

would be sent to the league. In fact, a lady member from southeast Grey, in the southeast corner of the house, who went herself there, once proposed to send me to the league; she said that if I went after I had scoffed at the sham and humbug of Geneva I would come home to pray. But, Mr. Speaker, I have never been blind to the sham and humbug at Geneva which brought us face to face with a second war.

I have heard a great deal in the past about the first war that was to end all wars by Geneva and to make the world safe for democracy and to make this, among other countries, a place fit for heroes to live in. To-day the slogan "On to San Francisco" has been taken up all over the American continent. Well, I should like to see my learned independent friend from British Columbia, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) sent there. He is almost the dean of the house, and he would put a little common sense into the proceedings and tend to temper the clamour and agitation which will prevail there. We all know what will happen at this conference, because we know what happens when a lot of people get together. We know what happens at caucuses in and out of parliament, where all sorts of matters are discussed, from the foundation of the world upward. We know also what happens in community clubs and other organizations of that sort. Once people get together around the table they seem to get different ideas and the result is that there is a great deal of clamour and agitation and not very much that is really constructive.

For these reasons, the proposals which have been made do not commend themselves to me, and I do not think they will commend themselves to the wisdom and the sound judgment of the country. The first league of 1920 wound up in potter's field and caused a second war, and I am afraid of the consequences of this second attempt. At the end of the last war the allies parted friends, but those who had nominally won the war soon found that they were faced with all the elements that would make for another conflict. We lost Italy and Japan. Canada led in all this peace talk and cried aloud for the league and disarmament, that monument of folly. The result was a mad rush for disarmament, which led to another war.

Before we send off this delegation to San Francisco on the present trip of the good ship collective security, may I ask what the charter Party will be? Who will be admiral in charge? Have the shoals and seas of collective security been charted? Will the compass be laid on the table of the House of Commons? Are the proposals of the government to be brought

before the house? Will the government announce, in connection with these proposals, those who are to go, or will they meet separately? Are they to have some say or will they do as certain Republicans, selected to go by the United States, intimated to Mr. Roosevelt, when they said that they would carry out what they believed to be right? I would like to know what the long-term foreign policy of Canada is going to be. I have not heard of it. I would like to know what the long-term economic policies not only of Canada, but of Great Britain and the United States and of the other dominions within the empire, are going to be, before we decide to adopt these new proposals. These are matters that should first be considered before any question of collective security for the future can be broached.

Canada has never had a foreign policy except that laid down by Sir John A. Macdonald years ago. On this San Francisco occasion, this dominion will be going to the front—I think I might say that—without anything in the shape of a foreign policy. The new prospectus issued at Dumbarton Oaks in connection with the proposed new league which will emerge from the San Francisco conference contains two provisions as far as I can see; one is the policy of the old league and the other the policy of the new organization and what it proposes to do about the proposed economic council.

If the compass is not carefully examined it is hard to predict what the result will be. The Prime Minister did say that our delegates would meet, to see if they could harmonize their views. In my opinion it will be impossible to harmonize them because there are such wide differences of opinion. I believe in considering every case fairly and speaking common sense and I am not going to join in any halleluiahs chorus and hosannah shouting about the success of the coming world conference, because I have some knowledge of the history of the world with regard to other security leagues for many hundreds of years past.

In connection with this work the body of the new league of nations was settled at Dumbarton Oaks and its framework, the substance of the charter of the united nations, differs little from the functions of the 1920 league of nations. The fundamental provisions are that the security council should be endowed with authority to investigate any dispute, any situation that would lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute in order to determine whether its continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.