

major issues at the Ottawa Conference between Mr. Bennett and the representatives of Great Britain, was Great Britain's trade with Russia.

With this background, let us turn finally to the Canadian attitude toward the Far East; and may I suggest that we consider it in the light of the four major factors I mentioned above, namely: our natural desire to do nothing about it; the attitude and action of Great Britain; the attitude and action of the United States; and finally our commitments under the collective system.

On the whole, I think I can safely say that the first of these has counted most with the Canadian government, and as this happens to be the policy of the British Foreign office, our government has had a two-fold excuse for saying little and doing less.

In October of 1931 Mr. Bennett in his wire to the Fourth Biennial Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations then meeting at Shanghai, said as follows: "I trust your deliberations may result in promoting the cause of Peace and of mutual understanding among the peoples of the Pacific. Canada's interests in the Pacific are rapidly developing and her earnest desire is to maintain most cordial relations with all peoples. Canada firmly believes that international disputes should be settled by peaceable means, and she has evidenced this faith by participation in and support of the League of Nations, the Permanent Court of International Justice, the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact and the General Act providing for peaceable settlement of all international disputes."

In the Canadian House of Commons on November 21st, last, in answer to the question: "What, if any, is the policy of His Majesty's Government in Canada in regard to the situation in the Far East and to the Lytton Report?", he replied: "Perhaps I can best serve what I conceive to be the public interest by indicating that it is not thought desirable to enter into a discussion at this time with respect to a matter of this kind, for it not only cannot serve the public interest but would be anticipating action that might be taken and is therefore to be deprecated. Our relations to this matter arise primarily from the fact that we are a member of the League of Nations, and we must sit on that report and determine what action shall be taken to give effect or otherwise to the recommendations therein contained--but the broad general rule is that a matter that is sub judice, that is to say a matter that is being considered by a body charged with authority as is the League of Nations - the Assembly - with quasi-judicial powers, should not be the subject of expressions of opinion publicly---".

The British policy of Sir John Simon and the government he represents seems to be that of a benevolent onlooker, whose chief concern is to do nothing himself and refuse to co-operate with anyone else in doing anything. This policy he summed up in the words: "(British) Peace and Trade", and gave in more detail in his announcement of January 9th, 1932, that the British Government had decided not to follow the example of the United States Government in addressing a note to China and Japan regarding Manchuria; and in the Communique of the Foreign Office that: "His Majesty's Government stand by the policy of the open door for international trade in Manchuria...since the recent events the Japanese representatives at the Council of the League at Geneva stated on October 13th that Japan was the champion in Manchuria for the principle of equal opportunity and the open door for t