

An independent daily newspaper devoted to the upbuilding of Prince Rupert and Northern and Central British Columbia.
Member of Canadian Press—Audit Bureau of Circulations
Canadian Daily Newspaper Association
Published by The Prince Rupert Daily News Limited
J. P. MAGOR, President
Subscription Rates:
By mail—per month \$1.00; per year \$10.00
By carrier—per month \$1.25; per year \$12.00
Authorized as second class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa

Bravery Commended

THE Daily News offers its sincere and heartfelt congratulations to 13-year-old Hughie McKenzie, son of Mr. and Mrs. F. E. McKenzie, who Wednesday leaped into the icy waters of Prince Rupert harbor to rescue his young companion Ricky Newson from drowning. The boy's immediate and courageous action shows that even in a 13-year-old, common sense can prevail and that without concern for his own safety Hughie was willing to risk his own life for that of a playmate. Fishermen and boating enthusiasts will agree that the temperature of local waters is cold enough to be treacherous at any time of year. While to a good swimmer water may hold no fear, cold and cramp can betray that strongest man. Hughie overlooked this threat and today Mr. and Mrs. H. A. Newson still have a son.

For this reason, the Daily News takes great pleasure in announcing that it will immediately recommend Hughie McKenzie for a Royal Canadian Humane Association award for bravery. It will be little enough for a boy who was willing to risk his life for another.

The incident of the accident and rescue points up several hard cold facts concerning this city.

The first is that the Parks Board's swimming classes have paid off. The second is that such a program should be extended to such an extent that every child in Prince Rupert will have the opportunity to learn to swim. In that way they will have the insurance of being able to save their own life or that of someone else. Only an indoor pool can provide the necessary facilities for a complete Red Cross swimming and water safety program. The weather here is too variable to permit an extensive, every-day-of-the-week course that will turn out good, strong swimmers with life-saving qualifications. An indoor, heated pool, open all year round, will provide the facilities. It is essential that nothing, neither lack of taxpayers' support, lack of interest nor union indifference over providing volunteer labor, should prevent the completion at the earliest possible moment, of the Civic Centre's proposed indoor pool. Last but by no means least, the rescue stresses the fact that fishing from logs is not a healthy practice. Throughout the logging industry, boom men who have the added help of caulk boots to work on logs, are now being urged to wear life-jackets. Therefore wherever possible, adults should see that boys in ordinary clothes should not be permitted to fish from dangerous spots. It might spoil the fun a bit, but it might prevent a fatality.

Human Wastage Reduced

OF the 150,000 people being treated for sickness in Canadian hospitals, almost half show no visible signs of ill-health. But these are sick just the same, seriously sick. They are mental patients.

There are more than 70,000 patients in Canadian mental hospitals and an average of 20,000 new cases are admitted each year. But recently, thanks to new treatment and a new public understanding of their problem, there is good reason to believe that the peak has been reached and from now on this terrible wastage of human resources will be drastically reduced.

In the United States for the first time, there was a significant drop in the number of mental patients being treated last year. That trend is expected to be reflected soon in Canada.

Thirty years ago most mental illness was considered practically hopeless. Its victims were written off permanently as useful members of society. Today, most people suffering from mental disorders can expect recovery.

At the end of this month the Canadian Mental Health Association is launching a new drive, appealing to Canadian citizens to give more financial support for research. It is a campaign that deserves a wide and sympathetic response.

—The Financial Post.

WARNING TO MOTORISTS

The Northern Transprovincial Highway between Yukon and Pacific is in very poor condition, due to frost boils and soft spots.

We would advise motorists not to travel this section of the highway unless absolutely necessary.

H. J. KELSELL
District Engineer,
Dept. of Highways,
Prince Rupert.

April 24, 1957.



As I See It

by

Elmore Philpott

• We Asked For It

THERE has been a lot of nonsense, spoken and written, in the past few weeks, about the now famous Norman case.

Most of it is "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Mr. Lester Pearson is not running for re-election against the American columnist, Drew Pearson; nor against Robert Morris of the notorious committee of the U.S. Senate nor even against Pat Walsh.

No political party in Canada has criticized our own government's handling of this matter on any other ground than that Canada did not talk tough enough, soon enough, to the powers-that-be in Washington.

But out of all the noise and confusion, there is emerging one clear conclusion:

In one sense the treatment Canada is getting from her next door neighbor serves us right.

We asked for it—and how!

OTTAWA DIARY

By Norman M. MacLeod

Although a lot is being said in Parliament Hill circles these days about the likelihood of the Norman case becoming a major general election issue, the prognosticators of such a development are almost uniformly vague as to how it is going to come about.

The trouble with any party now making political capital out of the suicide of the unhappy Canadian diplomat lies in the fact that Liberals, PCs, and CPs are all adopted approximately the same ground

with respect to the Norman case. They have agreed that the late Ambassador was inured to his death by persons by a United States Congressional sub-committee. About the only difference in the views expressed by the three parties has been the competition amongst them to voice anti-Washington indignation. They have accepted the assumption that the party which makes the Eagle scream the loudest is going to wind up with the greatest number of votes out of the tragic affair.

In other words, as Capital political circles now size up the situation, the Opposition parties in the Commons moved too impulsively to the defense of Norman to change their tactics in the light of the later disclosures from Washington and admission from External Affairs Minister Lester Pearson. If they had been less anxious to climb up with the government on the anti-Washington bandwagon, they could have made the Norman case the springboard for a demand for a housecleaning in the External Affairs department that would eliminate any intellectual sympathizers with Communism. That is where government strategists consider that that opposition—PCs and CCPs alike—missed the boat badly.

As it is, the Opposition parties are on record in the official House Journal with palpable echoes of the Liberal Government's own reaction to the sorry affair. That isn't the way political issues are made.

All this doesn't mean that the Liberal Government is at all satisfied with the way the Norman case has worked out. Even though they do not anticipate that it will become a crucial issue of the campaign in itself, they recognize the danger—perhaps even the certainty—of it seriously affecting the government's offensive strength.

For as things have turned out, the Norman case clearly means that External Affairs Minister Pearson will be on the defensive throughout the election campaign. But the Liberals had been counting upon the brilliant Canadian foreign minister as one of their most effective platform performers. His loss from that role is viewed as definitely a weakening blow. The PCs optimistically share the view,

We laid ourselves wide open to the very kind of treatment which literally hounded one of our most brilliant and trusted diplomats to his death.

All this happened because, in our zeal to guard against spies and saboteurs, we ourselves adopted some of the most vicious and vile of the totalitarian secret-police technique.

CONSIDER only those three facts:

1. On October 17, 1950, in keeping with our treaty, the RCMP forwarded to the security forces in the U.S.A. a secret preliminary report on Herbert Norman; who for ten years had been one of our most capable diplomats; and who was then serving in a key post in Japan. In the preliminary report, the RCMP showed that as early as 1940 the RCMP had known, and reported to the government of Canada, that Norman had had Communist associations in his student days, in the 30s.

2. On December 1, 1950, the RCMP forwarded to the U.S. secret police a further full report which made it quite clear that Norman had been thoroughly checked, re-checked and double checked. Apart from the well-known fact, which Norman himself had never in any way concealed, that he had openly associated with Communists in his student days, the RCMP had found nothing to indicate in any way shape or form that Norman was not a completely honest and honorable public servant.

But the RCMP had quite conclusively established that some of the accusations and insinuations given by the "sources" in the preliminary report were not only false but downright ridiculous. For instance one "source" had described Norman as a McMaster University professor. Another item, given by a German Communist renegade, was that Norman had attended a Communist study group at Cape Cod.

The RCMP conclusively established that Norman had never been connected with McMaster, and had never been at Cape Cod; for any reason whatsoever, in his whole life.

WHERE the events in the U.S.A. serve us right is this:

From 1951 till 1957 the false first report which had been sent along by the RCMP was used as "evidence" by various U.S. witch-hunting publicity seeking committees, and by ex-Communists who were cashing in in a big way on their own Red past.

Never once did these ex-spies and continuing mongers of lies take any notice of the fact that there were two RCMP reports—not just the one exposed as false.

SURELY the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this is that the secret police techniques which we have thoughtfully adopted over the past few decades are undermining what we had all always considered as the most fundamental principle of British justice—that no man may be accused of any crime, except in open court, where he has the chance to face his accusers, and be found innocent or guilty in the eyes of all men.

As it is, the lesson in all this