

they are altogether wrong, that they are acting oppressively, that they are crushing a portion of Her Majesty's subjects and a great portion of the Empire in the Kingdom of Ireland. I would not hesitate, notwithstanding it might injure or prejudice our Canadian interests, to risk injuring or prejudice those interests, if we were called upon to do so with the hope and expectation and belief that our course would be beneficial to Ireland; but, as I have already, perhaps *ad nauseum* stated, it cannot be benefited, and therefore, without any evidence whatever, or with evidence so imperfect that it amounts to no evidence, we are actually quarrelling with Her Majesty's Government, as it were, and injuring ourselves without doing good to anybody else. Before sitting down, I would say, in consequence of a remark from my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) who drew a distinction between Conservatives and Tories, that whether the party was Conservative or Tory—and I think Conservative and Tory mean pretty much the same thing—I would say to that hon. gentleman that he quite misunderstood the line of argument followed by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). My hon. friend stated that because a measure might be adopted by force or by fraud it did not at all follow that that measure was not good in itself and might not produce beneficial results, and he quoted the instance of the Union between Upper and Lower Canada in 1841. That measure was passed without the consent of the people of Lower Canada, and everybody knew that the whole population, or at least the vast majority of Lower Canada, was against the Union. In Upper Canada it was equally unpopular. The hon. gentleman says that the Bill was opposed in Lower Canada because its provisions were unfair and because of the special unfairness in the distribution of representation. Sir, it was most fortunate for the Province of Lower Canada that the provision in that Act, to which they so much objected, was in the Act, and that was that the representation in each Province in the united Parliament should be equal. Then the Province of Lower Canada had a larger population than Upper Canada. No doubt there was, in the first place, opposition against the whole Bill. The majority of Lower Canada was against any union on any terms with the Province of Upper Canada, and they specially objected to the clause providing that the representation of each Province should be equal. But that has been the salvation of Lower Canada. In the course of a few years the population of Upper Canada equalled that of Lower Canada. This was all right, the representation was as it ought to be, but, by-and-bye, the Province of Upper Canada gained on the sister Province; by-and-bye her population became largely in excess of that in Lower Canada, and then the whole Liberal party of Upper Canada, as one man, joined to insist that there should be a majority of representatives from Lower Canada, and the object of that pressure was avowed. It was not secret, it was not hidden. The great leader of the Liberal party of that day, the Hon. George Brown, announced that they insisted upon having a majority of representatives in the united Parliament, because they had a majority of the population, and they declared that it was for the purpose of making French Canada English; for the purpose of forcing English institutions upon their French fellow-subjects; for the purpose of pressing Protestantism upon the people of Upper Canada; for the purpose of doing away with the use of the French language, as the official state language of that part of the country. The whole aim, and end, and object of the whole of the Liberal party, headed by the Hon. George Brown, was to crush out the institutions, the language and the religion of the people of Lower Canada. The people of Lower Canada were protected from this great wrong, this great outrage. Who were they protected by? By the Tories of whom the hon. gentleman has spoken so unfavorably. Why, I, as the exponent of the Conservative Tory minority in Upper

Canada, stood in the breach. Year after year we opposed the wishes of the majority of the people of Canada. We said, no, we will not do so; we accepted with every complacency the Constitution of 1841, when we were inferior in population. We had then an equality in representation, now that we are in a majority we must deal the same mode of justice, we must follow the same system that we claimed for ourselves, and obtained for ourselves, when we were in a minority. Year after year I was cried down, year after year we were in a minority, year after year we were insulted by being called slaves to French domination, year after year we were said to be priest-ridden and yielding to the pressure of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and, therefore, I think the hon. gentleman ought to feel a little more grateful on the part of his countrymen, when he looks back historically and finds that if representation by population was not carried, if there was not a majority of men of the Liberal party in the Parliament of old Canada, sworn as it were, to crush them out in all that they held dear, it was due altogether to the Conservative majority led by the humble individual who now addresses you. This, however, is perhaps an aside, but I thought it right I should speak to this subject as it was introduced by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault). Now, I have read with interest the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), and I must say that it meets my views exactly. I will vote for it with great pleasure. The resolution is:

That this House learns with regret that it is considered necessary to pass a Coercive Bill for Ireland.

It does not state whether that consideration is right or wrong, but it states, what we must all regret, that it is considered necessary to pass a coercive measure for Ireland. Would to God there was no necessity for such legislation, if there be any necessity for any such legislation. Would to God that Ireland, England and Scotland could be governed by the same law, civil and criminal. We can all express our regret that it is considered necessary by Her Majesty's Government in England to pass a coercive measure for Ireland. Then it goes on:

And it reaffirms its conviction, as expressed in the resolutions of 1882 and 1886, that a plan of local government for Ireland which would leave unimpaired the links connecting Ireland with the British Empire and guard the rights of the minority, would be conducive to the prosperity and stability of the Empire.

That is a repetition of motions which I voted for with much pleasure in 1882 and 1886, and I should hope that this House will adopt this amendment. If, however, it is lost, I shall, for the reasons given by the mover, my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) vote for his amendment; and for the reasons I have given now I shall certainly vote against the resolution of my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran.)

Mr. MILLS. I wish to say a few words on the subject of this resolution which has now been proposed for the consideration of this House, and in reply to the very extraordinary speech addressed to the House by the leader of the Government. It will, I am sure, seem very extraordinary to many members of the House who remember the motion which was introduced here in 1882 and the motion which was introduced here in 1886, when they remember the course which the leader of the Government took upon both those motions, to listen to the extraordinary speech the hon. gentleman addressed to the House a few moments ago. In 1882 the hon. gentleman boasted that the resolution of the hon. member who is now Minister of Inland Revenue could not have been carried in the House without his support. He sought to impress upon the friends of Home Rule everywhere throughout the country that he was the friend of Home Rule, and that he had given it his cordial support on that occasion; and last year the hon. gentleman supported a resolution on the