

Minister who has just spoken has strongly concurred in that objection. Without arguing the question as to the propriety of bringing it up in that manner, I wish to quote a precedent or two—one precedent at least which I think ought to be conclusive and satisfactory to the leader of the House, whether it be satisfactory or not to his follower, who has sometimes been known to differ from him. I refer to the authority of the hon. the Premier of the House himself, and the occasion was the motion he proposed in regard to Mr. Letellier de St. Just, then Lieutenant Governor of Quebec. That resolution was proposed in the Session of 1878. The hon. gentleman, then leader of the Opposition as he is now leader of the House, did give a general notice that he was going to bring up a motion of that sort, and offered to communicate with the leader of the House about it. He said on 9th April, 1878:

"Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to state to the House and the hon. Minister at the head of the Government—as I have already done to him privately—that it is my intention to move, on going into Supply, at an early date, a motion, in order to bring under the attention of the House the late occurrence in Quebec. The resolution which I intend to move, I shall, in the course of the afternoon, communicate to the hon. gentleman at the head of Government. I would like a day fixed for the purpose of discussing this very important question. I would suppose that the hon. gentleman would allow it, by general consent, to be brought out upon going into Supply on Thursday, and I shall then move my resolution on the motion that the Speaker do now leave the Chair. I intend to bring up the constitutional question, as much as possible on its own merits, and try to raise the question out of the slough of party."

Exactly what has been proposed in regard to this resolution—that it should be discussed on its merits, and not be allowed to drop into the slough of party. The then leader of the House suggested what could be done, he said:

"I think that the proper course for the hon. gentleman would be to bring it up as a substantive motion, and I shall afford every facility for doing so on Thursday. If it is intended, however, to move an amendment, of course the hon. gentleman will see that he is confining it in such a position that it is quite impossible to avoid the conclusion that there is something political in it."

Exactly the same sort of argument that has been urged tonight in a stronger form. To that the then leader of the Opposition replied:

"I would have no objection to this proposition, but for this fact: I desire to make a certain proposition to this House and to have it discussed on its own merits, but if I make a separate and independent motion it can always be avoided by a motion for the previous question, or a motion in amendment, giving the go-by to the principle laid down in the resolution, and passing to the order of the day. Anything of this kind can be done; and, therefore, as it is a well known principle that a motion which in no way affects the Government of the day in its terms, as it is not a vote of want of confidence, or censure from any point of view."

I think that description will apply to the present resolution also.

"It is a grievance that should be made on going into Supply, which is the proper constitutional period for making such a motion. I shall then be obliged to move it. I will communicate this resolution to the hon. gentleman, and if he makes any suggestion to alter and amend it, on which we can agree, I shall be most happy to settle the resolution, so that we can have it discussed on its own merits."

Just what the leader of the Opposition is offering to do now in regard to this motion of the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Not at all.

Mr. CASEY. Oh yes. The hon. gentleman's ears are at fault. The leader of the Opposition did offer to consult with him in regard to the terms of this resolution.

"But the hon. gentleman cannot engage for the House that no amendment will be made, even if he and I agree upon a proposition. He cannot control the House, and any member can make a motion which will prevent or intercept the consideration of the constitutional proposition which I desire to make. I, therefore, feel myself bound to move it on going into Supply."

Now, Sir, I fancy my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, is in the same situation as was the then leader of the Opposition, that in order to prevent the possibility of

Mr. CASEY.

intercepting the consideration of the constitutional proposition which he is about to make, he must make it upon going into Committee of Supply. It was contended, at that time, by the present leader of the Government, and no doubt will be contended by him still, that such a motion was not necessarily one of want of confidence. Perhaps a point will be made by him, as was attempted by the Minister of Inland Revenue, out of the notice that was given of the latter's resolution in 1882, and the notice that was given in the Letellier case. Now, Sir, I have quoted the leader of the Government against himself, and I intend to quote the Minister of Inland Revenue against himself. He did give notice of a resolution in 1882, and he did, as he stated this afternoon, obtain the advice of other representative Irishmen in preparing that resolution. He did not follow their advice in every particular, but he did ask the advice of many, and obtained the advice of some; and with their assistance he prepared the resolution, but when it came to be moved in the House we found that it varied materially from the resolution of which he had given notice, and we were just so much worse off instead of being better prepared for the consideration of the question by having had notice of a resolution which was not the one actually proposed. We were not allowed to discuss the notice which had appeared on the paper, but were compelled to discuss another resolution different in many vital particulars. To show you how different they were, I will read a few extracts from both. I have here a volume of the Votes and Proceedings for 1882, and also of the Journals of that year. The first two or three paragraphs do not differ materially, except for the omission of certain words from the third paragraph, casting the responsibility for the existing state of affairs in Ireland upon the Imperial Government. But in the 5th paragraph we found the following words in the notice of motion:

"We should most respectfully pray, may it please Your Majesty that some such form of local self-government may be extended to Ireland, as is now enjoyed by the Provinces comprising this Dominion of Canada, and under which your Majesty's Canadian subjects have prospered exceedingly so that Ireland may become a source of strength to your Majesty's Empire, and that your Majesty's Empire and that your Majesty's Irish subjects, at home and abroad, may feel the same pride in the greatness of your Majesty's Empire, the same veneration for the justice of your Majesty's rule and the same devotion to, and affection for your common flag which are now felt by all classes of your Majesty's loyal subjects in the Dominion."

Substituted for that clause, which was settled with the advice and consent of representative Irishmen in the House, was the following, when the Minister of Inland Revenue came to make his motion:—

"We desire to respectfully to suggest to your Majesty, that Canada and its inhabitants have prospered exceedingly under a Federal system, allowing to each Province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government, and would venture to express a hope that if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured, some means may be found of meeting the express desire of so many of your Irish subjects in that regard, so that Ireland may become a source of strength to your Majesty's Empire, and that your Majesty's Irish subjects, at home and abroad, may feel the same pride in the greatness of your Majesty's Empire."

and so on. Now, there is a great difference between these two. The original clause, which was what these gentlemen who consulted with the hon. member expected he would introduce, asked for the granting of some sort of Federal Government to Ireland; the other merely called attention to the success of Federal Government in Canada, and made a very namby-pamby, weak, wishy-washy suggestion of some concessions to the Irish. Then further. At that time there were certain persons in custody in Ireland under the suspension of *Habeas Corpus*, or the Coercion Act, and the representative Irishmen who consulted with the hon. member agreed that he should propose this:

"We would further respectfully pray that your Majesty would be graciously pleased to take into your Majesty's favorable consideration the cases of those persons who are now suffering imprisonment in