

I feared the defeat of the resolution. I deny ever having made such a statement. I entertain no such fear. I am quite satisfied that the Parliament of Canada, that the representative men in this country are always ready and willing to give an expression consistent with the privileges and the constitution under which we live, and that there is no man in Canada who would not be willing to see his fellow-men in any part of the globe enjoying the privileges of free and self-government which we enjoy in Canada. I did say, however, that, as we could not expect to get Parliament to give a stronger expression of opinion, what would be the object of introducing the question again, when the risk might be to get a weaker expression of opinion. I did not say that the question would be defeated. I did not entertain such a belief at all, but it is possible that some division might take place, that some one man or some two members, or three or four, if you will, might differ from the views taken by the majority of the House of Commons on that occasion, and therefore, to that extent, the expression would be that much weakened. I am not on this occasion going to make any allusions, or to impute motives either to the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution or to those gentlemen who, outside, have suggested that it should be moved. I am simply going to take the ground that I intend to discharge my duty faithfully and honestly in the interests of the country, and with a due regard to the expectations that my countrymen entertain of the manner in which I should discharge my duty here. I know that my motives have already been attacked; I must submit to that. I will not retaliate at present. I will confine myself particularly to the duty that I think devolves upon me now. That duty is, while I take the same ground that I took before, while I say I would not be responsible for bringing this question again before Parliament for the reasons I gave, that Parliament can give no stronger expression than it generously gave before, to see, as far as I can, now that it is forced upon Parliament, as a believer in the free institutions of this country, and one anxious and willing that those free institutions should be extended to our fellow-countrymen in Ireland, that no adverse vote shall be recorded on this question, no matter who is responsible for it. With that view, I propose to move an amendment to the motion placed in your hand by the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat. Before I do that, I must also give another ground which I stated at a very early stage when discussing this question with some friends outside. I stated that, in view of the reception with which the respectful Message sent by the Parliament of this country to Her Majesty met at the hands of the Government then, by the reply given by the Earl of Kimberley, I did not think it would be right to ask this Parliament to move another Address in view of the reply given at that time. Nor do I believe that, so far as that particular phase of the question is concerned, if it be brought in as an evidence of sympathy with our people, that our people care little in what form that Address shall come. All they want is an assurance that the Parliament of this country sympathise with their fellow-countrymen in Ireland in their efforts to obtain the rights which, as I said before, we prize so highly in this country. I, therefore, beg leave to move in amendment to the motion, seconded by Sir Hector Langevin:

That all the words after "That" be struck out, and the following added instead thereof:—the Commons of Canada desire to express their deep and abiding interest in the prosperity and happiness of their fellow-subjects in Ireland, and their adhesion to the sentiments expressed in the Joint Address to Her Majesty of both Houses of the Canadian Parliament passed in the Session of 1882;

That in such Address Parliament suggested that Canada and its inhabitants had prospered exceedingly under a Federal system, allowing to each Province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government, and expressed a hope 'that if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority were fully protected and secured, some means might be found of meeting the expressed desires of so many of Her Majesty's Irish subjects in that regard.'

That in answer to the said Address the then Secretary of State for the Colonies was commanded to state that "Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the Parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs, but with respect to the questions referred to in the Address Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the Imperial Parliament and Ministers, to whom all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain."

That this House, having reference to the tenor of the said answer, does not deem it expedient again to address Her Majesty on the subject, but earnestly hopes that such a measure or such measures may be adopted by the Imperial Parliament as will, while preserving the integrity and well-being of the Empire and the rights and status of the minority, be satisfactory to the people of Ireland, and permanently remove the discontent so long unhappily prevailing in that country.

Before resuming my seat, I would ask the privilege of adding a few words. I think, if the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution now before the House, to which this is an amendment, will consider this matter, he will acknowledge that the amendment will cover the grounds as well as his resolution, with the exception that it does not propose an Address to Her Majesty. I do not think that it will be asking the hon. gentleman to make too great a sacrifice if I say that I think he would do well to give his support even to the amendment, in order that it may have that strength which a united action alone can give it in its passage through this House. The hon. gentleman may object, on the ground that he still prefers the terms of his own resolution; but he must remember also, that, on a former occasion, when I moved the resolutions of 1882, he then found fault with their terms, as did many of his friends, and stated that they had been mutilated—in fact, emasculated, so that they were almost worthless. The hon. gentleman, the other day, in alluding to those resolutions, stated that on that occasion Parliament spoke, and spoke loudly. I think it did; I think it spoke loud enough, and I think that all reasonable-minded men will be satisfied if Parliament speaks in the same terms to-day. The fact of the resolutions being mutilated or emasculated did not prove that they were not the wisest that could have been submitted to the House. The object was to carry such resolutions as would embody the principles that we advocated at that time, and those resolutions did clearly embody those principles. They secured the most important end—they secured the unanimous support of that House, and the almost unanimous support of the Senate. More than that: after the action of Parliament had become known to the representative Irishmen on the other side of the water, those who, I suppose, were as deeply interested in this question as any man in this country can be, the Irish representatives in the Imperial Parliament at that time, met and returned a vote of thanks—not to the political leader of the Conservative party, not to the political leader of the Liberal party, not to the mover or seconder of the resolutions, but they returned their sincere thanks to the Parliament of Canada for passing an Address which they considered the most important step that had been taken outside of the United Kingdom. With these remarks I will take my seat, earnestly hoping that this amendment, being a repetition of the sentiments expressed, and which were so acceptable to the people of this country in 1882, may be acceptable to the House now, and that it may pass now with the same unanimity that the resolutions did on that occasion.

Mr. CASEY. I have heard the remarks which have fallen from the Minister of Inland Revenue with regret that he should have seen fit to adopt the course he has taken. He adheres to his former argument, the argument which he said he used in speaking to the deputation which asked him to take charge of a measure of this kind: first, that the former expression of opinion was sufficient; and, next, that it was not prudent to bring it up now because he feared, not the defeat of the motion, but a less unanimous expression of opinion than that formerly given. He said: "Why should we bring it up now, why renew it? Was not the