

Who has the minerals of Labrador right now? Isn't it the Labrador Mining and Exploration Company? Isn't that company spending millions of dollars to develop those mineral deposits? And isn't this company a Canadian company with American capital in with them? What more could Canada want? They have Labrador's mineral wealth right now tied up safe and secure. And our Commission government gave it to them under an act of parliament. Canada already has the mineral wealth of Labrador. For goodness sake, let's keep our feet on the ground and not be led astray by such foolish statements.

Several times since this debate began it has been hinted or bluntly stated that if we go into confederation the Newfoundlanders working on the American bases would lose their jobs. Major Cashin apparently couldn't resist the temptation to make the statement. If this were true, if those 2-3,000 Newfoundlanders now working on the American bases were to lose their jobs because of confederation, or if they could be made to believe that they'd lose their jobs, that would mean many thousands of votes against confederation. Now what's the truth? Every member of the Ottawa delegation knows the truth, for the matter was raised by me in our talks with the Government of Canada, and every member of the delegation remembers what happened. We were told bluntly that the American bases would remain here. Mr. St. Laurent told us bluntly that the American bases would remain here as American bases. They would not be disturbed, and that the men would not lose their jobs through confederation. More than that, we were assured that an official statement would be made in Parliament this winter to this very effect. And I see that since then Mr. St. Laurent in a public announcement in Canada, sir, at a press conference ... has announced publicly to the world that the American bases in Newfoundland will not be disturbed by confederation. The American bases will go right on as though nothing had happened. And later this year there will be a statement in the Parliament of Canada itself, an official statement to that effect, saying that in plain words. The Newfoundlanders working on the bases may become deceived on this matter for a short while, but they'll know the full truth before the referendum takes place.

Mr. Chairman, something of the same situa-

tion exists with regard to the 4,000 men who are employed on our railway system. A strong effort has been made to persuade our railroaders that some of them would lose their jobs under confederation. The cold-blooded truth of course is that their only hope of not losing their jobs is confederation, their only hope. Sixty men have lost their jobs in the last few days already in Port-aux-Basques.... If we don't get confederation, if our transportation system is not taken over by the Canadian National Railways, then hundreds of railroaders are doomed to layoffs and wage cuts. Confederation is their only hope of security, stability, steady wages and expanding opportunities. When the matter came up early in the debate, I said I would settle it once and for all. I addressed the following question to the Government of Canada: "To ask His Excellency the Governor in Commission to ask the Government of Canada to state whether in the event of union and the consequent operation of the Newfoundland railway steamship system by Canada, whether it would be the policy of the Government of Canada to continue in their employment all the employees of the system at the time of union, with the rights and privileges with respect to continuity of employment that are accorded to employees of the Canadian National Railway." Now I ask you to note carefully how I worded that question, for you may be sure that the Canadian government noted the wording very carefully. I did not ask if it would be their policy to hold on to some of the employees of the Railway, but all the employees existing at the date of union. That's why it breaks my heart to see 60 men laid off today in Port-aux-Basques. I want to see no railroader laid off until after this referendum, not another man. Because all who are employed on the railway at the date of union will be kept on and it's a shame to see a man laid off before that. I did not ask if it would be the Canadian government's policy to hold on to some of the employees, but all the employees existing at the date of union.... My question was unmistakable in its meaning. And what was the Canadian government's answer? I'll read it to you:

As provided in clause 17.1 of the proposed arrangements, if the Canadian National Railways were to assume responsibility for the operation of the Newfoundland Railway and