

the conference be enlarged to embrace a world gathering to deal with the world situation. Does any one suppose that if a suggestion of this kind came to this parliament we should think of passing it on to the British government? The sooner we realize that there is no panacea for world peace, and that perhaps the last of all panaceas is a world conference, the better it will be in the end for the peace of the world.

Miss AGNES C. MACPHAIL (Grey-Bruce): I am glad that the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Heaps) placed this resolution on the order paper, if for no other reason than that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has admitted that he has lost his confidence in conferences. So far as I can recall, in the last half-dozen or possibly ten years he has had a great deal of confidence in conferences—I am speaking of conferences with respect to national affairs—and has always been able to delay action by painting a gloomy picture of what would happen if anything were done without a conference. I was wondering who it was to whom he was directing the first part of his speech. It was a tirade, but I did not know against whom he directed it. The hon. member for Winnipeg North certainly had not said anything that would call for the first part of the Prime Minister's speech, and therefore it must have been somebody else he had in mind when he made the remarks he did. I do not think that suggesting to the United States that they call a conference would be interfering in their national affairs, any more than I think that if they had extended an invitation to Canada to attend the Buenos Aires conference that would have been interfering in Canada's national affairs.

A world conference as proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North would have one great merit; it would take the heads of the nations of Europe out of Europe and bring them to a continent which is in some degree sane. One fault with all the world conferences is that they were held in the wrong place. We should stop having conferences about world affairs in Europe. Europe has played much too large a part in determining world affairs, and if the heads of the European powers had to travel across the ocean as often as they want other people to travel across it to attend their conferences they might realize how wide that ocean is, which would be one thing gained. If the conference were called it might not accomplish much, but merely bringing the European leaders out of Europe might do some good. Then there is always the chance of the boat sinking, and

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

that might help more than anything else. It would be a nice quiet way of getting rid of a lot of trouble. Certainly extending an imperial conference to include world powers would not start a world conference off well, because it would be too much an imperial affair from the beginning.

At least the introduction of this resolution cannot have done any harm. The speech made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North was good, and was beneficial to the house. The debate at any rate will suggest the idea to President Roosevelt, even though he may not care to act on it.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): It is not often that I wholly agree with the observations of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), but in this instance he so nearly expressed my own views that I shall make my observations exceedingly brief.

It would not only be futile to suggest to the United States the calling of a world conference, but in my judgment it would be—I shall use the harsher word, although the Prime Minister did not—impertinent to do so. I cannot think it would be anything short of that for the Dominion of Canada to suggest to the president of the United States what he should do. He has advisers; he has knowledge of world conditions; he is as deeply concerned in every matter with which this resolution deals as we are, and for eleven million people on the northern half of the American continent to suggest to the head of a state of one hundred and twenty million people that he should do something affecting world problems is in my judgment little short of impertinence.

As far as the next question is concerned I can only say that I would hardly agree with the mover of this resolution (Mr. Heaps) that the United States is at this moment exactly the country to call such a conference. The United States at the present time is spending larger sums on armaments, has to that end made commitments of more hundreds of millions of dollars, than ever before in its long history, and that notwithstanding the Kellogg-Briand pact. This is a fact which must be faced.

I can readily understand my right hon. friend making the observations he did with respect to conferences. He, like myself, had very great hopes of the Kellogg-Briand pact, but we know it was a broken reed—let us face it frankly. We all had hopes of the League of Nations. It failed because the United States ceased to be a member of it,