

38

Mr. MACDONALD (Richmond):

1. Has a subsidy been awarded for the steamship service between Mulgrave and Arichat, Nova Scotia?
2. If so, to whom has such subsidy been awarded?
3. What is the name of the steamer that is to perform such service?
4. Has the government any information regarding the qualifications of such steamer for such work?
5. What is amount of such subsidy?
6. Will government table report of Inspector Tupper re steamer Prince Albert?

Hon. Mr. MALCOLM:

1. Yes.
2. The Prince Albert S.S. Co. Ltd., Halifax, N.S.
3. Prince Albert.
4. Yes. The Prince Albert is reported, with certain repairs and alterations, which the company has agreed to make, to be suitable for the service.
5. \$15,000 per annum.
6. Yes.

4/27

GERMAN REPARATIONS

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Did Germany undertake in the treaty of Versailles (expressly set out in article 232 and annex I of part VIII of the treaty of Versailles) to make compensation for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allied and Associated Powers and to their property?
2. Was it the duty of the Reparations Commissioner to investigate and report upon all claims submitted to him for the purpose of determining which of the said claims were within the said annex I, and the fair amount of such claims?
3. When was the first Reparations Commissioner appointed and who was he?
4. Did Germany undertake in the treaty of Berlin (United States and Germany) to make compensation for all damage done to the civilian population of the United States and to their property, and does Canada receive similar compensation under the treaty of Versailles?
5. Is not this undertaking expressly set out in article 232 and annex I of part VIII of the treaty of Berlin (Reparation), and also as relates to Canada in the treaty of Versailles?
6. Was it the duty of the Mixed Claims Commission at Washington to decide upon all claims submitted to it for the purpose of determining which of the said claims were within said annex I, and the fair amount of such claims, in a similar manner to the Commissioner on Claims in Canada?
7. Is Germany carrying out the obligations assumed in article 232 and annex I, of both treaties, namely the treaty of Versailles and the treaty of Berlin?
8. If so, is she carrying out such obligations by means of the Dawes payments, made under the so-called Dawes plan?
9. Are Great Britain and the overseas dominions receiving their share of the Dawes payments?
10. Are the United States receiving their share of the Dawes payments?
11. Is Canada receiving her share of the Dawes payments?
12. If so, from what source?
13. What amount has Canada received under the Dawes plan to date?
14. What is the total amount which Canada is entitled to receive as her share of reparation payments under the Dawes plan during the next few years?
15. How much each year?
16. In addition to what has been received under the Dawes plan, is not Canada entitled to receive immediately from the British government a sum approximating \$4,000,000 as her share of reparation payments in kind as announced in the British House of Commons a short time ago?
17. How soon will this amount be paid over?
18. When this amount is paid over, what will be the total amount on hand immediately available for reparation?
19. What is the intention of the government with regard to payment of the awards made by the Reparations Commissioner?
20. Is it the intention of the Secretary of State or any minister of the crown to reintroduce this session, the bill providing for payment of the commissioner's awards out of the Dawes money received and to be received and out of said amount which is to be received by Canada immediately as her share of reparation payments in kind?
21. Has there been an act passed recently in the United States providing for payment out of the Dawes money of all claims held to have been within the provisions of annex I of part VIII of the treaty of Berlin (reparation), and are such claims not exactly similar in character to those which the Canadian Reparations Commissioner has held to have been within the provisions of annex I to part VIII of the treaty of Versailles (reparation)?
22. Was there an act passed in Great Britain either during the war or shortly afterwards setting up a commission to adjudicate upon reparation claims and to provide a fund of \$5,000,000 out of which to compensate claimants, and do any Canadians benefit from such funds?

4/27

Did the Canadian government make any claim before the Canadian Reparations Commissioner under categories 2, 3 and 7 of annex I of part VIII of the treaty of Versailles (reparation)?

23. Did the United States government make any claim before the Mixed Claims Commission at Washington under categories 2, 3 and 7 of annex I of part VIII of the treaty of Berlin (reparation), and did the government of Canada make any claim before the Canadian commissioner for reparation?

24. Was it stated by the Mixed Claims Commission at Washington, in their opinion, in the "Lusitania" case of November 1st, 1923, that while under that portion of the treaty of Versailles which has by reference been incorporated in the treaty of Berlin, "Germany accepts responsibility for all loss and damage to which the United States and its nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war, nevertheless the United States frankly recognizes the fact that the resources of Germany are not adequate to make complete reparation for all such loss and damage," but requires that Germany make "compensation" for specified damages suffered by American nationals, and does the government of Canada share this view?

Hon. Mr. RINFRET:

1. By article 231 of the treaty of Versailles the allied and associated governments affirmed, and Germany accepted, the responsibility of Germany and her Allies for causing all the loss and damage to which the allied and associated governments and their nationals have been subjected as a consequence of the war.
- By article 232 the allied and associated governments recognized that the resources of Germany are not adequate to make complete reparation for all such loss and damage. The allied and associated governments, however, required, and Germany undertook to make, compensation for all damage done to the civilian population of the allied and associated powers and to their property during the period of the belligerency of each as an allied and associated power against Germany by land, by sea and from the air, and in general all damage as defined in annex I of part VIII of the treaty. By article 233 of the treaty it was provided that the amount of the above damage for which compensation is to be made by Germany shall be determined by an inter-allied commission, to be called The Reparation Commission and constituted in the form and with the persons set forth in the following articles and in annexes II to VII of Part VIII of the treaty.
- The loss to the civil population was to be the measure of the amount of reparation to be paid by Germany to the Allied and Associated Powers.
- Subsequently at the Spa conference this method of computation was set aside and the total amount payable by Germany for reparation was fixed at 132 milliards of gold marks.
- (a) The commissioner was appointed to investigate and report upon claims of persons residing or carrying on business in Canada who have been subjected to loss and pecuniary damages arising through the destruction of life and property through the illegal warfare of the enemy and
- (b) Claims for damages to which persons residing or carrying on business in Canada have been subjected for breaches of contracts, which contracts were prevented from being carried out owing to the operation of the Statutory List of persons in neutral countries with whom such contracts were declared illegal:

for the purpose of determining whether they are within the category set out in the first annex to section I of part VIII of the treaty, and the fair amount of such claims, and to make such findings as may be of assistance to the government in determining which, if any, of such claims should be paid, and the extent of payment thereof.

3. 31st October, 1921, the honourable Sir John Douglas Hasen, K.C.M.G.
4. Section 1 of article 2 of the treaty of Berlin reserves to the United States the same rights to reparation as are set out in part VIII of the treaty of Versailles. The right of the Canadian government to reparation is set out in the answer to question 1.
5. There is no article number 232 in the treaty of Berlin, but article 233 of the treaty of Versailles provided as set out in the answer to question 1. The rights of the Canadian government are also set out in that answer.
6. Yes.
7. No, but payments are being made by Germany under the Dawes plan and London reparation agreement to the United Kingdom and Canada, and under the treaty of Berlin to the United States.

Continued on next page

4/27

4/27

8. Answered by 7.
9. Subject to certain priorities Great Britain and the overseas dominions are receiving their share of the Dawes payments as arranged at the Spa conference and the Imperial conference of 1921.
10. Yes.
11. Yes, subject to certain priorities.
12. Payments to Canada made through the treasury of the United Kingdom.
13. \$4,000,000.
14. Canada is entitled to receive 4.35 per cent of the amount received by Great Britain, and Great Britain is entitled to 22 per cent of the amount payable under the Dawes plan and London reparation agreement. These proportions are subject to certain priorities.
15. Germany is required to pay under the Dawes plan and London convention the following annuities: (taking 21 to equal 20 gold marks) 1924-25 \$50,000,000; 1925-26, \$61,000,000; 1926-27, \$60,000,000; 1927-28, \$57,500,000; 1928-29, \$125,000,000; and each year thereafter \$125,000,000. The amounts may be increased by the operation of the "Prosperity Index" but this can only begin to operate after 1930. Canada is entitled to receive the proportion, as set out in answer to question 14, of the above amounts.
16. \$3,789,430.
17. Payment of this amount is withheld by the British treasury pending settlement of certain other accounts between Canada and Great Britain.
18. \$7,708,947.24 together with any instalments that may be paid in the meantime.
19. The policy of the government will be decided when the reparation commissioner has completed his report.
20. Answered by No. 19.
21. No act such as referred to has been passed by the United States. The claims considered by the United States Mixed Claims Commission are similar to those considered by the Canadian reparation commissioner.
22. No act passed, but an appropriation of \$5,000,000, was made for distribution to claimants who had suffered loss and this distribution was carried out by the commission of which Lord Sumner was chairman. Claims of Canadians domiciled in the United Kingdom were considered by this commission.
23. No.
24. No.
25. The reference to the opinion of the Mixed Claims commission of the United States in the Lusitania case is correct. The view held by the Canadian government is that claimants for losses above referred to have no claims against either Canada or Germany. If there is any claim it is in the right of Canada against Germany under the treaty, and this right is being enforced as set out in answer to questions 3 to 12. This view is also held by the government of the United Kingdom. The Canadian government has under consideration the making of gratuitous payments to claimants, and if it is so decided, parliament will be asked to make an appropriation for that purpose.

***CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—EMERALD JUNCTION—STANLEY BRIDGE BRANCH LINE**

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings):

No. 9.

1. Have petitions been received from residents of Cavendish, Hope River, and Stanley, in Prince Edward Island, asking for an extension of the Borden branch of the Canadian National Railway from Emerald Junction to Stanley Bridge?
2. What is the intention of the government in relation to the prayer of such petitions?

Hon. Mr. DUNNING: Mr. Speaker, the answer to No. 9, sub-question (1), is: No petitions have been received.

PENSION ACT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. YOUNG (Toronto Northeast):

1. Is the Pension Act administered by the Board of Pension Commissioners or by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?
2. If the provisions of the act are given effect in part by the Board of Pension Commissioners and in part by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, what part is within the respective jurisdiction of the department and the board, and what parts if any, are under the board and the said department jointly?
3. How is the degree of pensionable disability ascertained, and in such ascertainment what part is the responsibility of the board and what part, if any, is the responsibility of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?
4. By whose authority are pension examination or re-examination carried out?
5. Has the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment any control over the Board of Pension Commissioners as to administration or otherwise?
6. Is the Board of Pension Commissioners entirely independent of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. The relations between the Board of Pension Commissioners and the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment are defined by P.C. 3722 of the 17th August, 1921, which provides that:—
- "The Board of Pension Commissioners shall, through the department, lay down the policy to be followed in the administration of the provisions of the Pension Act."
2. The board is a court of judicature rather than an administrative body. It determines questions of eligibility, of degree of disablement, and is the sole authority competent to award or refuse pension. The department pays the pensions awarded by the board, arranges for the routine medical examinations of pensioners and prospective pensioners and is generally responsible for the administrative work involved in giving effect to the decisions of the board and in collecting and collating evidence relating to pensionability. No parts of the act are administered jointly by the board and the department.
3. The degree of pensionable disability is ascertained by the medical examiners and specialists employed by the department, who have been specially trained in assessment work by the medical advisers of the board. They examine individual pensioners and make recommendations as to the degree of disablement. The medical advisers of the board review such recommendations and place them before the board, which approves, rejects or amends them as to it appears proper. The department is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the medical reports and examinations presented to the board and in respect of investigation reports made by departmental officials for the information of the board.
4. The treatment branch of the department recommends the review dates for medical examinations and the board approves or amends such recommendations. In certain circumstances, the board calls for special medical examinations at other than the regular review dates.

5. Answered by No. 1.
6. Yes.

39

4/27