

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
FRIDAY, MAY 9, 1980

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I am sure hon. members would like to join me in welcoming to the galleries today the Provincial President of the Royal Canadian Legion, Mr. Gordon Collins, and representatives of legion branches from Botwood, Pouch Cove, Portugal Cove, Bell Island, Ferryland, Kelligrews, Holyrood, Brigus, Bay Roberts, Spaniard's Bay, Carbonear, Whitbourne, Mount Pearl, Pleasantville and St. John's. Also representatives from the Royal Naval Association, the 59th. Regimental Association, the 166th. Regimental Association, and the Korean Veterans Association.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I would also like to welcome to the galleries on behalf of hon. members, Mayor Gerald Hynes and Councillor Morris Kennedy, of Manuel's Cove - Gillard's Cove - Bluff Head Cove Council, in the district of Twillingate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement with respect to the development of an aviation system for Newfoundland. This has come in for some discussion in recent days and weeks. It concerns the planning, and it is just in that stage now, the planning of possibly closing out one of the airports on the West Coast, either Stephenville or Deer Lake, and I would wish to make this statement.

The Civil Aviation Planning Division of the Atlantic Regional Office of Transport Canada commenced the development of an aviation area master plan for the Island of Newfoundland in 1976. The objective of the plan was to provide guidelines for the development of the aviation system in Newfoundland over the next fifteen to twenty years.

MR. BRETT:

In the initial stages of the planning process, officials of my department provided the Transport Canada planning group with demographic and other relevant statistics for particular locations across the Province. The department also provided additional data to keep the material current on an as requested basis. As part of the overall development plan, an analysis of the future roles of Deer Lake and Stephenville airports was undertaken.

In the Summer of 1979, Transport Canada advised the department that they would like to meet with us to ensure we are kept current in regard to the latest planning development and are in agreement with the findings of the study or otherwise. They stated they are willing to provide a briefing on the study and/or to invite representatives from the Department to participate in public meetings that Transport Canada would be organizing in the very near future.

We responded in August 1979, saying we would appreciate receiving a comprehensive briefing at Transport Canada's convenience, but we were reluctant

MR. BRETT:

to participate in the planned public meetings because the main objective of the meetings was to engage in discussions with interested parties in the various regions of the Province to get their input into the development planned, and the provincial presence could have the effect of inhibiting open and frank discussions, recognizing that aviation is exclusively under federal control. The consultive process was deferred because the Atlantic Region Air Administrator of Transport Canada was awaiting his minister's approval to commence this phase of the programme. That approval has now been received and Transport Canada are planning to meet with interested groups during the last week of May.

Officials of my department met with Transport Canada people yesterday and were given a briefing which consisted of reviewing the work done to date on assessing possible alternate future roles for Stephenville/Deer Lake and St. Anthony airports in the Western portion of the Island.

I might say, although it is not written in the statement, Mr. Speaker, that we are adamant in our stand that both the Stephenville and the Deer Lake airports must continue to operate.

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

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, in response to the minister's statement I find very little in it to comment on. I certainly would not want to see a division between two communities, Stephenville and Deer Lake, and I would like to suggest that they would most certainly make a joint approach to federal authorities on this matter themselves instead of setting up a division between two communities that presently are eighty miles separated. People in Stephenville have to drive to Deer Lake to get a way out by air, or from Deer Lake to Stephenville in order to be able to fly to the Mainland. And to me it is very unfair for the federal or any other authority to think in terms of phasing out either of these airports. We have already been phased down in other areas, like rail

MR. BENNETT: services. We have not got the best Trans-Canada in Canada, the TCH. We have not got the best transportation methods to be used by our people and I think it is criminal to think in terms of closing out either one of these airports.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave this morning of the House of Assembly's time for maybe twenty minutes or longer to give the full details of the Fisheries Loan Board.

MR. NEARY: A point or order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the hon. gentleman has a thirteen page so-called Ministerial Statement that he is going to make to the House. Your Honour knows that this matter has been raised on more than one occasion and I do not think up to date that Your Honour has given a ruling on whether or not ministers are abusing the time of the House, abusing their privileges by making technical and political statements. My understanding, Mr. Speaker, of a Ministerial Statement is that the matter has to be urgent, there has to be an emergency, it has to be brief, concise and to the point. And here we have a minister with a thirteen page Ministerial Statement and he will probably depart from it and add another little bit so you are talking about a statement that is going to go almost three quarters of an hour

MR. S. NEARY: at a time, Mr. Speaker, when people of this Province were told there was going to be a flag debate in this House. So apart from the fact that it may be out of order, it is discourteous to the Royal Canadian Legion who have brought so many members to the public galleries today, and I would submit now, Mr. Speaker, that it is time we had a ruling whether or not long-winded, technical, political Ministerial Statements are in order -

MR. L. THOMS: And are debatable.

MR. S. NEARY: - and are debatable; and then it will take another fifteen or twenty minutes for somebody on this side to respond, so you are wasting an hour of the House when in fact, Mr. Speaker, the statement could be laid on the table of the House. The information would be given to the members, we would get the information, the press would get the information. A technical statement of that nature, in my opinion, does not warrant the time of a Ministerial Statement and should be laid on the table of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order, I do not think there is anything in the Standing Orders or in any of the rules of the House saying how long a Ministerial Statement should be. This particular Ministerial Statement is one that the Opposition have been asking questions on over the last several weeks and months. It happens to concern 20,000 or more fishermen of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and I think I speak for every member of the Canadian Legion in the galleries today when I say that they are just as interested in the fishery of this Province as this government is, and I think they would be only too glad to hear what this government intends to do for many aspects of Newfoundland society, not just what the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) is interested in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

To the point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

If I might, Mr. Speaker, and I will not attempt the kind of cheap shot the Premier just attempted -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS:

- I would like to refer Your Honour to Section 262 - our Standing Orders, by the way, are silent on this matter, I would suggest. Section 262 of Beauchesne in its entirety reads: "Statements by Ministers have now been given a recognized place in Routine Proceedings. The Standing Order is specific but considerable latitude has been left to the Speaker to set limits on the participants. The Speaker has emphasized that both the Government and Opposition contributions should be brief and factual."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS:

"The purpose of the ministerial statement is to convey information, not to encourage debate."

MR. S. NEARY:

Right on!

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the issue is not the one the Premier has attempted to make with a cheap, low-class kind of debate. Sir, we would be quite prepared to debate the fisheries in this House at any time. If the government wished to debate the fisheries this day, I am sure the gentlemen from the Legion would be as willing as the government are and as we are to debate it.

MR. S. NEARY:

Right.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

But let the government not attempt to do it in the form that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) comes in to make a twenty minute speech to which there is no right of response except a very limited one and no debate allowed under the rules of the House. If the government are genuinely concerned, I say to the Premier, if he and his colleagues are genuinely concerned with the fishery as opposed to cheap second-rate politics, then let him set the matter down for debate and

MR. E. ROBERTS:

we will debate it in this House this day and as long and as often as the government wants, Sir, but Ministerial Statements, I submit, are not the way to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! I will hear a final submission from the hon. the Premier to the point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, just let me say that this hon. House of Assembly has been open all Spring, the Opposition have had ample opportunity to debate not only the fisheries but every other public posture that this government has taken. We have the budget debate coming up, the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) has already spoken in the budget debate. He was the person who was designated by the Opposition to be the major person to speak on the Budget Speech in which there was a lot of the fisheries policy contained therein. There is to be a White Paper on the fishery and so on. So as the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts) should know we are open always to debate not only the fishery but whatever -

MR. S. NEARY:

Your Honour, that is utterly ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- other issue that the Opposition might want to debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. J. MORGAN:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I believe I have heard enough with respect to the point of order to enable me to make a ruling. First of all, I might point out that we have used about eight minutes already in discussing a point of order, whether or not we have too much time allotted for Ministerial Statements. In view of the fact that our Standing Orders are silent, Beauchesne clearly says that considerable latitude has been left to the Speaker to set limits on the participants. I will quote only what we use as precedents in this House with respect to Ministerial Statements: They are for the purpose of conveying

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): information and the member responding is entitled to ask explanations, make a few remarks, but no debate is then allowed. It is also the practice of this hon. House that the member responding to Ministerial Statements may use approximately half the time used by the minister in presenting his statement. We also have many precedents in this House where Ministerial Statements have been lengthy, short, brief and whatever and there has been considerable latitude. And I think in view of the importance of the statement, I will allow the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) to make his statement.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say before I commence my statement, I had the courtesy to give the Opposition members copies of the statement two days ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, over the past number of months there has been some controversy and questions that need answering regarding the operations of the Fisheries Loan Board in the Province here. And the government appointed a committee to do a thorough review of the Fisheries Loan Board and, as you know, in the House of Assembly the appointment was made recently of Mr. Fred Pike, a new Chairman and a new Comptroller, Mr. Sydney Blundon.

Now that the report has been completed, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today in the House of Assembly here that the review and re-evaluation of the Loan Board has been completed and the report has been made and now major changes are being put in place to the Fisheries Loan Board to make the Board more efficient and more responsive to the needs of our fishery. Today I wish to outline to the House, and I am sure all member who represent fishermen around the Province will be interested in knowing this information, the new operations, the day to day operations of the Board and new regulations and policies under which the Board will operate. One of the major changes in the operations of the Fisheries Loan Board, Mr. Speaker, would involve the granting of loans by chartered banks to fishermen for the acquisition of fishing vessels and

MR. J. MORGAN: equipment. During the past few months we have been negotiating with the chartered banks regarding their involvement, **in providing financial assistance to fishermen, and** I am pleased to announce that these negotiations have been brought to a successful conclusion. So under the Fisheries Loan Board now the new programme, the Bank Loan Guarantee Programme, will take effect throughout all the chartered banks in the Province on June 1st. of this year. And fishermen requiring a loan in excess of \$50,000 and for not more than \$1 million will be able to directly deal with the banks in their own respective areas of the Province and other requests for loans up to \$50,000, from \$1,000 to \$50,000, will be dealt with through the Fisheries Loan Board as in the past.

Mr. Speaker, the government will guarantee **these** loans made by the banks to the fishermen. I want to point out and make absolutely clear and clearly understood to all fishermen that the fishermen who will be arranging their financing through the chartered banks will not be paying more for their loans, although they are dealing with the banks; that those who deal with the banks in the future will have the interest rate difference between what the banks will be charging the fishermen and what the Fisheries Loan Board is now charging, the 8 per cent, that it will be subsidized by the Newfoundland Government through the Fisheries Loan Board. So there will be no extra cost to the fishermen.

The interest on these loans, of course, will be paid directly to the banks by the fishermen and upon verification of payment to the banks that the interest has been paid they will then be reimbursed by the Fisheries Loan Board, by the Newfoundland Government.

MR. J. MORGAN:

The fishermen in the future will be required to pay and make a downpayment of 10 per cent on all vessels. There are some changes from there in the past; there was 10 per cent ~~down payment~~ for new vessels and 15 per cent for used vessels. Now it is 10 per cent downpayment for all vessels and 15 per cent for all their loans involving all their equipment.

And, Mr. Speaker, the financing through the banks will also encompass loans to fishermen who want to build their own boats, ~~and~~ that is important as well. Our way of life in Newfoundland is that many of the fishermen can and do build their own fishing vessels and, therefore, the loans will cover that kind of a programme whereby fishermen can build what you call back yard construction, carry out back yard construction, do their own boat building. The maximum term of loans, Mr. Speaker, will be for twenty years for steel vessels, fifteen years in the case of fibreglass - We will be subsidizing by means of loans and bounties the fibreglass vessels in the future and ten years for wooden vessels.

MR. MORGAN: The most important thing, Mr. Speaker, now, and to clarify any misunderstandings in the future, to make sure there are no misunderstandings in the future, the government has now sat down and clearly defined what we would call the eligibility criteria, whereby every single fisherman around the Province will know and clearly understand who can qualify and get government assistance for loans and grants, or bounties as they are called. Now these criteria are newly established criteria, established by means of consultation with the fishermen around the Province through the Fishermen's Union, representing the fishermen. And the criteria are in fact I think very important for all members who have fishermen as constituents to understand. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to table this and outline what the new criteria will be.

The new loans will be made only to fishermen and fishermen's groups, not to companies any more in the future, strictly to fishermen and fishermen's organizations and groups. And the requirements or the eligibility criteria are as follows: the fishermen must be of legal age. They must have had fishing experience as a full-time fisherman during the last two years as either an apprentice, a crewman, an owner/operator, a co-owner/operator for the fishing season in his respective region for the past two years. He must have obtained at least seventy-five per cent of his income from the harvesting sector of the fishery in each of the past two fishing seasons in his respective region - not seventy-five per cent of his income for the past two years, but during the fishing season in his respective region of the Province. That will clearly define who will qualify. Of course, he will also satisfy he has the experience to operate a vessel as a fisherman, and can also demonstrate to the Fisheries Loan Board and to the banks that he has the necessary licences from the Federal Department of Fisheries which is now responsible for the licencing of fishing vessels, that he has the necessary licences to operate and carry out the prosecution of the fishery.

And a very important one as well, that in

MR. MORGAN:

the future there will be no loans made to fishermen who are in substantial arrears with the Loan Board. That is a new regulation. So any fisherman who is in substantial arrears with the Loan Board will know automatically now he cannot qualify for a new loan until his old loan is up to date with the Board, or with the banks in this case.

Mr. Speaker, the details of these guidelines and criteria will be mailed out to all fishermen, and that is going to be important, I think, for all fishermen to fully understand, because sometimes this kind of a statement, lengthy as it is, cannot be fully covered and carried through the media. So it is important that the fishermen understand what we are saying as a government, and as a Department of Fisheries, so we intend over the next two or three week period, we are now in the process of publishing a brochure clearly outlining and defining the criteria and the guidelines of this new programme. And that will be mailed out to all fishermen throughout the Province, indicating the major changes now being made, and there are some major changes and I want to indicate what these major changes are.

The changes, for example, are that only fishermen will get loans in the future, not companies. The downpayment rates have been changed to ten per cent for all vessels, whereas before it was different in new and used. The interest rate has been changed from six per cent to eight per cent, which of course was announced in our most recent budget for the government here. There has been a lower limit and an upper limit on loans, \$1,000 to \$50,000 through the Fisheries Loan Board, and from \$50,000 to \$1 million through the banks.

Loans for new vessels can only be made for boats that are constructed within the Province. And that is an important point as well. However, we will consider - the Board will consider and the banks will consider loans for the purchase of used vessels from outside the Province.

MR. J. MORGAN:

And we are also, Mr. Speaker, outlining in our brochure the new requirements for what we call, as I mentioned earlier, backyard construction which will enable a fisherman to construct his own vessel and get the necessary assistance required to do so.

There is also, Mr. Speaker, in the new regulations, a penalty for a person who sells a vessel or equipment outside the Province or outside the fishing industry. In other words, we want to make sure that the vessels that we help to finance either by loans or grants through the taxpayers' dollars, we want to make sure that these vessels stay in the fishing industry. So there will be a penalty in the future to any fisherman who takes a vessel and sells it outside the industry or outside the Province and makes a capital gain. This was not previously covered in the old regulations. Also, there will be a regulation which states that a fisherman who sells his boat and obtains a capital gain, that the capital gain must be applied to his new loan before a new loan is issued.

These are the kinds of regulations, I think, Mr. Speaker, that are important for the fishermen to be fully familiar with.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we have made changes to the Bounties Act. We call them bounties. They are really outright grants to fishermen. And these grants in the future will be made only to the fisherman who obtains a permit from the Fisheries Loan Board or the Department of Fisheries to start construction of his boat. They will not be paid to fishermen who start construction without a permit to do so. There will be no bounties paid. And that will give us good guidance in having some control as to how many vessels are being built and who is building them and why so that we will know first-hand as we issue the permit to build and then the bounty comes after.

Mr. Speaker, the same qualifications for the bounties, of course, as I mentioned earlier - I will not go over them again the second time - apply to the loans as well as to the bounties, the criteria.

MR. J. MORGAN: The bounties, Mr. Speaker, will be \$45 per foot for 25 - up 25 foot vehicles - I am sorry - up more than 25 foot vessels - up to 35 feet and these guidelines without listing them off for the record of the House, are in this attached document and will be tabled here in the House giving the details of the bounty structure.

A further change, Mr. Speaker, is that in the future we will be providing bounties for vessels not only constructed of wood, but we intend to supply bounties for vessels constructed of steel and fibreglass and aluminum. We find that fishermen are more and more demanding boats constructed of steel in many cases now, the most recent years, and more so in the fibreglass field. So we now intend to have the regulations regarding grants for these vessels apply to that type of material used for construction of fishing vessels.

The one important change, I think it is important to fishermen I talk to in my travels and also in the views of the Fishermen's Union, is that we are now going to be applying a bounty or a grant to fishermen who want to repair their vessels. I found in my travels that because fishermen could not get assistance to repair their longliners, that they ended up applying for a loan to get a new one. They really did not want to get a new one, but they had

May 9, 1980

Tape No. 1411

AH-1

MR. MORGAN: no assistance to enable them to repair their old vessels, so now the regulation will be that any vessels more than eight years old will qualify for a provincial bounty, a bounty to enable the fishermen to carry out the repairs or rebuilding, if you want, of their old boats. The new programme, Mr. Speaker, will be called the Provincial Fishing Vessels Assistance Plan. As I mentioned earlier, administered by two sources, the Fisheries Loan Board on one hand, up to \$50,000 and on the other hand more than \$50,000 up to \$1 million, all

that fishermen
rd and rightly
s inspected

We have now
e vessels under
carried out

e, more so
t smaller

cs around
ives in their

the Fisheries
se to train
arry out
the very near

himself.
have the
uld call order

ster wishes

ormation of
lar. there will
to overcome

4-22-80

MR. MORGAN: that long process of having vessels inspected. The number of inspectors now are eight in the Loan Board and we are recruiting additional inspectors to make a total of twelve. The new operational procedures in dealing with loan applications, there are changes being made there to streamline the operations of the Loan Board so with the eligibility criteria now being clearly spelled out, the loans officers will be able to screen out the applications, deal with them to a point where it will remove the need for the Loan Board directors themselves in dealing with the application to have to spend too much time in getting additional information. The criteria will clearly enable the loans officers to determine who can qualify and whether or not the applicants in the applications made that qualify to go before the board to be voted on to obtain assistance.

Mr. Speaker, it has been recognized by, I think, all parties in the House here that there has been a communications problem, it has been recognized by me as the minister, a severe communications problem in the past between the fishermen and the Fisheries Loan Board. To overcome this problem, a new position has been created

MR. J. MORGAN: within the Loan Board, that of
Inquiries Officer. This position has been temporarily filled now by Mr. Len Edwards and fishermen can contact him by the telephone number that is listed in this document today and will be listed in the brochure which will be sent out over the next two or three week period to all fishermen. And this gentleman will be responsible for dealing with all inquiries from fishermen and will improve the liaison in communications between the fishermen and the Fisheries Loan Board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had considerable questions in the House over the past number of months regarding the make-up of a new Fisheries Loan Board. Who will be the new Fisheries Loan Board? Will there be fishermen on the Loan Board? Will there be all civil servants? Mr. Speaker, today I want to put to rest any further questioning on that matter because I wish to announce that the following people have now been appointed by the Cabinet, by the Governor in Council to be a new Fisheries Loan Board for the Province and they are as follows: Mr. Fred Pike, as I announced earlier, the new chairman; Mr. Ray Andrews is now the Assistant Deputy Minister of the department, he was with the Federal Department of Fisheries for as long as twenty years and he is now the new deputy chairman of the Fisheries Loan Board; Mr. Eric Wells, who is the Director of Internal Audit for the Department of Finance, he will serve on the Fisheries Loan Board representing the Department of Finance; Mr. Charlie Parrott, who is the regional Director for the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Mr. Parrott deals with all bounties and subsidies from the Federal Government, and we think it

MR. J. MORGAN: is important for him to be on the Fisheries Loan Board dealing with applications for assistance.

MR. S. NEARY: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, again I ask to be heard in silence. I am being interrupted by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) continuously.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The hon. minister has the right to be heard in silence, as all members are aware.

MR. S. NEARY: It is an abuse of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
I have already ruled that it is not an abuse of the House and I ask hon. members to give the minister silence.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I would ask you to express your opinion quietly.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in continuing without the interruption of the member, who does not care for fishermen in his own district on the Southwest part of the Province, we have agreed to appoint fishermen to the Fisheries Loan Board and we felt that it was important to have representation from the fishermen on the Loan Board dealing with fisheries matters, in this case, assistance to fishermen. And we asked the Fish, Food and Allied Workers' Union to make recommendations to us as to what fishermen should be appointed to the fisheries Loan Board. And I am pleased to accept, and it has now been confirmed by Cabinet, the appointment of Mr. Kevin Condon, a fishermen from Calvert, Mr. Condon, by the way, is also the vice-president of the Fish, Food and Allied Worker's Union for the Province. Also Mr. Kevin Carroll; Mr. Carroll is a fishermen in Torbay, He is a staff member of the Newfoundland Fish, Food and Allied Workers Union as well. The Union is now in a process of putting forward to us one further nomination and I am of the opinion he will come from somewhere in the Northeast coast of the Province.

May 9, 1980

Tape No. 1412

DW - 3

MR. J. MORGAN: And that recommendation will be put forward to Cabinet for approval for the appointment of a third fisherman to the Fisheries Loan Board.

Mr. Speaker, in my closing part of the statement, the most important part of all, is the - we have talked about the procedure, the new Loan Board, the new guidelines. Now the question is what kind of money do

MR. J. MORGAN: we have to offer the fishermen this year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a total dollar value to this new Provincial Fishing Vessels Assistance Programme of \$22 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, that amount of money will be divided in the following way, and it is important for people who will be answering questions from fishermen in their own districts to have this information. \$9.3 million will be provided through the chartered banks for loans, as I mentioned earlier, ranging from \$50,000 up to \$1 million. \$8 million will be provided through the Fisheries Loan Board directly in loans to fishermen from the Board ranging from \$1,000 to \$50,000. There will be \$3 million allocated for a new large vessel bounty programme where we want to see the fishermen move from the smaller boats to larger boats that can go further offshore, in midshore and offshore waters. There will be \$1 million for new small vessel bounties. There are still people in certain parts of the Province who do not want to get into larger boats and they want to continue to use the trapskiff or the boat around the thirty-five foot range: \$1 million for these smaller type vessels.

There will be \$200,000 for vessel reconstruction and repair grants. They are bounties, grants, for the purpose of repairing vessels that are already in the fishing fleet. And of course there will be \$500,000 allocated to subsidize the interest difference I mentioned earlier between what is going to be charged by the banks now and charged by the Fisheries Loan Board. In other words, the 8 per cent and whatever the bank rate will be when the loan is made to fishermen.

Mr. Speaker, these are the full details; I skipped over some of the minor details. They are all attached to this document here. I have gone over all the major points and I want to stress again that these major points are important for all members who have fishermen in their districts to know, all the

MR. J. MORGAN: information so they can answer questions.

And also I mentioned the fact that a brochure will be sent out in the next two or three weeks giving all of these details to all fishermen so fishermen will not be able to say in the future,

"I know a certain politician, I can get a loan from the Board, or "I know somebody else. I can get a loan from the Board." The Board will operate strictly within the guidelines set down by government. And the Board will not be allowed to go outside these guidelines or regulations set down by government. I think that is of the utmost importance for the future operation of the Loan Board.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I will say I am convinced that these changes, fairly major changes, to the operations whereby assistance will be made available to the fishermen, that these operations which will now be carried out in a businesslike manner by the Fisheries Loan Board will go a long way to improving the situation with regards to making assistance available to fishermen for them to improve their vessels and their fishing equipment on their vessels.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) is starting to take on some of the characteristics of Mr. Walter Carter and, I would submit, possibly has the same future. Sir, I think this is an extremely important statement and the minister could have presented it at any time in the last few weeks, in fact, I have had a copy of the statement from the minister for the past three days and I have prepared a long response and I have some twenty-five inquiries and questions as a result of the statement made by the Minister of Fisheries this morning. But, Sir, out of courtesy and deep respect for the members of the Canadian Legion and other distinguished ladies and gentlemen who have travelled long

MR. F. ROWE: distances today to come to hear what was clearly to be a debate on the flag, I will refrain at this time from replying at length to the Ministerial Statement and will instead prepare a release listing off the enquiries and the questions and the responses that I have to this particular Ministerial Statement. And I will also, Mr. Speaker, endeavour to meet with the minister to point out what I consider to be some of the strengths and some of the weaknesses of his particular statement with respect to the Fisheries Loan Board.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, there is half an hour allocated under our rules for Question Period, but in view of the contemptible performance of the government, Sir, my colleagues and I are going to ask no questions at all this morning so that we can get on with the business which this House was scheduled to do today, namely the debate on the flag, Sir. There will be no questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is fine with us. We are willing to move on into the flag debate. We would have liked - it is unfortunate that the members of the House on both sides could not have gotten together before today and agreed to dispense with all matters and go right directly into the debate under discussion, for the bill. I mean, that would have been perhaps the proper way to do it. And if we had to have notice, in the same way as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) gave notice on his Ministerial Statement, if we had to have that kind of notice from the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), of course we would have been willing to dispense with all

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Orders of the Day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! I understand there is, then, an understanding -

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know under what rubric of order the Premier was speaking, but may I be allowed to respond to it?

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, I would assume that he responded to your first comment which was a question.

MR. ROBERTS:

I was out of order when I spoke. If he was out of order when he spoke, I want to be equally out of order in saying the whole thing is ridiculous. The government deliberately planned this, I think, in my opinion, to shorten the amount for the debate today. That is what we are objecting to, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is obvious that the hon. gentleman was out of order in making those statements. It is obvious that the Leadership Convention is on and it is also obvious that the hon. gentlemen are determined to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

It is also equally sadly obvious that the hon. gentlemen are prepared to attempt to make a political issue -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

- out of the flag debate -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

- which is a free vote.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, I will hear one final submission from the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: To the point of order, Sir, I want to simply say the minister's comments are contemptible and I will not honour them in any way. I am not worried about the leadership. We will take that when it comes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), who has won, I think, two out of eight elections is hardly one to speak. I want to simply say that -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) way ahead.

MR. ROBERTS: - the contemptible comments of my learned friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) speak for themselves. They are not a point of order. I will not even dignify them by replying.

MR. SPEAKER: I will have to rule in this particular matter that there is no point of order. But I do understand that the Question Period will not proceed. Therefore the next item of routine business is Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Human Tissue Act, 1971."

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Worker's Compensation Act."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

May 9, 1980

Tape No. 1414

NM - 4

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 40, Bill No. 44.

MR. SPEAKER:

Second reading of a bill entitled,

"An Act To Adopt A Flag For the Province." (Bill No. 44).

The hon. Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the Committee, the Committee of the House of Assembly, a select committee, and I want to do it sincerely in the selection of the flag and their going around the Province and their meeting with the people in the Province,

MR. W. HOUSE: hearing their opinions and then, of course, with the foresight of getting such a tremendous artistic Newfoundlander, Mr. Pratt, to put form to that thought. And, of course, they did seek the expression of the people, whole categories of people, and in my estimation, the expression that the flag shows is a good one. So I want to compliment the Committee. And I might point out to the hon. House again that it is a Select Committee, it is not a committee of the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), it is a Select Committee, a committee of four members from this side and three members from the other side.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. W. HOUSE: And, of course, I always agree with that kind of a committee in the House of Assembly, and I agree that when we have that kind of a committee and come up with a resolution we should have a free vote on that kind of resolution, and that is what we are having.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) spoke yesterday. Of course, he complimented the Committee too and then proceeded to tear them apart.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. W. HOUSE: When you are talking about symbolism, there are a lot of things that you can generate. There is one point from the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. G. Warren) yesterday. I think the main point in his speech was the fact that the arrow was pointing backward, pointing the wrong way in ceremonial. Of course, in ceremonial, as I know it, when you are carrying a sword or something of that nature, the point is always behind, it is never going forward that way. The same thing with an arrow. If you just study your artifacts and look back at the Indians who used the arrow, you will see that when they carried the arrow the point was behind and down, away from the person in motion. So I think with the flag being carried in ceremonial, that is the proper way for the arrow to be pointing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and unexpected privilege of helping decide on a provincial flag and it is one

MR. W. HOUSE: that has caused me a lot of soul searching, particularly in the fact that we have a free vote and I know that there are people pro and con, there are people for and against this flag. This has called forth many emotions, some nostalgia about the past, but it has also called forth some hope and a little bit of joy from what I see.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in issues of this nature we tend to become emotional and it is difficult to try to win an argument when emotions come into play. And if one tended to argue from a rational viewpoint and a realistic sequence, you risk, of course, the outbursts of cliches and the outbursts of motherhood statements and sayings that could put you in a pretty bad situation.

A couple of days ago in a Budget debate and, of course, also in this present debate, there were remarks made that to me were made deliberately to try to stir up emotions. Some of the remarks were, in my estimation, in very poor taste, for instance, people using the term, 'trampling the Union Jack in the mud'. And I see the contingent from the veterans today, the Legion. Another statement was used, 'slapping the veterans in the face.' Mr. Speaker, these were just gross insults. That is a gross insult. There is nobody trampling any flag and there is nobody slapping anybody in the face.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, these kinds of remarks distinguish a speech not for what it says but for the emotions and dirt it tries to bring up. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, this kind of emotion-mongering, if I may use that term, has made this nation the hodgepodge of political opportunism it is.

MR. S. NEARY: Who wrote that for you?

MR. W. HOUSE: That is why we have such a state in Canada today with regard to unity, that kind of political opportunism.

MR. S. NEARY: The Nurse's Union will deal with you.

MR. W. HOUSE: The Nurse's Union and I are getting along very well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, this debate

began in the media the day after the Committee was announced.

We knew that it was going to be contentious, we knew that there was one group, a large group, who wanted the Union Jack, we knew there was another large group who wanted the Pink, White and Green and I gather from the Committee as they were going around that the larger group wanted something distinct and, of course, I stand with that group. I want to point out, though, and I want to make this clear to anybody and I guess a lot of people will be surprised to see me standing today in this debate and talking in this way, that there is no more traditionalist than I am, there is no more a loyalist than I am in this Province, there is no more a British traditionalist. As a matter of fact, the hon. member across the way will know from my days at university that I was that kind of a person, such a Monarchist that people tend to call me the jingoist - that is, my country and my emotions right or wrong. But where I am today, Mr. Speaker, I am representing a Province, I am representing a district and through my district a Province, and I have to act rationally and I have to let my emotions go, but I want to point out to all people that I have a lot of respect and faith in our traditions and in our past. But we are living, Mr. Speaker, in a very different age than what we lived in when I was a boy, when I was ten years old. We are living in a system that is different, not different by virtue of anything we have done, nothing by our own volition and not by our desire, but by political and financial realities of the time. There is no longer a British Empire. When I was a boy there was a British Empire. There is no longer a British Empire and that great nucleus of the Empire which was Great Britain have said to all the constituent parts of that Empire, "You are on your own, but we will come together in a Commonwealth and we will try to influence the world through that Commonwealth." And we might point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is only through political persuasion and social relationship and our native backgrounds - we are not even tied to the British Empire economically. They are closer with the European Common Market. So we are a Commonwealth and the Union Jack, a flag which I am very proud of, is the flag of Britain and that

MR. HOUSE:

Commonwealth and a Commonwealth which we aspire to having a great world impact. So I am a member of that Commonwealth, Mr. Speaker, Canada is a member of that Commonwealth and the Union Jack is my Commonwealth flag. It indicates that representation in the Commonwealth and I am going to cherish it all my life as the Commonwealth flag, but I do not think I have a right to it particularly as a provincial flag. I could use an analogy and say I have a right to a part of my father's inheritance, but not all of it.

Mr. Speaker, there is nobody that has any more respect and gratitude for our veterans than I have. As a matter of fact, I am an honorary member of one of the Legion branches in the Province and it is because, of course, of the work that we have done together that I want to point out to them that their ideals were represented by the flag but it was human ideals that they fought for and they won and that was symbolized, of course, in the flag.

The other thing I think should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that, God forbid we would ever have to go to war, we hope we will never have to again, but if ever our young Canadians will ever have to go to war, they would never have to go, they would not be able to go to war, of course, under the Union Jack. They would be going to war under the Maple Leaf. Now I want to look at the flag and look at some of the things coming from - and, you know, I am not going to say - I have said I have a lot of faith and love for the Union Jack, but I have looked at some of the conglomerations that people have been putting forward, various things from potatoes to codfish to what have you,

MR. W. HOUSE: and, Mr. Speaker, a flag is not supposed to be a panorama of historical events, it is not supposed to be representative of the fauna and flora of a country. If I wanted that- you know, I have seen pictures that people have wanted as flags which looked more like a tossed salad than it did a flag, plants and so on.

Now, to get a little bit facetious about it, I wonder how the birch leaf feels when it sees the Maple Leaf as the sole representative of Canada. And I said to somebody the other day, 'I wonder how the black spruce feels, you know, here is that sturdy, hardy tree that is going to be the future of our woods industry, how it feels when we get up with great gusto and sing, 'When sun rays Crown thy pine clad hills'. And here is the pine, it has just about left us. What I would like to point out is plants and animals could go out of existence but symbolism cannot!

MR. L. THOMS: (Inaudible)

MR. W. HOUSE: He does not understand symbolism so I will not - The flag that we have before us today depicts the sea, it depicts the land mass, it depicts human effort, it has design that brings forth symbolism from the past, for us it shows the artifacts of the past. It does have part representation of the Commonwealth and the arrow, of course, which does signify the bright future. And gold certainly is a symbol of hope and brightness.

It is very refreshing, Mr. Speaker, to look at that flag and I look at it proudly. It is past, it is present, it is future and 100 years time, Mr. Speaker, you will be able to look at that flag and it will be past, present and future. And I will tell you there is a lot of flags in Canada you cannot look at and see that now.

MR. W. HOUSE: I have looked at some flags, Mr. Speaker, and the vision which was created in some of them was less than illuminating. If we read the inscription it gives history a series of relationships, a wide open future, a geographic concept all in a design unencumbered by material paraphernalia.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, now!

MR. W. HOUSE: If I wanted ships and I wanted materials and trees I would go and get a book printed and call it the Newfoundland Book.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just to recap what I have said. I am saying we have now a Commonwealth flag, a flag that we love and cherish, that flag is the Union Jack. We have a National flag, the Maple Leaf that we cherish and most of us will come to love. It takes a little time, you know, because the flag is not that old. We have our floral emblem, Mr. Speaker, and now we want our own flag.

Some time ago I was out in my district and one person said to me in a little bit of a derogatory way, one of the derogatory remarks that I heard -

MR. W.N. ROWE: Of the many.

MR. W. HOUSE: - that the proposed flag looked like a road sign. Now, I did not say anything at all but I said by gosh that is good I am going to use that in the debate. What is more indicative, is more symbolic than arrows pointing, or a sign pointing to a direction to the future?

There is nothing wrong with that. But the thing about what people say across the House, 'What does a straight line or what does diagonal represent?' A lot of people recognize that the Union Jack is a beautifully designed flag. the symmetry is good but its triangles, crosses, straight lines. And, Mr. Speaker, a lot of people do not exactly know the total meaning, most do now because we have gone into it.

MR. W. HOUSE: Somebody said, 'What does the Stars and Stripes represent?' I said, 'To be frank about it I have not studied it. I presume each star represents a State.'

MR. T. LUSH: And unity.

MR. W. HOUSE: And unity, that is the State.

MR. T. LUSH: The study of vexillology, vexillology is what it is called.

MR. W. HOUSE: And we have our triangles here. There is nothing different from having a triangle represent a land mass than it is a star. So that is representing the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one little thing further. I would be delighted to go back in the classroom-and I think they would have me back in the classroom teaching, I am sure they would - and I would be delighted to go back and be able to take that flag and teach a lesson because you could teach a very inspiring lesson from that flag, I will tell you.

MR. S. NEARY: Sit down, boy.

MR. W. HOUSE: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member across the way is just trying to interrupt-I am not going to stand up and be screaming for the rest of the year and trying to make headlines. I am not running for any leadership as I know some are. I am trying to do my work honestly and sincerely.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, one more thing, I do not know how long I have but I want to say one more thing and that is a few years ago I had the honour and

MR. W. HOUSE: privilege of introducing new mathematics to the Province. I believe I piloted it for two years as a pilot project. And I am going to tell the episode for a couple of reasons, not because I was the best man to do it, I was, obviously- I was the best man for it but I am not saying it for that. But it was viciously attacked, attacked mainly by, of course, people who were comfortable with the present structure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. W. HOUSE: And, of course, the other thing is we had to adjust to it. That is the first point I want to get across. But the new approach was necessary because the old math could not encompass the totality of the math and of course, we were getting into computers and we did not need people to be computers any more. Anyway the thing that this educator came up with, not me, the educator who brought in this math, he said, "Look, there are a lot of things we can teach children at a very early age." We were teaching mathematics, starting geometry at Grade IX. He said, "You can do that at Grade I because a youngster sizes up his world in geometric forms and that is his first means of communication." And I never thought about that until I started preparing for this flag debate that that is a good symbolism in itself, that youngsters themselves start sizing their world up in forms of squares, rectangles, triangles, circles and arcs and so on.

So I tell that for two reasons that particular one and the fact that a lot of people will attack a good thing anyway. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to carry this on any longer. I want to congratulate the Flag Committee. I am going to vote for it, I want this flag. It is timeless, ageless, progressive, promising, pertinent and may it ever prevail. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! Before I recognize the next hon. member I would like to welcome to the galleries today on behalf of all hon. members fifty-seven students - Grade V, VI and Special Education, from New World Island East Elementary School and their teachers, Mrs. Bernice Mahaney, Mr. Roland Hanlon and Mr. Rod Woolridge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES: The central theme of the government speakers for the past few days has been that all hon. members of this House when speaking on this subject of a new flag should be unemotional and quite rational. And there is a reason for that because the government realizes that they have a real hot potato on their hands in this topic. For the first time since this new Peckford administration has come to power they are falling into the age old trap of going above the heads of the people and ignoring their true feelings on a very substantive and essential issue of importance to them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES: Emotionalism and rationality - when the previous speaker, the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House), spoke on this topic he showed neither. He showed neither emotionalism, because he has been told not to, nor did he show rationality because this new design can not be rationally justified.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. LUSH: It defies rationality.

MR. R. MOORES: If the government wants to talk about rationality, I recall just a few weeks ago when we were on the discussion of offshore ownership, that the Chairman of this Flag Committee, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), when my colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts) was speaking, pointed at him and said, "Traitor". Now, that is rationality and that is emotionalism.

MR. S. NEARY: That is not emotionalism that is irrational.

MR. R. MOORES: And it was rationality too when this government imposed the new Municipalities Act that forever will be considered one of the worst pieces of legislation in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES: And there are a lot of other pieces of legislation

MR. R. MOORES: that we could approach that this government has submitted to this House as being rational and unemotional. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to be both this morning. I want to be both emotional, because this is an emotional topic -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: - and I want to be rational because in my condemnation of this new design, this atrocious, ridiculous design, one can very easily be rational.

Now, this Committee that was appointed by this House to look into the idea of a new design for a new flag has done, in my opinion, a reasonably good job. They have fulfilled their mandate and they agreed unanimously that they would submit to this House of Assembly a design for debate and discussion. They had no more mandate than that. They could not decide on a design for a flag for this Province, they could only suggest one to the House of Assembly.

MR. S. NEARY: Right on!

MR. R. MOORES: And the House of Assembly, for fear of anybody misunderstanding its role in society, is the people. It symbolizes and embodies democracy in the sense that not everyone in this Province can come and sit in this House. You cannot put 600,000 people on this floor. So we elect representatives to come and speak for us. But the primary function of an MHA is to seek first the feelings of his constituents, and the responsibility of this House on so substantial and so basic and so fundamental an issue is not to ram it down the throats of the people but to go back to the people and ask for their opinions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B. TULK: You do not fight the people.

MR. R. MOORES: You do not fight the people. And this, ladies and gentlemen, hon. members of the House, is where I have to get back, not to the primary issue in this case, the one of a new design, but I want to get back to the role of the government. This is a piece of government legislation. I have no control over it, nor does any member of this Opposition. Government legislation is introduced, created, composed by the government.

MR. S. NEARY:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES:

And it is presented to this House for discussion. We have nothing to say about it on this side, absolutely nothing. And when a piece of government legislation comes before this House, by its very nature as a piece of legislation, our responsibility as an Opposition is to seek down through it, in essence, anything which may be of confrontation, of dislike, of rejection by the people that we represent. The people on this subject have spoken clearly, unequivocally and without any feeling of bitterness or bigotry. No religion has surfaced its head, no bigotry that I know of, no bitterness have I seen. The Royal Canadian Legion are in the gallery this morning. They have come here with the greatest sense of civility - no noise, no beating doors, no approaching members and confronting them - they have come here as responsible citizens to voice their protest and they are not concerned with any action by the government against them. They are not concerned that the government in this case is acting as a government, they are concerned that the government is acting without the will of the people.

SOME FON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES:

And this is consistent with this government. Do not let anybody be fooled that this is not consistent with this Premier. Do not be so foolish as to think that we on this

MR. MOORES:

side do not see a pattern of approach by this Premier to issues confronting the people.

In 1977 when he was the Minister of Municipal Affairs he told every town council in this Province that, "You will impose \$144 a year on water and sewerage or else -

MR. NEARY: That is right. Right on.

MR. MOORES: -"or else," he said, "if you do not impose it we will see that you do not get your capital grants." Now there was no consultation there, no compromise, no discussion. "You do it or else." And when it came to offshore oil regulations, he said to the oil companies, Mobil Oil, and the others that, "You will accept the regulation of Newfoundland or else." And the oil companies laughed at him and except for Allistair Gillespie, the Federal Minister of Energy, we would still be waiting for the oil companies to be drilling for oil.

MR. NEARY: Right on. Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: And just last year, Mr. Speaker, I get back to this new Municipalities Act, the single most disgusting piece of legislation in this House since I have been a member, no consultation, "you will take property tax or else." And now they are saying to the people of Newfoundland, "You take the new flag or else."

MR. NEARY: Right on. Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: We do not buy that. We do not buy that type of dictatorship, nor do we buy that the Premier of this Province has given his Party a free vote, nor do we buy that.

MR. WARREN: Shame! Shame!

MR. MOORES: I have not heard anyone on the government side yet in opposition to it. And I can guarantee the Canadian Legion, and I can guarantee the people of Newfoundland, that if you do not speak up this flag is as good as through the House, because the trained seals on the other side will beat their flappers when the time comes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: And I say to you here now, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson), the Liberal Party of Newfoundland could have turned blue in the face, he could have told me from dawn until dusk that you are going to vote for or against this flag and it would have had as much effect on me as water on a duck's back.

I am proud to say here that five minutes after the new flag was unfolded I walked into the Common Room of the Liberal Party and I was asked by a person who had been listening, "What are your feelings?" And I said I have never been more disappointed in all of my life. And I want to back that up by saying that I, for what it is worth, in fact, it is worth nothing politically, that I am the first Canadian born Newfoundlander to sit in this House. That is to say I was the first Newfoundlander born after we joined Confederation to sit in this House. I have no allegiance to the Union Jack. I never fought in a war and I do not want to fight in one. I believe that the way through confrontation is through peace and negotiation and I believe in that the Canadian Legion here, that that too is their goal and objective, when I sat in the Liberal Reform Party, I was elected as a member of that party to this House firstly, I recall confronting the former leader of that party in 1976, when the earlier design of the flag was proposed, and saying to him that I want a new flag, a flag that does not embody any of the biases or the bigotries of Newfoundland. But I want one that is distinctively Newfoundland, that embodies 400 years of history for the people of this Province.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

May 9, 1980

Tape No. 1420

NM - 3

MR. MOORES:

400 years of suffering, of toil, of
sweat, of humiliation, of degradation, of colonialism, 400 years when
most provinces in this Canada were not even in existence. We have

MR. R. MOORES: had self-government longer than the Provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta, Manitoba have been in existence. They were still over there making mud houses when we were here with a government of our own, and that self-government has survived for those many years because governments have a tendency to act in accordance with, not against the will of their electorate.

MR. S. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: This new design, Mr. Speaker, embodies, in my opinion, the foolishness and the folly of a few gentlemen on a committee and one artist in Newfoundland to make their mark in history. And I say to you that when I came into this House, I came in here knowing - my father always says that no politician will end up anywhere but in hell - but I know when I came into this House that I was getting into politics and that I would have to take the negative with the positive, in my case, more negative than positive but that is not indicated in the polls, thank God!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: And when I got into politics, Mr. Speaker, I was the same as Mr. Pratt - once he took upon himself the responsibility of creating a design, he automatically and implicitly took upon himself the responsibility of any praise or any criticism. And I know for a fact, because one of the best artists in all of Newfoundland is a personal friend of mine with whom I have daily conversation, that there was no consultation by the designer of this flag within his profession. David Blackwood, Noseworthy and a half dozen others, fine artists in their own right, were never consulted, which leads me to believe that the designer of this flag chose to make his mark in history. He said, 'If it is accepted, it will be forever,' - the design of Christopher Pratt.

Now that public opinion has taken its course definitively and in opposition to that design, he must also now take the negative criticism. He must also stand up and be counted in the sense that he has created a design which is not acceptable to the people of this Province. And the government, too, rather than ram it down the throats of Newfoundlanders, should go to the people in a referendum. I have suggested

MR. R. MOORES: that ten days ago, I think, to my party in caucus and I am proud to say that the Canadian Legion now has it as one of the planks in its movement. And I want to point out some misconceptions, Mr. Speaker. I am, myself, proud this morning that I was scheduled to speak at a time - by the way, scheduling to speak is done as a result of consultation with party members. I do not choose to speak on a certain day. I asked for that privilege to speak and I was given it. And I am proud to say that the Canadian Legion this morning is here while I am speaking, and I am proud to say that I do not have to say that I am going along with the crowd, that from the very first minute that this flag was unfolded I was against it and I will be against it for as long as it flies or as long as I am alive, whichever comes first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: The one thing that I like - one must refer to the principal opponents of the flag. The principal opponents in this House, as I understand it now, are the Opposition, not because we have been forced to be. Nobody forces - I can point at a dozen men on this side of the House that you could not force if you tried, to make a decision on any issue like this. You could not force them! They would just as soon sit as an Independent or leave politics altogether than to be forced.

MR. S. NEARY: We are not trying to get into Cabinet.

MR. S. NEARY: Nobody is trying to stay in the Cabinet or weasel their way into Cabinet.

MR. R. MOORES: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: Completely independent and objective.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES: We have chosen -

MR. S. NEARY: We want no favours.

MR. R. MOORES: - an independent free vote and if I choose to vote with the Leader of my Party it does not mean that I am protecting my extra \$10,000 a year. I do not make \$10,000 extra a year and for that one basic reason, why, I could not care less how he votes. I suggest that that may not be true of the government side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES: I admire, first of all, the principal opponents in the public for the stand that they have taken.

The Canadian Legion, as I understand it and I have it here right in front of me this morning, are not saying that they want the Union Jack. They are not saying that. There is no bigotry here, no bias. Naturally, because the men represent the institution, not the group but the institution that they represent, naturally they would like to see the Union Jack embodied. But they are not saying that and this is a misconception promoted and perpetuated by a government to lump them in with the monarchists and the other biased individuals who want to express a point of view which is not consistent with rationality. They do not want the Union Jack, they want a flag that is different from this design, a flag that embodies the substance, the essentiality of the Newfoundland people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES: And that, Mr. Speaker, is a reasonable and a fair and a sensible request. That is all we are asking, that is all I am asking, a new design. I will vote for any new flag that is introduced in this House that will embody the substance, the essence -

May 9, 1980

Tape No. 1422

SD - 2

Lush
MR. T. LUSH:

The soul.

MR. R. MOORES:

- the soul of the Newfoundland people -

any new flag.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES:

Now, a word of warning, I must end

off, Mr. Speaker, as I always do - the Premier leaves, you see, when I speak. I do not know if you have noticed that but he always leaves when I speak because he can not take it, particularly from the member for Carbonear. And there is a reason for that, I will not go into it but there is a reason for it. I am going to issue a warning to the Premier of Newfoundland as I issued a warning to him on the offshore ownership topic. I said, 'If you continue on this 'me too' concept idea that you have about ownership, it is going to turn on you and it is going to consume you.' A week later I read in the Toronto Globe and Mail that the Premier of Newfoundland was speaking to a group in Toronto defending his 'me too' philosophy, saying, "I am not anti-Confederate, we do not want all of it for ourselves. We are going to be fair, we are going to be good Canadians." Now, if the speech was not lost on him then that is why he gave that defence in Toronto and it means that he was not in tune with the people of this Province. But he does not frequently or often enough go outside of the overpass to talk to the people and I am warning him now as a Liberal, I hope everyone of you on the other side votes for the flag because in the next election I can drape it outside my headquarters in Carbonear and I can say, 'Look, this is the only thing that Peckford ever gave us and that is something that we did not want.'

Now, everyone of you can vote against it or for it as the case may be and I will be happy. But as I Newfoundland - a young Newfoundlander not an old one - a young Newfoundlander, one of the youngest in this House, there is only one younger and I think that is the Minister of Education (Ms. L. Verge), I am warning the Premier of this Province that if he continues on this stubborn, one-track mind that he has and forces this down the throats of the people of Newfoundland without going to them - now he has a number of methods open to him. He can go to the people in a referendum and although

MR. R. MOORES: the Province of Newfoundland has no
Referendum Act as such -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. R. MOORES: - the Opposition here will agree to
pass a Referendum Act in twenty seconds and go to the people on this
issue, let them voice their opinion and if he has nothing to fear, if
he believes that this flag is the flag of the people of Newfoundland or
the majority thereof, then fine. I will stand up here in six months or
a year and retract every word I have said.

But, Mr. Speaker, I know that the
people of Newfoundland will not forget this basic issue. They will forget
that you put up their taxes and they will forget that you introduced
school tax and took away the mothers' allowance and they will forget
a lot of other things like matrimonial property laws, like universal
property taxes, they will forget that but when you rob them of their
spirit, their identity -

MR. G. FLIGHT: Their heritage.

MR. R. MOORES: - their heritage -

MR. G. FLIGHT: Their traditions.

MR. R. MOORES: - and their souls do not expect them
to forget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. MOORES: And they will not forget and I predict,
Mr. Speaker, that if the Premier of this Province is

MR. MOORES: concerned at all about democracy, if he is concerned at all about his government and more importantly, most importantly, if he is concerned with the people of Newfoundland he will not bring in this flag, he will let it die on the Order Paper, or he will go to the people in a referendum.

Now I challenge the Premier. He got up last week in this House and he challenged the Opposition, all of us to write a letter giving him our full support in favour of their submission to Ottawa on offshore oil and gas. Now I challenge the Premier, if you have any intestinal fortitude, if you have the courage that you say you have, if you are the man for Newfoundland that you say you are, go to the people, **take** it to the people, and let us see who will come out on top on this one.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. NEARY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. NEARY:

I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time, that the flag debate be laid on the table of the House and not be raised again until six months hence.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order on that particular part. I recognize the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is typical of the tactics which we are seeing across the floor of the House. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will have his chance to speak in this debate, and he attempts to get up on a point of order -

MR. NEARY:

Your own members are (inaudible)

MR. BARRY:

- and cut off debate so that I do not get my chance to speak.

MR. NEARY:

You can speak on the (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Baird)

Order, please!

We saw the hon. member opposite come in like a parliamentary pirate the other day with his black flag to express his contempt for the House, refused to remove it when asked by the Speaker and now attempts to cut off debate in this House.

MR. NEARY:

I am trying to **get** (inaudible)

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was elected a member of this House and I want to have my say in the flag debate. I am entitled to have my say and I intend to have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

And if the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) disagrees with that that is just too bad.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. member is not (inaudible)

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see members of the Canadian Legion here in the gallery today. I am particularly pleased to see certain of my constituents from Mount Scio district. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position clear on the flag. I will be voting in favour of the flag, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

I will be voting in favour, I might add, despite a personal discomfort with the design. It is not a design with which I am comfortable. It is not a design that I looked at and that grabbed me that I immediately said, "That is it. This should be our flag." It is not a design that I can see myself taking to quickly, wholeheartedly. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to this hon. House that this is not the point, that the selection of this flag should not be a matter of personal **aesthetics**, because if the selection of this flag depends upon getting unanimous consent, or even I would submit, Mr. Speaker, a majority of agreement with respect to the **aesthetics** of a design, we will never find a majority. We will never find fifty-one per cent in this Province who will say **aesthetically**, "I find that design pleasing." "I like that design." "It moves me." "It pleases me." "I prefer it to another design."

Mr. Speaker, we will never get to that point

MR. BARRY: and, therefore, I believe that we have to put our personal preferences in terms of the aesthetics, in terms of how we feel about the design aside, and we have to consider this. We can have some emotion in the debate, Mr. Speaker, but we have to consider it rationally. And we should not let, as the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) attempted to do, let emotion replace courage. We should not, Mr. Speaker, as elected representatives of this House of Assembly, attempt to pass the buck and be afraid to exercise some leadership and some courage in making these difficult decisions. Because, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most difficult decisions that any House of Assembly would have to make for the very reason, as I have said, that there are so many different views, so many diverse views that it is impossible, definitely impossible to expect unanimity, but virtually impossible to expect

MR. BARRY: even a majority agreement. Now, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite, I think, will agree with me on that point add I must say I sympathize with hon. members opposite who sat on the Flag Committee, who are now being stabbed in the back by **their own** colleagues opposite, who are starting to inject their partisan, political debate into what this House had earlier decided would be an non-partisan debate. And this House set up a select committee to go out and listen to the people of this Province and , Mr. Speaker, I suppose there has **never been as democratic** an exercise in terms of seeking the views of the people of this Province. And I think, as the Chairman of the Committee pointed out, the consensus of that Committee, of this House, Mr. Speaker, was that there was not in this Province one clear symbol, one clear design that stood out above all as something that had to be our flag. So that, therefore, we had to , Mr. Speaker, see some initiative on the part of our Flag Committee and I must say I compliment them for the courage with which they undertook this difficult task.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to just briefly speak for a few moments on the purpose of a flag, on the history and symbolism of flags. That by the way, the study of the history and symbolism of flags, is called vexillology from the Latin vexillum meaning a square flag or banner. Now , Mr. Speaker, the purpose of a flag, the colours, **the design** is supposed to **stand for a country's** land, its peoples, its government, its ideals. The Egyptians were one of the first to use flags, streamers that they put on poles going into battle in the expectation that their Gods would help them win by this particular display. There was a more practical reason , Mr. Speaker, for flags in early military life. The flag showed the direction of the wind. It assisted the soldiers in aiming their arrows by telling them which way the wind was blowing. It also, Mr. Speaker, in battle represented a particular side and in the hurly-burly, the confusion of the battle field, it gave the opposing sides positions around which to rally and you have the phrase, 'Rally around the flag.' As people, as one side

MR. BARRY: or another became hard pressed the flag was the position around which they would rally. Mr. Speaker, there is supposed to be symbolism in a flag. A flag is supposed to symbolize the ideals of a country, a nation or a Province and, therefore, we have the cross which is present in many flags and is present in the design that is put before this House, a cross, the symbol of a Christian nation. We see in many other flags symbols such as stars. The star is the symbol of life and of unity. We have other symbols of peace. Different colours are supposed, in certain countries, to connote peace and life. Mr. Speaker, all of these contain certain symbolisms for the people of the nation which has the particular design in the flag.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask why was it that our Flag Committee in going around this Province, in going around to all parts of the Province, was not able to come up with a single symbol that the majority of our people could look at and say, "That is Newfoundland. That to me represents Newfoundland"? Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it is very probable that the reason no such symbol exists is because we have been so divided in our past by the type of partisan, political politics we see played here today by members opposite, that we have not had sufficient unity within our Province to develop one outstanding symbol that is Newfoundland's, the symbol of Newfoundland. Ours, Mr. Speaker, has unfortunately all too often been a history

MR. L. BARRY: of division, of unrest, yes, even of hatred at times amongst ourselves. We have been divided religiously, we have been divided ethnically, we have been divided politically, and Mr. Speaker, it is time to make a new beginning. And this flag can be the symbol of a new beginning. This flag can be the symbol of a new Newfoundland, a non-partisan symbol selected by members from both sides of this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, that is why I am voting for this flag.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY: And I am doing it, Mr. Speaker, in the knowledge that I have had serious expressions of concern from constituents in my district. I have had expressions of concern from members of the Canadian Legion - I have had expressions of concern from Legionnaires who were on the executive of my district association. I have had expressions of concern from citizens, and I have to mention one lady in particular. She called me up the day after the design came out and she said, 'You know, this design bothers me. I am not comfortable with that - I do not think I will ever be able to accept that design.' And she said, 'You know, I want a new flag.' Her daughter, Mr. Speaker, had had the honour of carrying the flag in the Newfoundland Summer Games. She carried the Union Jack. And her daughter was almost brought to tears when she came home telling her mother about how many times she had to try to explain that Newfoundland was not part of Britain to members of the other delegations out West where the games were being held. And, Mr. Speaker, because of that particular experience, that family - and it was a family of five or six children and the mother and father - they had decided that they had to accept the notion that Newfoundland should have its own distinctive flag - not because the Union Jack, Mr. Speaker, is not a good flag. I must say, looking at the cleverness, the ingenuity, the imagination that went into the creation of the Union Jack from the flags of St. George, St. Andrew and St. Patrick, it was a tremendous flag to help bring together England, Scotland and Ireland. I am not sure that it succeeded in its

MR. L. BARRY: task, Mr. Speaker, totally, but it was a tremendous flag. But, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, it was a flag that was adopted in another country and while we are proud as Newfoundlanders to acknowledge our British tradition, and while we respect the tremendous sacrifice that our veterans gave to this country - and my father is a veteran, Mr. Speaker. I have uncles, close relatives, who fought in the Second World War, so I have direct representation from members of our Canadian Legion very close to home. Mr. Speaker, we can acknowledge our traditions, we can respect the sacrifice of our veterans, but that does not mean that we then have to refuse to adopt a flag that is distinctively Newfoundland's.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that we can and we should adopt a new flag. I am saying this, again, with the other concern that has been raised with respect to this particular flag. On the one hand we have people saying that the Union Jack is not there. Well, we have the suggestion that a goodly portion of the Union Jack is there. People will disagree as to whether they see it or not. Okay, I have had serious concern expressed by members of the Provincial Flag Society who put a lot of work into trying to develop a new flag and their main concern is that the Irish tradition is not represented in the new flag, that there is no green in the flag or nothing to connote

MR. BARRY: the Irish tradition and you have forty-eight to fifty per cent of our people in this Province who can trace their ancestry back to their Irish roots, and I am one of them, Mr. Speaker. I am one of them. I am proud of my Irish ancestry. But, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to go with a flag that does not have something that is obviously Irish because I am saying to this hon. House, and I asking members of this hon. House to adopt a flag, to adopt a design, to adopt a symbol which, if it does not immediately evoke all the history and tradition, the ethnic links and so forth of our nation, it can be the symbol of a new beginning for this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And it is not easy, Mr. Speaker, I have to say, for me to take this position because I say again I do not like the flag. Unfortunately I do not like the design. I respect Christopher Pratt. I have to take the blame, I suppose, if you call it blame for having suggested the name of Mr. Pratt. Myself and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), even before the Flag Committee was set up by the House, had sat down for an hour or so and tried to put together a couple of designs. And I believe we have to take some blame for the triangles as well, because this was a symbol for Newfoundland and Labrador that we arrived at and that we passed on to the Flag Committee. But, Mr. Speaker, although I like Mr. Pratt's art, I have three or four of his prints at home, I enjoy looking at his prints, I find them peaceful, relaxing, unfortunately when I look at this particular print I do not find it peaceful or relaxing. I find it jarring, and I think it is the arrow, the golden arrow that is disturbing. But, Mr. Speaker, I think everybody would have to say it is unique. It is different. And, you know, again, I never thought that I would be bothered enough by the final design of a flag to spend a lot of time thinking about it and I found myself the night after this one came out, I had to take out the World Book Encyclopedia and go through the ten or eleven pages of flags there, they have

MR. BARRY: all the flags in the world, and I had to go through trying to see if there was maybe another design that could possibly be brought before this House that would sweep everybody up in the emotion of the moment and that we could walk out of this House with a different design. I was that serious about my personal discomfort with the particular design. And I even arrived at a design, Mr. Speaker, that might have been appropriate until I looked through here and I found out that Iceland had already adopted it some time ago.

Mr. Speaker, I mention this just because I can sympathize with my constituents, I can sympathize with the people of this Province who are uncomfortable with the flag. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that as soon as I saw it I was uncomfortable with it, as soon as my wife saw it she liked it immediately. And I respect her opinion in matters such as this. She has a good head on her shoulders, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to say that I believe, I believe that within one year, and it may take that long, that within one year after this flag is adopted in this House, that not only will I feel comfortable about it, not only will this, for me, symbolize Newfoundland, symbolize our Province, Mr. Speaker, I think the same will be true for the vast majority of people of this Province. I think that within one year, Mr. Speaker, that we will see the people of this Province accepting this flag as the symbol of a new beginning, Mr. Speaker, a symbol that Newfoundland has arrived at the point where we are going forward into a bright future, a symbol

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, that we now have in this Province, a progressive, dynamic, growing and proud group of Newfoundlanders, Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, wanting to stand on their own two feet, wanting to develop their own resources by Newfoundlanders for Newfoundlanders, sharing definitely with the rest of Canada, sharing with other parts of the world that are not as lucky as we are, but, Mr. Speaker, having in their own hands the degree to which they share, not being exploited, being proud Canadians as well as proud Newfoundlanders, developing their resources for their people to the extent where not only are they standing on their own two feet, earning their own way in Confederation, but also able to contribute and share to other parts of Canada and other parts of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what I see this new flag may symbolize for us. I believe that even if within the year we still have some people in this Province who are disturbed by this flag, that we have to think in terms of generations and, indeed, in terms of centuries, and that, Mr. Speaker, the next generation. they will see this flag and they will say, 'Has there ever been anything else?' And I must say I was impressed, Mr. Speaker, by the television programme I saw the same day that the flag came out where they showed one of the classrooms in the city and they showed the teacher had set up the design in front of the class and had asked the kids what they thought about it and had set them to drawing it. I was amazed that they all had their little rulers out and their little compasses and they were going right to it, Mr. Speaker, and they had done it, they had put that design down in the space of about five or ten minutes and it was so natural, it was so fresh

MR. L. BARRY: the acceptance with which that design came into that classroom.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that members of this hon. House should think in those terms. We should be prepared ourselves, Mr. Speaker, even if we may be a little uncomfortable with the newness, maybe even the brashness, some might feel, the boldness, the challenge that is evoked by that great golden arrow, which bothers me, Mr. Speaker, but we should be prepared to accept the discomfort, we should be prepared, even if it is the rest of our lives, to be a little unsettled with something new that has come into our life, if, by doing that, we can have develop from this day on in this Province a symbol of a proud, united Newfoundland that our children will then accept with full and open hearts, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that for once we see this Province make a new beginning, united, confident and proud. Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Have I been recognized?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North has been recognized.

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the comments made about this flag. I am sure that the young people who are visiting here from Twillingate this morning -

MR. W.N. ROWE: New World Island.

MR. L. STIRLING: - the district of Twillingate, New World Island School, are seeing at first-hand, and they will be interested in telling their children, and in same way as some of the Legionnaires will be telling their grandchildren, that they sat here this morning and listened to part of this great debate, the

MR. L. STIRLING:

debate about our new provincial flag.

Now, I do not know if they still teach

in school a little story that they taught when I went to school twenty years ago, but there was a little thing called The Emperor's Clothes.

I do not know if they teach that in school anymore.

MR. T. LUSH:

No, that is old-fashioned.

MR. L. STIRLING:

It was a little story about the

emperor - we could call him 'Emperor Peckford' for the sake of making a comparison with that little story in school and today. Somebody went and sold the emperor some new clothes and the story of the new clothes was that the emperor was bare, naked. The emperor was absolutely bare, naked, but this great designer who had been brought into the court - let us call it Emperor Peckford's court - this great designer came to the emperor and said, 'I will design you the finest suit of new clothes in the world.' He said, 'You cannot feel the material, you cannot see the material, but it is the finest material in the world.' And nobody in his court would tell him the truth. And they designed it and designed it, and there was the great day, the great unveiling, when the emperor went out in front of all the crowds in his new clothes of the finest material, and he was stark naked and nobody dared tell him until a little child who was standing up at the side pointed out and giggled and said, 'The emperor is naked!' The little child told him the truth.

'Mr. Barry' told us the story of

The Emperor's New Clothes this morning. He said, 'I looked at it and said, 'Oh, my, do I have to live with that?' And Emperor Peckford told us here when that was brought in - swore, said, across the way, 'I did not see it before. I did not see the flag,' the Flag Committee did not let him see it. I think he was even turning his back when the thing was unveiled, talking to somebody. As soon as it was unveiled - 'Hurray, great new flag!' Before he saw it, it was a great new flag, a wonderful new flag, and everybody there looked at the emperor and said, 'Yes, the emperor says it is a new flag - it is a new flag.'

I do not know whether the children all

over the Province said to their mothers and fathers who are in this

MR. L. STIRLING:

House of Assembly, as they went home, the kinds of things that were said to me; 'Oh, yuk!' - that is a child's expression - 'How gross!' So my eyes were opened from the first. But then, I am only one representative and I make no apologies, I could not serve in the last war because I was born a year or two before the war broke out. I could not serve in the last war, but I tried to find out from people who did serve what it meant to serve under a flag, what it meant, what kind of sacrifice. What are these Legionnaires here this morning for? Is it just because the emperor did not want to be told that he had no clothes? Is it as the member for Mount Scio (Mr. L. Barry) said this morning, 'I did not like the flag. I went home and I got out the encyclopedia and said, Somewhere in the world there must be something better.'

MR. STIRLING: There was such a feeling that people came on Open Line shows, they called in in legions and said, "This cannot be true. My God this cannot be true. They do not really say that this is going to be the new Newfoundland flag." And the reaction that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) had was echoed right through this whole Province.

Now there is a lot of symbolism.

My colleague from Carbonear (Mr. Moores) put his finger on it this morning, the symbolism in this flag. It is not a mistake. This Premier, just as soon as he got elected said, "Every premier in the past was a dead loss, they blew it." The former administration, Premier Moores, the former administration before that, everybody, There is going to be a new date as the next thing brought in, everything will be before Peckford and after Peckford, the new beginning.

MR. LUSH: BP and AP.

MR. STIRLING: He came on and said, "Newfoundland starts as of March 1979," forget 400 years of history. Forget it, it just started. And there has been evidence of it in everything that they have done and this is very symbolic. Regardless of the feelings that the member for Mount Scio had, he is a member of the Cabinet, and I am sure that he had to say to his colleague, the Premier, "Look, you are never going to get away with this." Now, the Premier was approached by the Legion on a means of fair play. Now, those of us on this side, from a political point of view, saw the first indications of the kind of fair play from this Premier when we called a leadership convention last Spring. Our leader had called a leadership convention last Spring and we were starting to look at various candidates. On the Friday morning that we were talking about, 'Let us look at the potential candidates and would Mr. Jamieson be one of them,' Friday morning we started that, this same Premier, who when he got elected said, "Oh, we will maybe have

MR. STIRLING: an election in the Fall," before he got elected was saying, "My approach is that I am going to prove to the people for three or four months what kind of a Premier I will be and then in the Fall maybe we will have an election," this same Premier that Friday afternoon, twenty-one days notice, called an election and he was successful. Let us give him credit for that. As a politician he was successful, and he won the government. And maybe that was the undoing of that government and that Premier because he then said, "I can do whatever I want. Fair play does not make any difference. The people in Newfoundland did not revolt against me." He made the mistake of thinking that because he got away with one dirty trick then the people of Newfoundland did not care. He did not realize how important it was to the people of Newfoundland that they said, they said, "There is a Federal PC Government in Ottawa, this is our first chance to have a Provincial PC Government here, let us, for the first time in our lives, have these two great governments working together." And the people of Newfoundland said, "That makes sense. Young 'Peckford' makes sense. He is talking about a clean, new approach to government and we are going to give him a chance. Because for the first time we are going to have a PC Government there -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):
we are discussing Bill 44.

I would like to remind the hon. member

MR. L. STIRLING:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We are talking about Bill 44, symbolism. What is being symbolized in this flag? Everybody on the other side talked about symbolism, the last speaker talked about it, our great future, and, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that there is a lot of symbolism in this flag and that is what I am trying to tie it into. I am trying to tie it into what this flag really means and the pattern of this government, the pattern of this leader who made the mistake of thinking that Newfoundlanders would allow them - they thought that Newfoundlanders were voting for them because he called a trick election and he caught the Liberals not being prepared and that was true. But he missed the main point, that the reason that Newfoundlanders voted for him and his government was that they were going to give him a fair chance, fresh new government with a PC government in Ottawa and that was the main reason.

Newfoundlanders basically in their gut are fair, absolutely fair. Now, let us take a look at this debate, let us take a look at what we agree on on both sides of the House. I think we had one of the finest Committees that we could have selected. I think the committee did a very conscientious job, they went out and they got opinions and then, because there was not agreement, they said, "Okay let us submit it to an artist to design," And they submitted it to one of Newfoundland's greatest artist. And, with all due respect, with everything that they gave him to do that, he did a good artistic piece of work, in keeping with his other work and if anyone would like to buy that as an artistic representation of what all Newfoundlanders ask for that would be acceptable but it is not acceptable to the basic decent, hardworking average Newfoundlander, it is not acceptable as their flag. Now, let us see what we agree on.

I am concerned that this pattern, the government's pattern is being followed into this flag debate. The government found they had a problem with the Fisheries Loan Board and what did they do? The Premier came in here in October and fired the fishermen off the Board and said, "That is it," He has never admitted

MR. L. STIRLING: yet that they fired the fishermen off the Board. They had gone through all kinds of legal entanglements but without the sense of decency to contact the fishermen, he fired them off the Board.

Now, what did he do with the flag? He brought in the flag and said, "We like it, we are going to force it through and we had better force it through fast before the Opposition builds up" Now, let us look at the position of the Legion. And the Legion are being painted as the villain by the government in this. Let us look at the position of the Legion.

MR. NEARY: shame.

MR. L. STIRLING: Now, what rights have the Legion to question or tell Emperor 'Peckford' that he has got no clothes? What right have they got to point out -

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING: - that this does not -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Hon. members should be referred to by their district. I would remind the hon. member of that.

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What right have the Legion got to come in? I do not doubt that I will be called to order a dozen times during my comments on this important matter because it is an important matter. What right has the Legion got to ask for six months postponement? What did they ever do to come into the government and say, "Listen, Premier, we want a distinctive Newfoundland flag. We have debated it, discussed it brought it into our Legion meetings, brought it into our annual conventions. We want a distinctive Newfoundland flag and we want something of our heritage and our past." Now, what right have those fellows got to ask for that, asking this House to postpone the debate on a flag for six months? You would think that there was a war tomorrow morning and we have got to have a flag -

MR. W.N. ROWE: To go to war.

MR. L. STIRLING: -to go and fight under it. I will tell you, if there was a war tomorrow morning 99.9 per cent of the Legionnaires

May 9, 1980

Tape No. 1430

SD - 3

MR. L. STIRLING: would be the first ones to line up
as they did in 1939, and they did in the Korean conflict. What right have
they got to ask the Premier to postpone something for six months' when
they went in 1939, and fought and gave up their families and their homes
and their security in 1939, - what? - for two days,

MR. STIRLING: seven days, six months? Is that what they are trying to trade off with the Premier, six months that they gave of their lives and their family's lives? Is that what they are asking for? No, Mr. Speaker, six years! Six years! Children grew up, friends got killed, brothers and sisters and husbands got killed over there in the trenches and we on November 11th have the gall to go through the lip service of saying we will wear a poppy and thank God that they fought. We are talking about a new beginning for Newfoundland, a new future for Newfoundland. Who gave it to us? Who gave us the future if it was not the Legionnaires and the people who fought and the families who gave up? They traded six years of their lives and they went and saw the Premier and said, "Can we have six months, Mr. Premier? Can we have six months?" Was this all such a great issue? Is this such a great issue that these Legionnaires do not have the right to say to our Premier, "Give us six months. Just give us six months"? What has their approach been? There is a way out, you know, but I do not think this government can take it. In the same way as they have looked for confrontation today, Mr. Speaker, today they are making the most un-Canada like, the most cowardly, the most separatist kind of move by breaking off with Quebec and saying, 'Ottawa you come in.' And I tell you, I had people in here from Quebec who said, "What is your Premier doing?" 'Peckford' said this and then you had a situation in which Levesque was using it in the media, saying, 'Here you are, if we were an independent country we could negotiate.' Now they are referring it to Ottawa. I do not believe that this government has any loyalty to anybody but Emperor 'Peckford'. And I think what this government will do - from a purely political point of view I agree with my colleague from Carbonear (Mr. Moores), as a Liberal who intends to contest the next election and fight as a Liberal, I would like nothing better, from a purely political point of view, than to be able to look to this flying symbolism of the 'Peckford' absolute arrogance, the arrogance that would not let the Legion say,

MR. STIRLING: "Let us look at it for six months." That is all the Legion has asked for. Now, there is a way out. There is a way out but I do not know if this government who has a past of taking the bit in their teeth and saying, "To hell with the consequences, we will fight, it does not make any difference"- now there is a way out and the way out was given to us by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). Symbolic that it comes from Labrador, symbolic that it comes from a new member, and what he said was so simple if we could agree to it, every member in this House should be able to agree to it, it tied in with what the hon. member for Mount Scio just said, it tied in with what the Legion is saying. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) gave us the answer but I do not know if the other side is interested in a way out off a problem that will help Newfoundlanders reconcile it. The member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) said in his speech, for the first six months that the committee was meeting - and they are an excellent Committee. One of the real problems that I have is that I have to vote against this flag when I have great respect for the Committee and I would like to be able to support them. But the way out has been given by the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren). Here is what he said, "It is obvious that we are looking for something that will unite us and put us together." We are all in agreement on that. We are agreed on the other side. We are agreed here and the Legion agrees. The member for Torngat Mountains

MR. L. STIRLING:

(Mr. Warren) said, 'Let the committee take this flag and go throughout the Province and hold its hearings because because, now people have something to react to. Go out, hold your hearings, people will have something to react to, Now that they can see it, they will come in and give you their input and let the committee report back then on their findings not stubbornly, blindly going ahead. 'To hell with the consequences, to hell with our traditions.' Because one of the things that has been said by everybody throughout Newfoundland is, 'We want to be united, we want to have a future, we want to be good Canadians but we want to be Newfoundlanders and we want to see something so that when you look at the flag you can feel proud. You can say, there is Newfoundland, there is my Newfoundland flag'. And when they are marching with it, when the Legion are up there they can be happy, they can be proud, they can have something that reminds them of Newfoundland, something of the past. They must now, in their families, say, 'What did we fight for? From 1939 to 1945 we thought the enemy was over there. But today Legionnaires from all over the country have come in, taken time off from work, given up holidays, given up sacrifices and they come in and say, 'Premier, out Premier' - great respect for him - they say, 'Premier, why do you not delay this for six months? Let us go out and see if there is not a compromise, if we cannot negotiate something that we can all be proud of?' That is all that they have said, they have not said they want the Union Jack first, last and always. What they said is 'We want a distinctive Canadian flag, that is what we want'.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A distinctive Newfoundland flag.

MR. L. STIRLING: A distinctive Newfoundland flag, right. 'We want a distinctive Newfoundland flag! You want it on that side, we want it on this side and the Legion wants it. Mrs. Carter, who is here this morning, one of the greatest representatives of the Monarchy and all of our traditions would be happy with a distinctive Newfoundland flag that gives proper attention to the Monarchy and the Union Jack. And the Legion have said, 'Look, there is no rush in this, what is the rush, Premier?' They said, 'Look, why do we not take a six month delay!.

Our friend for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has come up with a solution. I, for one, would agree with the solution, I am sure that all reasonable people would agree with the same thing. The Legion and all of the people of Newfoundland are asking the Premier to be reasonable, are asking the Premier to give us six months. What is the great urgency other than the same kind of thinking that said, "Emperor 'Peckford' has decided what is in the best interest of Newfoundland?"

MR. S. NEARY:

King 'Brian'.

MR. L. STIRLING: No, emperor, The emperor had no clothes and this is the same kind of thing. If he will allow - Premier, I am glad that you are back because I would like for us to try to find the area in which a problem can be resolved. There are no problems that cannot be resolved if reasonable people sit down

MR. STIRLING: and work out a reasonable basis.

There is no problem in the world that cannot be solved by negotiations amongst reasonable people.

MR. NEARY: With a little common sense.

MR. STIRLING: But there are two approaches.

There is no question that the government has the absolute right to ram this through. There is no question that they were elected to govern. No question whatsoever that they have the right. From a purely political point of view I hope that they do not have the good sense on this occasion to recognize that there is a substantial body of opinion who are saying, "Premier do not rush into a decision today or tomorrow or you will regret it."

Now, the Canadian Legion has become the focal point because they have served in a way that none of us can ever duplicate, and I hope, as members do on the other side, that we are never called upon to have to go through that kind of problem. I hope that we never ever have to fight again. But out of respect, if there was one Legionaire, if there was one Legionaire in this country, just one, who came to me and said, "I have very strong feelings about this flag and I want to have some time to think about it, can we not delay it for six months?" I would say- if there was only one in the whole country who fought for this country in the only way, the absolute sacrifice, laid down his life. Some of them actually paid the supreme sacrifice. It is the kind of stupidity - I was in the Royal Newfoundland Militia and I am proud to still be in the reserve of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment - it is the kind of stupidity that the Premier is going ahead with this morning, and whenever he pushes it through, if he is going to be stubborn, it is the same kind of stupidity that put the first ranks of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment into battle against unbelievable odds and got them wiped out. If there was one relative of that Royal Newfoundland

MR. STIRLING: Regiment who came in here and said, "Look, for something as important as the flag--because I would say for the majority of us, the majority of us have never had the occasion to rally round the flag. Every member of the Canadian Legion did.

The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) mentioned the case of a young lady who did. She represented Newfoundland carrying what was the Newfoundland Flag, the Union Jack, and she came home in tears, as he has said, because she did not have a distinctive Newfoundland flag. Everybody wants a distinctive Newfoundland flag. There is room in it for the Union Jack. There is room in it for all of the other concerns. The Canadian Legion - you see the chuckling.

MR. NEARY: They think it is funny.

MR. STIRLING: On one hand this symbolism tells us that everything got put into it, that everything got put it. If you look at this flag it has everything that everybody has asked for, if you hold it the right way and you be careful not to hold it the wrong way, I was accused of making an obscene sign with the flag. The flag lends itself to ridicule. And there is one thing that is absolutely, absolutely something that no Legionaire will stand for, ridiculing the flag. It is treated with the greatest of respect. And this flag lends itself to ridicule.

I am not criticizing the Committee. I am not criticizing the artist. All I am saying is the same thing that the Legionaires have said, that if you are so sure - it is the emperor's new clothes all over again. The last speaker, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) said, "I do not like the flag but I will accept

MR. L. STIRLING: what the Premier says, that it will grow on me. The Emperor's New Clothes - if he walks around naked long enough and convinces enough people that he has a suit of clothes on, they will believe it. That is very narrow-minded.

I may run out of time anytime; I have been warned that I have a few minutes left.

MR. S. NEARY: Pretty soon that rocket will hit them in a place where they least expect it, that rocket on the flag.

MR. L. STIRLING: I just want to sum up by saying I did go out to my district to find out how the people in the district felt and the people in the district want me to vote against the flag. I make no apologies that I, in my own case, consider I represent the people of the district of Bonavista North and I am voting in accordance with their wishes. I make no apologies for saying, yes, I was influenced by the Royal Canadian Legion, and yes, I will be a mouthpiece for the Royal Canadian Legion, and yes, I will ask the Premier as many questions as the Royal Canadian Legion want asked, or any other group, because we, in this House are not the emperors, we are not the kings. We got elected and we know. During an election we go along and we knock on the door and say, 'May I have your vote?' - 'Oh, thanks very much, boy!' And you go to the next guy - because they are putting in us as servants.

The Premier and his group may feel that the people who are strong lifetime P.C.s are going to say, 'Well, when the time really comes they will rally round the flag. You can take St. John's for granted, you can take the Legion, who are P.C. members, they may be upset now, but this will all die down.' That is an absolute insult to the intelligence, to the determination, to the emotionalism of Newfoundlanders. We have been asked, Do not get involved in emotionalism. Mr. Speaker, that is all the flag is. The flag does not represent anything else but the blood and sweat and emotions and souls of Newfoundlanders. There is nothing else to the flag. The flag can be a nice artistic design. That is all that the flag is, the emotionalism, something to rally round and say, 'I am a Newfoundlander and I am proud to rally round the flag. That is my flag! Get excited about being Newfoundlanders:

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I know my time has run out. I could go on for hours because it is important to me what Newfoundlanders think and feel. I am not critical of the members on the other side and have never been. I believe that they, too, are here to serve the people, that they want to serve the people, and I urge you to do what the Legion have suggested, take a look at it, what some of the colleagues have suggested, and more particularly, the way that you can get out of this impasse if you can let your pride down a little bit, by the very reasonable suggestion by the member for Torngat (Mr. G. Warren) to let the Committee take this out and hear what the people have to say. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, when this debate was first called at the instance initially, although there was unanimous decision on this at the time, of the Leader of the Opposition, subsequently confirmed by the Premier, this was supposed to be a free vote. It is a free vote as far as this side is concerned, but the unfortunate situation is it has now derogated itself into the realms of partisanship as we have seen from the statements emanating from the other side of the House.

Members of the Canadian Legion here opposite who are here present today, I know full well that they will sit back and they will judge the type of speech that we have just heard as being an hysterical speech, the same type of hysteria and demagoguery, I

MR. W. MARSHALL:

would say-not the same type, obviously, I would not say, but this was the type of thing that they fought against many years ago. And I think that they can judge from the nature of the speeches coming from both sides of this House as to whether or not, on the overall thing, whether it is better for the government to be in the hands of a group of people who are attempting to govern this Province or whether it is better in the hands of a group of people who will go to no ends to use hysterical and emotional means, to try to stir up the emotions of the people of this Province including the Legion and other people, for their own political interests.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset and reiterate, really, some of the things that have been said purely and mainly for the purpose of the members of the Canadian Legion who are here today. Because, as I say, this is not an original statement, it has been stated by the government. First of all, let us make it crystal clear that there is no member of this House, certainly not on the government side and I know not on the other side as well, who has nothing but the most unbounded respect and affection for the Union Jack.

And I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this bill does not in any way intend to, neither does it, take away the Union Jack from its place in this Province. As a matter of government policy and it is unfortunate we have to get into the government area because, as I say, this was supposed to be a free vote but it has been rejected, it has been made crystal clear that we, being a member of the Canadian nation will be flying on government buildings the Maple Leaf. We being a Province of Canada, of course, will be flying our own provincial flag, whatever that flag may be. If that flag turns out not to be the Union Jack, the Union Jack will continue to fly on government buildings

MR. W. MARSHALL: throughout this Province for years and generations yet to come, to symbolize not only the fact that we are a member of the Commonwealth but also to symbolize as well the fact of everything that the Union Jack stands for. So this is not a flag taking away anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: Let us be quite clear about that. I would suggest that this particular policy that has been enunciated, that it is too bad that the Federal Government, from whatever political stripe that has been in since the Maple Leaf was enacted as the flag of Canada, did not take the same degree of pride of the membership of the Canadian nation in the Commonwealth of nations and its relationship to Britain but sobeit.

But that is the position of this government. This flag bill does not take away a flag, there is no intention to take away a flag and, as I say, we have a great deal of respect for it. But the time has come, Mr. Speaker, in my own opinion, as I know other people have voiced it not only on this side of the House but a few on that side of the House, the time has come for a new provincial flag for reasons - I will give my own personal reasons as to why I think so as I know other members have and will later in the debate.

May I also say at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that in adopting and suggesting a new provincial flag it means in no way at all that there is any disrespect not for the Canadian Legion as the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) has described it from time to time in his speech but for the Royal Canadian Legion and particularly the branches in this Province. I say that as far as this government is concerned, as I said it when this debate was first started off, when partisan matters were attempted, again, to be entered, in my view, into the debate by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) in asking a question, that this

May 9 1980

Tape No. 1435

DW - 3

MR. W. MARSHALL:

government holds the Royal
Canadian Legion of this Province in the highest degree
possible of esteem and respect and gratitude and
this particular bill does not in any way at all
diminish the regard which we have for the Royal Canadian
Legion. I feel myself that it is too bad, as

MR. MARSHALL:

I say, that there are certain political aspects. I know I cannot speak, I could not be as presumptuous as to speak for the Canadian Legion but I have noticed in the galleries of this House today that there are certain members of certain parties who hang around, who are around certain officers of the Legion who I will not name because I do not want to embarrass them. I feel myself that they do not come here as a political force but they come here to represent their own views and their own ideas and knowing the gentlemen myself I would say they probably died a thousand deaths because they did not want politicians hanging around them at the time. But this is the type of tactic that unfortunately has attempted to be played in this particular debate. And if there is any low point of the debate, I would say that this is the unfortunate, as I say, part about it.

It is too bad, as I say, it has been made a political football but we are attempting for it not to be. We on the government side are attempting to give a rational debate with respect to it. It is a free vote, despite the pseudo and quasi insulting remarks made by the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) in his speech with respect to the Premier, by instead of, as is customary in this House, to refer to a person as the hon. member for so and so, as the hon. the Premier, the hon. Minister of So and So, this is the only way in which you can maintain civil decorum in any chamber but, of course, as the hon. members opposite know, the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) chose to refer to the Premier as the emperor and such other appellations as that which were intended to be -

MR. H. BARRETT:

Insulting, degrading.

MR. MARSHALL:

- insulting and which they were insulting, but we did not rise and I know that the people in the galleries would not appreciate this particular type of thing. This is not exactly what the

MR. MARSHALL: people from the Royal Canadian Legion, ex-servicemen, fought for in the wars, to be treated to this type of spectacle and it is unfortunate that it occurs when we are discussing a serious matter like the matter of adoption of the provincial flag.

I think, in referring to the debate, there were some points made that I think were of real value and of great significance, that merit being pointed out again. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) yesterday in his statement, in his speech indicated that of the forty odd Commonwealth countries, or nations in the world only four of those have the Union Jack in it. Many of the others do not have the Union Jack, including the Canadian Nation as we now know it.

The issue, Mr. Speaker, in this particular bill - as far as I am concerned there are two issues. Number one whether or not we should have a new flag for the Province, a new Provincial flag. And the second, another issue, of course, is if the answer is yes to that what design should be adopted? And that is really, as I say, what the debate should revolve around and that is what I propose and hope to be able to keep on now for the remainder of my remarks.

Should we have a new flag or not? That is the big question? Why do we need a new flag? Why do we need a new flag, the Union Jack was used before? The simple fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the Union Jack, as I say, it is to be respected and I very much bitterly resent statements that are made from time to time that any person who is for the provincial flag is thereby dragging the Union Jack down in the dirt. The fact of the matter is that the Union Jack is a flag of Britian, of the British Commonwealth of which we are a part. There are few really distinctive flags in the world today, the Union Jack, the Stars and Stripes, the Japanese

MR. MARSHALL: flag, the Hammer and Sickle and what have you. And it is a fact that the provincial flag is used extensively from time to time in competitions, in sporting competitions, in cultural exchanges within Canada, wherein the delegations, mostly young people who participate in these contests, in the sporting events and cultural exchanges, very often come out under their provincial flag, you identify them by their flag. And it is also a fact that the younger generation have expressed concerns from time to time, and their concerns have to be heeded as well, over the fact that they feel somewhat embarrassed over the fact that while they do not have any

MR. MARSHALL: disrespect for the Union Jack as such, they do not feel like coming out as a Province with the Union Jack because people say, "Look, where is the Newfoundland flag, that is the flag of Britain?" And regard it, unfortunately, over the past number of years - although the Newfie joke has fast disappeared and now they call us selfish since the oil has been off our banks, but our young people are very sensitive with respect to it and quite frankly I can understand it and that is one of the main reasons why I think we need a distinctive flag. I do not think that that is disloyal at all. I think that the Union Jack, as I say, belongs to the British Commonwealth, and as part of the Commonwealth we will fly it but when we want to be distinguished as a Province within the Canadian nation, and as a Province within the Commonwealth we have to have something to distinguish us and for that reason I feel that we do need a new flag. There has to be in my view a new flag. Now when you come to the old position of the Union Jack I would point out that the old National Flag Act, which this bill will repeal, what was the Union Jack to us at the time was not completely our flag. Curiously in that particular act it was provided that it was the national flag of Newfoundland while it was flown on the land but if it was flown at sea the Union Jack could not be used. If the governor or the Lieutenant-Governor happened to fly a flag he did not fly the Union Jack he flew - he had the Union Jack in it but he had an emblem or a badge and I think it still flies.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) in the fly.

MR. MARSHALL: That is right. Now the reason for that - now I am not an expert on heraldry and that - I know the hon. the member, the Chairman of the Committee, who was always an expert on heraldry and since his visit to Britain, I suppose, has certainly gotten a refresher course and can enlighten us so I stand subject to correction but I know generally the reason for it is, that the Union Jack, that you can only fly the ensign on ships on sea. So in other words, there, when the Newfoundland presence was prior to the enactment of this act - we do not have that now.

MR. MARSHALL: Of course, since we joined Canada because that comes under the National Government and ships of Newfoundland or ships of Canada fly the Maple Leaf, but it was our flag certainly on the land but it was not on the sea. But, as I say, that is aside, I feel myself that we do need a new flag in this Province and for that reason that answers the first question.

Next we get on to the matter of design. This committee, Mr. Speaker, was struck about six months ago, seven or eight months ago.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, no.

MR. MARSHALL: Was it not?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, when the House met at the end of September.

MR. MARSHALL: Certainly. The last session of the House which had to be November. So that is six months ago.

MR. ROBERTS: Six months? How quickly time passes.

MR. MARSHALL: Six months ago this Flag Committee was struck by the - I believe by the unanimous consent of the House itself at the time. And at that time everybody - the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) nods, he remembers it was by unanimous consent. Now at that particular time the motion brought in was the fact that a Committee should be struck for the purpose of determining a distinctive Newfoundland flag. So I take it that if that motion was passed unanimously that all members of the House agreed at the time that there should be at least an enquiry into a distinctive Newfoundland flag and presumably there should be a distinctive Newfoundland flag. So in other words, it was then the unanimous opinion of this House that the Union Jack, which we all very much respect for reasons that members may have individually - I have given mine a moment ago - should be replaced as the provincial flag. So presumably now the only issue before this House is the design, as to whether anyone likes the design and what the reason for rejection or acceptance of the design is. But I would suggest

MR. W. MARSHALL: to the House, Mr. Speaker, that the nature of the debate has altered a great deal, that the nature of the debate has altered to the extent that I think it is quite obvious and I will leave it to the people who have received the speeches to judge, that instead of there being a unanimous consent now that we need a distinctive flag, it has now become a political issue because the hon. gentlemen there opposite feel that this is a way that they can get at the government. It is fair game for them but I do point out that there has obviously been a change of mind.

Now, there were seven members on that committee over six months ago. There were four from this side of the House and there were three from the Opposition. The Chairman was duly elected, being the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), on the Opposition side the member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms), the member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) and the member for Eagle River (Mr. E. Hiscock), on our side the member for Kilbride (Mr. R. Aylward) and the member for Menihok (Mr. P. Walsh) and the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. D. Stewart). So we established a democratic committee, a Select Committee of the House consisting - not loaded with government members because we had no preconceived notions, but with four government members and three Opposition members. And they took the delegation given to them by the House to the people of this Province and they met they went as far as they could in every nook and cranny of the Province both here on the Island and in Labrador. And they came up with a recommendation to this House which was unanimous and what I mean by unanimous, each and every member voted for this particular design - the four government members and the three Opposition members.

I think it myself, I must say, a little bit unfortunate, very unfortunate indeed that the line of tack has been taken that the Opposition appears to want to take a type of tack, a tack that they have taken purely and simply for short-term what they think are short-term political advantages. And in that respect I feel myself that they are letting down badly, and it is not for me to be concerned about that, but I really feel, in sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that

MR. W. MARSHALL: they are letting down badly the members of the Opposition who served on that committee and who did such a good job.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: It is a little bit too much coincidence that the way it is lining up now, Mr. Speaker, is that the three members who were on the committee will apparently vote for the flag because the brought in the recommendation and all of the rest of the Opposition, like a bolt from the blue, all of a sudden are going to vote against it.

Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask the members of the Royal Canadian Legion and I ask the other people who are opposed, do you really appreciate the fact that a political football is being made not just of this particular flag that has come in but of the Union Jack itself? Because this is, in effect, as far as I am concerned, what has come about. The hon. gentlemen there opposite in their speeches from time to time have - I was somewhat amused by the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) who yesterday got up and spoke, incidently, for the first time since the election last June - the leadership as I said earlier today, the leadership convention is on - but for the first time he uttered a word in this House yesterday, the first time since he was elected. And at the time he made references which I found particularly objectionable, that there was a free vote but he had, as far as I am concerned, the unmitigated arrogance to say that there was a free vote over there but there was no free vote over here. And I think that calls into question really the motives of people. I am quite prepared to say that certainly the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) got up and made his speech. He did not like the flag, he did not like the design, he gave the reasons. Perfectly reasonable, what have you, in a free vote, in a free society, in a free assembly. And certainly I would be the last one to even question the Leader of the Opposition, this is the way it is done. And I do feel that it is very unfortunate that this is the way it has come down and I do really feel, as well that the House has been let down by this particular attitude, I mean, we delegated it a committee and particularly, I would suggest to this House, that if all members of the Opposition save those on the committee are the ones who are

MR. W. MARSHALL: going to vote against this flag, well, certainly, if I were a member of a caucus - I will not say, Mr. Speaker, if I were a member of the hon. gentleman's caucus because they would not want me and I would run the hundred yards dash in five seconds rather than go near their caucus or join it. But Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, if I were a member of a caucus in that particular situation, I would feel woefully let down by my colleagues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: Now, I want to point out on the design, Mr. Speaker, I think one of the best speeches, if I may say, from my own opinion, that was made - there were two really good speeches. There were more than two, but two that really stuck out to me were made by the hon. the member for Kilbride (Mr. R. Aylward) on this side of the House, who was a member of the Committee, and the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms). They pointed out - given that one accepts that you need a new flag, that there should be a new flag and people get up, as I say, and in their own conscience they make their decision and they say accordingly. In my opinion, I think we need a new flag.

Now, the hon. the members for Grand Bank and Kilbride, pointed out that they went, as I say, all over the Province everywhere. And I think the member for Kilbride said it best. He said they could not get agreement on a design. Of all the hundreds and thousands of designs that came in and were presented to the Committee, there could not be any agreement whatsoever on the design itself. Some people, he said, wanted flags with pictures, some people wanted flags with emblems. Some people, I know, wanted the Union Jack, other people wanted other insignia. The member for Grand Bank, I think, said it very well too. He said, 'There are 600,000-odd people in Newfoundland, all with varying degrees of ideas as to the design.' And he said he believed you could not get sixty people to agree on a design. It would be very difficult to get them to agree on an actual design. He said he did not think it possible to get a majority and if he felt a majority would have

MR. W. MARSHALL: accepted a particular design he would have gone along with it. And I think that is eminently sensible. These people - look, they met to talk about - and I really think that the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. L. Stirling) - you know, I really wish he would reconsider his speech when he talks about 'emperor' and lack of democracy. Look, we had a democratic committee. This Committee did not meet in a room downstairs in private. It did not meet in Corner Brook in private. It took the whole issue out to the people of this Province. They took it out to every community that they possibly could. They travelled extensively throughout the Province itself. And there has been no attempt - this has been an exercise of democracy in action whereby a committee of this Legislature has gone out to the people, has taken a sample of the opinions, has invited briefs, has invited designs, and after that was over, all seven of them came up with the conclusion that they could not get unanimity and they went to a distinguished Newfoundland artist, presented all of the briefs to that particular artist, Mr. Pratt, as everyone knows, and asked him to give them assistance. He assessed all of the designs and came in with this particular design himself.

Now, this design is a geometric design. And as the member for Kilbride (Mr. R. Aylward) pointed out, there are two provincial flags in Canada that really

MR. W. MARSHALL: strike you, really stick out, that are recognizable, the flag of Nova Scotia and the Fleur d'Lys in Quebec. Both of these are geometric in nature. The other flags, as he said, aside from the two provinces which have the Union Jack and maybe three when you come to British Columbia, but as we know, British Columbia is sort of an elongation of the Union Jack itself - but just say three - three provinces have the Union Jack on them, others do not. But aside from the Union Jack on them, I challenge most people to turn around and tell us, number one, which flag is which. I bet you that 99 per cent of the people could not identify it offhand by just being shown the provincial flags of the provinces, which is which, and neither, having seen the flags and knowing which they are, be able to interpret the symbolism on them.

I feel myself that a geometric design is a good design. I feel it is very important that our flag avoid ethnic and religious connotations and I feel that some of the symbolism and the emblems that we have, a large number of them, obviously are going to have by their very nature, certain ethnic and other considerations.

The flag itself, when I first saw it, my first impression was when I looked at it - to be perfectly frank, I looked at it and I said, 'I thought we were going to get all ethnic considerations from it, but the thing it reminded me most of more than anything else, by the left hand corner was the Union Jack itself, because it had certain portions on it. But generally speaking, the Committee has done what it was commissioned to do. It was asked to give a distinctive Newfoundland flag. The reason why it was asked to give a distinctive Newfoundland flag was because we did not have a distinctive one. We used a flag that was, in the general minds of most people in the world, a flag of England, a flag of Britain, as I say, a flag that we have all been and we will continue to be proud of. But I feel it is very important when you are making decisions that you make them on a rational basis, and as far as I am concerned, while you could look at that flag - I am sure anybody in this House could look at that flag and suggest certain things which aesthetically you might like to change, that you might like to alter.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

I bet you if you put everybody in this room here now, both in the Assembly and in the gallery, in separate places and said, Now we will forget this particular design of the flag. Now you go out and you design one and bring one in. And I bet each and every one would have some variation and some difference to it.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, this, as I say, is a flag that will grow on us. It is growing on a lot of people now. I have not had really all that many - I mean, certain groups of people such as the Royal Canadian Legion, obviously - but I will say by some individuals - from the calls that I have received, I would say that the positive calls far outnumber the negative calls. And they are people, by the way, who are equally - you know, feel loyalty towards the Crown, loyalty to the Union Jack equally with anybody else in this Province.

We are not trying to ram this through, we are trying to come up with a decision that has been democratically made, which a lot of people in this Province feel is a necessary one, to adopt a distinctive Newfoundland flag. And if you are going to adopt a distinctive Newfoundland flag, for my part, I could not think of any one better than the particular one that is here now. As I say, if I thought overnight about it or further on you might make a few changes hither, thither and yon, but it is attractive, it has significance. I will not bother to explain - because it has been done over and over -

MR. MARSHALL: what the various symbolism means. I want, Mr. Speaker, in closing to congratulate the Chairman of the Flag Committee and all of the members of the Flag Committee, but particularly the Chairman himself who has borne the brunt of a lot of this on behalf of all of us, and has done, I think, an admirable job in putting the position forward.

I want to also observe that I am very sad, whether the hon. gentlemen opposite like it or not, that they have attempted to turn this into a political football. I know from my knowledge of many people, who are not only in the Canadian Legion but who hold very dearly the Union Jack, that I do not feel that they will long forget this particular debate and that they will appreciate very much the type of base political types of attacks that have been made on a very important issue in this House which, to my mind, instead of speaking against the bill go more to derogate the Union Jack and the traditions that it represents and the British sense of decency, really, than anything else. We saw an example of, and I will just point to it again, I know here, again, that the Canadian Legion - and who am I to speak for them? - must have cringed the other day when they saw a member of this House purporting to be their spokesman coming in and, in effect, challenging the hon. the Speaker and in challenging the hon. Speaker thereby challenges the very institutions of British parliamentary traditions and all things that the Union and all of us stand for.

So this is the unfortunate part, Mr. Speaker, this is the way in which this debate started off. I will not dwell on it anymore because all I can tell the members of the Canadian Legion, or any person that we have the duty to represent - when we

MR. MARSHALL: represent a district we represent all of the people in our district, I can only vote as sincerely held views are, particularly in a vote of this nature, and for the reason I have given I will vote for this flag, in a free vote before this House, and I will vote for it with a great deal of enthusiasm and at the same time I will hold, as my family has many years before me, the Union Jack in the high degree of respect and esteem as it has always been. And I will fight - I will not have to fight while this administration is in because we will see that the Union Jack will continue to fly on provincial buildings in this Province very proudly, along with our new provincial flag and along with the Maple Leaf.

As I say, would that the federal government had taken the same position in putting the Union Jack in the ascendancy that it deserves and it ought to have in the hearts and minds of the people of the nation as we will in the hearts and the minds of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, while I realize the clock is quickly moving, and we only have about eight minutes of the House left, I think that we should use every minute at our disposal to debate such an important issue.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, purely for the convenience of the hon. member, if he wishes to he may - I mean, as far as we are concerned, if the hon. member does not want his speech interrupted and he wishes to adjourn the debate, we are perfectly willing to do so.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Is it agreed to call it one o'clock then? The hon. the member for St. Barbe. Agreed?

MR. BENNETT: Agreed.

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

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, May 12, 1980, at 3:00 p.m.