

be adjourned if any hon. gentleman so desires.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is this debate?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Yes.

Mr. J. ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): I understood the Prime Minister to say that there was only one copy of the Treaty in French. Would it be possible to have further copies printed for distribution to hon. members?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If hon. gentlemen desire it, it can be done; it may take a little time. I might explain that it was impracticable to translate the Treaty into French and have it printed, for the reason that it would not be authentic. There were two authentic originals, one in English and one in French. The French text arrived only two days ago, and therefore could not be printed in time. If we had attempted to translate it after we had received the English copy of the Treaty, we would have had two French versions, probably differing somewhat from each other, and that was not desirable.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): One would have been in Parisian French.

Mr. BUREAU: And the translation might have in it the patois.

THE PEACE TREATY.

RESOLUTION APPROVING OF THE TREATY MOVED BY THE PRIME MINISTER.

Rt. Hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (Prime Minister): I beg to move the following resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient that Parliament do approve of the Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Germany (and the Protocol annexed thereto), which was signed at Versailles on the twenty-eighth day of June, nineteen hundred and nineteen, a copy of which has been laid before Parliament, and which was signed on behalf of His Majesty, acting for Canada, by the plenipotentiaries therein named, and that this House do approve of the same.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we are still too near to the tremendous and terrible events through which the world has passed since August five years ago to realize fully their supreme significance in the world's history and their all-compelling influence upon the future destiny of humanity. The conflicts of a thousand years fade into relative insignificance when compared with this struggle in which for one or another purpose the entire manhood, and more than that, the entire womanhood, of the belli-

[Sir Robert Borden.]

gerent nations were engaged. This war numbers its dead by millions and its maimed and wounded by tens of millions. It surpassed all previous conflicts in the extraordinary extent to which applied science and the control of mankind over the mighty forces of nature were brought into play for purposes of destruction. It overthrew and destroyed the most formidable and highly organized military power known in the world's history; it crumbled thrones and sent kings and princes wandering as outcasts far from the places they once occupied; it tested as never before the courage and self-control of all the nations; and finally it seemed to shake the very foundations upon which organized society has slowly, and as we thought securely, established itself during a score of centuries.

It was a war not of armies but of nations; and yet if we mistake not it was something more. If we cannot perceive in its genesis an inevitable clash between two strongly opposed and mutually destructive ideals and in its issue the triumph of reasoned justice and ordered liberty, if, out of its limitless sacrifice, mankind may not gain redemption from such unendurable horrors in the future, where can we see one ray of hope to lighten the pathway that lies before the nations?

We are assembled to consider terms of Peace which were presented to Germany after many anxious months of study and debate. Including the British Dominions, who were given in the Peace Conference a place commensurate with the part they had taken in the war, there were thirty-two nations assembled on the 6th day of May last in the secret Plenary Session of the Peace Conference at which those terms were unanimously adopted. I do not claim that there was no hesitation or even that there was no protest. Probably there was not a single nation whose representatives were absolutely satisfied with every disposition contained in the Treaty. I do not except the representatives of Canada from that sweeping assertion. But there was the great outstanding fact that thirty-two nations of varying and sometimes conflicting ideals and aspirations, widely divergent in status, in power and in political development, and separated sometimes by ancient antagonisms and long-standing jealousies, did finally give their undivided assent to a treaty which, whatever its imperfections may be, was designed in all sincerity to assure the future peace of the world.