

know, from what he said on many occasions while he was in Canada, that that is substantially the view which he entertains. I protest against our minister taking sides against China in this conflict, bearing in mind, as we must, that China was attacked without any declaration of war, that unfortified cities and towns have been bombed, and that innocent women and children are being killed by the thousands. It is also to be remembered that Japan was a signatory to the pact of Paris, the Kellogg-Briand pact, which we discussed in the house on one occasion. At that time the then prime minister, who is again the Prime Minister, intimated that that pact should be set up in every schoolhouse of the country. It has been summarized in a single sentence, "The signatories renounce war as an instrument of national policy." Broadly put, that is what they did; they renounced war as an instrument of national policy. Notwithstanding that, China was attacked without a declaration of war. That was the finding of the League of Nations, of which Senator Dandurand is a distinguished member, representing this country on that occasion, as well as when Manchuria was attacked and the Lytton commission reported as it did. Bearing in mind these facts I deprecate greatly that this country is represented by one who has declared himself to be thus strongly aligned with the forces of Japan against China. The matter is far too serious to be discussed in an acrimonious sense, but I think the Prime Minister will agree that we should not have it appear that we are not neutral but are instead lending the support and weight of our influence to Japan in this war against China. I think this circumstance is to be deprecated very greatly and it is open to no other construction in view of the known attitude of our minister, who returned some time after the Toronto statement and is now, I believe, in Tokyo. It will be within the memory of this house how great was the importance we attached to the Kellogg-Briand pact, and that all of us agreed with the statement made by the then Prime Minister and with the position he took with respect to the matter.

We might bear in mind that in Great Britain the Archbishop of Canterbury presided over a great gathering in London at which vigorous protest was made against the treatment received by women and children in China, and that other nations have seen fit to express themselves in terms of detestation of the manner in which this conflict has been carried on. I believe we should not permit it to be said that the thought of trade has dulled our sense of honour. That is a statement which is made

[Mr. Bennett.]

in some quarters, that we are lacking in appreciation of the magnitude of the questions involved and are permitting ourselves, for the sake of the material that is being sold, to take no notice of what is transpiring in the far east. We have a very great interest in that matter, and if it were not that I think it might be misconstrued I would use very much stronger language than I have done as to the conduct of Japan with respect to women and children in China. Those states which are still members of the league and took part in the debate decided that Japan had no defence to make for her unprovoked attack upon China. Under these circumstances I think we should at least indicate in some way to the world that, though we are not actively participating in any diplomatic or other action which has been taken, we are not for that reason supporting the position of Japan against China.

I desire also to discuss the position of some of our own missionaries who have found themselves in a precarious position, located as they are in some parts of China. I know that appeals have been made to governmental agencies for their protection. I am not inclined to discuss the matter in any censorious spirit because I recognize the magnitude of the difficulties that have to be faced. On the other hand, if we are to maintain neutrality we should at least do it in such a way as not to leave an impression on the minds of Chinese and others that we are favouring the cause of Japan merely for trade purposes.

It cannot be forgotten by those who are familiar with our history that the migration from Japan into this country of Japanese subjects is governed by what is called a gentleman's agreement. Now, sir, I ask you what importance can attach to a gentleman's agreement when there is a violation of what is admittedly a national treaty—at any rate so far as we are concerned—according to the finding of the League of Nations, and other bodies as well, that there has been a repudiation of the terms of that treaty, an utter disregard of the responsibilities under it, and that war without declaration has been resorted to. I think that the sooner this so-called gentleman's agreement is terminated the better it will be for this country, so that we may not find ourselves in a most difficult position in consequence of reliance upon it.

But there is another side of the matter to which I direct attention. During recent months much has been said regarding the knowledge possessed by Japan of the condition of our Pacific coast and of other matters that have to do with this dominion. I was astounded the other day—and I am sure