

Please be advised that personally identifiable information has been withheld pursuant to subsection 40(1) of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015.

3. Do you have any additional comments you would like to add with regards to proposed changes to the Coat of Arms Act?

I don't believe that simply stating that the two Beothuk are depicted in what would be worn if they were going to war necessarily implies an unsubstantiated aggression on the part of the Beothuk. Were the Act to say that it was the guise most commonly seen or something similar then perhaps, but it doesn't say that and in fact specifies that the two Beothuk are being depicted in this way, as opposed to what might be worn for fishing or celebrating a significant event.

I also don't believe any sensible person would object to removing the word savage in reference to Indigenous people and their cultures and practices from all legislation in the province as a gesture of respect towards Indigenous people. If it is the opinion of Indigenous people in the province that specifying the two Beothuk are dressed for war is unnecessary or unwanted, then by all means remove it. Anything meant as a gesture of respect towards Indigenous people must involve Indigenous voices first and foremost.

Judging the past in terms of the present is never a sound practice.

Why is there --- in the banner? Maybe it should read. For the love of our land and water.
Where is the recognition of Labrador?
Should the elk be replaced with a native Newfoundland and Labrador animal? Maybe the Caribou?

Not fixing anything, just causing more separation.

Will you please stop trying to change history to score brownie points.

Language update in legislation:

From: The Escoccheon supported by two Savages of the Clyme pper armed and appared according to their Guise when they goe to Warre.

To: The Esocheon, bearing the Royal Symbols of Scotland and England, propped up (syn. Brace) by the Beothuk people.

Let us correct the entire Escochen; from Wikipedia:

1. Crest - An elk appears standing on a wreath of gold and red to represent Newfoundland's wildlife.[6]

> Update this to a Moose Rampant

2. Escutcheon -Two silver unicorns and two gold lions occupy opposing quadrants of the shield. This part of the Coat of Arms recalls the royal beasts which appear on the Royal coat of arms of the United Kingdom. The lion represents England and the unicorn represents Scotland.

> Update this to include Ireland and Spain.

3. Compartment - A mossy knoll.

> Fine

4. Supporters > The two supporters are fanciful interpretations of the Beothuk, an Indigenous group from the island of Newfoundland.

These should be dressed in ceremonial garb for harvest.

5. Motto - Quaerite prime Regnum Dei, quoting Matthew 6:33 from the Bible, "Seek ye first the kingdom of ---".

> Fine, though I prefer something about the nobility and perseverance of humanity.

Yes, can't it say "two Beothuk in traditional hunting apparel? or even two Beothuk in traditional apparel?"

Need authentic depictions.

I don't agree with the change because the Indigenous people should be removed from the Coat of Arms altogether. They had no say, and were killed, in the process of NL becoming a British colony. Feature some French, English, Irish, and/or Scottish people instead. They're the ones who murdered the Beothuk. It's insulting to stick two poor Beothuk people on NL's Coat of Arms, as if they would have supported what happened to their own people at the colonizers' hands.

This Coat of Arms should represent the past and present native peoples of Newfoundland and Labrador. This is their land and we need to show thanks. We owe them.

Leave Red Indian Lake as is.

Besides including Labrador in the Coat of Arms Act, I also think you should include an image to include Labrador; such as a black spruce twig, etc.

I feel that the opinions of Indigenous peoples should weigh heavier in this matter, than those of us who are not Indigenous.

I could never understand why the NL Coat of Arms has an elk on it. It should be replaced with the proud caribou, like those we sent overseas to honour our brave fallen soldiers. Thank you very much.

I think you might go a bit further. Having a couple of Beothuk on our Coat of Arms when they were wiped out by colonists is at least a bit weird.

No.

I find the name Newfoundland also highly inappropriate and I would suggest a contest to rename it. Something like Beaver Island or New Hope Island.

I would like to see the Francophone and Acadian population of Newfoundland and Labrador also represented in the Act, as they had a significant impact on the history of the province.

No.

The description is the verbatim archaic 1637 text of the warrant granting the Island to Kirk. At that time the term "savage" was not particularly derogatory; indeed, the wording calls for presentation of the two figures "attired for war," as would be done for European eminences of the day in other Coats of Arms. The name "Beothuk" was not in use. The idea that by expunging some words from such a document to salve contemporary sensibilities, some "problem" will be alleviated is naïve and demeaning of the public's ability to make the distinction between archaic and current language usage. Should we re-write all of Shakespeare's "racist" passages while we are at it? Should the reference to "elks" be changed to "caribou," etc.?

I believe that the changes will respect the true natives of NL, the Beothuk, and help get rid of the notion that they were savages'. Maybe such description was accepted back in the day but it is not today.

Why not have one Beothuk and one Innu represented?

"Two Beothuk dressed for war" would be better, as it retains the cultural significance of their clothing.

I am just happy the Beothuk are being represented in the Coat of Arms to always be remembered. Their story should always be told with respect. Maybe "two Beothuk" would be more politically correct than "two savages". Who really were the savages of their time, I don't think it was them.

I think there needs to be something to indicate that the Beothuk were already here before the settlers.

Love that this change is being made. Long overdue!

Good idea.

This is a tiny start. I'd like to see more "real" action.

Of course racism should be taken out! 100%!!! But leave the old words there to remind future generations of what was.

I disagree with this proposed amendment to "help" reconciliation. This Coat of Arms is my history it represents not just Newfoundland but the past. We cannot run away from our past we need to learn what happened. In my opinion all of the people who are trying to change this are cowards. You need to release the past, let people see and come to their own conclusions. Not hide it and let it foster like what is unraveling now. I am [REDACTED] and don't say I know everything but what you are trying to do is making people hate being Newfoundlanders, making us feel guilty for something we didn't do. I didn't do anything to hurt the First Nations but I am expected to pay and change my Coat of Arms something that makes me proud to be from Newfoundland. YOU HAVE NO RIGHT!

This province has way more issues you should be concentrating on instead of this bull ----. Focus on important issues not something that has been around for the last 400 years. For Gods sake give it a rest!!!

Pointless to waste money removing these figures, let's not forget they are part of the cultural identity. Better to respectfully acknowledge them than to erase them.

While I have selected 'strongly agree', this is NOT the redesign of the Coat of the Arms that I was led to believe would be taking place. Replacing the racist terminology does not change the fact that this Coat of Arms is not representative of this province. I believe that this is an unacceptably weak approach at correcting something that is clearly unrepresentative of the change this government has indicated that they will lead.

Should have been done years ago!!

Surely if there are to be amendments to the Act and the description the Motto should also be revised? "Seek ye first the kingdom of ---" is hardly a statement that can be implicitly or expressly reaffirmed in any Government, legislation or public document in 2021. Also presumably the description of an "Elke" will be corrected to "moose" which is what it appears to be (since obviously we don't have elk)?

It needs to be more reflective of all Indigenous person's in Newfoundland and Labrador, while still honouring the Beothuk people.

Do not change the Coat of Arms, however I support changing the description to simply reflect "Beothuk".

This isn't about the Act, but considering that the Coat of Arms itself will still be what is described in the Act currently even if we do change the wording, we could consider changing the Coat of Arms itself to be less offensive. For example, the pictured Beothuk are portrayed as being quite angry, in line with the stereotype of being "savages" even without the descriptor being used.

Change the word Savages to Beothuk but leave the rest alone. We have to stop tearing down statues to appease a minority.

Leave it alone .

As [REDACTED], I am more concerned with the lack of reference to cod fish than I am of the use of antiquated language.

Looks like a unicorn on the shield. If so do we need to keep it?

I propose just changing the word savages to 'first peoples'.

First it was change the name of a lake, then the name of sports teams, then the name of a community, when does it stop. Trying to change history won't solve anything. Education is what needs to change, not changing 524 years of history.

I would like to comment first on the language used in question 2 above:

"Colonizing language is further demonstrated by the additional description of armament and war, which suggests an unsubstantiated aggressive nature of the Beothuk that may have been used to justify European hostility."

How does depicting the Beothuk in "their Guise when they goe to Warre" qualify as "colonizing language"? Is this not how the Beothuk dressed when they went to war? Did they perhaps wear some other attire? Or do you mean to suggest they never engaged in any kind of warfare at all? At best you might be able to call this depiction "historically inaccurate" but it DISHONEST to refer to this as "colonizing language".

This is preposterous waste of time and government resources, at a time when the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are faced with issues that threaten the very future of the province and it's people. I doubt that ANYONE other than the most naïve believe politicians are being sincere when proposing changes like this. It is very clearly an attempt to try to get a "PR win".

It should describe their attire, the history, perhaps "Two of the now extinct Beothuk, the Indigenous peoples of Newfoundland" murdered to make way for colonialism".

The faces of the two Beothuk people are quite severe and angry looking. If that could be changed I think it would be a more positive portrayal of the people.

Please also consider changing the "Elke" or whatever that animal on the top is to a proper caribou. Have the whole thing redrawn in consultation with proper historians and the Indigenous so that any depiction of the Beothuk is as accurate as possible.

Although I fully support the proposed change, long overdue, I think it does not go far enough. Can we come up with something less colonial and more symbolically inclusive of all people who for whatever reason love this place and call it home? Please call the amendment a start, not the finish line.

Regardless of who may complain about how some things don't need fixing, this is definitely one of them that does. Canada has only recently began to truly reconcile its past, and we need to be on the right side of history, regardless of what popular opinion may be at this time.

These are the words of one man, Sir John Borough. He wrote the words, and affixed his seal and scribed his name to them. You can't edit a man's words four-hundred years later because it's the fashionable thing to do. It's not what he wrote. This is madness.

Maybe the wording should be "two Beothuk in ceremonial dress".

Are the Beothuk the only Indigenous nation that supported / support the shield?
We should remove the aggressive look at their faces as well.

We need to consider whether we really need a Coat of Arms - they come from a time of war and battles.

If we choose to have a Coat of Arms - it should be modernized.

Do we need to have our Indigenous people with bow and arrow? Throw down tools so there will be no misrepresentation/may a landscape?

The emblem should also (without a doubt) represent our European ancestry - otherwise, it does not reflect our true NL culture?

Might a cod fish also replace the elk to be more symbolic of our culture?

There is no need for the "Royal Beasts" - they came from the Royal Coat of Arms of the UK.

The Coat of Arms is too narrow in its approach - it should represent survival against the backdrop of our environment.

Assign a focus group with an artist/s who can craft up some ideas and come forward to the public - much the same way as The Rooms was conceptualized.

What's there now is a depiction of war and it does not represent our full culture.

The Minister already notes this in her remarks: "I look forward to receiving input through the consultation as we work to ensure the Coat of Arms more accurately reflects the peoples and cultures of the province."

Newfoundland and Labrador's Coat of Arms should be changed to unofficial Labradorian Coat of Arms.

A sample Labradorian Coat of Arms can be found at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coat_of_arms_of_Labrador#/media/File:Labra... with the motto "Munus Splendidum Mox Explebitur", latin for "The Splendid Task Will Soon Be Fulfilled".

Include "Labrador" in the name. It wasn't a recognized part of the Country/Province until 1927 and wasn't recognized for voting rights until much later than that. That being said its part of our history and history cannot be rewritten it is what it is. We strive to make changes so that such injustices do not happen again and we move on.

I agree with updating the language, however I do not agree with changing the design of the arms in any way.

I think its about time the government worries less about wording on things, and starts to worry more about the problems our province faces on a daily basis. Things like health care, seniors, education are what's important, not the Coat of Arms or the name of a lake. Come on government, get your act together.

Use the same logic in renaming Red Indian Lake, i.e. Beothuk Lake.

I'm happy that you are keeping the Beothuk, but are changing the language with reference to savages. Thanks!!

Change the Coat of Arms itself? The description was bad, but the depiction of two Beothuk, now culturally extinct, holding up the shield of the people responsible for their deaths, is just as bad.

Since it's 2021, you might want to consider updating the entire text to current English.

Our province must now not forget its Francophone and Acadian communities, which have been present for more than five centuries, and which are also part of its history.

In addition, Newfoundland and Labrador is now a Canadian province (which it was not when these coats of arms were made), and our province must therefore also take into account the reality of the country's bilingualism.

I would not want to see the Coat of Arms change but updated to reflect the current language.

Can we change the motto from Seek ye first the kingdom of --- to something more inclusive to all members of our province what about something like "Nos amare te ventus stillavit terram" (We love thee windswept land).

No.

Do not stop at changing the wording; consider amending its visual presentation - especially the Elk. The only reason an elk is on the Coat of Arms is because David Kirk had elk on his estate in England. Replace it with a Woodland Caribou, an indigenous animal.

Indigenous should include Beothuk, Innu, Inuit as these three groups are native to NL. Mi'kmaq were immigrants as were the European.

There is much more to consider in this redesign. There are problems with the Coat of Arms, and with the idea that a Coat of Arms should represent the province. This consultation is short sighted and should not proceed. I will make a submission to explain the issues, but please, consider widening the concept here. Also, we should not use any of this imaging, as it was drawn by people imagining the new world of the 1600s.

I would like to see the elk removed and replaced with an animal native to Newfoundland and Labrador.

You could put a fleur-de-lys in the Escoccheon (instead of repeated unicorn and lion) to symbolise NL's Francophonie. A pitcher plant could be in the other bottom corner.

It would also be nice to have the other Indigenous person have a basket rather than a bow to represent berry pickers and femininity.

I also agree with the idea of representing a moose rather than an elk. Finally, please do not remove the Indigenous people. Maybe find a way to make one represent the Mi'kmaq.

I don't agree with using Indigenous people as mascots for the province especially when all other provinces use animals in their Coat of Arms (only exception being Nova Scotia). In University Indigenous studies we were taught that this was unacceptably racist. Removing the derogatory slur does not erase the racist context of the Coat of Arms.

The provincial government needs to do a better job of understanding the subtlety of issues like this. The mismanagement of the renaming of the lake leading to fresh consultation only underlines this fact. We can amend current statutes to reflect current reality and attitudes. But this is also a teachable moment. The 1637 charter is an historical document from a different time. Any messaging and communication on the charter should include taking a moment to make it clear, we are not really amending the original document. That document is part of the historical record that shows us how attitudes and views and language have changed over the centuries. That document should continue to be available to be seen and interpreted in its historical context. Amending the current description by statute is something distinct. Also, should there be a desire to do future consultations on re-naming, particularly of geographic features whose names sit in a particular historical context, you should always consult locals and all affected parties. You should also make use of the Indigenous Language Guidelines documents of Queens University and UBC. Those documents clearly state that there are contexts - namely historical contexts - where some words that would not be appropriate to use to describe Indigenous people directly today may still be appropriate if they are historical references, documents or names - like names of works of art or places.

Anyone who disagrees with this change is doing so just to argue.

Was this true, that the Beothuk were armed and dressed for war? And, independently, was war involved in the taking of their lands and or in the genocide of their entire population? Your proposed change, as indicated in your question, is not respectful of the saddened genocide.

We can't just change history or the wording of a document because the meaning has become out of favour. However the word 'savage' is a corruption of the French 'sauvage' meaning wild. It is the same as changing the word 'gay' from the 1930's meaning of happy or joyful to the current meaning of sexual orientation. You can't change historic meanings just because current usage changes.

Consideration should be given to updating the emblem as well.

The Coat of Arms if okay but the wording is offensive as is. Change as little as possible to recognize our history.

I think there should be something in the Coat of Arms to reflect our French, English and Irish history and culture.

No need for this. Leave it as it is.

Am thinking about how the Innu and Inuit of Labrador could also be included or referenced? Some way to recognize all Indigenous people that occupied the territory of the Province prior to its settlement by Europeans?

This is a good thing but let's not go too far with WOKE Culture.

Just put two Beothuk honoring their past.

I'm [REDACTED], so my opinion is not as important as an Indigenous person's on matters pertaining to Indigenous community, on depictions of first peoples or on potential harms to present day First Nations. Have Indigenous communities been consulted? It is sad that Beothuk are centred in this image but their wellbeing as a nation was never centred and that they were exterminated. From the perspective of [REDACTED] this image is the poster child for the erasure of Indigenous bodies on this land. The image is tokenistic, paternal and the persons depicted here are objectified. In my mind, this is a derogatory image. I shudder every time I see it. Eve Tuck and K.Wayne Yang have a 2013 article titled Decolonization is not a Metaphor, that I would recommend for some perspective. Also, following Kim TallBear on Twitter is an education in itself. She is the national research chair for native studies out of The University of Alberta and her commentary on Indigenous issues is sobering. She has a great way of cutting through white supremacy and getting REAL about affirmative relations and moving forward in good relation. If we are committed to good relations with Indigenous communities we have to listen first. The onus is not in Indigenous communities for reconciliation - it is on white settlers heritage peoples. Also, the recent continual focus on the Beothuk in the news is dangerous and it makes white community more comfortable imaging that Indigenous peoples are "ancient" or that the harm against the first peoples of this land are "historic". What about celebrating and centering first people who are present and living today!!! Reproducing this comfortable (for whites and other immigrant newcomer settlers) historic imaginary view of peoples who are actually very present and vibrant perpetuates harm against Indigenous community by promoting the idea that Indigenous peoples (MMIWG) are disposable, i.e.. historic and going to die off anyways. Indigenous persons are targeted for harm and experience incarceration at higher rates than white people because of the perpetual projections of indigeneity as "historic, "ancient", living in the past. This is not a benign image. White government can't wield images of "historic" Indigenous persons and expect that there are no consequences. Also, the two people in the image are set in relation to the "crown." The crown is not presented as a person, here, or as people. So the violence against Beothuk persons is not interpreted as being enacted by persons but rather by a force. White settlers who look at this image may not see themselves here and as a result may not view themselves as being in relation with first peoples of this land, or in relation with violence, but we very much ARE. Please please please consider a deeper revision of these materials than just a single word. There's a lot more going on here that's harmful.

No.

I fundamentally oppose the symbolism whether direct or indirect from two Beothuk "supporting" a colonial emblem. It is inappropriate as the colonizers did not support the Beothuk, they began to shoot them on sight. It is a injustice and a misrepresentation of what happened and would be misleading for the public to think the Beothuk supported the colony.

Should an element of Labrador not also be added? Perhaps with the black spruce sprig or inuksuk or both?

Throw the entire thing in the garbage and start over. This was created like 100 years ago, and its old, and outdated. Come up with something that actually represents NL, not this trash.

Assuming the Beothuk "supported" (either in physically holding up the Coat of Arms or being pro-Newfoundland) the colonization of their land is worse than using a derogatory term. Take reconciliation a step further than just changing a term, which can amount to tokenism. I'm happy NL is looking at this but it's not good enough and insulting to the Indigenous people of NL.

Remove the 'Elk' as there are no elk in the province. Personally, I'd like to see the total removal of the Beothuk altogether since we killed every last one of them, and thus, should be ashamed to have them displayed in our 'Coat of Arms' as if we 'protected' and were 'proud' of them. I think it is ridiculous and self-righteous, as well as, embarrassing and 'smug'.

We need to re-create a 'new' and vibrant Coat of Arms that accurately displays both our Indigenous and non-Indigenous citizens so that it reflects today and into the future.

____ off with this PC _____. Do some real work and leave it alone.

Using the Beothuk on a settler state's Coat of Arms is problematic. Further, it also fails to recognize the Mi'kmaw, Innu, and Inuit as original inhabitants of this province. The Coat of Arms needs a complete revamp not just a change in the descriptions.

They should not be changed. Specifically the reason they should not be changed is because it is from 1637. It is historical, unaltered, and unrevised. Burning the past won't solve our social problems in future. In fact, nonsense like renaming Red Indian Lake or changing the Coat of Arms WILL NOT HELP ANYONE, but I do wonder why the government is determined to go down on it's sword over these virtue signalling ideas. My [REDACTED] will continue to live for better or worse whether this change occurs, a change which only affects the sentimental and the intellectual and is purely based on principle. Change the text of a 400 year Coat of Arms? What keeps you from changing the image in that case? And if either is changed then it's no longer a 400 year Coat of Arms intriguing found in the British archives in 1928, you make even one change and it's not 400 years old anymore, it's new and worthless and changed for nothing and in that case just as well be a dollar store design. It makes me wonder, when we are bankrupt as a province, what they're trying to divert attention away from with this blast of identity politics straight from the NDP handbook of day-to-day outrage. Savage is only offensive if you use and take the term as offensive. Think of the word savage in the Elizabethan context rather than through our modern Elton John rose coloured glasses. It was not an adjective it was more of a noun to refer to a Beothuk Warrior. Which brings me back around to I have no real issue of changing "Savages" to "Beothuk" as both are the same thing at core. I am against change for the sake of change. And as [REDACTED] I'll be damned if I'm going to sit by and watch the Mi'kmaq hijack the process in some way like they always seem to do. Like they did having Red Indian lake named after them, because the Newfoundland government, (in spite of all this new apparently progressive nature) has a 18th century approach to Indigenous people via the Soft Bigotry of Low Expectations. It's like they think "oh just give it a native name that should make the natives happy"— completely disregarding who and where different groups of Indigenous people live, lived and warred with amongst themselves. It strikes me very much as the decolonization of Africa where they thought black Africans were all simply black and ignoring the different tribes, ethnicities and languages that the borders split down the middle.

In summary you can change it if you wish my consultation will not sway you just be very very wary of letting change after change after change come when no one (no one I respect anyways) are the only ones insisting the change be made.

I'm [REDACTED] and I am intelligent enough not to be offended. --- Bless.