

ness against his neighbour. He made a very profound speech here the other day, in which he said that I stated—and he never took it back, although he had an opportunity of seeing in Hansard what I did say—that I did not want Canadians represented upon this Council at all, that I wanted everything to be done absolutely and exclusively by British representatives and not by colonials or Dominion representatives at all. That statement has been used for the purpose of doing injury to myself and to my party. I notice that the press representing the President of the Council took up that idea and said: "McKenzie wants Canadians to have nothing to do with those agreements—everything should be left to the British plenipotentiaries." I said nothing of the kind, and I think, Sir, with your permission, I should quote what I really did say, dealing with this question. As reported at page 81 of Hansard, I said:

We are part of a great Empire, of which we are proud, and we are nothing else. I fully agree with the representatives of Canada who took every possible part in the deliberations, as far as the Empire was concerned, that the Canadian plenipotentiaries should sit in the Council as the plenipotentiaries of the Empire, and that whatever conclusions should be reached should be conclusions on behalf of the whole Empire.

I said that I wanted Canadian plenipotentiaries there in one body and in one Council:

I am not to be understood, Mr. Speaker, as saying that I do not attach any importance to Canada being represented on those councils—I do say that we cannot be too strongly represented on those bodies—but at the same time I maintain that it is not a strength but a weakness for us to put ourselves to one side, to separate ourselves from the rest of the Empire, and attempt to become a separate nation, or a separate part of the Empire, as far as those obligations are concerned.

Nothing could be clearer, Mr. Chairman, than the attitude which I took in that regard; and I do not think the President of the Council did me justice in attempting to represent my views in any other way. It does not make very much difference except that while I occupy the position I do on the floor of the House anything I say may be reflected upon other gentlemen of the party to which I belong. For that reason I wish to make it perfectly clear that I was always in favour of Canada being fully represented upon the councils of the Empire; but there should be one united body, one united council for the whole of the Empire, with Canada fully represented; there should be one conclusion, one treaty, one signature. That is my position. If that is a weakness, I am altogether astray;

[Mr. McKenzie.]

but I do think, Sir, that the more united we are and the better we understand one another in connection with Empire matters and Dominion matters, particularly when we are facing a foreign foe or foreign complications, and the closer we keep to the statesmen of Great Britain in responsibilities for the whole of the Empire, the better it will be. It is not an advantage for Canada that British statesmen should begin to say: "Well, we have no responsibility in this matter; Canadians are looking after themselves, they have their own representatives; it is no longer necessary for us to concern ourselves about it." I do not think that attitude or state of mind would be an advantage to Canada or any other part of the Empire. Those are the reasons why I expressed the views which I did the other day, and which cannot by any possibility be misunderstood where there exists any desire to properly understand.

As far as this agreement is concerned, from the opportunity that I have had of giving it any thought, I do not think it is necessary to prolong discussion upon it. I do feel, however, that I was perfectly justified in not agreeing to this resolution at two o'clock this morning when we knew nothing about it and had had no opportunity of reading the Treaty.

Mr. BELAND: I rise simply for the purpose of getting some further information. Is it contemplated that Canadian troops should share in the occupation of that territory?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, there is no such contemplation.

Mr. BELAND: Further, is there any special reason why Italy and Japan should not be parties to this Treaty?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think the reason why those countries are not parties to the Treaty, if I understand it rightly, is that the occupation is to be carried out by the countries who are parties. The occupation of the territory in question is, I understand, to be by the United States, Belgium, the British Empire, and France, and they therefore make this agreement. This is not a separate Treaty; it is an agreement merely to regulate the carrying out of certain provisions of the main Treaty. If the hon. gentleman will look at the first article he will find that it refers back to Article 428 and the following articles of the Treaty. It says "the armed forces," etc., "will continue in occupation of German territory"