

wording of the resolution. I quite agree with the remarks of that hon. gentleman, so far as they apply to that clause of the resolution which defines the system of government proposed to be given to Ireland. I think it is rather a departure from the former action of this Parliament, and being rather definite in its character it might subject us to unfavorable criticisms. I trust the suggestion made, therefore, will be accepted, and that the clause will be modified so as to reiterate the opinion expressed by previous Parliaments. The hon. gentleman took exception to another feature—not strong exception, if I understood him, for I think he expressed a willingness to support the resolution, even if the changes which he suggested were not made. The other change is as the term used in connection with the Coercion Act, now before the British Parliament, and the question is whether the word "protest" should be in it or not. Well, we all have, I trust, the same desire in dealing with this question, so far as the question of principle is concerned, if we can maintain that, it is not of very great importance what words may be used and if by the re-wording of the resolution, my hon. friend, the mover of the resolution, may secure a larger measure of support, I would advise him to make that change, especially as the hon. the leader of the Opposition having advised it. The motives of the hon. member for Montreal Centre could not be questioned if he yielded to the suggestion. I would, however, advise the mover, before making this second change with regard to the wording of the protest, to assure himself that in making that change, he is going to promote the principle at stake, by adding materially to the support he would otherwise get. Otherwise, I would be against the change suggested. I am not in the habit of detaining the House at any great length. I feel that I have discharged a duty incumbent upon myself in saying a few words on this question, not, as is frequently said by hon. members, that I require to say anything in explanation of the vote I intend to give, because the vote requires no explanation. It explains itself. The remarks I have made were intended to express my continued deep and heartfelt sympathy with any movement calculated to assist in the amelioration of the unhappy condition of Ireland, and if by making any appeal to this House, I can contribute to add to the support of the motion of my hon. friend from Montreal Centre, I consider that in doing so I discharge a duty incumbent upon me and accomplish some good. Therefore, I would earnestly ask our friends on both sides to give this motion the favorable, patient consideration they have given previous motions in the same sense, and to give it, what is more important still, the support of their vote. I thank you, Sir, and this honorable House, for the attention with which you have listened to my remarks.

**Mr. McMULLEN.** I had no intention of detaining the House in the discussion of this important question, had it not been for some remark of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. Referring to the discussion in this House, in 1886, over the resolution then passed, he arrogated to himself all the credit for those resolutions. Now, it will be no harm to refer shortly to the events connected with the introduction of those resolutions. It is well known that people in Ottawa, and possibly throughout the Dominion, who were anxious to get resolutions of sympathy with Home Rule adopted by this House, appealed strongly to the hon. gentleman himself and other hon. gentlemen on that side to introduce resolutions for the purpose of taking the sense of this House in regard to the question of Home Rule. In the first place, these hon. gentlemen said, in answer to these appeals, that they had felt the pulse of the House with regard to the probability of carrying such resolutions, and declared it would be imprudent to introduce any at all. But on their own responsibility, claiming to speak in the name of the Irish people of the Dom-

inion, they sent instead a cable despatch to the Old Country stating that the Irish population of Canada were in perfect sympathy with Home Rule. That was all that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken and those associated with him were disposed to do. After the leader of the Opposition and other hon. gentlemen on this side had waited six or eight weeks after the House had met for the purpose of giving hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity of moving in the matter, the hon. the leader of the Opposition moved in the question himself. Then those hon. gentlemen opposite appeared to be extremely anxious to do a great deal in the same direction, but until then they were very unwilling to move at all, and the course they took was to thwart if possible, or at any rate interfere, with the action taken by the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) tried to show that the resolution which the leader of the Opposition had prepared was, in his opinion, not just the thing suited to the occasion. There are times, we know, in the history of every cause when it is well to act, and there are times when action will be of very little avail. So I say, if the hon. gentleman had seen his way last Session to take the action he proposes to take to-day, if he had seen his way then to give the leader of the Opposition the assistance he justly deserved, the weight of his little finger would then have been worth more than the weight of his whole body at present. Changes have since taken place in England. A Government that sympathised with the wrongs of Ireland, led by Mr. Gladstone, was then in power, and anxious to do everything possible; whereas now another Government is in power, which is not inclined at all to sympathise with the demand for Home Rule. The hon. gentleman, who then was very backward in acting, is now prepared to act, and I am glad to say hon. gentlemen on this side are willing to act under any circumstances. They were willing to act last year and supported resolutions which did not meet with the entire approbation of this side, rather than prevent a unanimous expression of opinion, and they are equally prepared to vote on this occasion in support of the principle of Home Rule. Had the hon. gentleman to-day persisted in the course he laid out himself, had he persisted in holding to the wording of the resolution, no doubt he would receive the active co-operation of hon. members on this side. I give the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) credit for the course he has taken in acceding to the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition, by adopting the words suggested as better than those embodied in the resolution itself. In accepting largely the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition, he has shown a desire to co-operate with my hon. friend. For my part I have always sympathised with Home Rule. I believe that Ireland is entitled to a measure of Home Rule. I believe that the question of Home Rule also embodies the question of protection to the minority, and I am satisfied that the English House of Commons will never pass a measure that will allow of any injustice to the minority. I think that this question of the risks which the minority will have to run, if a measure of this kind be granted, is simply a bugbear got up for the purpose of frightening people into the idea that injustice will be done. I do not think there is any possibility of injustice being done, but still to remove suspicion from the minds of the people I believe the measure will be so framed that the rights of the minority will be strictly protected. We are aware that landlordism in Ireland has been the great trouble ever since that country became part of the Empire of Great Britain. There are in Ireland about 650,000 tenant farmers. There are 538,000 of these who pay an annual rent ranging from £1 up to £20. There are 121,000 who pay an average rent of £56 a year or about \$280. The entire rent collected from the tenant farmers of Ireland is in the neighborhood of £10,417,000 sterling, or about