor for eight or ten years to the designer of this flag, I find it very difficult to come out and sort of offend him, I

MR. HANCOCK: guess. If I vote against the flag I would be offending him, if not, I guess -

MR. WARREN: (inaudible) home?

MR. HANCOCK: Yes. A lot of people say, Mr. Speaker, this flag will grow on you. An interesting comment was made by a lady the night, I was talking to, she is seventy-three years old and she said, 'Son, I am seventy-three now and I have heard talk that this thing will grow on you, but' she said, 'I do not think I will be around for another seventy-three years'. That was her opinion, what she thought of the flag.

I think a flag should symbolize something of our past, Mr. Speaker. I lost a number of relatives in the war and there should be some resemblance of a Union Jack in there. And if it is there, Mr. Speaker, you have to use your imagination and you have to stretch your imagination to find it. I think, just to show some of our appreciation toward the people who fought for us years ago, that there should be some resemblance to the Union Jack in there. I guess the only way we could come up with a flag that would suit everybody would be to - I think the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins) said it, every meeting they had around the Province somebody came up with something different. Some wanted a moose, some wanted a caribou, some wanted rabbits, whatever you want in the bloody thing, I guess the only way we could please everyone would be to take a picture of everything, have another ark and stick it on a flag and then fly it and then everybody would appreciate what the Committee has done. But I guess we cannot do that, Mr. Speaker, it would not be

MR. D. HANCOCK:

appropriate. The majority of the people, Sir, I have spoken to in the district, and I am sure I am in a position where I have spoken to more people since this flag was brought in than any other member in the House of Assembly, and I can honestly say that the majority of people in my district are against the flag. They do not like the design of the flag but they still feel that at the same time we should have our own identity and we should have our own flag. And I feel that way too, Mr. Speaker. But with a few alterations to this flag I think it would be accepted by a lot of people around this Province. I would certainly like to see that arrow taken out and I do not know what you could put in there, Mr. Speaker, but you could get something in there that is more appropriate and represents our heritage or our culture more than an arrow. It represents our future and I think there should be something in there to represent Newfoundland and its past. I also feel like the member next to me, that we should have the same flag for Newfoundland and Labrador. I feel very strongly about this and this is something we should consult with the people of Labrador and Newfoundland, about to see if we can come up with the one flag that is going to represent all because it does create some separatist movement if you have two separate flags. That is about all I have to say on the flag, Mr. Speaker, with a few alterations -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

The poem.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

Oh, yes. I had a poem. I do not if it would be appropriate to read this or not, Mr. Speaker. It is something which was presented to me last night at the house. A guy came up and gave it to me and he asked me if I would table it in the House and read it out. A flag, a flag, the Premier said./ Let's pick ourselves a flag./ Take six wise men John Carter, make haste, no time to drag./ Make haste, make haste John Carter,/ Time is running low./ Four hundred years we had it, The Union Jack must go./ With six wise men he travelled far./ Six hundred flags he saw,/ Six hundred flags rejected,/ Let's get Chris Pratt to draw./



MR. D. HANCOCK: That was his opinion of exactly what is happening with the flag, Mr. Speaker. Maybe by the time, Mr. Speaker,

MR. S. NEARY: You have to table it.

MR. D. HANCOCK: May I ask that this be tabled, Mr. Speaker. Probably by the time we do come down to a vote on this flag I will be in favour of it, Mr. Speaker. Right now I am not. Thank you.

MR. S. NEARY: You are voting against it.

MR. D. HANCOCK: I am voting against it.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker,

MR. L. THOMS: If the hon. member would close his coat - his tie is like a flag.

MR. L. WOODROW: It is a really lovely flag, is it not? If anybody, Mr. Speaker, would walk into the government common room and see the proposed flag flying, with the gentle breeze from the window, I think they would say it is beautiful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. WOODROW: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to make on it. I have listened to all the various speakers and they all spoke of different types of flags of other countries and different proposals they had from their constituents and the like. But I would say that in order to please everybody in the Province we should have at least 600,000 flags because in the matter of getting a flag you cannot please everybody. In fact I am going to use a Latin quotation which says, "Quot capita, tot opiones", in other words there are as many opinions as there are heads when it comes to choosing a flag. So it certainly is a very difficult thing to do. I would, first of all, Mr. Speaker, congratulate the Premier for having the courage because to make a proposal such as this you have to be youthful, you have to have vim, you have to have vigor, you have to have courage and you have not, in fact, got to be basing your life on politics, you have to be convinced of what you are saying. And that is

MR. WOODROW: the reason why that I think he really had the courage to do this. I knew it would be an emotional debate. Naturally it would be because it is a very important thing for our Province to have our own flag.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the members of the Committee, four members from the government side and three members from the Opposition side. It was done in a democratic way. These seven members were given the authority, and may I say the financial help to go across this Province and in Labrador, and the people, to my knowledge, were given due notice. That was the time for them to make their presentation to the Committee and many of them did.

Now, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this flag is a flag for the future. Before I conclude I am going to read a letter from one of the schools in my district. I appreciate the people, who sat in the galleries here on Friday, from the Canadian Legion and, also, the telegrams and the calls that I received from several Legionnaires in the City of Corner Brook and environs. They were proud of the Union Jack. In fact, they fought under the Union Jack. Many of them fought and came back, many others, Mr. Speaker, are still in hospitals and many others never came back, but that is the flag they fought under and they have every reason to be proud of it and it can still be flown in any part of our Province.

Just to inject one little note, I think it was the hon. member from Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) and the hon. member from St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas), they mentioned the Irish people who came to Newfoundland. If I wanted to be bias, Mr. Speaker, I have every reason to be so, because my mother, who recently passed away, she was a grand-niece of the founder of the Christian Brothers of Ireland, who brought so much to Newfoundland by way of

MR. WOODROW: education. I was a student at St. Bonaventure's College, and we also celebrated their 25th anniversary in Corner Brook just over the weekend. Of course, the Irish people have certainly given a lot to the Province of Newfoundland. But I think, Mr. Speaker, we cannot be biased, we have to be big in ourselves. Every time they will look at the gold in the flag, what does gold remind us of? It reminds us of a bright future, and are we going to look back at the past? Why should we look back at the past? The past was hard enough for us here in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I think it is time for us to look to the future with the hope that some good things will happen. I am sure it will.

Also, Mr. Speaker, fifty-two members were elected by the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We were not delegated to come here. We were elected to be a member of the district, and every time an issue comes up, surely goodness we should not go back to our people and say, "Shall I do this or shall I do that?" I am sure that they would think very little of us if we went back to them for every little thing that happened here in the House of Assembly, every issue that came up?

Once again, the decision,

Mr. Speaker, was

MR. WOODROW: unanimous by the committee and if we send out a delegate, if we have a commission or something sent out to ask and to do something for us, if we come back and say, "The heck with your decision," they will not have very much faith in us, I would not think.

I have had a few people who have called, but most of them called and said, "Oh," they said, what I would like and what I would not like. "But," they said - "you know," only a call from McIver's today, "the flag is growing on us." I remember, the hon. Speaker remembers when we opened the Cathedral in Corner Brook, monastic style the Cathedral is, a lot of people said they did not like it. But Bishop O'Reilly who built the Cathedral he said, "It is going to grow on you." And there is not one person today in the city of Corner Brook who is not in love with the Cathedral over there. People, in fact, who come to visit it, they feel the same way.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is a flag for the future. It is a flag in fact, not, maybe, for the older people but it is a flag for the future and the future, Mr. Speaker, belongs to the youth.

Now I have a letter here, Mr. Speaker, I am just going to read part of it, possibly all, it is not very long. It came from the school in Cox's Cove.

"Sir, as a member of the younger generation of Newfoundlanders I cannot understand the reason for disagreement with the flag. I can fully appreciate people's love for the Union Jack. I, myself, have a great deal of respect for the Union Jack. However, as a Newfoundlander I have great difficulty identifying it as my flag. Let us not forget that that flag existed before Newfoundland was known to exist. How could it symbolize something they did not know about?

"While it is true that Newfoundlanders fought and died under the Union Jack, World War II, I think it should be remembered that Newfoundland was a colony of Britian in the war years, and

MR. WOODROW: therefore, technically they were fighting as British subjects. I challenge the readers, however, were these British Newfoundlanders fighting for Britian or Newfoundland? It is my belief that Newfoundlanders who fought in World War II fought for freedom for Newfoundlanders regardless of the flag that flew over their heads. They fought to get freedom for Newfoundlanders and the freedom to choose a new and true Newfoundland flag.

"There was another people here before us. Let us not forget that. One of their races was wiped out entirely when they tried to keep their land. In what better way can we show our respect for these disappearing cultures than to commemorate their art as we have done in the flag?

"The red, white and blue of the Union Jack is represented on our flag. Are we afraid to put our own gold colour into the flag to represent our many resources?" And I think here, Mr. Speaker, of our future, the oil, the fisheries, the hydro, and the other good things that will come, we hope, to our Province. "The design is similar to the Union Jack. The Flag Proposal Committee are merely asking that it be changed to include design representative of our native culture.

"It is very interesting to note that many Newfoundlanders are fighting to keep the chief symbol of John Bull and jolly old England who, some thirty-one years ago, did everything to get rid of Newfoundland because they did not want us."

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I want once again to pledge my support for this flag. And as the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) said, I too - I will gladly fly it, in fact on my home in Corner Brook, and on my Summer home out in beautiful Bay of Islands -

AN HON. MEMBER: In your condominium.

MR. WOODROW: - in York Harbour. I have not got the condominium yet. But we shall do it and I once again congratulate the committee and may I say, as the two hon. members who spoke last said, "Let us get on with the job of accepting the flag and then get on with the other business of the Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD):

The hon. member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I

suppose that this is an historic moment perhaps in Newfoundland history that this House is now going through. And as part of this House it gives me, perhaps, a sense of adventure and pleasure to be involved in this debate. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the historic moment, perhaps, is found in the historical impact that this debate and the passing of the act now before us will have. It depends on the point of view that a person holds. If a person is for this particular design then, obviously, he will be pleased that the act is passed in the House of Assembly. If a person is not for it he will not be as pleased.

I would like to, if I could, Mr. Speaker, before passing my few remarks, to congratulate the previous speakers. And perhaps there is -

MR. STAGG:

Thank you.

MR. TULK:

You are welcome. And perhaps there

is little left to say.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The only exception.

MR. TULK:

Yes, he is perhaps the only exception.

Perhaps there is little left to say, Mr. Speaker, but I feel that in what I just called an historic moment in Newfoundland history, that perhaps one should make one's position clear and that, Sir, I hope to do in the next few moments. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I can, perhaps, keep in mind what the House Leader for this side keeps reminding us younger members of this House of, and that is that if you have something to say then perhaps you can say it in ten minutes as well as you can in thirty.

My first inclination, Mr. Speaker, is to perhaps congratulate the Committee and I congratulate them, Sir, in this regard in that they were given a task, I suppose, that they knew would not be easy. They perhaps knew that they would receive various criticisms and they have. And I congratulate them for having the courage

MR. TULK:

to do it. I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that we find ourselves in another unique position in that no individual in this House should feel slighted, on either side of the House, if his colleagues on either side of the House opposes him. We are, Sir, in a free vote and that too is another new experience and perhaps one that, if you stay in this House for twenty years, you may not have the chance to participate in again. However, Mr. Speaker, in congratulating the Committee I think it should be pointed out that the House of Assembly, even though they have struck this Committee and even though the Committee has made a unanimous decision or a unanimous recommendation, the House of Assembly does not have to accept that recommendation. And I say that again, Sir, without prejudice to the individuals on that Committee or the Committee as a group. If the decision of this House is that we cannot accept their recommendation, then I think we should perhaps ask the Committee to return again. In the same way every individual on that Committee has the right to refuse to serve on the Committee and we, Sir, as the House of Assembly, have the right to reappoint other members to that Committee.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having made those background points let me make a little confession. I must confess, Sir, that on April 29th, when this flag was displayed on the floor of this hon. House, I had no real reaction to it. I was and perhaps still am, more concerned with some of the problems that you find in a district such as Fogo district. Like my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) I had no great emotional like or dislike for the flag. I was not ready to jump out of my seat and say, 'Hurrah, at last we have got a flag'. I was not ready to go out and either do cartwheels in the corridors of this building or fire guns, tear up the thing or burn it or anything else.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You should have.

MR. TULK:

I should have? In short I had no feeling on the subject whatsoever. Sir, I must confess to the Chairman of the Committee that when he explained the symbolism on this flag then I put my reaction down to a lack of imagination, or a poor artistic

MR. TULK:

background, that I am supposed to come from. I do not believe that really, Sir, but I must say that I found this flag very difficult to either relate to or reject. I had the distinct impression, Sir, that we need a flag in this Province, we need a distinctive flag and in my book, Sir, at the time, this one would do, yes. In short, Sir, I was prepared to vote yes on this flag. And I somehow felt that that yes was connected with progress. Being a young Newfoundlander I want Newfoundland to progress. And as the Premier so often says, Sir, and he is quoted



MR. B. TULK:

quite often and I am sure it is one of his favourite sayings "that in the '50s and '60s, and this is the Premier's quote, "Newfoundlanders underwent a revolution between the ears." Well, Sir, I am a product of the '50s and '60s and I would like to think that perhaps I too underwent a revolution between the ears. In other words, Sir, what I am saying is that I think the Premier was right, I believe he was absolutely right, we are no longer satisfied as young Newfoundlanders with what was or is. But perhaps, Sir, we should keep something else in mind and that is that, in our haste for progress in this Province and trying to change things that we will, indeed, shelve our traditions. We seem to have a great haste in Newfoundland to, perhaps, write about our heritage, to act it out but in the final analysis, Sir, perhaps all we want to do is to titillate our emotions and perhaps shelve our heritage and our traditions for another time.

And, Sir, I believe that if you look at the design of this flag, if you look at what is supposed to be suggestive symbolism in it, I believe that this flag is a living example of the process that I am talking about. Sir, I want, without suggesting any great feeling for the Union Jack or without saying that we should obey what the Legion of this Province - the Canadian Legion - are saying, I want to suggest to you that the Union Jack has indeed some great meaning for the older generation of this Province. And I suggest to you that perhaps it is far more than it is for me. And, Sir, that is pretty natural, because while I heard somebody say that they fought under a flag, I believe it was the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins), I can assure the Minister of Finance that having fought under that flag their feelings became very much attached to it.

Now, Sir, I think I have to say in all fairness that I believe that this flag that we have makes little reference to our traditions and I want to sum up this part by saying that it makes little reference to our traditions and there is nothing that I can see in it that is distinctively Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in short

MR. B. TULK: our background and traditions are being driven further into our background and our background will soon become a tradition.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Hear, hear.

MR. B. TULK: There is a wedge, I believe, Sir, being driven between the young people in this Province and the older generations in this Province and I want to object to that because I believe that instead of driving that wedge we should be building on the past.

MR. D. HOLLETT: That is right.

MR. B. TULK: And my hon. friend from Bay of Islands (Mr. L. Woodrow) made the statement that this flag is for a younger generation.

MR. D. HOLLETT: He is writing everybody else off.

MR. B. TULK: Indeed it is, it is so far; I suggest to you, Sir, in the future that our older people, and they do make up a portion of the population of this Province, our older people, again, as I said to you before, are being driven further and further apart from our younger people and I can not accept that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the Committee, when it set out to choose a new design for this Province, took five reasons, they set five standards for themselves. Now, they have all been alluded to by previous speakers in this House and they are, Sir, first of all, the flag should be simple; secondly, it should be attractive; third, it should be distinctive; fourth, it should mirror our important traditions and fifth, Sir, should be accepted by the majority of people. Now, Sir, the flag is simple that is simple in the extreme nobody can dispute, it is an undisputed fact. It is made up of nothing but straight lines and geometric designs.

Mr. Speaker, if it is distinctive then I say it is not distinctive of Newfoundland. Like my friend from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. D. Hancock) I would have accepted a picture of the member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) in it and that would have been

May 13, 1980

Tape No. 1509

SD - 3

MR. B. TULK: distinctive of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker,  
but perhaps not in the way that we want. It is distinctive not of  
Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, but if you put the first condition that the  
Committee set for itself, nobody set it for them, and the third  
condition, that it be distinctive - the first one

MR. TULK:

was that it be simple and the third was that it be distinctive, then I would like to put the two of them together, Sir, and say to you that I think it is indeed distinctively simple. Now, Mr. Speaker, a number of people who have gotten up in this House and spoken to this bill have said that if you were to put something in there distinctive of Newfoundland then you would have to put dogs and cats and everything else that you could think of, codfish, kelp. Sir, I suggest to you that that is not what the opposition is all about to this flag. We have the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) on the other side suggesting that we put in a can of Carnation Milk. I suggest to you, Sir, that that is not what the opposition is about. The opposition to this flag is that there is nothing, absolutely nothing that is distinctive of Newfoundland.

The fourth standard that the Committee set for themselves, Mr. Speaker, was that the flag should mirror our traditions. Mr. Speaker, I think I have already stated and pointed out, perhaps enough, that it does not because, Mr. Speaker, if you look long and hard at this flag then I suppose the one thing that you can see in it is some resemblance to the Union Jack. But, Mr. Speaker, that is the only image, I suggest to you, that is close to being either bit concrete, that is either bit close to being what this Province has been about throughout its long history. And the remainder, Sir, is totally abstract with no concrete foundation in Newfoundland's heritage or history whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of things said about this flag but I suggest to you that if you go to the flag and perhaps look at it from its focal point, Sir, which is the center, we have been told that indeed the flag represents Newfoundland and Labrador and it is somehow connected by this arrow. What does it say here? It says the two triangles outlined in red portray the mainland and Island parts of our Province reaching forward together. The golden arrow points the way to what we believe will be a bright future. Mr.

MR. TULK:

Speaker, if you look at that flag, look at the center of it and let your eye wander out then indeed what you are seeing is that, if you follow the hypotenuse of the right angled triangle, then indeed what you are seeing is that Newfoundland and Labrador are separating more and more all the time.

MR. WARREN:

That is the intention of this government.

MR. STAGG:

No, they cannot (inaudible) geometrical entities.

MR. TULK:

Oh yes indeed they can, geometrical entities can be. Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) pointed out that indeed this flag if you fly it or if you carry it is pointing backwards, a future that is somewhere behind us. Mr. Speaker, I am using those arguments not to ridicule the design or the artist but just simply to point out that it is so lacking, the flag itself, the symbol itself is so lacking in tradition and so symbolic that its image at times can be ridiculed. I have heard it, Mr. Speaker, compared to a rocket ship. I have heard it compared to an oil rig. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, on the weekend, even pointed out to me that it seemed as if it was a decayed molar ready for extraction. I point that out as I said before, Mr. Speaker, not to ridicule the design or the artist, the Committee or anybody else but just to point out that it is so symbolic, as I said before, that it borders on the ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, if I could, to speak, perhaps, on the fifth standard which this Committee set for itself, and that fifth standard, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, was the most laudible that a Committee could set for itself.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) Liberal.

MR. TULK:

No, I do not believe they have, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Committee or this House is Liberal.

MR. FLIGHT:

He is attacking the integrity of the Liberals now.

MR. TULK:

Our design, they said, must be accepted by the majority of people. And to that end, Mr. Speaker, they visited some twenty-six communities. They had scores of briefs presented to them. And, Mr. Speaker, if I am going to go by the reaction that my constituents make to this flag, I suggest to you that there has been an overwhelmingly negative response.

MR. TULK: I find it difficult to accept, as I am sure all members of this House do, that depending on the side that you are on on this flag, the reaction is either negative or positive. Mr. Speaker, I have contacted and talked to in the last little while, I have talked to approximately 200 people. That is not an accurate figure but it is very close. And I found six of my constituents in favour of it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come back again and point out that my constituents in Fogo district are not saying that you have to have the codfish, the coat of arms. They are not saying that you have to have a caribou or anything of the sort, but what they are saying, and this is invariably the comment, that there is nothing in this flag that represents Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have said enough to point out that I agree with them and it is needless for me to say anything else.

I want to come back to some of the comments, perhaps, that we have heard in the media and by other people in this House. I have heard comments like, "People who oppose are the grumblers, are those who oppose everything that is put forward in this Province". Well, Mr. Speaker, I heard my friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) say that perhaps a poll would lend some accuracy to whether, indeed, our feelings concerning this flag are right. Well, I challenge the Committee and the government to do it, do the poll. Let us have a scientific, independent poll done by some group not connected to government at all.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) years down the road (inaudible).

MR. TULK: Indeed you did, but you said 'now' as well.

MR. HODDER: I did not say that.

MR. TULK: Let us poll this Province and put one question on a piece of paper, and all the person

MR. TULK:                               responding will have to do is answer yes or no. The question on the flag, on the design that we have before us, should be, perhaps, "Do you like the design presented to the House of Assembly for our provincial flag?" Yes or no? Well, Mr. Speaker, some people have said that they have spoken out of conscience on this matter. I suggest here that the way that you speak on this flag, whether you agree or disagree, is not a matter of conscience. I have even heard people compare voting on this flag, a free vote on this flag, as comparing it to whether you should vote aye or nay on, perhaps, the Criminal Code of Canada, whether you should vote aye or nay on hanging in this country or not. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is ridiculous. There is no matter of conscience, there is no moral issue here, and I suggest to you, Sir, that perhaps all that matters is that you reflect, perhaps, the wishes of Newfoundlanders.

  Mr. Speaker, one other question that has been continually posed by people in my district and people in the media as well, I guess, is why the rush? Why do we have to rush this thing through this House?

MR. STAGG:                               It is called leadership.

MR. TULK:                               It is called leadership. Why does the design have to be as -

MR. THOMS:                             (Inaudible) the quicker we get to the Budget, boy.

MR. TULK:                               Well, let us table the thing and get to the Budget.

  Why does the design have to be accepted immediately? Do we have to take it right now, tomorrow or the next day? Mr. Speaker, some people who have stood up in this House and defended this design have said, "Oh, it is going to grow on you". Well, I say to those people, Mr. Speaker, let us display this thing for six months -

MR. W. N. ROWE:                       And let it grow.



MR. TULK: - and let it grow. I have no objection in the world. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the conclusion, obviously, is going to be and it is fast becoming, that this flag is being pushed down our throats. We are having this thing pushed down our throats. And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that that phrase 'pushed down our throats' will also become part of the symbolism of this flag and indeed it can.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can understand, I can readily understand the Premier's position of wanting a new flag, of wanting his name put in history as being the Premier in this Province who brought in a flag, who brought in, perhaps, a distinctive Newfoundland flag, who gave Newfoundland its distinctive colours. But, Sir, perhaps I should tell the Premier, and perhaps we should all tell the Premier in this Province that one of the prime essence of virtue is patience, and I suggest to you and I suggest to the Premier that his place in Newfoundland's history will be much better founded and much better accepted by accepting the majority of people's opinion in this Province, or the majority of people's opinion,

MR. B. TULK:

in my opinion. In concluding, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I find this design to carry very little of Newfoundlands traditions. I find it, to use the phrase, symbolically inflated, blown out of proportion, as a matter of fact. I find it not acceptable by the majority of my constituents and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote no.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear !

MR. SPEAKER ( Simms )

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

The question that I basically have on my mind with regard to the flag, I will say right at the outset, I have no hesitation, no hesitation whatsoever supporting this 100, 200 300 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear !

MR. E. HISCOCK:

But I am becoming a little bit surprised by the tactics that we are beginning to use. And I am also concerned that once this flag has been passed how it will apply. The member from Fogo just basically said 'patience'. I think that really should be reflected upon instead of - I do not know how in this House, since I have been here, that three opposition members spoke on this side and not one person on the government side has done it. But again it is not my intention, basically, to get into this realm. I want to ask some basic questions. Why does the Province of Newfoundland want a flag? What do we hope to accomplish by a flag? Or, what do we want to see embodied in a flag?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not so fast.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

We want the flag for the emotional outlets. But basically by asking a lot of questions and I have asked a lot of questions to individual legion members; I know the official stand of the legion, but I have also gone around the Province and when I have asked this question, I have had a lot of legion people turn around and tell me that they preferred a unique flag. But they gave some negative things towards it, the Union Jack and lots of things

MR. E. HISCOCK: but also rather unique. I have asked a lot of young people, and asked a lot of other people generally, whether that would be travelling, whether that would be in my friends' homes or in the lobby of the Confederation Building, in schools or whatever. I polled the schools in my area and basically it comes out - in Mountainfield Central High the majority of the students came out against - in Henry Gordon Academy the majority of students came out against - in Our Lady of Labrador it came out in favour, overwhelmingly in favour and these were just some. Due to the mailing problems in Labrador I have not got the other replies coming in. But, I really want to ask a question, and I find it a little bit upsetting since this flag has got on, the tit for tat going back and forth the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. E. HISCOCK: And I would like to be heard in silence

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt): Order, please! The hon. member for Eagle River wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. E. HISCOCK: And I am a little bit concerned that basically, as I said, I feel as a young Newfoundlander, and I do not agree with the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), who says that we should go to the future and we should forget about our past. I think we should listen to our past and remember our past and build on it and go to the future.

MR. WOODROW: Not live in the past.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Not live in the past exactly, but we should always pay respect to it -

MR. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

MR. E. HISCOCK: And I feel with my British heritage and Irish heritage, on both sides of my family - the Barnes' the Hiscocks and the Kents go back quite a long ways in this Province. And I found that when I first sat down with this Committee I started out with the premise that the Union Jack had to be in the corner. I started out with that premise. And going through the Province and meeting various people, and in Labrador, the problem I had to decide was, basically,

May 13, 1980

Tape No. 1512

RA - 3

MR. E. HISCOCK:

how could I accomodate the majority  
of the wills of the people of this Province? It has been mentioned  
before, the Irish, Pink, White and Green, the Union Jack, the  
Orange Lodge,

MR. HISCOCK: the Heritage Society down in Labrador who want the Labrador Flag recognized as the official flag of Labrador, and then, also, to try to incorporate the idea of uniqueness. It was not an easy decision. And to say the least, the Committee was a non-partisan committee and it was not easy altogether getting opinions. Myself and the Chairman had various disagreements from time to time. And again I found that, basically, both of us gave in each way. I was a little bit upset, if I may say, personally, when the flag was officially printed in its paper form and the sentence said, "Surrounded by red to indicate human efforts. The arrow suggests that our future is for the making and not for the taking." I was personally upset by that, so much so that I said if it was not removed from this printout I was going to vote against it because I felt that that had nothing to do, nothing to do with the interpretation of what the flag meant.

I am also a bit concerned, that in asking various people, some people suggest this is a Circular Road flag, that this is a PC flag, that this is a party flag. For my part, as a member of the committee, and a non-partisan member of the committee, I do not particularly care who says who had input, or whether it is a Circular Road flag or whether it is this or whether it is that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: - Because I want to point out, as has been pointed out in the past, that this flag, when it is approved, will fly long after Premier Peckford, long after other premiers in this Province, and, hopefully, we will be able to attach the emotion of us as a people going forward not into the eighties, but going forward as a people building a province and building a nation and building a better world for ourselves.

I was a little bit concerned at one of the committee meetings when one of the members ended up talking about the display that Newfoundland had in Scotland, and it was a perfect job whereas Canada was a hodgepodge. And then the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) ended up saying, "Wait until we get the new flag." And the Minister of Mines and Energy has also talked about a dynasty.

MR. HISCOCK: These are the things that I fear. These are the things that I fear, that if we approve this it will become so petty that basically there will become a division in our Province, there will become, maybe of the young and the old, there will become the idea that it is a PC flag and not a Liberal flag, or not a people's flag.

That is why I want to make it quite clear, quite clear now, that the three people on this Committee who were Liberals, were non-partisan. And whether the government wants to turn around and use this, whether it is free vote, or whether the Opposition through a free vote, in conscience decides to turn around and vote against that, that may be so, but, again, I think that the long-term effects that this is going to have - and this flag will fly, because, as I said, I have not been in the House of Assembly where three members on the Opposition spoke right after each other and not a person on the government side. There is a little bit of impatience on this to get it through. And maybe from a political point of view it is quite wise, and maybe from other points of view that we are taking here in this House, from a political point of view is quite wise. But as I said, my concern is with the flag itself. I was given a job as a member of the Committee to go and listen and to hear and to look at various proposals. I think I have done that.

To say that I was not tempted to turn around and vote against this flag would basically be saying that I was very naive because at times I wanted to vote against this flag. I wanted to vote against this flag because I saw the area that the flag is going into, and that is non-partisan. And that is why I want to reiterate by saying that this Committee was unanimous in its decision, all people. And that when the final vote is taken, and it is taken in this House, however it may go, I hope that, basically, when it is flown on flagpoles of our Province that it will be looked upon as the flag of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Right on.

May 13, 1980

Tape No. 1513

NM - 3

MR. HISCOCK:

There are some people who basically say that this is another step in consolidating Premier Peckford's position in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY:

Right on.

MR. HISCOCK:

That Premier Peckford himself, basically, has put the Opposition into

MR. HISCOCK:

a position where, 'You are not Newfoundlanders, you are not true Newfoundlanders. You have got to stand up and be counted on your offshore rights, on the Northern cod stocks'. And now the flag is basically the same way, that the flag may be entering into the realm of partisan adapting. I have asked the question to myself and I may say it now, that we had some flags come that were made up and one of them is flying in the government common room. We will be getting one or more but out of courtesy why were not two given at the same time? It is these things that present me with the question of what is happening and what possibly will happen to this. And if I may say, and will say this, if I feel that this Province itself and this flag will enter into the realm of partisan and political opportunity then I, myself, will be extremely hurt emotionally from the point of view that I regret that I turned around and used my intellect and used my emotions and energy to go around this Province, and at great cost to other members on the Committee financially, who have taken great time to go around, to finally see this cheapened. I did not turn around and recommend this out of conscience. I knew that we would have our problems with it and I knew that we would have problems with the Legion and the Orange Lodge and various other groups, but yet, I am willing to face that. But I do ask this House for the respect. When each member on this side gets up to speak for it, that it is out of conscience, and they be given respect. And I also ask the members on this side to respect the members on the government side, that when they get up to speak they also listen out of respect. So I support this flag but I caution the government from the point of view, you have the numbers, you have the idea to turn around and pass this when you want to pass this, but do not let it fall down, do not let this flag fall down to the depths that even before it is flown it is being walked upon. I think the House owes more



MR. HISCOCK:

to the Committee than that. I think the House and the government owes more to the people, of not being impatient and of listening. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close and I would also like to finish by saying that I do think that this flag will grow, it will grow on us. And I also think that once the final vote is cast that we will become quite proud of it. I am willing to stand on it but I am not willing to stand on Mr. Peckford's terms and say, stand up and be counted.

MR. THOMS: Not now.

MR. HISCOCK: Any other time. So this flag, as far as I am concerned, and I want to say it now, is the flag of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, irregardless of colour, irregardless of religion and how the people, after it is approved, want to go and put emotions on it, that is entirely up to themselves but I will stand on my own. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: Now we are going to hear (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. HOLLETT: I would like to thank the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) for the introduction. I do not know if I need it here, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I will accept Premier Peckford's terms in relation to this flag debate, in relation to what he said, amongst other things, I am quite willing to stand up and be counted. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I find it very, very disappointing as a member of this House to know that it is only our side who have all

MR. HOLLETT:

indicated they wish to speak to this issue and have it duly recorded so that everybody in this Province who cares can check Hansard and know where each individual member of our caucus stands. I find it very, very disappointing to know that the big boppers on the other side just

MR. D. HOLLETT: do not possess the intestinal fortitude to stand up, the front benchers in particular. The minister, yesterday, tried to close debate by standing. He was recognized. There was a questioning of this. Twice three times today he has tried it. And yesterday the Premier himself indicated that he cared to speak in this debate. It is recorded in Hansard. And once again in the wee small minutes of the closing of this afternoon here we are trying to close off the debate again. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people who do not address themselves to this matter, who do not have their comments recorded will live to feel sorry for it, whether the flag becomes the most acceptable symbol that we have ever had in this Province or if it washes out. So with those few comments, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just say a little bit about my background in connection with the flag in case there is any doubt. I have always wanted a distinctive flag for Newfoundland, ever since the first time I had the opportunity to go to Nova Scotia, on an old coal vessel, when I was nine years old saw their flag. I could not understand then why we did not have our own distinctive Newfoundland flag. Every opportunity I had, Mr. Speaker, I spoke for it and worked towards it. Quite actively in 1965-66 and Come Home Year, when I was the Southern Vice-president, I thought we should have had it then, Centennial Year and all other associations I have had which I will not mention. I think a province with the history and tradition that we possess deserves a very distinctive provincial flag. And, Mr. Speaker, this is not just from me. I think if we wander around this Province and talk to people, and over the years I have asked a lot, and I think it is fair to say that everybody in this Province would like to see a very distinctive flag. And, Mr. Speaker, why the Union Jack is being dragged in as a red herring is beyond me. A lot of people have tried to excuse themselves and talk themselves out of the Union Jack issue. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the members of the Legion, and for some strange reason we only associate the Legion with the Union Jack, but I can assure you that there is a lot of people in this Province who still think a lot of that flag.

MR. D. HOLLETT: But those people, by far the majority, would be quite willing to accept any form of symbolism in a new flag that reflects the Union Jack and what it has meant to the people of this Province, starting from the colony up or from the first day that the so-called fish merchants settled the Province. I find it also somewhat peculiar, Mr. Speaker, that people refer to the native peoples who settled here. We start with the Inuits, the Beothics and everything else. Nobody has mentioned the Vikings, they were here. The Portuguese were here, the French in particular. If you look at just the place names that are still quite common, and certainly on our older maps, by far the majority of the place names in this Province are French. So I do not think any of those arguments are valid at all when we come to a very distinctive flag.

I think we should have a flag that is going to represent what Newfoundland was, what it is and what everybody's aspiration for it to become. And I think that to a certain extent that whole three-step logical process has been somewhat ignored. Mr. Speaker, I cast no reflection on Mr. Pratt. I would suggest that probably Mr. Pratt did the very best he could in relation to all the information that was compiled by the Committee and presented to him. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record and say that I was and still consider myself a personal friend of Mr. Pratt. Back years ago, in the early fifties, we used to go fishing together. As a matter of fact, I am proud to say that I have the first painting that he ever completed, that he did with his Aunt Myrt's water colours in the attic of his father's house on Waterford Bridge Road when we were tying flies to go salmon fishing in St. Mary's Bay. And because it was my turn to use a vice he started dabbling. And I am very proud of that particular painting. And I am quite proud of not only Mr. Pratt but his wife and his family's accomplishments and what they have done to portray to Canada and the world the ability of Newfoundlanders, the ability that he inherited, Mr. Speaker. And that came from the past not from the future.

MR. HOLLETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I can get very emotional over the flag issue for a lot of reasons. I think that this Province has a past that we can all be very proud of. I have heard mention made that we should forget it. Mr. Speaker, I will suggest there is nothing that has happened in the past in this Province that we can forget, whether it be good, bad or indifferent. Every bit of it added up equals one things, just what we are today, individually, from an economic point of view or anything else. I do not think that anything bad in the past should be looked upon disparagingly. The very worst it could do is teach us what not to do in the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the flag itself, when I saw it unveiled here in the House I will be quite honest, I was expecting something quite different, but I had no preconceived ideas. I was hoping that a certain thing would be there, and I did not even have it really identified, but I must say, when it was unveiled, it did not grab me anywhere. It did not do a thing for me emotionally or otherwise, and I really tried to sit down and assess this flag, all sorts of ways individually, because I believe that a person is elected here to make some basic decisions. And I did not do any canvass in my riding, I can assure all members of that. I had no intention to, because I feel that an issue such as the flag issue is one that you have to feel yourself you want to do something for it, something that you can stand up and shout and be proud of. I do not find that in this particular design. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would say quite emphatically to me I find it somewhat repugnant, because there is nothing in it, in my opinion, to indicate anything prior to whatever the date it was introduced in 1980.

MR. HOLLETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I think a lot of my forefathers. I think they made a contribution to this Province in all fields, including the two great conflicts. Some gave their lives. I will not expound on that all all. But, also, other people I know and just about everybody here, their forefathers made a great contribution to this Province, and I cannot understand, in my simplistic way, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to a flag that is going to be, hopefully - every Newfoundlander will be proud of in the years to come - why there is not one little thing in it to indicate, other than they were all born in 1980, that Newfoundland came to the surface like some gigantic volcanic eruption in 1980. I just do not see it. The hon. member from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) referred to it as being a young people's flag. Well, I will suggest, Mr. Speaker, that young people also grow up and become old, but I think that is forgotten. The member from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) over here smiles. Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, if the member from Stephenville got up and spoke his mind as I am doing, I suggest he would have made a much different speech, because the members can sit here, the members who can sit here and smile and make light -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. HOLLETT: - any member who can smile and make light of any member who is speaking in this debate, I find that, also, very offensive, because I think every person who has spoken -

MR. STAGG: I always smile at the hon. member.

MR. HOLLETT: I trust it is with pride,

Mr. Speaker. Every member here who has spoken, I have listened attentively, and I respect each and every one for

MR. HOLLETT:                    what they have said, but I do not think in a debate as important, in my opinion, to this House should just be made of what anybody said. I believe they said what they honestly believe. I believe that every member in this House is voting as a free vote. Very seldom we get that opportunity, and that is why I said at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I just cannot understand why every member here is not determined to ensure that his feelings on this important issue are on the record. I just cannot conceive it, I do not know why, and time will tell.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on on this particular issue. I see no point in it. I honestly believe that the ones who prefer not to speak on it will either just stand up and vote yes or be conveniently absent when the vote is taken. I do not think that is proper, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people in this Province will know it, it will be made public, and I do not think any member can slough it off in his riding or anywhere else he travels in this Province by saying, "Boy, I was not there", or, "I was out when my turn came to speak". I think it is incumbent that everybody record their real feelings or the feelings they feel that are dictated to them to have recorded, as a lot of members have said. I have heard members say that they are elected to represent a riding, and they feel because they are the people's representative that the majority of the people in their ridings told them not to vote for or against it. I accept that, if that is how a person thinks.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to go on record

MR. HOLLETT:

and say that I am going to vote for this flag how I feel, what I believe in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I live where I live by choice and I am proud of it. And I am only sorry to say that I am not quite that proud of this flag.

Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, is it the wish that we adjourn the debate or is it the wish that we carry on?

MR. NEARY:

Carry on.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed. Carry on.

MR. HICKEY:

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my comments to the debate. I am not sure where the impression came from that no members on this side wished to participate. Certainly it was my intention to.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible) close the debate.

MR. HICKEY:

It was my intention, Mr. Speaker, to add my comments right from the beginning -

MR. ROBERTS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY:

- because I happened to have some involvement in attempting to bring in a flag in this hon. House, some, roughly, five years ago - four years, five years ago. A flag was on the Order Paper, in terms of a bill, and died on the Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of my involvement at the time, and because of the controversy which ensued when there was a public pronouncement that the government was desirous of bringing in a proposal for a distinctive flag for this Province, that allows me to participate in the debate in probably a little different way than I normally would because I had some exposure to some of the controversy, some of the suggestions. I did



MR. HICKEY: some research into the past in terms of flags and designs and what not. And it is also, Mr. Speaker, a reason why I am somewhat surprised to find that some of the people opposing this design, on the grounds that it represents nothing of the past, state their case in that way. Because some of the people, Mr. Speaker, who appear to be, and I will give the benefit of the doubt, appear to be violently opposed to this design on the grounds that it represents nothing of the past, and it does not have the Union Jack on the design, **were just as violently** opposed to the design put forward in this House some four or five years ago which had, very simply put, a white background, the Provincial Crest on the right, or towards the right, almost in centre, but a bit towards the right, and a miniature Union Jack in the upper left hand corner.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that design surely was representative of the past. It has to be argued what more clear representation of the past could one get than to have, as some of the people, at least, who oppose this design say now, the Union Jack should be there or something symbolic of our past should be there.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it leads one to the conclusion, I believe, and certainly it has led me to the

MR. HICKEY:

conclusion, not only now but as it did then, that it is virtually impossible for Mr. Pratt, the great artist that he is, and/or anyone else in this Province, to produce a design which will not bring about similar opposition from various groups that we are hearing about today.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Mr. Pratt designed (inaudible)

MR. HICKEY:

Yes, a very pertinent point which I was going to get to. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded by my hon. friend, Mr. Pratt comes in for a great deal of criticism and abuse which is unjustified totally. And I believe it is shameful that he has been **subjected to this kind of criticism because he was engaged by the** committee and did for the committee in, as far as I can determine, what he was asked to do, based on their findings in their travels, in holding their meetings and so on.

My hon. friend from Eagle River

(Mr. Hiscock), Mr. Speaker, mentioned the issue becoming partisan, and I can relate to that, especially in this instance, where a select committee of the House was struck to bring in a proposed flag. Made up of hon. members from both parties one would have thought that we could have gotten through the debate and passed or dealt with the issue along non-partisan lines. If the issue has become partisan, it behooves all of us, not necessarily to look only at the government side of the House, but to look at both sides of the House, for the simple reason, Mr. Speaker, that there has been the suggestion, indeed there has been constantly the statement from the other side of the House, and in fairness not only the other side of the House but outside the confines of this Chamber, that this design or what will be a flag, hopefully, when it is passed, is being rammed down the throats of our people. Mr. Speaker, nothing can be so ludicrous as that statement. What do we mean by ramming this so-called flag down the throats of our people? A Select Committee of both sides of the House,

May 13, 1980

Tape No. 1518

NM - 2

MR. HICKEY: representing both parties in this House was set up. They went around the Province and held public hearings. Their meetings were advertised. They were not behind closed doors where nobody knew about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: With no design in mind.

MR. HICKEY: No what?

AN HON. MEMBER: With no design in mind.

MR. HICKEY: With no design in mind, exactly. Exactly.

But nevertheless, Your Honour -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: - nevertheless the committee was charged with the responsibility of bringing in a design.

MR. T. HICKEY: And that design was to be brought in based on the views of hon. members from both sides and/or submissions presented by the general public at large. Now, Mr. Speaker, very often one hears in this House on many and varied issues that the answer is to set up a Select Committee of this Legislature to solve the problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! I am having difficulty hearing the hon. minister speak.

MR. T. HICKEY: Thank you, Your Honour. And I do not think, Your Honour, that one can quarrel with that concept of a Select Committee, very often it is the way to go. But here, Your Honour, we had a Select Committee set up, a report brought forward, comprised of members from both sides of the House, input from the general public, spread over a reasonable period of time, that report brought forward a design, unveiled, a bill brought forward, a full-scale debate taking place--

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. T. HICKEY: - independence of mind being brought to bear through a free vote and yet we hear cries of ramming this so-called design down the throats of our people. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that is hogwash.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: 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.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House now adjourn. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: It is certainly our pleasure but I would ask the hon. gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall)

MR. ROBERTS: - on tomorrow, of course, it is  
Private Members' Day and we shall carry on with the motion in the  
name of the gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), can the  
House Leader (Mr. Marshall) indicate what we will be doing on  
Thursday? Are we back on the flag?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: That is something to look forward  
to, Sir. Thank you.

On motion, the House at its rising  
adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 14, 1980, at 3:00 p.m.