

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, we will not.

Mr. JAMIESON. Then, I suppose you will sustain the course pursued by the hon. member for Bothwell, who instead of urging this question on its merits, used it as an opportunity of making a personal attack on myself. But I can say this—my own constituents, and I believe every honest man in this Dominion, will give me credit for being at least sincere on this question, and doing what I can for the purpose of advancing this policy.

Mr. SCRIVER. It is now so near six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, that it is very evident that this question cannot be disposed of before you leave the Chair; and, under the rules of the House if the debate is not adjourned, the order will disappear from the paper. Therefore, with the view of keeping the question before the House, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the House is very thin this afternoon, and as the question has not come to a vote, I think the debate should be adjourned, so that the House may have an opportunity to consider the matter and deal with it as they think proper.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CLAIM OF WARREN ALLEN.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for:

Return of all papers and correspondence relating to claim for compensation by Warren Allen for an ice-boat burnt to save the lives of the crews and passengers of the ice-boats, in the month of January, 1885, while crossing from Prince Edward Island to New Brunswick; and also for the use of an ice-boat and a crew, engaged in search of the missing boats.

He said: As the hon. gentleman will see, I am making a motion in relation to the claim preferred by one of the ice-boat men, who, during the year 1885, lost his boat in a storm. It will be remembered that one of the members of this House was among the passengers on that unfortunate occasion, and although this man was not in the employ of the Government in any sense of the word, but was the owner of a volunteer boat which was making crossings at the time, still the circumstances strongly favor his claim. The Government boats carrying Her Majesty's mails and a number of passengers were caught in this awful storm, and Mr. Allan's boat was accompanying them. In order to save the mails and the lives of the passengers, the boat, in the last extremity, was broken up and burnt. No doubt the heat thus obtained was the means of saving the lives of the passengers and of saving the mail. I think altogether the claim is a very good one, and is based on the highest grounds. Mr. Allan's property was burnt for the preservation of Her Majesty's mails, and also for the preservation of the lives of the unfortunate passengers. I do not know whether the hon. member for King's County is in his seat or not, but I know that he was one of the passengers, and he can bear personal testimony to the facts I have stated. My hon. friend's life was in danger, and he was many months recovering from the effects of the trip. I am aware that the Government were not themselves in charge of the boat, and the only ground on which I recommend this claim is that this boat was burnt in order to afford warmth to the passengers and crew, and thus enable them to weather the storm. I think, therefore, the claim, small as it is, should recommend itself to the just consideration of my hon. friend, and I sincerely hope he will see it in his power to satisfy it. I have heard this claim urged by a great many gentlemen irrespective of politics. I do not know what are Mr. Allan's politics. In fact he is not a constituent of mine at all, but is a resident on the other side. Everybody speaks favorably of the claim, and I sincerely hope the hon. gentleman will give it his attention.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will let the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries know what the hon. gentleman has said about the case. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in saying that this is not a question of politics. There cannot be any politics in a matter of this kind, that of saving the lives of the passengers and the mails. I am sure my hon. friend will consider the case if he has not already done so.

Motion agreed to.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

FISHERIES TREATY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for second reading of Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The subject which the House has under consideration this evening is one of unusual importance. In matters which concern ourselves and ourselves alone, if we make a mistake, it is possible for us to retrace our steps. Our blunders may impede our progress for the time being, but they cannot put ultimately any obstacles in our way. But that observation will not apply to the Bill which is now under consideration. Every step we take is a step in a direction from which there is no returning. Every act that we do is final. And if a blunder is made, if we do something that is detrimental to the interests of the country, it will wholly be beyond our power to correct the errors into which we have fallen or the mistakes we have made. It is therefore of very great importance that we should carefully consider the subject now before us. It is important that we should not hastily come to the conclusion, and I confess that I am wholly unable to understand the extreme haste with which the hon. the Minister of Finance and his chief are disposed to press forward a matter of such vital importance to the country. We know that the concessions we are called upon to make are of very great magnitude. We know that the concessions are wholly upon the one side; we know that we are not in this matter standing as the aggrieved party. The complainant is the United States. It is the country to the south of us that has demanded concessions from us, and we, at all events, before we are called upon to approve of what has been done by those who claim to represent us—we ought to know whether they are prepared to accept the extraordinary concessions which have been made or not. Now, I understand that within twenty-four hours this subject is, in all probability, likely to be dealt with at the capital of the neighboring Republic. In all probability, within the next twenty-four hours, the Senate of the United States will either postpone or reject the treaty that has been negotiated. Why, then, are the Government so anxious? Why is the Government so anxious to press this to a conclusion? Why should we commit ourselves to a proposition, which, if rejected, will simply be made the starting point for further concessions at a future period? If this question were allowed to stand over, if Parliament were not called upon to commit itself on it at this moment, should the Senate of the United States within the next twenty-four hours reject the treaty we would then be as free to start again from the point at which the hon. gentleman started a few months ago as he was at that time. But if this House, representing the entire country, is called upon at this moment to approve and does approve of what has been done, and if what has been done should be rejected by the party to whom the concessions are made, why, when we start again to negotiate with our neighbors to the south of us, we will have to start from where we left off in this