

sustained by the Government. Of course the loss of life was direct and serious enough, but the amount of money lost must have been trifling, while the great bulk of the claim consisted in the expenses incurred in the invasions and threats of invasion and in arming the volunteers and other preparations. The claim was therefore in its very nature inferential, though on a previous occasion the member for Lambton (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) taunted the Government because they presented the claim in a consequential form, but in what other forms could that have been presented in?

If therefore the Commissioners had insisted that the claim should be received and disposed of, the very same principle and the very same argument would have applied to the immense claims of the United States for the consequential damages in connection with the Alabama, and it had struck him at the time that the English Government had acted most judiciously in withdrawing the claim, so that there could be no argument to support a claim for consequential damages.

He thought the claim of Canada against the Imperial Government to have some recognition of her losses was a good one, as we were not the provoking parties, and the invasion was not against Canada, but was an attack on and an insult to the British flag over our head, and this being so, our fellow subjects in the other parts of the Empire were bound to contribute their share of our loss, and he could see nothing humiliating or undignified in the matter.

Years ago Canada had been proud to assist the Empire in the struggle against Russia, and had boasted of it, and so now there was no humiliation in asking England to assist her in some way. Assuming then that England offered us her guarantee for the sum that had been named in connection with the Fenian losses alone, he could not see that she could do more, and thought that we should accept it thankfully, and as an evidence that the people and Government of England were prepared to strengthen the bonds of connection between them and us, and that they entered into a new alliance with us, with a desire to show their sympathy and good will towards their fellow subjects in Canada.

In this sense the offer would be received by all loyal subjects, though he in no degree doubted the loyalty of the mover of the resolution, but that gentleman had lapsed into a complaining mood lately. He referred as an instance to the action of Mr. Cartwright in his vote of censure last Session in the matter of withdrawal of the troops, and he hoped the hon. member would perceive that it was neither expedient or proper to ask the House to affirm a resolution expressing regret because the Imperial Government deemed it proper to arrange our Fenian losses in a manner different from that we desired. (*Loud Cheers.*)

It being six o'clock the House rose.

## AFTER RECESS

**Mr. MASSON (Terrebonne)** resumed the debate. He said he could not support the motion. It was not avowedly a motion of non-confidence, and if it declared a want of confidence in any body it was in the British Government. He did not altogether approve of England's mode of treating this country in respect to the withdrawal of the troops; but it was no use indulging in recriminations in view of the arrangement now in progress. Such recriminations could only do us harm, and they certainly could do us no good. The motion was inconsistent with itself, because, in the first place, it blamed England for withdrawing our claims at Washington, and in the next, because it alleges that we had no claims upon England. The House would be doing wrong in throwing taunts at the Mother Country, or passing resolutions which would cast a slur upon her honour.

**Mr. HARRISON** said that viewing the fact that we are about to build a great inter-oceanic railway, in which work we were expecting to receive Imperial aid, it would be short-sighted policy to pass a resolution of this kind. The hon. gentleman who introduced it had said that the subject was an unpleasant one. He quite concurred with the hon. gentleman in that opinion, and he would ask why introduce unpleasant subjects for discussion, in this House, if no good were to arise from the discussion? (*Hear, hear.*)

He quite agreed with the mover of the resolution with regard to Canada possessing a good claim for these Fenian outrages, and whenever he had occasion to say anything in the House upon the subject he had always asserted that these expeditions were simply and solely outrages of the worst kind, and that they were breaches of international law, and that it was a wrong against the country to have permitted these men openly to band themselves together in the United States without any disposition having been shown to keep check or to prevent them injuring life and property in this country.

He had always felt that when the United States Government did interfere, it was only when their interference was no longer required; and in those cases where they had arrested these marauders instead of punishing them, they had liberated them after a short imprisonment which was little more than a farce.

Under these circumstances, he quite agreed that it was right for the Canadian Government to have brought under the attention of the Imperial Government the question of our right to compensation for these inroads. That was exactly what the Government had done. They had brought the matter before the Imperial Government in language that was strong and emphatic, and they had done all that was in their power in order to obtain redress.