

Mr. ST. LAURENT: The department would, of course, receive courteously and file anything that would come from any group in Newfoundland, but the department would not act on anything that does not come from those who have the constitutional responsibility for the government of Newfoundland at the present time.

Mr. MacINNIS: With noted lawyers on my right, I was wondering, since the position is now that a referendum is to be taken on two questions—union with Canada or responsible government—if the vote decides for union with Canada it decides against responsible government. Surely the United Kingdom would not then insist that Newfoundland should have responsible government before it could have union with Canada. It seems to me that the question we are discussing is purely academic.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: It is not academic so far as the people there are concerned.

Mr. MacINNIS: But the people there are going to decide. If they decide by whatever majority they do decide I do not think Canada can say to the authorities in Newfoundland or to the authorities in the United Kingdom, if they should be acting for Newfoundland, that we cannot accept Newfoundland as a province because the decision of the people has not been decisive enough. I claim that this discussion is purely academic until such time as the referendum is taken and we begin to work it out. Certainly we cannot do anything about it tonight.

Mr. CHURCH: I wish to say something on the administration item.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The discussion is on Newfoundland. We should try to complete that discussion before discussing other subjects. If the hon. member is to speak on Newfoundland it will be proper for him to speak now. If not, would he mind waiting until we have exhausted the discussion on this subject?

Mr. CHURCH: I do not wish to be here all evening waiting for others to speak. I have made a study of this question since I came here in 1921, and am not like some of the amateur diplomats who are now appearing on the scene. I have been following this situation for many years past. I want to find out from the Secretary of State for External Affairs what is or what is not the policy of the government at the present time regarding foreign affairs. We may have an invasion just like a thief in the night, the way it came at Pearl Harbor. What are you going to do about it? There is no use in our pretending that we are a first-class power

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

when we are not. I have never been at one of those UNO conventions because I do not believe in them.

In his opening address this session, the minister said that the foreign policy of Canada was wrapped up exclusively with the UNO. That is the present policy of the government. There is no use in our pretending that we can rely on such agencies any longer. That was shown by the action of Gottwald regarding Czechoslovakia in the deposing of the late president. It shocked the whole human world, and shows us the grave danger we are in. What is this famous UNO in which the minister has confidence? We used to have an empire parliamentary association. They safeguarded our interests so far as foreign affairs were concerned. They forgot all about the empire and became pan-American. We are not a first-class power. We have had two wars to teach us that lesson. You have had this second UNO league of nations. We had the first league of nations on which this country expended nearly \$5,000,000 in sending deputations over to Geneva. They built buildings costing fabulous sums of money, millions of dollars in Switzerland and Geneva, and, after that was done, it was found that it was a hollow mockery, a sham and a humbug, and drove us into a second war.

There was not a newspaper in the country except one or two which had three or four lines about the collapse of Geneva, and the buildings there are wasted. We sent these deputations over there, which was supposed to be a consolation prize for those members of the government and others to have a little side trip after the session was over. My hon. friends to the left believed in it. My hon. friends to the left, away back in 1938, six months after Munich, right up to the opening of the war years, asked what was the use of depending on Glasgow and London for defence, when we would get all the defence we wanted in Washington; but we had a rude awakening in 1939.

The second war was caused by whom? It was caused by the very people in England, in Canada and in the other dominions who were members of what they called this league of nations society, which we are now recommending for a \$5,000 grant, consisting of well-meaning highbrows, parlour pinks, professors, and others. Britain will come to life again in Canada. There is no use in our depending on any such agencies as UNO and similar societies. It was the proposal of the late great president of the United States to bring Geneva to San Francisco, and New York to Lake Success. Now the congress at Washington wishes to get rid of the UNO. Congress wants