

many's signature stands to-day to a treaty in which she admits that she was responsible for the war and for all the damage that grew out of it. That should answer for all time the question of the responsibility of the war.

Mr. GOOD: Could it possibly be said that that signature was secured under duress?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is unnecessary to answer my hon. friend's question. Article 232 states that the Allies recognize that Germany is unable to pay the full amount of these damages; it is further provided that the allied and associated governments require, and Germany undertakes, to make compensation for all damages done to the civilian population and their property.

Under article 253, the amount of these damages was directed to be determined by the Reparation Commission. The category of damages which Germany undertook to pay was set out in the annex following article 244.

At the conference of the inter-allied representatives, held at Spa in July, 1920, the amount payable by Germany was allocated between the different allied powers, 22 per cent being the amount receivable by the British Empire.

At the conference of the inter-allied representatives held at London in 1921, the amount of damages payable by Germany was fixed at one hundred and thirty two billion gold marks. The provision of the treaty that the amount be fixed by the Reparation Commission was at that time superseded.

At the conference of the British government with the prime ministers of the dominions in 1921, at which conference I think my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) was present, Canada's share of the amount to which the British Empire was entitled, was fixed at 4.35 per

4 p.m. cent of the 22 per cent to which the British Empire was entitled. Seeing that the British Empire at the time that the question was being decided as to what amounts Great Britain and the several dominions were to receive, acted as one; that all the different parts were taken into consultation, would it not appear in every way right and proper, and indeed the only thing that is fitting, that, before any alteration is made by any one part of the British Empire on this question of reparations, they should all have opportunity of conferring together with reference to that question? I will not take second place to any hon. member in this House as to a desire to see Canada manage her own affairs, maintain in every way and at all times her identity and individuality;

but there are occasions when not only is it right and necessary, but when any other course would appear to be wrong and improper, that all parts of the British Empire should act together as one. In regard to a settlement such as this, dealing with a matter of war, in which different parts of the Empire fought together, in which their sons died together, where the matter was originally determined in common conference, the only proper way in which to deal with the question at issue namely that of reparations would appear to be by all parts acting together as they did at the time the agreement was made as to the proportion which each should receive.

Indeed, only a few days ago the Prime Minister of Great Britain, speaking in France, made reference to the possibility that at some time the British Empire might consider what could be done in this very matter of reparations. But Mr. Bonar Law was careful at the time of making his statement to say that whatever Great Britain might do in the matter, would be done only after consultation with the different British dominions. I think it will be the wish of the British dominions throughout the Empire to adopt precisely the same attitude towards the Mother Country in this matter as the Mother Country is prepared to adopt towards us.

My hon. friend who has moved the resolution says that his purpose is the furtherance of world peace. I believe he is quite sincere in so stating his position, but I would say to him that I fear the effect of his resolution, if adopted by this House, would be entirely the opposite of what he would wish it to be in that regard. We cannot as respects any resolution passed by this House dissociate the effect of its interpretation outside of and within the House; we cannot dissociate its effect beyond the boundaries of and within our own country. My hon. friend says that this would be a gesture. I am very much afraid it would be a gesture which would be construed as anything but favourable to France, and rather strongly in favour of Germany at this particular time. As my hon. friend knows, the relations between France and Germany at the moment are severely strained. The most serious situation that we have in the world at the present time exists because of those strained relations. Is it conceivable that this parliament at this moment could pass a resolution which has a bearing upon that situation without it being construed abroad as an expression of our attitude in that very serious situation?