

ma question resulted in war, who would have been the chief sufferers? Would not the people of Canada? (Hear, hear.) That the Treaty was fair to England or to this country, I am not prepared to assert, but two important considerations must not be overlooked. 1st. No Treaty agreed to by the American Plenipotentiaries could go into effect until ratified by a two-third vote of the United States Senate. 2nd. The English Commissioners were hampered by instructions, and it was a foregone conclusion scarcely concealed in Washington that they were to return with a Treaty of some sort. Englishmen are proverbially frank and outspoken, and it is not surprising that their more astute opponents should have profited by it. Apropos to this, it has struck me as a curious fact, that while Mr. Fish's proposal of reference is in terms most comprehensive, "ALL the questions which now unfortunately stand in the way of an entire and abiding friendship between the two nations," his Government should have objected that it did not cover the Fenian claims, while the provision for settling the losses by means of the Alabama and other vessels has since been claimed as including consequential damages, not referred to in the Treaty. (Hear, hear.) Talleyrand's celebrated saying that, "language was invented to conceal men's thoughts," is no longer a governing rule in European diplomacy. The negotiations resulting in the Treaty of Vienna, dragged through several years, while the Conference at Washington produced the important Treaty under consideration in a few weeks. On this occasion that frankness to which I have adverted was carried almost to the verge of indiscretion. Many things were taken for granted, and a loophole was left for the indirect claims which have since excited so much bitter feeling. It is very much to be regretted that this was left to understanding, and that the matter was not placed beyond cavil by the introduction of a few plain words. Happily we at last see the silver lining of the cloud that for the past three months threatened to overshadow the two countries. It would indeed have been a sad spectacle for men and angels had this first attempt to settle international disputes by international arbitrament proved abortive. In the interest of peace and civilization we must all rejoice at the prospect of its being carried to a successful issue, and thus ensuring lasting harmony and good will between the two great powers of Europe and America. (hear, hear.) Reverting to the Washington Conference, I have reason to believe

that but for the tact, ability and firmness of Sir John A. Macdonald, even less regard might have been had to the interests of Canada (hear, hear.) In corroboration of this, it is only necessary to refer to the minute of the Privy Council, 28th July last, in which the Ministry have well and ably reflected the prevailing sentiment of Canada, and have set forth in the strongest light the objections to the measure. In this report strong ground is taken, and very properly too, on the subject of the claims for losses by Fenian raids. I need hardly remind the House that on every occasion when this matter has come up I have denounced the conduct of the United States Government as unworthy of a friendly nation and contended that there is no principle on which the Alabama claims could be contended for that would not apply with tenfold force to our claim for indemnification on account of these Fenian raids. My hon. friend from New Brunswick (Hon. Mr. Wark) seemed to make it a subject of complaint against the Treaty that it laid down no rule to prevent such raids in future. Had he referred to the 6th article, he would have found that the second rule does provide for the future by stating that a "Neutral Government is bound not to permit or suffer either belligerent to make use of its ports or waters as the base of naval operations against the other, or for the purpose of the renewal or augmentation of military supplies or arms or the recruitment of men." And the third rule makes this obligatory as to "all persons within its jurisdiction." So that this is an additional feature of the Treaty which should commend it to all Canadians. Had this been in force in 1866 or 1870 the incursions from the other side of the border could not have taken place, and in future all such raids are simply impossible while the two countries remain at peace, (hear, hear.) As a recognition of our claim for these Fenian losses we have received the Imperial guarantee for twelve million of dollars in aid of our contemplated canals and railways; the money advantage of this to us is great and palpable, but I attach even more importance to it as a pledge and token of lasting connexion with the mother country (hear, hear.) My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Letellier) talks mysteriously of the future of this country, as if public opinion in England pointed to an early separation. I do not propose to go into that question at large to-day but I wish to say that I have no sympathy with those views, and I believe this House has none [hear, hear]. There may be *doctri-*