

great nation. I submit, however, that we are sufficiently important and have held a sufficiently responsible place in the league, being for a time a member of the council, not to adopt the attitude of a junior partner or, if I may use a parliamentary term, a back bencher. In the person of Doctor Riddell, Canada has a representative at Geneva. We are in as good a position as any other nation to keep in touch with what is going on in the league, and it seems to me we should make up our own minds with regard to our attitude on the various events which from time to time come before the council or the assembly. I do not think we can be true to our responsibilities under the treaty unless we follow that course.

I had intended to refer hon. members to some clauses in the treaty, but at this stage of the session I shall content myself by giving a very brief summary concerning our international commitments. This I find in the issue of the Canadian Forum for the month of March, 1932, and to save time I shall read the following:

By the league covenant every member binds itself to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. If disputes arise between members which are likely to lead to a rupture, they promise to submit the matter to arbitration or judicial settlement or to inquiry by the council; and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the judicial decision or the report by the council. Should any member of the league resort to war in disregard of its covenants it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the league who undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade and financial relation.

Those are very concrete and definite responsibilities. I know the statement may be made that Japan did not resort to war. Technically that may be so, but to all intents and purposes it was a war, and the most offensive kind of war—and I use the word "offensive" in a double sense. It was an unjustifiable resort to force. Yet we, following the example of a majority of the members of the league, remained very largely quiescent. I continue with the quotation:

By the nine-power Washington treaty of 1922 (signed by Sir Robert Borden for the Dominion of Canada) each of the contracting powers agrees to respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China; to provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government; to maintain the open door in China, and to refrain from taking advantage of conditions there in order to seek special rights or privileges for itself. And they also agree to full and frank communication [Mr. Woodsworth.]

among them if a situation arises which, in the opinion of any one of them, involves the application of the stipulations of this treaty.

If I understand correctly, the United States was willing to intervene, and did make a very effective protest against the action of Japan in China. It seems to me that this country might very well have joined the United States in making a strong protest, but we remained silent. We are sometimes told that Canada might perform a very useful function in seeking to interpret for Great Britain the opinions of the United States. In this particular instance we gave no lead whatever, abstained from action, and waited until somebody else came to a decision. I read on:

By the Kellogg Pact of 1928 (signed on behalf of Canada by Mr. Mackenzie King) the high contracting parties solemnly declare that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounce it as an instrument of national policy. They agree that the settlement of all disputes of whatever nature which may arise among them shall never be sought except by pacific means.

Japan, as well as Canada, was a signatory to that treaty, and yet Japan openly and flagrantly did resort to other than pacific means for the settlement of a dispute between herself and China. If I may be permitted to read—for I should like to bring to the attention of the house the opinions of some of those who are in a position to judge with regard to these matters—Mr. Norman Angell's article in *Foreign Affairs*, for April 2nd. He writes;

Whether Japan has been wronged by China is not the issue. The issue is whether Japan shall be the judge in the case; alone entitled to decide what measures shall be taken to vindicate her rights; entitled to use her power as she sees fit; to be litigant, judge, executioner of the judgment, all in one.

He goes on to say the basic principles of the league are as follows:

That frontiers cannot be modified by force at the will of one interested member of the community; that a threat to peace occasioned by such defiance of the law is the concern of all nations; and that all are under obligation to cooperate to restrain such illegality.

My feeling is that in the last few months Canada has not taken that stand which she might have taken under these international committees.

Mr. BENNETT: Might I ask the hon. gentleman does he consider Canada has any armed force with which to carry out the sanctions that are involved?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We might have used certain sanctions. I am well aware that