

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, MAY 15, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the gallery on behalf of hon. members the town manager of the town of Happy Valley - Goose Bay in the district of Nas-kaupi, Mr. Cecil Vincent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: And I have a communication here that I have been asked to pass on to hon. members. It is addressed to "Mr. Speaker," The Lieutenant-Governor returned from hospital yesterday and is making good progress to normal health. He has asked me to express to you and to the members of the House of Assembly his deep appreciation of the gracious resolution which was passed by the House. His Honour was also deeply appreciative of the beautiful flower arrangement that he received in hospital. In thanking you and the hon. members for their thoughtful kindness, His Honour wishes me to observe that it is only in keeping with the cordial and happy relationship that His Honour has always enjoyed with the members of the House of Assembly. Signed by Major Donald C. Barter, Private Secretary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. This is the first opportunity that I have had to raise this matter. It has been reliably reported to me that on one of the open line programmes, specifically Bas Jamieson's Open Line programme this morning that he declared that were stacks and stacks of boxes of new flags stored in Confederation Building, and also that the artist, Christopher Pratt, had received an enormous fee.

MR. J. CARTER: Now, on the second point first: Mr. Pratt has done his work free of charge, completely free of charge. The committee feels that he should be paid for the art materials that he used, which might come to \$100, the cardboard and the paper and the paints, aside from that his workmanship was entirely free.

On the first matter, there are only eight flags and none of them belong to the government. So far they are charged out to me. One is in the hall downstairs, in the lobby, the one we can see; another one is in the Opposition common room, and six are at my house. And so far they belong to me, they do not even belong to the government. So I would like those matters to be straightened up.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle, to the point of privilege.

MR. ROBERTS: I was going to say I think this falls under the rubric of not so much a point of privilege but the well known practice in the Chamber of a member, you know, making a statement under the guise of a point of privilege which really it is to clarify a matter or to set straight a matter. I do not think it requires any action from the House, but the hon. gentleman has made the statement, I think that speaks for itself.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of privilege then, I would rule that there is no prima facie case but the hon. member for St. John's North has taken the opportunity to clarify or point out the position with respect to some comments that were attributed to the situation with regard to the flag.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to inform hon. members of the House with respect to the Recruit of the Year Award for the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, which was made a short while ago; as hon. members may recall, the Rotary Club of St. John's, through a group called the Lion Tamers Group, yearly since 1965 have made such an award and I was pleased to be there and to congratulate the three constables and to inform the House who they are. The winner of the Recruit of the Year Award was Constable Terrence Augustus, and the two runners-up in order of running up are Constable Gerard Power and Constable Eric Keating. I know that all hon. members join me in congratulating those three members of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues and I on this side of the House should certainly be happy with congratulations to the Recruit of the Year and the two runners up. I have often stated in this House, Mr. Speaker, that the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary is a police force

MR. THOMS: that is second to none. They are one of the best. I have had a lot of contact with them during my professional career and I can safely say that they are second to no police force in the world. And on behalf of myself and my colleagues I would certainly extend congratulations to these three new recruits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Premier of the Province. In view of the enormous respect, and in view of the tremendous sacrifice that members of the Royal Canadian Legion throughout Newfoundland, and, indeed the world, you know, we do owe an awful lot, the free world owes an awful lot to these men who fought in the First and Second World War and also to veterans who fought in the Korean War. In view of this fact would the Premier not reconsider the government's decision to permit a member of the Canadian Legion to appear before the Bar of this House in connection with the proposed flag?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I for one, I guess, could demonstrate tangibly and concretely my respect and esteem for the Royal Canadian Legion by citing the fact that I was astounded last year on a number of occasions to physically be present at a number of ceremonies that the Royal Canadian Legion are engaged in as a part of their mandate and constitution which had never been attended by a Premier before. And I was really surprised by that and I think that if the executive of the Royal Canadian Legion, and the other members whom I have had a lot of close dealings with over the last year—I know they would vouch for this, that I have been, as a Premier, a very good friend of the Royal Canadian Legion in anything they have come and requested of this government and have requested of me.

On this particular issue the government, through the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), made their wishes clear yesterday. And I would only reiterate the reasons that were given in that letter that Mr. Marshall delivered to the Speaker which I think are very, very substantial reasons for not allowing a member of the Royal Canadian Legion to come before the Bar. I think it would be a serious affront to the British parliamentary system because it would be a serious affront to the Select Committee itself and the members of the Select Committee who represented very admirably every member of this House as a Committee when they went around this Province.

And more importantly or just as important the whole question that all 'special privilege to none', 'equal opportunity for all' is the kind of policy that this administration wants to pursue in its desire to bring in new measures or whatever in this House and hence we will

PREMIER PECKFORD: always use the Select Committee route, the public hearing route to ensure that all agencies, all individuals, all groups of people in this Province get an equal opportunity to put their views on issues of major import.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). The people on the Labrador coast, in particular, are a bit surprised, basically, with regard to the Northern cod stocks. It is their attitude that if anybody should have a say on them it should be the people on the coast of Labrador. In this regard the question comes up with regard to the government barge. When the Union ended up applying for the fish plants in Mary's Harbour and in Snug Harbour and in Cartwright, they also asked for the use of the barge. Will the company, the local people along the coast of Labrador, be getting that barge for the fish plant?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the preamble to the question I want to mention that in our position on the Northern cod there was substantial input

MR. MORGAN: in that policy position from the Labrador Advisory Council. I am convinced, if I can recall correctly that their position in fact was almost stronger than what our position is today on the Northern cod issue. Now as pertains to facilities in Labrador, I thank the hon. gentleman for asking that question. It is only today I have been dealing with that matter. Some weeks ago I met with the Fishermen's Union, Mr. Cashin and others, and a new company, called the Labrador Shrimp Company, formed by the union. They have licenses issued by the federal government for the fishing of shrimp and they wanted to get involved in facilities in Labrador owned by the Newfoundland government. At that time I advised them and in writing after the meeting as well, that our position would be we would consider leasing the facilities at Cartwright and at Mary's Harbour and possibly the barge, providing they could in return for that approval in principle indicate to us, before giving final approval, the type of operations to be carried out and who they would have as manager-operators in these facilities. I was of the opinion they had Bay Bulls Seafoods as the company to operate Cartwright. Unfortunately, for some reason that company has now withdrawn the proposal to operate that facility. So I have now as of today in a telex to Mr. Frank Flynn, the President of the corporation, the shrimp company, asked him to clarify to us as soon as possible what the plans are of that company, the shrimp company, so that we can make a decision whether to lease the facilities to the union through their companies or to lease the facilities to private enterprise, in this case to a company like Fishery Products, or somebody else, who operated last year. So right now it is in a bit of a limbo. We are awaiting word from the Fishermen's Union, Mr. Cashin and Mr. Frank Flynn, the President of the union's shrimp company, to indicate to us what their plans are for the operations this year. But until we get that, there is no decision being made in a definite way. But I want to stress the importance of

May 15, 1980

Tape No. 1560

AH-2

MR. MAYNARD: getting a decision as soon as possible from the union so that we can make a final decision with regards to the leasing of the facilities for this year's operations.

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary. The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the barge, regarding further information, is it not true that the government is basically leaning in favour of Fishery Products and Fishery Products will use this barge out of St. Anthony because of the low production in St. Anthony, and take the fish from the Labrador coast, instead of having some processing on the Labrador coast, and bring it to St. Anthony?

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

MR. MORGAN: Well, I guess we can use the term 'leaning in the direction,' I guess it is an accurate statement because I learned a few days ago in private meetings with Mr. LeBlanc that

MR. MORGAN: the fishermen's union was wanting to get involved in over-the-side sales or direct sales in Labrador this year, in direct sales of cod and turbot, and, of course, we are opposed to that. I am opposed to any over-the-side sales to foreigners of species of that nature which we feel, and the industry feels, can be processed by the industry operating onshore in Labrador, in this case Fishery Products which carries out a collecting service for the St. Anthony operations and Nickerson's operations working South from Black Tickle. So, because of that, we will not be leasing the barge to any activity, in this case union activity, that would be aiding over-the-side sales which we are opposed to. So, until the Federal minister makes a decision on whether or not to grant licences or grant approval for over-the-side sales to the union in Labrador, which I am hoping he will not, by the way. Mr. Cashin does not like that, but I am strongly opposed to having species leave these waters and go into foreign nations - which can be processed on our shores in Labrador. So, until Mr. LeBlanc makes a decision, which he indicated last Saturday he would make this week, there has been no decision made with regard to leasing the barge. But if we do lease it to Fishery Products, it will be going into Smokey as a collecting point and a service centre to service the operations of Fishery Products in collecting fish along the coast.

MR. HISCOCK: A final supplementary.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Does the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) also know that Fishery Products have plans to close down their rooms in Snug Harbour and Fishing Ships this year, thereby having the local fishermen find their own supply of food, salt and gasoline?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, no, I am not totally familiar with what the company is doing in Labrador. I planned to hold meetings with Fishery Products this week, but I am of the impression from talking to Mr. Etchegary, in particular, that if they can get the

MR. MORGAN: lease, if they can arrange for us to lease the barge to them, that that would be the floating service centre to replace other centres they used last year. So, they are in right now, I would say, limbo as well, because there is no decision made by us with regard to the leasing facilities and we are waiting on two decisions. In this case, the faster they come the better, one from Mr. LeBlanc in Ottawa with regard to over-the-side sales and the second, from the union with regard to finding manager-operators for the facilities at Mary's Harbour and at Cartwright.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). No doubt the minister is aware of the recent developments and the circumstances surrounding these developments at St. Brendan's re their dissatisfaction, one, with their regular ferry service and, secondly, their discontent and dissatisfaction with the ferry that was to replace their regular ferry service while it was in for its annual refit. I wonder if the minister can tell us what action he has taken, or is taking, to resolve that very serious situation?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, we had a boat or a ferry to put on that run while the regular was under refit. Unfortunately, it did not meet with the approval of the people. And I do not particularly like the part of the picketing and all that because I do not think government should act under pressure, not that type of pressure. But we have or should I say we are negotiating to get another boat. I think the problem with the one that we found was that she could not take cars, just pedestrians. So the operator went there actually with the boat but things were so hot that he pulled out of it. But we are negotiating with another boat owner and we are hoping to be able to get that boat and that one will be able to take cars. What it will mean is that the regular ferry will stay on until this other boat that we are negotiating for is ready.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: It indeed was unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the law-abiding citizens of St. Brendan's had to take this action but it came through frustration and dissatisfaction and discontent. But I wonder if the minister would address himself to the real large problem of the people's dissatisfaction with the present ferry services. And in view of the concern expressed by the people of St. Brendan's and the action that they have taken, I wonder if the minister is in a position to indicate to the House just what he plans to do with the present ferry services? Has he changed his mind with respect to providing extra funds for the purchase of a new ferry service for St. Brendan's in this fiscal year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not changed my mind. I could not if I wanted to because the government does not have the money. It is just as simple as that. I do not expect there

MR. BRETT:

will be any change in the ferry system at St. Brendan's this year. However, I will be in a position, hopefully not later than the latter part of next week, to make a fairly comprehensive statement or lengthy statement on what government plans to do with all the ferries of the Province.

MR. LUSH:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

A final supplementary.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

The minister again set up a committee to look into the whole issue of intraprovincial ferry services within the Province. I wonder if the minister can indicate to the House today whether that committee has advocated any major policy change with respect to the operation of ferries and what time can the members of this House expect to be presented with that committee's report?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, they have recommended some very, very major changes and that is what Cabinet will be discussing within the next four or five days and as soon as Cabinet makes its decision I will be making a statement in the House.

MR. LUSH:

In four or five days we will have it?

MR. BRETT:

There is going to be a special Cabinet meeting. I do not know, it will be in a week or so I guess.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier. Sir, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) managed to get out through the fog up to Ottawa and met with his counterpart up in Ottawa. But my question does not have to do with that. The hon. the Premier committed himself in this hon. House about a week to ten days ago that any proposal put to Ottawa in writing in connection with the offshore resources would be tabled in this House, would be presented to this House before the document was brought to Ottawa. What has happened to that promise, that commitment that the Premier made?

MR. S. NEARY: Did the minister, indeed, make a presentation on behalf of the Province in writing and, if so, why was it not presented to the House either the day that the minister went to Ottawa or before he went?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: A copy of it, Mr. Speaker, is down in my office on the desk. I did not have a chance to go back to my office on the way in because I was over at a T.V. interview and I came on up here and my raglan is in there on the floor because I wanted to get in here for Question Period. But the copy of the letter that puts this whole matter in perspective from government's point of view is on my desk and I will have somebody go down and pick it up and table it in a few minutes. I want to do it. I could have done it yesterday but I did not know if the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) would get to Ottawa and what the story is. The co-ordination is there. It will be tabled in a few minutes.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Another example of breakdown in communications. We were led to believe in this House that the document would be presented to the members of the House before -

AN HON. MEMBER: No

MR. S. NEARY: - well, that is my impression of what the hon. gentleman said.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: And I now want to ask the hon. gentleman what he thinks of the meeting? Was it a success? Are we on a disaster course, as the papers have indicated?

MR. L. THOMS: A serious threat to Confederation.

MR. S. NEARY: A serious threat to Confederation as some of the papers have indicated? Has the minister reported back to the hon. the Premier, and if so, what does the hon. gentleman think now of the route of negotiating a settlement?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The Minister of Mines and Energy

(Mr. L. Barry) can answer the details of the meeting he had. It would be perhaps worthwhile for the minister so to do in a few minutes. My own overall view of the situation is - and, of course, the minister and I spoke about it this morning and partially through lunch hour - on the ownership of mineral resources and the claim that the federal government has on that and the claim that the Province has on it, I think the minister would indicate, and has indicated to me, that the present minister in Ottawa is not inclined towards having the federal government relinquish its claim, but as I understand it, the minister will be bringing that whole matter to the Cabinet or to the Prime Minister. So that is number one. And in line with that, may I just say that at the same time as our Minister of Energy was meeting with the Minister of Energy for Canada (hon. Marc Lalonde) and almost - I do not know if it was the same hour, but the same day, I guess it was - the Prime Minister committed in a speech in Quebec that right after the May 20th referendum they would work towards constitutional change and reform. And that is a fairly significant commitment in my view. The Prime Minister had indicated on a number of occasions things towards that end.

Now, every province in Canada, as I understand it, has asked for constitutional reform and some form of renewed federalism - every Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

All the political parties in Canada represented now in the House of Commons, except the Liberal Party - the New Democratic Party and the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, all of the provincial governments represented by their Premiers, Intergovernmental Affairs and Energy ministers, all have supported that one of the tenets that is crucial to an acceptable, renewed federalist constitution would be the ownership of mineral resources on the continental shelf belonging to the provinces. So I would look upon Mr. Mahon's statement yesterday of going back to the Cabinet with it, in connection with the statement that the Prime Minister said yesterday, in connection with what all the provinces and political parties except the federal Liberal party, what they are saying, that we are on a proper and orderly course towards having something substantial done in our favour on that issue.

On the pricing issue, it is still fairly well up in the air. On the whole question of the transmission of electricity through Quebec from Labrador, our logic is impeccable, can not be argued with and I think the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) could report that his logic was so impeccable that there was very little response from the federal Energy Minister, that the Minister of Energy had done his homework, done his job with the document he presented here and that we are on extremely safe ground as it relates to logic, constitution and you name it. It is just a matter, again, for a will.

I have written the Prime Minister and I will be tabling a document on Monday or Tuesday of next week, a detailed document as it relates to federal/provincial relations, or I can do it some other time. I would just like to read into the record, if the hon. member does not mind, to the Prime Minister, a copy of which was delivered by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) for Newfoundland to the Minister of Energy for Canada yesterday.

"My dear Prime Minister, I refer to the agreement between the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and

PREMIER PECKFORD: the federal government as embodied in my letter of August 23rd, 1979 to Prime Minister Clarke and his letter of response of September 12th, 1979 confirming Newfoundland's ownership of offshore resources. You will note by these two letters both governments formally agreed that their positions in this matter would be governed by four basic principles which, for your convenience, I attach hereto.

"Given the nature of these undertakings by the federal government under the signature of the Prime Minister, I naturally assume that your administration will feel bound by the agreement so reached.

"Accordingly, the province stands ready to proceed with the secondary but necessary step of drafting a detailed agreement between our two governments embodying not only these four basic principles but also those collateral issues which any important matter such as this inevitably gives rise to as well as any legislation necessary to ratify the same.

"In view of the very important oil discovery at Hibernia, we must proceed speedily and diligently in this matter. Accordingly, I suggest that a meeting between us is necessary before implementation talks can begin at the ministerial or official level. - "

MR. S. NEARY:

You are going to table that?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes.

"So that our mutual commitment to the implementation of the existing agreement between the two governments can be made clear. In view of this, I will be available on a date and at a place convenient to you. Sincerely yours."

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

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In view of a recent aircraft accident in Makkovik, Labrador, a couple of days ago, to an aircraft owned and operated by Labrador Airways, could the minister advise us if the cause-if he is left to understand that the cause of this accident is because there was not proper maintenance done to the airstrip?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have been out of my office now for three days and I have not had time to be briefed by the staff but they did mention it just quickly before I came here.

It is my understanding that, I guess the frost was coming out of the ground and it is a gravel runway, it is not paved, so therefore it is soft and I think the aircraft went through. Now there is some question, and maybe the hon. member intends to come up with a supplementary, there is some question about some member of the staff or a staff member - there is only one, I think-being laid off who probably should not have been laid off. It was my understanding that he was not. I think we intended to keep the gentleman on as long as it was felt necessary. However, to answer that even if the staff member had been kept on, there is very little, I think, that can be done, in a case where frost is coming out of the ground and it gets soft. You cannot bring boulders in to put on an airstrip like that. There is a certain kind of stone that would have to be put there, so I would like to think it was more an act of God than negligence on the part of the Department of Transportation and

MR. C. BRETT: Communications.

MR. G. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is probably an answer. to my supplementary, but I would like to remind the minister that it was not due to frost coming out of the ground, because actually there was a snow storm there on the weekend in which several inches of snow fell, and I understand in a letter from the minister on the 17th of April that he did state that the heavy equipment operator would be kept on and I do further understand that the operator was laid off back on April 22nd and this is the reason, that the Department of Transportation had not kept the operator working at the airstrip. I am just wondering if the minister will ensure that an operator will be hired on within the next few days to make sure that that airstrip is brought up to standards for aircraft going in and out of Makkovik.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, if it is necessary it will not take two or three days. We will have him on tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier and his answer to my hon. colleague from LaPoile a little while ago there, sort of is, almost a preamble, it might be partly the question I would like to ask the Premier. My question to the Premier might very well be a little premature and, of course, Mr. Speaker, we only get questions that we can ask in this hon. House because of our exposure to our districts, at least that is the way I feel, or the exposure we get to the outlying areas. First of all, I would like to make it quite clear Mr. Premier, that I, myself, and the people around me, and I think all the hon. people in this House want to have a flag. We would like to see something that would relate to the Province.

MR. T. BENNETT:

In his design we see nothing that is British, nothing that is Canadian, nothing that is Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. member has a question?

MR. T. BENNETT:

In view of all the ramifications with regards to the flag, with regards to the offshore oil, gas, fisheries, with regards to the present cod war that seems to be building - there are questions being asked outside - and I would like to ask the Premier would it be fair to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we ourselves might be heading toward a sovereign state, not only Quebec, but ourselves, Newfoundland, would we ourselves be heading in that direction?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is absolutely - if there is anybody in this House who ever raises that kind of issue, you know, I will be four square against it. I mean, the hon. member takes me by surprise by even suggesting that this Province - you know, all of these issues, I hope that the hon. member feels as strongly as I do about the fact that we just want the same rights to transmit electricity as other people in Canada have to transmit oil and gas. I hope the hon. member feels the same way about us owning but sharing the oil and gas the same way as provinces now own and share their resources. And I hope he feels the same way as I do about the fact of trying to reduce unemployment in East and Northeastern Newfoundland by the access to additional codfish. That has nothing to do - and the flag is to be a distinctive representative of Newfoundland and Labrador in

PREMIER PECKFORD: that we are honourary, solid members of the Commonwealth and solid members of the Confederation that we would like to see renewed in certain instances. But nobody should ever misconstrue that inside or outside of this House as any lack of resolve that our partnership in the world community is reflected through our nation and through our Commonwealth is any less than it has ever been. I am one of those, as I said in answer to the question earlier on the question of the Canadian Legion, I have been as a person, for example, closer to the Canadian Legion and have done things with the Canadian Legion as a government and as a person, and they can vouch for that, than any Premier has done since 1949. And I would suggest to the other premiers not to throw anything negative on them - they had far more reason because of their age and all of the rest of it to be far closer to our past and our heritage than I would be. But I have on many occasions been told by people who are older that I have a far greater attachment to those things than other people who are much older than I am and I will continue to have that. And I reassert the desire on behalf of myself as Premier and everybody on this side towards being vibrant members of a Commonwealth and vibrant, strong members of a Canadian nation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): We have time for one final, quick supplementary, about forty seconds remaining in which to answer.

MR. FLIGHT: A question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. In view of his very rational approach in answering the member for LaPoile's (Mr. Neary) question, I wonder would the Premier agree that the minister's approach, or the purported approach in today's paper that is being read all over Newfoundland, where he indicates that a solution to the offshore would have to be according to the way he sees it, or his government sees it, or it would be a threat to Confederation, is that kind of a public line conducive to resolving the problem and getting an agreeable solution to the problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You are bringing in the minister's statement and I would like for that minister to respond.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, there were enough cameras and recording devices around after our meeting that if anybody wants to check they will find that my reference to a serious problem for Confederation in the event it is not resolved referred to if Ottawa and Alberta do not arrive at an agreement with respect to oil pricing. And my comments with respect to a serious problem for Confederation, despite the story which I see carried in both papers over CP, was incorrect. I might say, however, Mr. Speaker, that I did make it clear to the minister, I did make it clear that I was very concerned from the sentiments that I have been receiving in letters in my office, that if the federal government attempted to run roughshod over this Province's rights, that if the federal government did not live up to its commitment to a renewed federalism, that we would see a disenchantment with Confederation. And I think that that is fair enough.

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

Questions has expired.

000

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I wonder if we could revert to tabling.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

It is not reports as such, but hon. members will recall an undertaking with respect to a pamphlet outlining the basic principles of the Matrimonial Property Act, and I would table it as a means of having it distributed to hon. members. And also this is due to go out through household mail to every household within the next several days.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, to several questions actually. A question asked, I am not sure if it is on May 9th., or May 12th., by the member for Eagle River, and the question was - two questions, a question in two parts - how many ferries in the Province are receiving provincial subsidies, and could the minister list the prices and the amount of subsidy each received, and the population of the centres?

The answer to the first part is eight, and the places are Bell Island - Portugal Cove, the subsidy is \$1,188,000.

MR. BRETT: The population is 7,000; St. Brendan's to Burnside, the subsidy is \$105,000 and the population is 650; Greenspond to Badger's Quay, the subsidy is \$113,400 and the population is 450; Fogo to Carmanville, \$181,500 and a population of 4,000 people; Change Islands to Farewell, \$120,000 subsidy and 600 population; Little Bay Islands and Long Island-St. Patricks, \$250,000 subsidy 1100 population; Woody Point, Norris Point and St. Bonne Bay \$110,000 subsidy and 3500 people; and Ramea-Burgeo-Grey River \$110,000 and 3600 people. The other question was also from the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock); Has the government evaluated its air subsidy programme to Labrador Airways from St. Anthony to Mary's Harbour and points on the Labrador East Coast and, two, has the minister been in contact with Labrador Airways with regard to this subsidy and what is the result of the negotiations and when can we expect the minister to make an official statement with regard to the air subsidy?

The first question, the answer is yes; to the second one, our officials have contracted Labrador Airways to advise that effective 1980 04 30 government will discontinue its financial support towards the operation of this service. Of course they knew that when they started, and I had not intended to make any official statement on it because it was an experiment that we tried, I guess government will sort of take a look at the whole thing and probably somewhere down the road in a month or so we may have to decide whether we are going to continue or if we will not subsidize it any further.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms)

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, on the Order Paper

of Friday, April 25th is Question 13 in the name of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to lay upon the Table of the House the following information, a list of names of individuals and/or companies who received loans from the

May 15, 1980

Tape No. 1568

AH-2

DR. COLLINS: Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation and the purpose for which the loans were granted. Prior to 1977, Mr. Speaker, it was the policy of the Corporation, which is a federal/provincial Corporation, not to release the names of such companies, but by agreement between the federal government and the provincial government in 1977 a revised policy was adopted whereby such names were released and I would like to table the names of individuals and companies for the dates from April 1, 1977 up to and including March 31, 1980.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Perhaps someone from the Table would like to take the material.

Further answers?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to delay the proceedings very much. I commenced my few remarks on Tuesday afternoon and I think I should just put in perspective the reasons, some of the reasons, at least, why government and the majority of members on this side of the House support, as well as some of our honourable friends on the other side support, this design for a provincial flag.

I said then, Mr. Speaker, that I had the privilege of introducing a bill in the House some three or four years ago recommending a design for a provincial flag and that design had the small Union Jack in the upper left-hand corner, the provincial emblem in the center on a white background. And, Mr. Speaker, a number of organizations and a number of people in this Province opposed that

May 15, 1980

Tape No. 1568

AH-3

MR. HICKEY: design, some of the people who opposed that design on the grounds that it was not distinctive, it did not adequately represent our history, our past, it was not a proper design for a provincial flag, oppose this flag, which gives rise, Mr. Speaker, to the question as to what kind of design could any organization, group, select committee or anyone else produce in this Province which would meet the approval of

MR. T. HICKEY: the greater majority of those people who feel strongly about a provincial flag or any change in the system that we have or the situation that we have right now. In other words, Mr. Speaker, a lot of those people, whether they want to acknowledge it or not, would prefer to maintain the status quo, hold on to the Union Jack.

Mr. Speaker, as a former Minister of Recreation, it came to my attention in the most vivid manner the embarrassment that some of our young people, some of our best athletes, were faced with in competing in national and international events. When any colour guard representing Her Majesty or the Governor General appeared on the scene, this Province, the only province in the country, including the two territories, did not have a flag to fly. We were without a flag. The Union Jack has to be taken down. Because naturally, Mr. Speaker, the Union Jack is the flag of Great Britain. It is the flag that is flown insofar as any official visits by the Governor General or in this Province, the Lieutenant-Governor. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, even with the official flag, as we call it, the Union Jack, I do not know - in fact, I have not been able to find out if there is another country or territory in the world that has borrowed a flag of another country and taken it as the flag for that territory or province or country. So we are in a unique position, there is no doubt about that. That is why, Mr. Speaker, that we have always felt strongly on this side the need for a distinctive provincial flag.

People who suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this design does not represent our past, our history, our culture, that is quite debatable, Mr. Speaker. Right on the paper that we have depicting the design, it shows clearly how it was put together based on public hearing, based on submissions, briefs, dialogues, all brought about by a Select Committee representative of this Legislature - not this government, not this party that sit on this side of the House, but both parties, the entire Legislature, and so we have a design that the Committee felt acceptable to them based on their findings in terms of all their meetings and discussions that they held throughout the Province.

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, one of the arguments against the design and the bill which I introduced some three or four years ago was in fact to allow the people to have some input through a Select Committee. We went and did that, Mr. Speaker. The result is this design from a Select Committee.

AN HON. MEMBER: What happened to the other one ?

MR. T. HICKEY: Never mind that one. We all know what happened to that one, Mr. Speaker. That died on the Order Paper. And the reason that died on the Order Paper was because of some of the arguments put forward and that the government was not determined enough to put that flag through this House despite the fact it had a majority and could have. But, again, it listened to some of the critics who suggested that the people outside this Legislature should indeed have some input.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard of railroading, we have heard of ramming this down the people's throats. I ask the question, 'Says who?' How can this design based on the way it came to us through the public meetings, through the efforts of a Select Committee, how can that be ever interpreted as ramming it down the throats of our people? Surely, Mr. Speaker, is it not one of the responsibilities of a government to deal with such issues? Is it not the chief responsibility of any administration to govern the affairs of this Province? Is that not what we were elected for? Are we to be assumed to go back to the electorate every time that we run against or run into an issue which is controversial

MR. T. HICKEY:

or becomes controversial? Are we to take the easy way out, Mr. Speaker, and say no, government is not going to act for fear it might make a few bad friends, that it might lose some support, that it might reap some criticism? Is that what we are to do, and in so doing abdicate our responsibility as a government?

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is not. And I suggest that that is one of the reasons why this government is decisive and is determined to govern the affairs of this Province. Not unmindful of the feelings and the point of view of the electorate, and never let it be said that we are unmindful or unaware or unconcerned, we have acknowledged that by indeed setting up the process of the Select Committee which resulted in this design.

Mr. Speaker, the Royal Canadian Legion is an organization that has the respect and high regard of the people of this Province. And as one minister I know that for good reasons, because there is hardly ever a month of the year or maybe even a week of the year that I am not made aware, through my position, of the good work done by the Royal Canadian Legion for our less fortunate citizens, for their own membership, their own veterans and for people throughout this land. Never let it be said, and never let the issues be confused, that this government is unaware or not appreciative of the efforts and the good work done by this organization.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. T. HICKEY:

But, Mr. Speaker, I find myself a little disheartened, similar to the sentiments as expressed by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) a few days ago when he indicated or quoted a statement by some member of the Legion in which the suggestion was made that there would be an organized effort to defeat any M.H.A.

MR. T. HICKEY:

who supported this flag.

In the document that we have received today, Mr. Speaker, there is not that statement. But at the end of the statement, Your Honour, there is this following statement and I will read it, 'I assure you the electorate will remember the manner in which this decision is made'. Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to address myself to that statement and I hope that I read it right because I do not read into that any threat and I do not read into that any suggestion of a denial of the right of freedom of expression, freedom of our own opinions and freedom to do the things which we think best. And I do not read any of those things into that statement.

And I hope, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of that tremendous organization that I just referred to and all of the good work that it does, that there is nothing like that embodied in the suggestion made by someone or some member of that organization some days ago. Because, Your Honour, that would be a sad commentary indeed. For as those people displayed their courage, some of them in making the supreme sacrifice and those who came back having gone overseas to do what, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that all of us could live in a land which was free, who could live in a land where there would be freedom of expression, freedom of speech, freedom of choice and all of those good things, surely goodness one is not to read in anything the Legion says with regards to the design of this flag that there is to be anything less than they fought so hard to preserve.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude my remarks by saying I have no difficulty in adding my support to this design for a provincial flag. I have good reason, Mr. Speaker, to take the stand that I take for the simple reason, as I said, I am acutely aware of the embarrassment that some of our athletes have been

MR. T. HICKEY:

exposed to at international and national events. I am acutely aware that embodied in this design is indeed our past, our present, our future. I am also very much aware, Mr. Speaker, that there is no suggestion, no decision to remove the Union Jack from our Province. The Union Jack will continue to fly as the flag of the Commonwealth, as the Maple Leaf will fly as the flag of this country.

We, therefore, Mr. Speaker, are not asking that any less loyalty be afforded the Union Jack or the Maple Leaf. We are simply asking that some loyalty be shown to this our flag when it passes this House. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that is too much to ask.

Let me conclude finally by saying this, that any flag, and there are many in the country that are not distinctive - what would one, for example, interpret of the flag of British Columbia, the sunset or sunrise? - surely that is not peculiar only to British Columbia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) around here.

MR. T. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, let me suggest that

any flag -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. T. HICKEY:

- will demand loyalty when it is our flag and this design, which will be our flag, will get that loyalty, I suggest, from all of our people in time when it becomes our provincial flag. As one of the military people said in the Canadian Forces when they were presented with the Maple Leaf, "If this flag does not have any history, let us give it some." And, Mr. Speaker, let me say that whilst this design is symbolic of many, many things in our Province, to those who find no history in it, let them have a little patience. And with all of the problems that we face in this Province and with the bright future that we have, they will not have to wait too long indeed before this flag will have plenty of history. It is with this thought in mind that I give my full support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, this has been a long and

hard fought debate. Members' emotions have -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Risen.

MR. S. NEARY:

- risen over the last week or ten days -

MR. L. STIRLING:

Not much in the last week or so.

MR. S. NEARY:

- and I suppose, looking back at day one

in the flag debate, the day I draped the black crepe paper on my desk out of mourning for the people of this Province, not out of mourning for the Union Jack or the Canadian Legion or anything else, but out of the fact that the government were defying the people of this Province, the government were not acting as they should as servants of the people of the Province, I suppose you can say that I was the first casualty of the flag debate. On that, Mr. Speaker, I have no regrets because in my opinion black flags should fly all over this Legislature and all over this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY:

And every member should have a black

flag or black crepe on his desk. This is not, Mr. Speaker, a matter of the Canadian Legion and the Union Jack or the Union Jack versus the new flag. This is a red herring that many members on the government benches have dragged into the debate. And the speaker who just took his seat, Mr. Speaker, dragged in another red herring. I could not believe what I heard the hon. member say when he said how ashamed he felt when he went off to various sports activities when the athletes from Newfoundland had no flag to carry. The hon. gentleman said, "They had no flag to carry." They could not carry the Union Jack because it did not identify with Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY:

how ignorant can you get?

Or how stupid can you get?

I remember another gentleman in this House who used to say that you can almost forgive a person for robbing a bank, you can almost forgive a person for committing a serious crime, but you cannot forgive a person for stupidity. And I cannot forgive, especially a minister of the Crown, to stand in his place in this House and say he was ashamed because the athletes could not carry a distinctive flag of Newfoundland.

Well, I want to point out to hon. members of this House that in the process of debating this new flag that we are taking away a flag that we already have, a flag that has been a distinctive flag in this Province since 1927, I think it was, and the statute that made it the flag of this Province was revived in 1970. Chapter 244, "An Act Respecting A National Flag For Newfoundland And Colours To Be Worn By Vessels."

And in case hon. gentlemen do not believe me, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, I am in order, if Your Honour would check the Flag Debate in Ottawa, that I am in order by holding this flag, this Newfoundland flag in my hands. I know I am not allowed to drape it over my desk, but just in case the hon. minister who just took his seat, or hon. members on the opposite side do not think that Newfoundland had a distinctive flag, well, there it is! There is it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WHITE:

A nice one, too.

MR. NEARY:

There it is.

MR. FLIGHT:

It is a big improvement.

MR. NEARY: A much nicer looking flag than the one we are debating now.

MR. WARREN: Right on!

MR. NEARY: That is the national flag of Newfoundland.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The Premier has to leave, look.

MR. NEARY: And the Premier has to leave at the sight of it. He cannot stand the sight of it.

MR. MORGAN: He cannot stand the sight of the hon. gentleman, I would say.

MR. FLIGHT: No, he cannot stand the sight of the flag.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is what we are doing away with, this distinctive Newfoundland flag. We are doing away with this and replacing it with a rag that you would not polish your shoes with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We are tearing down this beautiful flag, and then the members on the government side have the face to stand and tell us that they were ashamed because the athletes from Newfoundland could not carry a distinctive Newfoundland flag, and there it is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have also heard it argued in this debate that you cannot get a flag that will satisfy everybody in Newfoundland. Well, that is a slick piece of rhetoric. Maybe you cannot get a flag that everybody in Newfoundland would agree with, so what you aim for, Mr. Speaker, is a flag that at least is acceptable to 51 per cent of the people of this Province.

MR. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

MR. NEARY: Who said you need a flag

MR. NEARY: that has to be 100 per cent acceptable? Who said that? It is the government members who are saying that and that is deceiving. You have to get a flag, a design that will be acceptable to at least the majority, a simple majority of the people of this Province.

And then we have heard it argued that the Pearson flag - look at the furor and the fuss that was caused about the new Canadian flag, the Maple Leaf. Mr. Speaker, I would submit that that argument is phoney, that that argument does not hold water, because the Canadian flag had a Maple Leaf on it, something that you could identify with Canada. There is nothing on this monstrosity we have before us in this Province to identify in any way, shape or form with Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard considerable argument about how this is a free vote and how the Committee went around the Province and did such a magnificent job. And nobody dare question it,

MR. NEARY: nobody, except, that is, only the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), who took the time to go to the Legislative Library to see how hard the Committee worked, to see how many places they visited, to see how many briefs were presented in writing and to see how many briefs were presented - or how many suggestions were made orally. Well, the Chairman of the Committee is right. The Select Committee visited twenty-six communities in Newfoundland, twenty-six, no argument with that. Out of the twenty-six communities, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee visited, and one was a non-scheduled visit, by the way, really officially they were only supposed to visit twenty-five communities, but they made a non-scheduled trip to Valleyfield, that was unscheduled. So you cannot say they scheduled officially twenty-five communities. But anyway, let us assume that they visited twenty-six communities and they did, the total number, listen to this, Mr. Speaker, the total number of communities, of scheduled meetings, at which briefs were presented totalled-how many would hon. members say? Anybody want to take a guess. Out of the twenty-six, at how many of these twenty-six scheduled meetings were written briefs presented, or oral briefs for that matter? How many? Anybody want to take a guess?

MR. FLIGHT: Twenty-five.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman says twenty-five. Any takers on twenty-five? Well, here is the answer, Mr. Speaker; out of twenty-six communities visited, twelve meetings were held, twelve briefs were presented.

AN HON. MEMBER: No interest.

MR. NEARY: I am going to deal with that no interest bit shortly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Poor advertising.

MR. NEARY: There were fourteen scheduled meetings, fourteen scheduled meetings, some of which did not take place. The Committee went there in a rush and visited the schools in a couple of instances. There were fourteen scheduled meetings that either did not take place; if they did take place, no briefs were presented. And I can give you a list of them in case you want to argue about it.

In St. John's, Wabush, Happy Valley and Nain briefs were submitted. In Hopedale and Davis Inlet the Committee took advantage of their visit to visit the schools. That is all that happened in Hopedale and Davis Inlet, Mr. Speaker. In Makkovik, a brief was submitted. In Harbour Breton, scheduled meetings, no briefs. In Burgeo, we heard my hon. friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) get up the other day and talk in favour of the flag - in Burgeo, no briefs; Port aux Basques, briefs; Gander and Grand Falls, briefs.

AN HON. MEMBER: - people of Port aux Basques.

MR. NEARY: - Fogo, listen to this, Mr. Speaker, Fogo, Twillingate, Greenspond, Valleyfield, which was unscheduled, as I said, Valleyfield; Fogo, meetings at school, Twillingate, no briefs.

MR. W. ROWE: That is because nobody knew about it.

MR. NEARY: Greenspond, no briefs. Stephenville and Corner Brook, briefs or submissions were presented. In Clareville, Bonavista, Harbour Grace, no submissions. Placentia and Grand Bank, briefs; Marystown and Bell Island, no briefs; St. Anthony, no briefs. Now this is the Committee, Mr. Speaker, that went up around this Province sounding out the people to such a degree that the government are now hanging their hat on the fact that the Committee had done such a tremendous job, that they have gotten such a great reaction from the people of this Province, that democracy has spoken. They are now hanging their hat.

MR. WARREN: On a sky hook.

MR. NEARY: On a sky hook, as my hon. friend said.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the attendance at the meetings. And this is not speaking about the members of the Committee in a derogatory way, but the argument has been used, and it has to be pushed right back at the government, because it is government members who are using this argument about the Committee. A non-partisan committee, they are saying, went around the Province and eventually ended up with this monstrosity we have before us. Well, let us see now what happened in St. John's. Mr. Aylward, Mr. Carter, Mr. Thoms, Mr. Walsh and Mr. Hodder attended the meeting. In Wabush, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Thoms, Mr. Hiscock and Mr. Aylward attended the meeting. And in Happy Valley, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Thoms, Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Aylward and Mr. Warren attended the meetings. In Nain, Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Warren and Mr. Aylward, three people, went to two meetings in Nain and Makkovik. In Port aux Basques, the capital of the Southwest Coast, Mr. Carter, Mr. Hodder and Mr. Aylward attended the meetings. And listen to this, in Gander - and my hon. friend has not spoken in this debate yet - in Gander the Committee thought so much about getting the views of the people of Gander, of finding out if there were any hard feelings in Gander one way or another on a flag - would hon. gentlemen care to take a guess how many members out of seven members of the Select Committee wound up in Gander at the public meeting they held out there? Does the hon. minister know? Well, the Committee thought so highly of getting the views and the feelings of the people of Gander that two members -

AN HON. MEMBER: What, two ?

MR. S. NEARY: - went to a meeting in a hall where nobody knew there was being a meeting held.

AN HON. MEMBER: In Gander?

MR. S. NEARY: In Gander, one of the biggest communities in Newfoundland, fastest growing town in Newfoundland.

MR. WHITE: The crossroads of the world.

MR. S. NEARY: The crossroads of the world, Gander - two members, Mr. Carter and Mr. Aylward.

AN HON. MEMBER: Boy, oh boy, oh boy!

MR. S. NEARY: In Corner Brook, the West Coast capital of Newfoundland, four attended - Mr. Carter, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Thoms and Mr. Walsh. In St. John's at another hearing, Mr. Carter, Mr. Thoms and Mr. Aylward attended. In Grand Bank, down where my hon. friend is laying his political reputation on the line - does my hon. friend know how many members of the Committee - I believe he should - how many members of the Committee went to Grand Bank to get the feelings of the people on the Burin Peninsula and in the Grand Bank-Fortune area on this new flag? How many?

MR. L. THOMS: Tell me.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman that he did not even go himself.

MR. L. THOMS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order, the hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: I was waiting for the point of Grand Bank before I got into this, but as a point of - really I guess more a point of clarification, I would like to advise my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr.S.Neary) that when these meetings were being held, particularly the one in Grand Bank, I happened to have been in a body cast and could not travel.

MR. W. ROWE: That is right, I will vouch for that.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I would just like to underscore the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that it is unfair, I think, for the hon. member. This is an example of the way the hon. member operates. Now he is operating against his own colleagues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. MARSHALL: I would point out from his own statistics that the one thing I do gather from it is that the hon. the member for Kilbride (Mr. R. Aylward) went to every meeting, which shows the way he represents his constituents.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order, I would rule there is no point of order but the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) has simply taken the opportunity to clarify remarks.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I accept my hon. colleague's explanation but I just want to point out to him that there were three other members apart from himself who must have been in body casts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Because there were only three -

AN HON. MEMBER: Head casts.

MR. S. NEARY: - either a head cast or a body cast.

Because there were only

MR. S. NEARY: three members of the Committee who went to Grand Bank, Mr. Carter, Mr. Walsh and Mr. Aylward. Now, Mr. Speaker, that raises some very interesting questions indeed. Because the government, as I said, Mr. Speaker, and I hate to be repeating myself, are hanging their political lives, their future on the activities of this Committee and as hon. members can see, Mr. Speaker, the Committee's activities leave a lot to be desired.

What they did, they did it well, I will grant them that, what they did was alright. I have no complaints about it and, as I say, my remarks are not meant in any way to be derogatory to the members of the Committee. But, certainly, Mr. Speaker, the activities of the Committee leave a lot to be desired and it explodes the government's argument that a thorough investigation, that a thorough fact-finding study was done throughout this Province before they arrived at the stage where they brought a bill into this House supporting this monstrosity.

And let me see what the hon. member for St. John's North (J. Carter) at all of these meetings, and this is typical of all the meetings that the hon. gentleman attended, let us see what he said in his introductory remarks and I will use the meeting in Gander as a typical example, and I have all the Hansards here, Mr. Speaker, and I have gone through them all and I can tell you that what I am going to quote from the meeting in Gander, you can find it in any one of these briefs where the hon. gentleman attended a meeting. You will not find it in them all, because the hon. gentleman did not chair all the meetings.

But when the Chairman of the Committee did chair the meetings, here is what he said. He says, 'I represent the district of St. John's North, this is Bob Aylward, he represents the district of Kilbride. We are the only two MHA's here tonight and this is Neil Penny, our Clerk of the Committee, and Terry Connors, who is recording

MR. S. NEARY: clerk. Bob is also secretary of the Committee. We must apologize that more of the Committee did not turn up but they have good and sufficient reasons ranging from medical reasons to political reasons" - medical reasons to political reasons; - " So we are the vanguard, as it were. If the amount of interest or if the amount of work that is required tonight is greater than can be handled in any one session, we are certainly willing to come back and do another session. The relatively small public turnout is not indicative of the amount of interest shown. Bob can tell you that there has been a tremendous amount of mail and written submissions and graphic submissions. Some of them are good; that is to say, some of them quite finished, others just bare sketches that have to be brought up by a proper graphics artist. So we will end this whole set of hearings with a massive amount of material - which is a gross exaggeration, Mr. Speaker, - " which is beginning to repeat itself. So we feel that we are getting as much or as many ideas as are formed.

And, then he goes on to say - let us see, the key to this opening statement. Here is what he says, let me see where it is, " I think most reasonable people, " I welcome you here tonight, " the emphasis should be informal" - oh, yes, here it is. "As soon as the Committee was formed we sat down and agreed quite quickly on five major principles and they are that the new flag should be simple, should be attractive, it should be distinctive-as soon as it is raised, you should be able to say, 'this is the Newfoundland flag'-and listen to this, "it should be acceptable to the majority as far as we are able to make it acceptable to the majority, and it should contain our traditions."

Every meeting the hon. gentleman attended, the hon. gentleman repeated that the flag must be acceptable to a majority of the people of this Province. As it turns out, Mr. Speaker, the majority of the people of this Province object to this flag and this design.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

May 15, 1980

Tape No. 1575

EL - 3

MR. S. NEARY:

And yet, the government persists for some unknown reason of ramming it through the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at that meeting in Gander, what else happened?

MR. NEARY: What else happened in Gander? Well, there was a gentleman there by the name of Peckford - it just says in this, Mr. Peckford - who made some awful, awful statements, derogatory remarks against the Canadian Legion and against the Union Jack. And if the hon. gentleman does not believe me I will give him the transcript to read. And this was the first time, Mr. Speaker, this was the first time that the triangles were raised, the triangles that are now in this new flag, raised at this meeting in Gander.

If you thumb through the transcript you will see interruptions and interjections all the way through it. The Union Jack, we are told by this gentleman who is recorded in this transcript, the Union Jack represents fifteen dollars a month and the Canadian Legion are nothing only soldiers and sailors, and said we should have triangles in the - one triangle representing Labrador and one triangle representing the Island of Newfoundland. And that is when the triangles were first raised. And there is where the idea came from for the triangles in the new flag.

I am not going to dwell on that, Mr. Speaker, except to say that a flag should be something other than a family affair.

MR. WHITE: (inaudible) probably struck dumb.

MR. NEARY: It should be something that represents the traditions, the heritage of this Province and something that is acceptable to the people of this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlanders cannot understand why the government are proceeding with such haste in trying to get this new flag approved. At the outset we said that the government were trying to

MR. NEARY: head off controversy, they were trying to head off people who objected to this flag before they got a chance to get organized and to a certain degree they have been successful.

One common denominator that I hear in this House, outside this House, 'Give us more time. If you feel the flag will grow on us give us a little more time. Do not go so fast. Slow down. Do not ram it down our throats. Give us more time.' And so, Mr. Speaker, in order that people may have more time, in order that members who feel that the government is rushing the bill through the House too quickly, I would like to move an amendment, Mr. Speaker, and my amendment is that the bill be not now read a second time but that it be read a second time this day six months hence.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): I will reply, please, before I recognize the hon. gentleman. I should like to have a look at the wording of the amendment.

MR. NEARY: Seconded by the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is in order.
The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is, in effect, what is commonly known in parliamentary circles as the six month hoist. I do not like that term myself, I do not like what it implies. In this particular case all we are asking for, all the people of this Province are asking for, is an opportunity to study the flag, to make further recommendations, to have more input

MR. NEARY: into the design of the flag. And, Mr. Speaker, you would want to be deaf, dumb, blind or all three in this Province today if you did not realize that ninety-nine per cent of the people are opposed to this design. Most people that I talked to want a distinctive Newfoundland flag, including the Canadian Legion, and if they had gotten an opportunity to make their speech before the House they would have told members of the House that they would go along with a distinctive Newfoundland flag, but not that thing that was unveiled here two weeks ago, that horrible design. Even the Canadian Legion are saying, "Give us a chance to have a little input in the flag, the new flag, and we will go along with a distinctive Newfoundland flag." You can hardly go to the shopping malls today, Mr. Speaker, you go to church on Sunday, you go to the shopping centre, you walk down the street, you go down in the cafeteria of this building and everybody but everybody is buttonholing you and saying, "Whatever you do, stop that horrible flag from being accepted by the House." Are members completely out of touch with their constituents and with the people of this Province? They must be the way they are defying the people.

The people, Lord, the people, not crowns and thrones but men. God save the people.

MR. WARREN: Right on. Right on.

MR. NEARY: The government have their majority in this House because of the people. They are servants of the people.

MR. WARREN: Never again.

MR. NEARY: And they persist, in less than a year, that is, Mr. Speaker, and they have forgotten that it was the people who sent them here. It was the people who gave them the majority, to be their servant, not the people to be the servants of the politicians and of the government.

It is a sad and pathetic sight indeed, Mr. Speaker, to watch one member of the government side after the other,

May 15, 1980

Tape No. 1577

NM - 2

MR. NEARY: stand in his place in this House and
defy the people. Some of them have not had the courage yet to get up.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Some are trying to hide their -

MR. WARREN: He is the Premier.

MR. NEARY: - hide their views of this flag, including
the hon. Premier, and the bill is in the hon. gentleman's name and he would
have been happy this last two or three days if the Minister of Tourism
and Recreation (Mr. Dawe) had closed the debate while he was sitting in
his seat. What could be more pathetic and sad than to watch the man
who introduced the bill into the House for this so-called flag, sit there
and try to get the debate choked off while a bill is being debated in
his name.

MR. WARREN: Terrible.

MR. NEARY: Words cannot describe it, Mr. Speaker.
It is unbelievable that a government could become so arrogant and hold
so much contempt for the people in such a short time.

MR. WARREN: The time will come.

MR. NEARY: The people, Lord, the people, not
crowns and thrones but men. God save the people.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Baie Verte-
White Bay (Mr. Rideout), who portrayed himself as such a hero a month or
so ago, has not spoken in this debate yet, trying to hide his feelings from
the people. At least my hon. friend, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms),
and the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), and the member for
Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), had the courage to stand in this House and
expound their views on the flag. The member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn),
who is a member of the Canadian Legion, has not had the courage to stand
yet.

MR. DINN: I am next.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they are all next now that

May 15, 1980

Tape No. 1577

NM - 3

MR. NEARY:

I am up. But the Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Dawe) had been on his feet three times to close the debate and the Premier would have been very happy, and very pleased if the debate had ended.

MR. WARREN:

Right on. Right on.

MR. NEARY:

Get it over with. Head off the controversy.

Head them off at the pass.

MR. S. NEARY: The member for Port de Grave (Mr. R. Collins) has not spoken in this debate yet and the people are waiting in Port de Grave. I have had more calls from that district, Port de Grave, and Harbour Grace, than any other part of Newfoundland, where there is a strong, strong feeling for the Union Jack.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not much of a feeling for the member.

MR. S. NEARY: And not much of a feeling for the member after this. The member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. N. Doyle) has not got up on his feet yet and told us where he stands on this flag. But they will all stand up and be counted, Mr. Speaker, before this debate is over. And the member for Naskaupi (Mr. J. Goudie) has not got up and spoken yet. We have had two members from Labrador speak in the flag debate, but the member for Naskaupi has not spoken yet.

MR. J. GOUDIE: I will be up.

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, no, he is going to get up now, Mr. Speaker, but if the Minister of Tourism and Recreation (Mr. R. Dawe) had shut off the debate, as they hoped would happen, that we were all going to collapse over here -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: - they would have been so happy that they would not have to get up, they would not be forced to stand in this House and take a stand one way or the other. And the member for - is that Humber East or Humber West? - the old Status of Women spokesman in this House, who will get up and talk about anything when it comes to the Status of Women, but has not got up yet and had a few words on this flag to tell us where the hon. minister stands on the flag.

I have a few pieces of correspondence here from Corner Brook, from Deer Lake and Fortune - Hermitage -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: I thought the hon. gentleman was up on his feet already. Or did he - no, it was something else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. D. Stewart) has not had the courage to speak.

MR. S. NEARY: They will all be up now, Mr. Speaker. I will wager you a bet before the vote is taken on this bill that they will all be up on their feet and they will all zero in on me. They have had their go at the Canadian Legion, they have had their go at the Monarchist League, they have had their go at the people, now they will all get up and it will all be blamed on me. Just watch! I will bet you a dollar, Your Honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: And the member for Humber - West, is it? - and the member for Gander (Mrs. H. Newhook) - Why has not the member for Gander stood up and been counted? I have had a few phone calls from the hon. minister's district over this monstrosity that we have before us that you would not wipe your shoes with. The member for Ferryland (Mr. C. Power) has not stood in his place yet in this House and told his constituents who have a loyalty to the Union Jack where he stands on the flag.

MR. F. STAGG: What do you want (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have had government members and ministers stand and tell us that this is the most important thing that ever came before this House, it is the most important thing ever to face the people of this Province, and over half of the government members have not spoken in the debate. Where is the member for Manihak (Mr. P. Walsh)?

MR. F. WHITE: He is a war veteran.

MR. S. NEARY: A member of the Canadian Legion, a veteran! Why has not the hon. gentleman spoken in this debate? And why has not the member for Trinity North (Mr. C. Brett) spoken?

AN HON. MEMBER: Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, I mentioned Fortune - Hermitage - and Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that they were hoping that they would be able to hide their feelings, that the people of this Province - that the vote would take place, the flag would slip through and the people would not find out. Well, the people are

MR. S. NEARY: going to find out. Everybody on this side has spoken for or against. Every man on this side has had the courage of his convictions. There is nobody left only me and the Opposition House Leader, and the Opposition House Leader will not be long when he will be in the debate. Every one of us to a man have taken a stand one way or another. At least the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. P. J. McNicholas) had the courage to stand up and say he was going to vote against this rag!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: It is not very often we agree on things, but we certainly agree on that.

Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of this Province has there been such a furore and such a fuss caused over one single issue than is caused over this flag and the government, especially the Premier, turns a blind eye and a deaf ear to the people. He says, "Take it, people.

MR. S. NEARY: You are going to take it whether you like it or not. I am Emperor Brian, I am going to force this on you. It will grow on you just like a pimple on the back of your neck, that will develop into a boil and burst!"

Mr. Speaker, I do not have very much time left. I wish I could talk for a week on this matter, Mr. Speaker. But I do want to say, Sir, that talking about the Monarchist League they did a more comprehensive study of the feelings of the people of this Province than the Select Committee did with all due respect to my colleagues and to the Committee. The Monarchist League of Newfoundland circulated a paper requesting the retention of the Union Jack to 300 communities in Newfoundland. They say that they felt that there was no time to canvass Labrador. Now listen to this, Mr. Speaker, within a six week period they received answers and the list of signatures here is attached back from 104 communities -

MR. L. THOMS: 104?

MR. S. NEARY: 104 compared to twenty-six of which briefs were presented to less than half of the scheduled meetings. One hundred and four communities for a total of 8,237 signatures. Is that to be ignored, Mr. Speaker? Are the views of the Royal Canadian Legion to be ignored? The hon. gentleman got a standing ovation at a meeting, he spoke to a Royal Canadian Legion in Corner Brook I believe it was. Four or five hundred people gave him a standing ovation. And now, Mr. Speaker, they are awfully, awfully disappointed with the hon. gentleman, with the arrogance of the hon. gentleman. But now he has become so arrogant and so full of himself, so full of himself he thinks he is riding so high that he can force a flag on the Newfoundland people and they will forget about it when the election rolls around. And make no bones about it, Mr.

MR. S. NEARY: Speaker, that this is a government measure. It is the government that calls the shots! The government decided there was going to be a Select Committee, the government decided this flag was going to be the flag of Newfoundland, the government decided that a bill would be brought into the House. It is a government measure! And I hope nobody will ever have any doubts about that. And if the hon. gentleman thinks the people are going to forget about it by the next election, well, then, he had better think again, Mr. Speaker, because I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is an accumulation of blunders, an accumulation of mistakes that causes the downfall of governments. The hon. gentleman has made three distinct and glaring blunders in the last several months. Number one, he told the people of this Province that he would never live in Mount Scio House, he would continue to live in an apartment and the next thing we know he is up on the hill with \$118,000 of taxpayers money, the only Province of Canada - \$118,000 to furnish it and renovate it and put up nice, new drapes for the hon. gentleman. And his thanks to the people of this Province, his thanks for giving him a nice, comfortable residence up on Mount Scio Place to live in is to throw it back in their faces by forcing this flag on them that they do not want. That is his thanks.

His next blunder was with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) when the Public Accounts Committee found the hon. gentleman guilty -

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

MR. SPEAKER A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is speaking to a motion he has before the House of a six month hoist. He is now obviously getting into areas which are -

MR. W. MARSHALL: indeed they relate to his perception albeit that it is a bent perception of affairs but they are not of interest to the particular amendment that he has proposed.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To the point of order, I would rule there is no point of order but would like to point out to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that relevancy is very difficult to define but I do think he is straying somewhat from the subject and would ask him to refer his remarks to that issue.

MR. S. NEARY: Blunder number three, Mr. Speaker, is the flag. That is blunder number three. Three serious blunders in a row. And, Mr. Speaker, I would submit there

MR. S. NEARY: is another blunder coming up in connection with the offshore and the Northern cod stock - that will be five blunders in about a year. And it is an accumulation of mistakes and blundering that will cause the downfall of this administration amongst which will be the flag, maybe the flag alone, maybe that issue alone will not defeat the government. I happen to think that it will go a long way in bringing down this government and showing them up for what they are, a bunch of city slickers who think they can foist their opinions and their ideas on the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, in every meeting I believe that was held, bar none, there were two groups of people who stuck out at these scheduled meetings. There was the group who felt we should retain the Union Jack. That group was quite large throughout this Province. There was another large group who maintained that we should have a distinctive Newfoundland flag with the Union Jack in it. And if you put these two groups together, Mr. Speaker, you have got a fair chunk of the population of this Province but the Committee and the government and the Premier chose to ignore that fact and all they came up with was a bunch of triangles and squares that mean nothing and then they tell us not to get emotional about it. The flag is with us forever, when you pass a flag it is with you forever, at least that is what they think.

Mr. Speaker, I will make a pledge to the people of this Province right now and I have not consulted my colleagues on this. Maybe the Liberal Party in the Fall of the year will have a leader who will say, "No, no, you can not do that." And I am going to say it right now and I will do it, and if I say it, I will mean it, that the government may use their majority to ram this flag through the House of Assembly but the moment the government changes, Sir, if I am in that government that rag will come down off the flagpoles of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY:

First of all, it will not be flown

in many

MR. S. NEARY: corners in this Province. If it is put on the public buildings then I will say I will do whatever I can as long as I am alive in this Province to haul it down off the flagpoles in front of the public buildings in this Province and replace it with something that is synonymous with Newfoundland, something you can identify with Newfoundland, something along the lines of the Maple Leaf. And hon. gentlemen have also used the argument, by the way, 'Oh well' - I have heard them over there trying to prop themselves up by saying, "Oh well, some people said a Newfoundland dog, some people said a caribou, some people said the Union Jack." I say, so what to that. That is no argument. It could be one of any dozen of things as long as you can identify with Newfoundland and as long as it is symbolic of Newfoundland, represents our heritage and the traditions of this Province, Mr. Speaker.

The flag is an emotional thing. You have to have feeling for it. This thing leaves you cold. You have to have feeling for a flag, how can you talk about a flag without getting emotional?

MR. G. WARREN: That is what the arrow is for.

MR. S. NEARY: We have some over there with the face of a robber's horse tell us, "Oh, do not get emotional, do not get this way, do not get that way." Now, how can you not get emotional when you watch an arrogant government with a majority, abusing their majority in the House. It would almost make you sit down and cry, let alone get emotional. "Going to bring democracy to Newfoundland," they told us. This is the crowd that boasted about making democracy work now stabbing the people in the back.

MR. G. WARREN: That is what the arrow is for.

MR. S. NEARY: That is what the arrow represents on that flag - a stab in the back for the people.

MR. G. WARREN: Right on, right on.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, when I sit down, when I take my seat in a few minutes they will all be up on their feet one after the other and they will try to answer the indefensible arguments that I put forward, completely indefensible, Mr. Speaker. The statistics and the facts and the figures that I laid on the Table of the House came from

MR. S. NEARY: the Legislative Library. The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) could almost be accused of misleading the House in his report, and as I say, that is no reflection on the members of the Committee. I have a great deal of respect and regard for my friend as I do for the member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) and the member for Eagle River (Mr. E. Hiscock) and I admire them for their stand but at least they had the courage to take a stand. They will all be up now, Mr. Speaker, I can see them, one after the other and they will lower the debate, you just watch, Your Honour, they will lower the debate. They will get on to

MR. S. NEARY: the personal attack. It will not take them long before they will lower the decorum of this House.

Mr. Speaker, it is very, very sad. When we think of the sacrifice so many men and women made in this Province, when we think of the great history of this Province. We are the oldest, Mr. Speaker, the oldest civilization in North America, right here in this Province. Nobody was here before us except the Indians. When John Cabot came over there were people here. He met Indians. When Christopher Columbus came over he met Indians. But, the Irish and the Scotch and the French and the English that came here under extremely difficult circumstances and conditions, made us the oldest civilization in North America. And can anybody show me where that is recognized in that rag that you would not wipe your feet with?

Mr. Speaker, I am for a distinctive Newfoundland flag. I like the Union Jack. I love the Union Jack. I love the white ensign but I am inclined to go along with the majority of the people, that we should have a distinctive Newfoundland flag. But, I do not think we should have that flag.

MR. HANCOCK: You are not voting for it, are you 'Steve' ?

MR. S. NEARY: No, I am not voting for it, that is for sure. But, I know, Mr. Speaker, that out there, out there in voter land, out there in the rural parts of this Province, down in Grand Bruit, LaPoile, pidgin Inlet, Makkovik, Forteau, Fogo, Bell Island, St. Mary's, all over this Province people are saying, 'For God's sake, do not pass that flag. Do not insult the Newfoundland people by forcing people to fly that flag over public buildings in this Province. Do not insult us. Do not do it. For God's sake, come to your senses. Have you taken leave of your senses?'

Mr. Speaker, I wish I could repeat some of the remarks that have been made about that flag. I wish I could repeat some of them. I wish I could read some of the letters that I have here.

MR. S. NEARY: I would be named. I wish I could quote from that meeting in Gander, from Hansard that I have here, to see some of the language that was used at that meeting. Feelings can be expressed without becoming obscene, without becoming unparliamentary and rude. It is very difficult in this kind of a debate, Mr. Speaker, to restrain yourself especially when you look at the arrogance of this government and the contempt they have for the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, a flag must be a very stirring sight as it flies in the wind. It must be a very stirring sight. People must have feeling for it. They must have emotion for it. You must be almost prepared to lay down your life for it if you have to.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the member for St. John's East Extern (T. Hickey), says the athletes will be able to carry this, Look! They will carry it in front of them. When they are going off, leading the parade, there is what they will have in front of them. Look! Now, that is something for the athletes of this Province to carry in front of them. That is something, is it not? You can really identify that with Newfoundland. The hon. gentleman would be proud, now, to see a bunch of athletes going off carrying that in front of them, would he not?

MR. HICKEY: Why would they not carry that ?

MR. S. NEARY: Because you hold it in front of you when you are marching down the cinder track, do you not? There is the way it would be.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

MR. S. NEARY: That would be something, would it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: You would have to strain your heads down to look at it.

MR. S. NEARY: You would be expecting the ground to blow out from under you with the rocket or whatever it is.

MR. S. NEARY:

It would be nice now to go into battle,
Mr. Speaker, God forbid, if we ever had another world war and I hope that
we never will, and I pray that we never will, but, let us say we did,
Mr. Speaker, let us say we did, and we sent our soldiers off on the
battlefield and here they are going with this thing in front of them.
The enemy would think it was a secret weapon, anew secret weapon.

They had the unmanned

MR. NEARY:

missiles there at the end of the Second World War and that is what that looks like, the Second World War, the unmanned missiles. What is it they are called? V-1, V-11. That looks like a V-1, V-11 only that is V-111. The enemy would think it was some kind of a secret weapon. It is absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. Words fail me to describe it. And as far as Mr. Pratt is concerned, there is evidence in these transcripts that the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), the Chairman of the Committee, had been negotiating with Mr. Pratt long before the Committee hearings ended, long before they ended Mr. Pratt was working on this flag, long before. They had their minds made up, maybe not all the members of the Committee but the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) had his mind made up because he had discussed this matter with Mr. Pratt and he had told Mr. Pratt of the feelings of a gentleman in Gander and the Premier that we should have triangles in it. There is evidence in all the transcripts. The hon. gentleman mentioned it himself at one of the meetings. So I say, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that all members on both sides of this House would vote for the amendment. A vote for the amendment is a vote for democracy and a vote for the people. Why, Mr. Speaker, why would anybody want to vote against this amendment? Why? The only reason they would want to vote against it is because they want to force the thing through as quickly as possible. The Premier thinks that if he forces this through the House with his majority that the people of Newfoundland will respect him for being a decisive Premier. There are times when you can be decisive and there are times when you can be stupid and arrogant and in this case the people will not recognize the Premier as being a decisive Premier but a stupid Premier and an arrogant Premier and a Premier with nothing but contempt for the people. The people, Lord, people, not crowns and thorns but men. God save the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Is the House ready for the question on

the amendment?

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, Mr. Speaker -

MR. F.B. ROWE:

Look, nobody from the other side.

It is shocking. Shame!

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT):

Order, please!

Before I recognize the hon. member the Speaker would like to come in and announce the Late Show.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please!

Although it is not quite five o'clock, rather than have to interrupt the hon. gentleman once he gets into his speech I can inform the House now that I have received notice of two matters for debate at five-thirty when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House.

Notice given by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the subject matter \$2.9 million in a bank account in Hamburg, Germany for the sale of Labrador linerboard.

The second matter for debate notice given by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and the subject matter is Canada Manpower Statistics as they apply to this Province in terms of employment levels in various industrial sectors and how close is the government approaching its target of 40,000 jobs.

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, before I go any further perhaps I could have a ruling on a somewhat interesting but I think relevant point. I have not spoken in the main debate. I believe I am the only member on this side who has not and I want to understand if Your Honour would be good enough to tell me whether I am now speaking on the main debate as the seconder of the motion or whether I am speaking in the amendment debate in which case, of course, if I wish I would have the right to speak in the House once the amendment is disposed of. Now,

MR. ROBERTS:

it is not of importance to me. I do not intend at this stage to speak more than once in this debate but I do want to have it clear. I would refer Your Honour, on the point of order, to 304 (1) of Beauchesne which says, "The member who makes a motion may give the name of his seconder who will, if necessary, indicate his consent, and the seconder will then be allowed to speak on the question". Well, the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made the motion and gave my name. I did not say anything until I was recognized by the Chair. I simply want to know whether I am speaking on the main motion, Your Honour, or on

MR. ROBERTS: the amendment, the six month hoist amendment. I mean, it is irrelevant to me as long as it is clearly understood that if I wish to speak on the main motion I may. I do not intend to, I will make it clear.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) the hon. gentleman (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I am speaking on the amendment. I would say to my learned from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) there is this most interesting reference in Beauchesne that apparently the seconder of an amendment has the right to speak on the main motion before the amendment debate begins.

MR. MARSHALL: If the seconder does not -

MR. ROBERTS: Does not say anything.

MR. MARSHALL: - does not say anything.

The seconder had - and I watched the hon. gentleman to see whether he said anything.

MR. ROBERTS: And I learned that from no better teacher than the gentleman from Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) who once, as I recall it, Mr. Speaker, made his entire contribution to the Throne Speech debate when he was Leader of the Opposition by saying, 'I second the motion'. And I think he was hoist on his own petard and we all learned from that.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Perhaps if I could, for the sake of clarification in the future then, I would obviously rule so there would not be any difficulty in the future that if you have not spoken in seconding the amendment, actually speaking, then you may then speak on the main question afterwards.

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Now, let me begin by saying to my friend and jousting partner, the learned gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), that it will be his choice and those of gentlemen opposite - lady and gentlemen opposite -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am quite prepared, indeed anxious to address this matter seriously as I believe have all hon. members who have spoken. But I am equally prepared, if the hon. gentleman should come against me armed as he is, whatever he is armed with, to reply to him in kind. I would say that I have not throughout this debate, to my recollection, intervened.

Now, I am not seeking mercy, I am not even asking understanding because that is beyond the gentleman opposite, but I would simply say, Sir, I would like to approach this in the same way as I believe most hon. members have who have spoken and those who have yet to speak and as I have throughout this debate. And I say that to my friend from Stephenville. I welcome his attempts to joust but I would say to him as his former leader John Diefenbaker once said, when I am after elephants I do not want to be bothered with rabbit tracks.

Mr. Speaker, our leader, the Leader of the Opposition announced that this was to be a free vote on our side and subsequently the Premier speaking in behalf of the government members announced it was to be a free vote and that is the way that I interpreted it, that is the way I have approached it and that is the way I intend to cast my vote when the time comes.

MR. ROBERTS: I want to say that I, like any other hon. member, and I do not claim to be any better, and I do not think I am any worse than any other member of this House, that I have given this matter a great deal of consideration and I may say it probably caused me as much difficulty as any of the questions I have discussed and debated during my years in the House.

I began the day the flag report was brought into the House with an extraordinarily strong predilection in favour of a new flag for this Province. I am one of those and I suspect that we are the majority of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador but it does not bother me whether we are or not, because this is a matter where each of us stands as an individual and says what he or her believes to be right. I began from that point of view because I am one of those, as I was saying, who wants a distinctive Newfoundland flag. And by Newfoundland I mean Newfoundland and Labrador. I want a distinctive flag for this Province. And without in anyway derogating or being disrespectful of the Union Jack, I do not believe the Union Jack is that flag, I have never felt that. I accept it and respect it as the flag of the United Kingdom. It may even be the flag of the Commonwealth, but I not sure of that. I am not sure whether there is such a thing as a flag of the Commonwealth. There no longer is an empire. It is the flag of the United Kingdom, it is made up of the three Crosses of St. Patrick,

MR. ROBERTS:

St. Andrew and George, and as flags go it is not as old as some. It is not as old as the French Tricolore, it is not as old as the United States Stars and Stripes. The Union Jack, as we know it, was adopted, I believe, in 1801 when Mr. Pitt, Pitt the Younger, the then Prime Minister, succeeded in bribing sufficient members of the Irish House of Commons sitting in Dublin to vote in favour of an act of union, and I think my statement is an accurate, historical statement. There were enough of the members of that House of Commons who were bribed in one way or another that they voted the Irish Parliament, as it then was, out of existence, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain became the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Until then, Ireland had been a separate possession of the British crown, cossetted as it had been by the treatment of Cromwell and the English over the years.

While I am on that, let me say a word or two about the Canadian Legion and their role in this, and let me make it clear that I have no hesitation - indeed, I would be most upset with anybody who challenged the beliefs of the Legion or their genuine sincerity with which those beliefs are held. I am glad that the Legion have not tried to pressure individual members, and I can only speak for myself but they have not tried to pressure me. I have had a telegram from the President of the branch at St. Anthony. That is one of the two Legion branches in my constituency, and Mr. Roy B. Pilgrim - there is a Roy A. Pilgrim and a Roy B. Pilgrim and a Roy C. Pilgrim in St. Anthony and this is Mr. Roy B. Pilgrim - and he makes it quite clear that they disapprove of the flag, and I respect that and I am prepared to take it very seriously, but I am glad the Legion have not tried to pressure. I quite agree with my friend from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) who was responding to reports that were in the press, not from the Legion. Wherever they came from, they did not emanate from the Legion, reports that there was going to be some attempt to try to pressure some of us politically. I cannot think of anything

MR. ROBERTS: that would get up more quickly the backs of any one of us than that. What I have to say, I will say in the House and my constituents in due course will get the opportunity to judge, and if they send me back to this House that is their choice, and if they do not send me back that is their choice, too. But I am going to do what I believe is correct and then my constituents, in turn, and they will get the turn, will do what they believe is correct.

Having said that, I want to go on to say that I do feel the government ought to have allowed the Legion to appear before the Bar of the House. It is not, in any way, Mr. Speaker, contrary to parliamentary tradition. It is certainly not contrary to the traditions of this House, and I would think there are numerous instances where individuals or groups have been allowed to appear, if one goes back.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) Dalton Camp, the big Tory.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Dalton Camp certainly spoke in this House and spoke eloquently, with great eloquence and great tradition. But many others - the present Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Trudeau, spoke in this House. He was then the Minister of Justice. I would think if, for example, Mr. Joe Clark ever visits this Province again, if an invitation were to be suggested to be extended to him -

MR. NEARY: Lord Rothschild.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Sir Edmond, he is not a Lord, Edmond de Rothschild. But, you know, it is not unique, and I do not think we are breaching any precedents or setting any traditions. To those who say - to allow the Legion to speak would simply be to, you know, single out one group and how could you single out one group? I would simply say that the next time one walks through the lobby of this building look up and look around, because there are, I do not know, forty or fifty flags hanging there from the Legion. They have been there for about ten years now, and if the Legion is taken sufficiently seriously by the government of this Province to be allowed to hang in the main foyer, the lobby of the senior building, the home of the Legislature, the alleged seat of government, if they are allowed to hang the flags of their individual branches here then, surely, they have

May 15, 1980

Tape No. 1584

GH-3

MR. ROBERTS: already been given a unique status by the government of this Province, and I think in turn it would be fair for the Legislature to reflect. However, the government have, you know, rejected it out of hand. That is certainly the government's prerogative, if that is their wish, as it is, and so I will not beat my gums further. I simply say that I think the reasons they have given for rejecting it, which I submit are not the reasons why they have rejected the Legion's request, the reasons they have given lack intellectual honesty and lack intellectual weight.

Now, Sir, as I said, I do not feel the Union Jack is the flag of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

There are those on this side who feel with equal fervor that it is. There are those on the other side, I assume, who feel with equal fervor that it is. I do not, I never have. It is the flag under which we were governed - or misgoverned for a couple of hundred years and I respect it for that and I am as conscious as any and perhaps more conscious than most of what that flag stands for, what it stands for in our heritage. We are Anglophiles by heritage. I am an Anglophile by inclination, very much so. I am wearing court clothes. I appeared today in one of Her Majesty's courts. The laws of this Province and the traditions and the spirit which underly those laws - and I believe the system of law is as fine as we know in this world. It is English to the core, Sir. The clothes that we wear in court, the very clothes, Sir, are modelled on the English practice and the law is shaped by England. Even to this day if there is no relevant law in Canada then one looks to the English courts and their pronouncements are taken with great - sometimes too great reverence by the judges who sit in this country. And, of course, this House itself, Sir, is a little Westminster, it is modelled on Westminster. We ape Westminster. We consciously and deliberately and proudly model ourselves on the British parliamentary tradition.

But, Sir, the Union Jack is not our flag.

It is not my flag. It is part of our history, part of Newfoundland's history and a proud part, but it is not our flag, Sir, any more than it is not the flag of Canada. And I, for one, would be very reluctant ever to accept as the flag of Newfoundland a flag that had as part of it the Union Jack. I do not say that against the Union Jack - other hon. members feel differently - but I do not like the flag of Ontario, particularly. It has the Union Jack in it. It is not why I dislike it, but I do not like this business of taking somebody else's flag and putting it in your own flag. I like the idea of having a flag of our own. And I do not feel in saying that that I am rejecting or in any way spurning the Union Jack, Mr. Speaker, I am simply saying that I accept it and respect it very greatly, very deeply, for what it is and I respect very much the fact that the men and

MR. E. ROBERTS: the women who fought for this country fought under - I do not know what flags you fight under, I mean, I have never seen a battle. There is a most interesting book by a man named John Keegan called The Face of Battle which hon. gentlemen might want sometime to look at. It tells you what battles are really like, and it is not the glory and the horses and the trumpets, it is blood and mire and guts and a thoroughly unpleasant practice. But, Sir, we fought for what we believed in. The men and women who fought, fought for what they believed in, and in many ways the Union Jack symbolized that. But I think it is, in my view, a misreading to say that the Union Jack has to be part of our flag. I realize there are those who are as genuine as I am and they are just as entitled to their view as I am, but I do not accept their view, that is all I say. I do not share it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I come to the point of saying that I want a distinctive flag. And when the Committee was struck I was as keen as anybody on it and I think they did as much as anybody could do. I do not think we are ever going to find a design that is acceptable to every single Newfoundlander, but I do think my friend for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) makes a very, very good point when he says we ought to find a design that is acceptable to at least a large proportion of the population of this Province. And that is what causes me the problem on this, Sir.

Now, do I need to say as everybody else does and with equal fervor, that I am a friend and admirer of Christopher Pratt? In fact, a friend of mine and I had dinner with Chris and one of his daughters at their home in Salmonier two days before the report came in. I did not see the flag, I hasten to say. I did not ask to and I was not shown it. I do not even know if there was a copy in Mr. Pratt's home at that stage. But I have known Christopher Pratt for many, many years. We disagree on some points and we agree on others. In fact, I went up to see him with a view to purchasing, and he agreed to sell me, a copy of a print he has done called the Strait of Belle Isle, and I have a very obvious and a very legitimate and a very deep interest in a print by that name. It is also a fine piece of work.

MR. ROBERTS: So when I say that the design of the flag is what is causing me the difficulty I have I do not think anybody - and certainly if anybody did I would reject it scornfully - would say that I am somehow criticizing what I believe to be a very superior work of art. And I think it is. I think the design that was unfurled in this House a couple of weeks ago is a very superior work of art, it is Christopher Pratt. It is a Christopher Pratt.

A print by Christopher Pratt, what are they worth now, \$1,000, \$2,000, \$3,000 when you can get them? The market puts the premium on them. Christopher Pratt has become not just a Newfoundland artist, not just a Canadian artist, but we may be on the verge of seeing Christopher Pratt's career become that of an artist on a world scale. The man is superb. Not everybody likes his work. I do. But not everybody does. Lots of people would prefer a different style of art, and that is fine.

So the design came in and it was unfurled and I have not said anything on it. In fact, I do not think any of my colleagues know how I am going to vote. They may have opined or they may have guessed, but nobody knows including my friend the Leader of the Opposition with whom I obviously discuss a great variety of things, including political questions.

MR. THOMS: I stand to lose a lot of money if you vote for it.

MR. ROBERTS: I say to my friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) that I do not have to say, even at this point, how I intend to vote. I will be here for the vote and I shall certainly vote in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: He bets on everything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: I say my hon. friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) has made a number of bets over the years not all of which he has won.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He bets on everything.

MR. LUSH: He is out money too.

MR. ROBERTS: I still owe the Premier a bet from the last election. I wish he would come to collect it, I have it for him.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I went down to collect to but there was nobody home.

MR. LUSH: He did not have it.

MR. ROBERTS: I have it locked up. It is that valuable, securely, well. I mean, when I hear the Premier sending people down to my place I certainly do lock things up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: But I assure him the wager is there and it was fairly won by him.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the hon. member wants to bet on the grounds of that kind of comment again he may, and he will lose again, so it is quite all right.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I have bet many times and I will say I will pay my wagers and I will collect them. The most recent one I collected was a hundred dollars off Jim McGrath in Ottawa. And I am sure that the Premier would have agreed with Mr. McGrath's stand.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I collected more than a hundred dollars off him.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. McGrath bet that the Tories would win the election in Ottawa.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That was an easy one.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, it was all I could get from him on it, he would not go any higher on the wager.

MR. ROBERTS: However, the problem I have, Sir, is with the design and I am not even going to speak of it technically. I made some notes earlier about some feelings I have with respect to the technical aspects of the design. I was given by a neighbour and a friend of mine at the People's Republic of Hogan's Pond - I do not think the gentleman minds his name because he wrote a letter to The Daily News and maybe The Evening Telegram and signed his name, Dr. Marshall Laird who is a world renowned authority on parasitology, and absolutely world league, and Dr. Marshall Laird came up to see me a couple of evenings ago, after the letter had been published, and brought me a picture he had cut from The Daily News showing Mr. Pratt holding a design of the flag on which Dr. Laird had sketched the same point that he made in the letter which was published, with his name signed - I am not breaching any confidences or any friendships - and that is that the design lends itself most readily to representation as a black fly, a species of the world with which Dr. Laird is intimately familiar because I gather the black fly's main contribution in life is that it carries the parasites -

MR. CARTER: Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

MR. ROBERTS: I say to the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) that if he and I never agree on anything else, we agree on that, that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. And what I am trying to say in my own simple, little way is at least one beholder has pointed out that this design to him speaks of a black fly which he may consider to be the most beautiful thing in the world. And the black fly's main role in

MR. ROBERTS: the world other than nipping people is to carry the - it is the vector, a word I would commend to the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter), the vector for the parasites to the study of which Dr. Laird has devoted his life or a large part of it.

MR. NEARY: The tsetse fly (inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know if it is the tsetse fly or not, I understood it is a black fly, but a fly is a fly is a fly to me.

MR. LUSH: I has teeth like a chain-saw.

MR. E. ROBERTS: My problem, Mr. Speaker, is quite simply that I do not like the design of the flag. I have looked at it now for -

MR. THOMS: That is your last invitation to St. Mary's.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Possibly it might be my last invitation to St. Mary's and if it is so be it. I do not think for one minute that Christopher Pratt will do that, I mean, if he wanted to be against me we could certainly discuss politics where he and I have had some notable differences of opinion. He supported the party opposite - support-ed I have no idea of what he is doing now -

MR. S. NEARY: He also did the design for the Tory Party in the 1975 election.

MR. E. ROBERTS: He did a campaign poster for them in the 1971 election which was a very splended piece of art and very hard to come by but I had one in my possession for a while.

MR. T. LUSH: I gather then he is a Tory. I did not know that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, I do not care what Mr. Pratt's political connections are, you know, that does not change my feelings for his art, generally, and it does not change - if this were a print I might be very tempted to go and buy it. But I do not like the design and I looked at it and looked at it and looked at it and thought about it and tried to come to some feeling, some conclusion as to whether I would - in a free vote. If it were a party vote I would have no trouble going along with my party because to be quite blunt I could not care less in a very real sense what design we have. In a very real sense, and a number of

MR. E. ROBERTS: my colleagues have made this point with great eloquence, the whole thing is a revealing episode when I think of the all the problems affecting Newfoundland and Labrador today, when I think of all the matters with which this House ought to be dealing, to think that we have been asked by the government, The government that sets the legislative priorities, to deal with this question of a flag. Symbols are important and I know man does not live by bread alone, Mr. Speaker, but he must have bread to live.

In any event that is the problem with this flag and I can sum it up very simply, that this design is an intellectual design and that is where the whole thing has gone astray. The flag is not the design that the Committee have put forward. And if I fault my friends on the Committee it is not for the design they have produced. One man's design, Mr. Speaker, is as good as another, Jack is as good as his master and my Jack is as good as yours'. The design - if I had my own choice, I like the Labrador flag. I think the Labrador flag is a superb piece of emotionalism and of symbolism and I do not know if I had been on the committee but I would have lobbied to have it made even though I know there are many people in Labrador, many of them were formerly constituents of mine, who say we should not take it because you have taken everything else from us. Well, I do not argue with that. But the fact remains I like it. But that is simply my design and I am not going to attempt to put up my design, we have one.

And the problem, in my opinion, and I have heard an awful lot of dribble from the other side on it, people talking what they ought to realize is nonsense, maybe they do not, but they ought to realize

MR. E. ROBERTS: the sheer dribble of symbols of this or trying to mock that. I think if it is not intellectually dishonest it is intellectually third or fourth-class, some of the speeches I have heard from gentleman opposite. The problem is that the flag ought to represent something of our history, it ought to represent some emotional factors. Every flag in history stood for that, even the red Maple Leaf which became the red Maple Leaf only after a prolonged debate, seven or eight months in Ottawa, the red Maple Leaf, Sir, the Maple Leaf was the symbol of Canada universally accepted, universally recognized. The trouble with this flag is there is nothing in it that is distinctively Newfoundland -

MR. L. THOMS: We do not have a universal symbol.

MR. E. ROBERTS: My hon. friend for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) says we do not have a universal symbol. Well, then maybe the report the Committee ought to have brought in is no flag, let us go on as we are. If you want to talk about the reality of it.

MR. F. STAGG: How about a white flag?

MR. E. ROBERTS: A white flag? Maybe the gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is used to standing under white flags. I do not care about an individual design I am simply saying that this design, Sir, I think is a bad one for a flag and I have given my reason for it. My reason is that it is an intellectual exercise, it does not grow out of the heart or the spirit or the history or the feelings of our people or of our Province. You could look at it, Sir, and you would not know it was Newfoundland. There is nothing in it in any way connected with Newfoundland. Every other flag that I am aware of over the years that has been adopted has evolved and not been proclaimed, not just been put in.

MR. ROBERTS:

That is the problem I have with this flag, Sir. I have only a minute or two left. Let me say two other things. First of all, the way in which the government have handled themselves in this debate, the government members, in large measure have determined what I will do. They have been arrogant. They have been uncaring. They have been unfeeling and in my view they have acted in a way that a group of men ought not to have done. And I look at the minister and say it is not him. I thought his speech introducing the flag was good. But a number of his colleagues, Sir, in my view have demeaned themselves, have demeaned the House and all I can do as one individual is say, 'I react against it. I react very strongly against it'. The flag ought not to be borne. There is no doubt that the flag will be. You know, the government have made up their minds. The Premier has made up his mind. The flag will go through. There is no question about that at all. In that sense the whole thing is just an exercise in futility, an absolute exercise in futility, a waste of everybody's time. The moment the Premier made up his mind - now, I am not saying he is forcing it but the gentlemen and the ladies on the other side, Mr. Speaker, will fall in line, for whatever reasons, good, bad or indifferent they will vote in favour of this flag, almost all of them. I understand there are one or two who feel sufficiently strong and they will either be absent or they will vote against it. One of them I believe, the gentleman for St. John's Center (Dr. McNicholas) has said he will not support it. There may be some others who may or may not appear. I do not know.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains the the government's conduct, in my view, throughout this debate has been dispicable and that has bothered me very much. One other thing that I want to say in closing is that this House can adopt a law and, as I have said, I suspect that will be the result. The press are giving a running count. I mean, never have the press been more wrong than to give a running count on this one, as if the issue was in doubt, which is the impression that is

MR. ROBERTS:

being given. No doubt about the issue. The flag is going to be the flag. This House can adopt the flag, Sir, and if the majority wish this bill to become law it will and it should become law. The majority are the majority. But, Sir, only the people of this Province can adopt a flag. Let us not kid ourselves. We can pass laws in here until we are blue in the face, until we are red in the face, until we are designed or not designed in the face, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador will decide whether this is to be their flag or not. The people of this Province, once it is adopted by this Legislature as it will be, the people -

MR. WARREN:

Maybe not.

MR. ROBERTS:

My friend from Torngat is living in a dreamland if he thinks - no, they have made up their minds over there.

MR. WARREN:

The Premier might change his mind.

MR. ROBERTS:

The Premier is not going to change his mind. The Premier, I say to my friend from Torngat Mountains, is not big enough ever to change his mind. That is one of the Premier's problems. He has strengths. The Premier has real strengths but one of them is not the ability to admit that he has changed his mind. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, it will become the law. But only the people of Newfoundland and Labrador can make it our flag.

Sir, I am going to vote against it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS:

I am going to vote against it because I do not like the design.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS:

I am sorry? Some hon. gentleman burped? If some hon. gentleman wishes to say something I will hear him but I warn him if he comes into a battle of wits he better come fully armed and not half armed as most of them do. Is that the gentleman for Humber West (Mr. Baird)?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. ROBERTS:

A self-made man because nobody

else will take the responsibility for him, Mr. Speaker. I began this by saying I did not want to be interrupted by that type of comment and I would be grateful if I would be allowed to finish the second or two I have left in the same way. And I will give the gentleman for Humber West (Mr. Baird) exactly the same courtesy.

Sir, I do not like the design. In a sense I am in the same boat as the gentleman for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), my reasoning is the same but my conclusion is different, Sir. I think we should have a flag and I only wish that we had found a design that had won some support among the Province. I have found no support for this, no significant support at all and I have found a great number of people who just do not like the design and that is the tragedy of it, Sir.

I have used my time. I thank the House. I shall vote against it, Sir, and I hope that in the years to come the people of Newfoundland, who will make the flag or break it, I hope, Sir, that they will decide that whatever we in this House as a whole do is right. I fear they will not, Sir. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

May 15, 1980

Tape 1589

MB - 1

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)
Buchans.

The hon. member for Windsor -

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I make the time to be about 5:28 p.m. so with your concurrence I will call it 5:30 p.m. and adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed to call it 5:30?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed. It being 5:30 p.m. a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House.

The matter for debate, raised by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is \$2.9 million in a bank account in Hamburg, Germany for the sale of Labrador linerboard.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I have the energy now to carry on. I was tempted to withdraw but because of the importance of this particular subject, Sir, I would like to just run through it again more or less for the sake of those people who do not understand what it is we are talking about here. But what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is the contract that Labrador Linerboard entered into with Schürfeld in Hamburg, Germany, in 1975. The contract was to market Labrador linerboard. And they did indeed market a certain amount of Labrador linerboard. And the contract was to run for ten years. The contract will not terminate until 1985. Now, since 1975, when this company was marketing linerboard in West Germany, 40,000 tons of Labrador linerboard a year in West Germany, they arranged to have the linerboard shipped to customers in West Germany, they collected the money from the customers and they put the money in a bank account in Hamburg. Instead of transferring the money to Labrador Linerboard, they put it in a bank account in West Germany, in Hamburg. And the money has been there now for several years. Four years the Moores' administration sat there knowing there was \$2.9 million belonging to the taxpayers of this Province in a bank account in Hamburg, Germany. For one year this administration have sat there knowing or not knowing, I am not sure which, I am a bit confused at this point

MR. S. NEARY: in time, Mr. Speaker. Five years - four years of the Moores' administration, one year of this administration sitting idly by while a company in West Germany-

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, sitting idly by, Mr. Speaker, because I am not quite sure that any attempt was ever made to get that money transferred to Labrador Linerboard or to the Newfoundland Exchequer Account. The minister told us the other day that he thought that the lawyer for Labrador Linerboard had made an attempt. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the documentation, I would like to have laid on the table of this House - If the news media are so hungry that they lap up what ministers say as gospel, then I would say to the minister, let him lay the documentation on the table of this House. And then we would see how often and how many times the Newfoundland Government tried to get that \$2.9 million over here to the Newfoundland Exchequer, that rightfully belongs to the people of this Province. I have grave doubts if any serious attempt was ever made. I have a feeling that the reason no attempt was made was because Labrador Linerboard felt they were in violation of the contract and they were afraid to ask Schürfeld to transfer the money, afraid they might take action against the Newfoundland Government or Labrador Linerboard for a violation of the contract. Now, Mr. Speaker, if a dispute did occur between Labrador Linerboard and the Newfoundland Government and/or Schürfeld there was an arbitration clause in the agreement. The arbitration clause was not used to get this money. And incidentally, the arbitration has to be done over in England, not in Newfoundland. The arbitrator has to decide this matter in England, outside of this Province. Four years the Moores' administration ignored it. One year this present administration has ignored the fact that there is \$2.9 million in a bank account in Hamburg, Germany belonging to the people of this Province. That, Mr. Speaker, is shameful and if the

MR. S. NEARY:

minister wants to contradict what I am saying let him produce the evidence. Let him lay on the table of this House documentation to show the members that the government indeed did make a genuine attempt to get this money transferred to Newfoundland. I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, they did not and I will know for sure in due course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

May 15, 1980

Tape No. 1590

RA - 1

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, to briefly review the matter.

One thing I want to clarify, there is a dispute about money owed to Newfoundland, somewhere in the vicinity of 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.6 million dollars. There is no amount of money sitting in a bank in West Germany just waiting for the government to collect, there would be no dispute if that were the case. If all one had to do was send somebody over to pick it up or have the government's bank phone Germany and say "My, send over that 2.8 or 2.9 million dollars we are ready to receive it now. We did not need it before, now we need it. Send it over". It is not sitting there waiting in a bank for somebody in the government to pick up, some deputy minister or somebody could go over the weekend, Monday morning when the bank opens in Hamburg walk in and say "Now, we will pick up that 2.9 million dollars that you have been holding for us" And that will be the end of it, surely to God - I mean - that is not a dispute then. It would just mean that there was money sitting waiting there for about three years and everybody was too lazy to go and pick up the money or to have our bankers phone the bank in Germany and ask them to send it over. What, in fact, is the situation is the contract which I tabled which the hon. gentleman is aware of, provided for the sale of Labrador linerboard to this German company for a period to terminate in 1985. When it was decided that Labrador Linerboard was going out of business, were closing, then obviously they could not continue shipping linerboard to this West German company, they would no longer be in existence. So the West German company argues, puts forward the argument of an anticipatory breach of contract. In other words, that is a breach which is caused by repudiating an obligation before the time comes to fulfill the obligation. That is what they charged. The government, Labrador Linerboard, initially, now they are out of business, the government puts forward other arguments which I am not going to go into because we do not obviously, we cannot argue it here, we cannot decide it here, but there is a dispute. There is no money sitting in a bank waiting for someone to pick it up. There is a dispute, a legal dispute over that allegation.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: by the West German company that there was an anticipatory breach of contract by Labrador Linerboard Mill and, therefore, they do not own them the money and the government's counter argument is that the money is owed. Now, we intend to make one final further effort at negotiations.

MR. S. NEARY: What were the other efforts ?

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: And if that does not solve the matter to the government's satisfaction, then we have two recourses (1) Arbitration as outlined in the contract, and the other one would be settlement by court, the matter would be determined by court. And we are not going to proceed with those until there is one final -

MR. S. NEARY: What court would have the jurisdiction ?

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: That would be one of the matters which would have to be decided, that would be one of the matters. It could well be in West Germany, although the contract says that it is English law which governs it. But that does not stop a West German court from applying English law, right? It is not for me to say, but it could well be that it would be decided if it got to court in West Germany, but according to English law, because the contract stipulates that English law is what is applied. So, we are going to make one final effort at negotiation, if that does not work then we will have to go either the arbitration or court route. And that is what it is. And let me repeat again that is is not the situation it sounds like, 2.8 or 2.9 million dollars sitting in a bank account that nobody will make the effort to transfer over, there is a dispute. Well, what the Germany company says is that they do not owe us the money and what we maintain is they do own us the money. If that were not the case there would not be a dispute.

MR. S. NEARY: Will you table the documents (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Simms) Order, please ! The second and final matter for debate raised by the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush) is Canada Manpower Statistics as they apply to this Province in terms of employment levels and various industrial sectors and how close is the

May 15, 1980

Tape No. 1590

RA - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms) government approaching its target of
forty thousand jobs? The hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear !

MR. T. LUSH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I
raised some questions relating to the Statistics Canada monthly report for
April, reports Mr. Speaker, that relate to this Province's number one
problem, namely, unemployment. But to hear members opposite speak about
this problem you would think it was solved. But, Mr. Speaker, this is
still the Province's number one problem. It is still the number one
task of the government to try :

MR. T. LUSH: and solve this problem. And then raising the matter with the minister, I was absolutely astounded that the minister had not studied the statistics and was not able to provide me with the answers. I knew the answers, of course, and that is the unfortunate part, usually, that we see ministers being interviewed and talking about something about which they know nothing. When members over here ask questions they know the answers. And I know the answers about the questions I directed to the minister. One of the questions was, Could the minister explain why the labour force only grew by 1,000. Now, as I said, I know the answer, but I want the minister to tell the people of Newfoundland why it was that the labour force grew by only 1,000. And I mentioned what a great year it was to reduce unemployment because the labour force normally grows by about 5,000 to 6,000 to 7,000, in that range. This year it only grew by 1,000 and yet the reduction in the levels of unemployment were not that substantial.

Mr. Speaker, the minister says that the government created 6,000 new jobs. Now, what a lot of malarkey! Again, that is just the normal growth. Every year we have about 5,000 to 6,000 jobs. That is just the normal growth. So these were not new jobs, just the normal growth in the economy and that happens every year. And I directed the minister's attention to the fact that the Premier in his election in June, just about a year now to the day - June 18th - promised to create 40,500 jobs over the next five years. I asked the minister could he give us a breakdown of what the employment was in each economic sector of the Province, and the minister could not do that. I asked that for a real reason. I secondly asked the minister, How close was the government to meeting this target of providing 40,500 jobs. Now, Mr. Speaker, they are not very close because if they are going to meet this objective, number one, in addition to the 5,000 to 6,000 jobs that are created every year at just the natural growth of the economy, he has to be on top of that. So the 40,500 jobs were to be created over the next five years of which one year is gone, and if the government is going to meet that objective, this year there should have been 14,000 jobs - 6,000 plus about 8,000, 13,000 to 14,000 jobs.

MR. T. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, the increase in the jobs was in the trade and service industries. And just again, so the minister can direct his attention to the matter which I raised of how close the government was getting to its objective of creating 40,500 jobs, the Premier said, and I read, 'that the five year job creating programme would tap the Province's potential for unparalleled growth and development.' Well, Mr. Speaker, if we take that as an example over the first year, I am afraid there is not very much growth.

But just look at where the jobs are going to come from. It says that we were going to get 6,500 jobs in the fisheries, and the statistics show that there was not one single new job in the fisheries or any of the primary industries, forestry, agriculture, mining - there was not a new job. The job level was the same a year ago as it was this year in April, so no increase there.

Mr. Speaker, another interesting statistic. It says, 'But the largest number of new jobs would be in services, especially 16,420 in hydro and tourism.' Now, Mr. Speaker, what new jobs are in hydro?

And the last one I want to read, 'and 7,000 jobs in government and Crown agencies.' And do you know what the statistics showed in April? We were going to create 7,000 jobs in government and with Crown agencies. In government and Crown agencies there were 7,000 jobs created over the next five years. Do hon. members know what the truth of the matter is? - that between April of this year and April of a year ago there was a drop of 2,000 jobs - 2,000 jobs less this April in the government and Crown agencies than there was a year ago.

MR. G. FLIGHT: How many?

MR. T. LUSH: A drop of 2,000 when indeed the Premier was going to create 7,000 new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like for the minister - the minister can say that these statistics are wrong. He is right, because the picture is much worse. It is much worse than what the statistics show and the government have been very successful in diverting public attention away from this, our number one problem.

May 15, 1980

Tape 1591

EC - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I only wish I could go on, but I hope the minister will stand and give the public of Newfoundland, give the press, some of the answers that I have been trying to get on this our number one problem and the number one responsibility of the government of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I have not heard as much foolishness in all my life than I heard in the past five minutes by the hon. member opposite, totally foolish. I mean, we talk about dichotomies. We have the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) who gets up and attacks the hon. the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Dawe) about giving one job to a Nova Scotian in North Sydney last year. We have the hon. member standing up and attacking hon. members over here, the Minister of Mines and Energy, (Mr. Barry) for his offshore oil and gas regulations when we provide 730 new jobs in the offshore that we would never have if it were left to hon. members opposite. Never have it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member takes these Liberal -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: -Statistics Canada statistics and tries to shove them down our throats. Well, let us have a look at some of the statistics. Mr. Speaker, last year the total number of people employed, 154,000. So we say, now where are they employed in Newfoundland? The Avalon Peninsula, 73,000; Burin Peninsula, 14,000; West Coast and Labrador, 32,000; Central, 31,000. If you add it up, it comes to 150,000. Now, what happened to the 4,000? They disappeared somewhere. Mr. Speaker, we had last year's statistics from March, 1979, to March, 1980, where - the hon. member did not ask me last month. Last month Statistics Canada reported that we had a total of 13,000 new jobs created in this Province. He did not get up last month - 13,000 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: - there were last month employed.

The hon. member did not get up then - Where was he?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: - so I checked the statistics.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I checked the statistics. I said 13,000. Now, I said, where were they created. On the Avalon Peninsula, 5,000; Burin Peninsula, 3,000; West Coast, 3,000, Central, 2,000. Now, that adds up to 13,000, they are right there. This month, let us have a look at this month.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) 6,000.

MR. DINN: Six thousand. Well, 6,000, he says. They created 6,000 new jobs, that is all we had. They add up to: two on the Avalon Peninsula -

MR. G. FLIGHT: Two jobs?

MR. DINN: - 2,000 jobs on the Avalon Peninsula, of 6,000. The hon. member is not with me. I will give it to him a little later in baby talk, like I would for the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary). As the hon. the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Jamieson) would say, do not come to the battle half armed in a battle of wits. The Burin Peninsula, 3,000; the West Coast and Labrador, 1,000; Central Newfoundland, 2,000. That adds up to 8,000 and, yet, the total is 6,000. Now, they cannot take the Statistics Canada statistics, they cannot take two and three -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. DINN: - and one and two -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - and add up to six.

MR. SPEAKER: If I might, I believe there was a fair bit of silence when the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) was asking his question, perhaps we should have the same type of silence when the hon. minister is responding.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, they cannot take the truth.

Hon. members opposite -

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. DINN: - just cannot take the truth. The hon. member for Terra Nova is over there like a chicken now trying to stretch

MR. DINN: his neck up. The fact of the matter is that they could not add up, Statistics Canada could not take the Avalon, Burin, West Coast and Labrador and Central and add those statistics up, 2,000, 3,000, 1,000 and 2,000, and come up with 8,000. They came up with 6,000. I am certainly not going to stand in this House and try to defend Statistics Canada. They have been fondling the figures for years, as the hon. members opposite have been fondling issues like the offshore when they should stand up and be counted like Newfoundlanders, all over the Province have stood up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get involved with this foolishness of the hon. member anymore. If he cannot ask sensible questions in this House of Assembly, then he should not be allowed to ask questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

On motion, the House at its rising
adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 a.m.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MAY 15, 1980

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

*Tabled by the
minutes of Finance
15 May 78*

APPROVED LOANS

APRIL 1, 1977 - MARCH 31, 1978

<u>NAME OF FIRM</u>	<u>TYPE AND LOCATION OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF LOAN</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF EQUITY</u>
Arctic Fishery Products Limited	Fish plant expansion Charleston, Bonavista Bay	\$1,000,000.	
Baie Vista Inn Limited	New motel construction, Baie Verte	330,000.	\$10,000.
Bayshore Foods Limited	Food products expansion Stephenville	40,000.	
Bernard W. Bartle Limited	Metal fabrication modernization, Grand Falls		75,000.
Gerald Collins and Sons Limited	Automotive parts fabrication, Corner Brook	102,000.	
Forward and Pike Manufacturing Limited	Furniture manufacturing expansion, Carbonear	30,000.	
S.T. Jones and Son Ltd.	Fish plant expansion Little Bay Islands	146,000.	
Notre Dame Bay Fisheries Limited	Canning plant expansion Comfort Cove	100,000.	
Victor Osbourne	Welding shop expansion Seal Cove, White Bay	6,000	
Port Enterprises Limited	Fish plant expansion, Southern Harbour	142,000.	
Rowsell's Motel Limited	Motel modernization, Robert's Arm	7,500.	

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

APPROVED LOANS

APRIL 1, 1978 - MARCH 31, 1979

<u>NAME OF FIRM</u>	<u>TYPE AND LOCATION OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF LOAN</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF EQUITY</u>
Anchor Inn Motel (1978) Ltd.	Motel Twillingate	\$ 190,000.	
Arctic Fishery Products Ltd.	Fish plant Charleston, Bonavista	500,000.	
Atlantic Analytical Services Ltd.	Rock cutting and analysis Springdale	80,000.	
Atlantic Bridge Co. Ltd.	Fishing Gear Manufacture St. John's	1,200,000.	
Avalon Farms Ltd.	Poultry and Swine farm Holyrood	150,000.	
Baie Vista Inn Ltd.	Hotel Baie Verte	95,000.	
Bay Bulls Sea Products Ltd.	Fish Plant Bay Bulls	170,500.	
Blundon Brothers Co. Ltd.	Concrete Block Plant Gander	385,000.	\$ 15,000.
Breakwater Books Ltd.	Book Publishing St. John's	55,000.	
Central Striping Ltd.	Line Painting Windsor	2,800.	
Fogo Island Shipbuilding and Producers Co- Operative Society Ltd.	Fish Plant Fogo	711,000.	
Gander Aviation Ltd.	Aircraft Maintenance Gander	90,000.	
Gilbert Goosney	Timber Harvesting Parson's Pond	9,000.	
Glenwood Forest Products Ltd.	Sawmill Glenwood	84,000.	11,000.
Goose Bay Timber Co. Ltd.	Sawmill Goose Bay	425,000.	
Hawke Industries Ltd.	Timber Harvesting Hawkes Bay	15,000.	
Island Seafoods Ltd.	Fish Plant Herring Neck	278,000.	
Jason Enterprises Ltd.	Fish Plant Bareneed	595,000	

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Approved Loans
 April 1, 1978 - March 31, 1979
 Page 2

<u>NAME OF FIRM</u>	<u>TYPE AND LOCATION OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF LOAN</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF EQUITY</u>
Eugene Legge	Poultry Farm Harbour Main	\$ 100,000.	
Ronald Lidstone	Service Station Roddickton	16,500.	
Neldo Marine Development Co. Ltd.	Fibreglass Boat Manufacture Argentia	69,000.	
Nfld. Paper Converting Co. Ltd.	Paper Products Manufacture St. John's	250,000.	\$ 42,000.
Northern Fisheries Ltd.	Fish Plant L'Anse au Loup, Labrador	144,000.	10,000.
Ocean Harvesters Ltd.	Fish Meal Plant Harbour Grace	870,000.	
Port Enterprises Ltd.	Fish Plant Southern Harbour	169,000.	16,000.
Seaside Fisheries Ltd.	Fish Plant Coley's Point	100,000.	
Newman and Michael Sinnicks	Timber Harvesting Hawke's Bay	7,500.	
Smith's Seafoods Ltd.	Fish Plant Norman's Cove	25,000.	
Terra Nova Shoes Ltd.	Footware Manufacture Harbour Grace	290,000.	
Texstran Ltd.	Rope Manufacture St. John's	110,000.	10,000.
Truck Bodies Ltd.	Truck Body Manufacture St. John's	337,000.	100,000.
Wallken Enterprises Ltd.	Floor Truss Manufacture St. John's	155,000.	
Western Farm Feeds Ltd.	Feed Mill Stephenville	288,000.	16,000.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

APPROVED LOANS

APRIL 1, 1979 - MARCH 31, 1980

<u>NAME OF FIRM</u>	<u>TYPE AND LOCATION OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF LOAN</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF EQUITY</u>
Avalon Sea Products Ltd.	Fish Plant	\$250,000.	
Bay Bulls Sea Products Ltd.	Fish plant expansion, Bay Bulls	120,000.	
Broiler Chicks Ltd.	Chick hatchery Whitbourne	283,000.	\$23,000.
Buckingham Marine & Fabricating Works Ltd.	Metal fabricating St. John's	250,000.	
Hayward Butt	Motel Carbonear	24,000.	
Cal's Sand & Gravel Ltd.	Cement batch plant Bonavista	319,000.	
Enaid Limited	Tourist Cabins Grand Falls	81,500.	
Emery J. Finta for Valley Bakery Ltd.	Bakery Goose Bay	81,000.	
Foxtrap Farms Ltd.	Hog Farm Foxtrap	191,000.	5,000.
G & L Marine Ltd.	Fibreglass Boat Manufacture Stephenville	282,000.	
E. J. Green & Company Ltd.	Fish Plant expansion Winterton	310,000.	
Hall's Bay Haulout Ltd.	Longliner Yard Springdale	250,000.	
Island Seafoods Ltd.	Fish Plant Herring Neck	210,000.	
P. Janes & Sons Ltd.	Fish Canning Hant's Harbour	193,000.	
P. Janes & Sons Ltd.	Fish Plant expansion Jackson's Arm	331,000.	
Ledreus Enterprises Ltd.	Tourist Cabins Traytown	46,000.	
Motel Bay D'Espoir Ltd.	Motel Milltown	187,000.	
Newco Farms Ltd.	Pig Breeding St. John's	238,000.	

NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Approved Loans
April 1, 1979 - March 31, 1980
Page 2

<u>NAME OF FIRM</u>	<u>TYPE AND LOCATION OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF LOAN</u>	<u>AMOUNT OF EQUITY</u>
Gordon Pennell	Motel Trepassey	\$162,000.	\$
Rowsell's Motel Ltd.	Motel Robert's Arm	110,000.	
Sandy Beach Enterprises Limited	Tourist Cabins Western Bay	80,000.	
Seaside Fisheries Ltd.	Fish Plant expansion Coley's Point	30,000.	
Smith Seafoods Ltd.	Fish Plant Norman's Cove	26,000.	
Superior Logging Ltd.	Sawmill Springdale	302,000.	
Texstran Limited	Rope Manufacturing plant St. John's	100,000.	20,000.
Topline Printing Co. Ltd.	Printing Shop Grand Falls	43,000.	
Western Farm Feeds Ltd.	Feed mill Stephenville		50,000

Question

- (1) Has the Government evaluated its Air Subsidy Program to Labrador Airways from St. Anthony to Mary's Harbour and points on the Labrador East Coast?
- (2) Has the Minister been in contact with Labrador Airways with regard to this subsidy and what is the result of these negotiations?
- (3) When can we expect the Minister to make an official statement with regards to this air subsidy?

Answer

- (1) Yes
- (2) My officials have contacted Labrador Airways to advise that effective 1980 04 30 Government will discontinue its financial support towards the operation of this service.
- (3)

Question

- (1) How many ferries in the Province are receiving Provincial subsidies?
- (2) Could the Minister list the places and the amount of subsidy each received and also the population of these centers?

Answer

(1) Eight (8)

(2) Yes

	<u>Place</u>	<u>Subsidy</u>	<u>Population</u>
(1)	Bell Island - Portugal Cove	\$1,188,000	7,000
(2)	St. Brendans - Burnside	105,000	650
(3)	Greenspond - Badgers Quay	113,400	450
(4)	Fogo - Carmanville	181,500	4,000
(5)	Change Islands - Farewell	120,000	600
(6)	Little Bay Islands - Long Island - St. Patricks	250,000	1,100
(7)	Woody Point - Norris Point (Bonne Bay)	110,000	3,500
(8)	Ramea - Burgeo - Grey River	110,000	3,600