

Newfoundland

in my hand a copy of *Everybody's* magazine, published by a great man in England, Mr. Poke. In an article he refers to the present Prime Minister. The article is a laudable one, which I approve. I knew the present Prime Minister before he was a member of this house. I have always had a great admiration for him because of his many personal qualities, which have endeared him to a large number of people. In the city I come from he opened our winter fair, and he has been a welcome guest there.

I also wish to refer to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Drew) because I have known him longer than anyone else in the house has. I knew his father: I knew our leader as a student at the university of Toronto. I did not like the reception the leader of the opposition met with here last Friday night, because he is a great Christian gentleman. He is a distinguished lawyer, and was an athlete. He is a kind-hearted man. I cannot speak too highly of the services which he gave to the glorious cause of education. I remember when he lived on Wellesley street. I lived around the corner from him, and he was a member of a great fraternity, D.K.E., opposite the house where young Jack Copp, a varsity rugby player, was killed by a burglar a few years ago. I have always been a great admirer of the leader of the opposition and I am a strong supporter of his today.

Now I wish to say something about the merits of the proposed bill. I was a member of the house in 1941 when the hon. member for Davenport, the great traveler and discoverer, took a trip down there in the summer of 1941. He made some discoveries about Labrador. The bill which was before us in 1947 had to do with the Quebec, North Shore and Labrador railway. I was a member of the committee which dealt with that bill. Important matters came up in that connection. At that time we had no control over Newfoundland. The sponsors of the bill were proposing to deal with the natural resources of Labrador and to build railways in contravention of the Railway Act. At that time we inserted a saving clause which read:

Provided that authority be obtained from Newfoundland.

That was a wise provision, because Labrador, I understand, is to have one member in the House of Commons and one senator. The final discussion on Labrador took place on April 25, 1947, and I shall quote from page 2433 of *Hansard* of that year. In connection with the bill many matters came up. The sponsors of the bill were asking for hotel services and railway services. At that time we

did not own the territory or the country. Here is a matter which I brought up at that time:

Another point I wish to make is that we are committed to a 99-year lease on bases, from Newfoundland to British Guiana, between Britain and the United States. That lease was given with the consent of Canada. We have given to the United States leases on all the bases in the Atlantic ocean, including some on the shores of Newfoundland and Labrador. The bases are not all out in the ocean, because some are on Greenland, Iceland and other places in the north country, including Newfoundland and Labrador, the territory under the joint defence board and the atomic board.

This proposed agreement is ultra vires of the dominion. At the end of the bill it is brought under the Railway Act by saying that it is declared to be for the general advantage of Canada.

We did not have the power in the House of Commons at that time to sanction the Labrador bill. But this lease for ninety-nine years was practically a freehold. They were urging that the Newfoundland and Labrador bases be given to the United States, although the lease for ninety-nine years was to protect United States shores.

I believe the government of Canada, the provincial governments and Newfoundland would be well advised to seek the co-operation of Britain and the United States in having that lease cancelled and charged up to lend-lease. In the darkest hours of the war, during the battle of the Atlantic, fifty ships, many of which were not fit for use and some of which could not be taken to sea, were given as consideration for that lease. I hope the Prime Minister will do something to help Newfoundland and Labrador by taking the action which I suggest.

I support the principle of the bill now before the house, and hope that it passes the House of Commons unanimously. If it does, I know that sooner or later we shall have the Chignecto canal leading into the bay of Fundy, because that is the back door into the St. Lawrence waterway. I speak with the possibility of war in mind—because this present weaponless war, as I call it, is just as dangerous as was the Hitler war. They are almost two of a kind.

I believe a better day is dawning for Newfoundland and Labrador and also for this country. Newfoundland was a pioneer at the time of confederation. I support my leader on the stand he has taken, and also the Prime Minister in what he has said. I do urge, however, that the giving up of those bases in Newfoundland and British Guiana in the darkest hours of the battle of the Atlantic should not be charged against Canada, Newfoundland and Labrador, but that negotiations should be had with the British government and with the United States to have them charged up to lend-lease.