

Mr. BLAKE. This discussion is somewhat amusing to hon. members who like myself recollect the denunciations which were poured upon the hon. gentleman with whom I was intimately associated when sitting on the other side of the House, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) and the late member for Westmoreland, formerly Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as to the *Northern Light*. I remember very well the forcible manner in which the late Mr. J. C. Pope, then sitting for one of the island constituencies, inveighed against the Government for their conduct in regard to the construction and working of that vessel. And when I saw him very shortly afterwards, a Session afterwards, accede to the position of Minister of Marine in a powerful Government with ample resources and a great majority, I certainly supposed that before now some steps would have been taken to remove the defects which he declared existed in that vessel. The language which he used was, as we all recollect, strong. He declared in the spring of 1878:

"She was a boat which from her model was never suited at all for such a purpose; he said so last winter and he repeated it now, and the experience they had, he thought, had proved it."

He, however, was frank enough to say that he did not blame the Government because the boat was not a success; but a little afterwards he said:

"While he did not find fault with the Government for the description of boat that was built, there was a great deal of fault to be found with them for accepting a boat in such a condition. She had powerful engines, but so far as the boat herself went, he never saw in all his experience—and he had been shipbuilding for twenty-five or thirty years—so great a fraud imposed upon any people."

She was then, I think, in her second season. That was in 1878. Hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in the fall of 1878. The winter of 1878-79 passed, and that of 1879-80, and so on until now, and it is the same boat with which the Government have been attempting to perform the service. There is one thing very clear, which is, that a boat performing a service so arduous as that the *Northern Light* is called upon to perform was not at all likely to improve by time, and if she was a fraud upon the people when first constructed she was now little likely to be a very satisfactory boat. But somehow or other the groans and maledictions poured out from these benches upon the late Government with respect to the *Northern Light* died out altogether when the utterers of those groans and maledictions, just before the elections of 1878, had succeeded, I daresay by the utterance of those groans and maledictions in part, in obtaining their accession to office and that power which a confiding people supposed they would use in order to remove the causes of those groans and maledictions. We find that, instead of improved steam service, there is the same old boat to-day. I do not think I could have a better proof of one of two propositions: either that the hon. gentlemen who did so villify the late Government, villified it undeservedly; or, if they villified it deservedly, they have themselves been neglectful of their duty. One thing or the other, either this villification was deserved or it was not, either the denunciation of the *Northern Light* was deserved or not. If it was undeserved, it was an unworthy act to so represent the *Northern Light*. If it was deserved, an unworthy course of conduct has been pursued in the Government not having removed the cause during the years they have been in power. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries commenced his observations by paying a high compliment to the hon. gentlemen who think and vote with him, for the mode in which they have conducted the discussion on this question. He said he thought it was a question which ought to be discussed on a non-partisan basis, that all sections of the community were interested in this work. I should like to know whether all sections of the community are not interested in all questions that are discussed here. All sections of the island are interested in all island questions

Mr. FOSTER,

that are discussed here, so far as I can judge. It is seldom you have a question in which only one section of the community is interested, in the sense referred to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He said it should be discussed in the non-partisan spirit in which the hon. gentlemen have discussed it—in that temperate spirit, that spirit of conciliation, in that spirit which he was kind and condescending enough to assure them, from his long official experience in his present exalted position, would not injure their cause. I am sure they must have been glad to know that they spoke humbly enough, spoke with bated breath enough, not to incur the anger of the hon. gentleman, and thereby injure the cause of the island and the cause of their constituents. I am sure they will be encouraged to pursue the same humble, deferential, and moderate tone in future and will take care to say nothing which will arouse the mighty wrath of the hon. Minister of Marine and thus induce him to say: I refuse justice to your people, because, forsooth, you offend the dignity of a Minister. But while hon. gentlemen had these tones for the hon. gentleman who announced that the Government of the island had done its full duty and taken its proper course in appealing to the Imperial Government for redress in this matter, in giving up the hope that hon. gentlemen on the other side would render justice to the island, in declaring that the time had come when appeals could no longer usefully and profitably be made to them, after the declaration that they could no longer hope to settle within the limits of Canada itself, this contention between one of the Provinces and the Dominion, as to the fulfilment of the fundamental terms upon which that Province became incorporated with the Dominion, after declaring that the hour and the day of petition, of memorial, of remonstrance, of exhortation, had ended at last, and that, sympathisers though they were in politics with hon. gentlemen opposite, supporting and sustaining them, they no longer ought to have delayed to carry across the water the question of the grievance, and it was their duty to do that which they did do—to go abroad. In fact the hon. gentlemen said their only hope was the intervention of the Imperial Government; he—even he, devoted follower as he is of hon. gentlemen opposite—even he, with that unbounded confidence which he to-day declared he had in hon. gentlemen opposite, said—I took down his words—that the only hope they had was the intervention of the Imperial Government, the paramount authority. I say while we see the hon. Minister of Marine had for such language as that, delivered by his follower, nothing but words of commendation, he came down upon my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) with language of severe denunciation because my hon. friend, he said, had talked in a spirit of the dissolution of the Union; my hon. friend from Queen's, who declared that it was premature to have gone to the Imperial Government at all; my hon. friend from Queen's, who declared that the Conservative Government of the island ought not to have taken the step which the hon. gentleman believes is the only hope of redress; my hon. friend from Queen's who did not despair as yet, although he has no confidence in gentlemen opposite, of justice being done within the walls of this Parliament, and even under their auspices, to the island—my hon. friend from Queen's is denounced as proposing a dissolution of the Union, while the hon. gentleman is commended because he said it was the right thing to appeal to England and it was the only hope for them. This is a specimen of the language addressed, a specimen of the equal and even justice which the hon. gentleman, who sometimes appears rather to assume the rôle of an expounder of the high moralities, exhibits in his treatment of this question.

Mr. MITCHELL. There has been a good deal of politics imported into this discussion, and as the leader of the Inde-