

out of the 211 members of this House; and that circumstance affrayed him from the enterprise. Well, we are glad to know that. In whatever quarter the hon. gentleman apprehended those three or four dissentients resided, it was not on this side, for he asked none of us our opinion on the subject; and we have tolerably well learned already, in the course of this debate, where it was the hon. gentleman found that the dissent existed. We have heard it from the outspoken utterances of some; we have heard it from the more veiled utterances of others; we know it was in the house of the hon. gentleman's own friends; and because there were three or four of his own supporters who disapproved of the measure, he chose—and that is his defence to the people of Canada—he chose to determine that no resolution ought to be moved here. But the hon. gentleman said: There was another reason; it is a useless thing to do in view of the circumstances of the former address, as well as a dangerous thing, because the new work could not be so thoroughly accomplished as the old. It was useless, although this was a new House; useless, although the conditions had changed so much between that time and this! I believe the feeling in Canada has changed; but my belief is that there has been a growing feeling in favor of Home Rule in Canada, and that feeling is very much stronger to-day than it was in 1882; and certainly that is not a change which should affright us who favor Home Rule from endeavoring to obtain the views of the representatives of the people on the subject. But there is another circumstance. The time is critical. Read the cabled reports in the newspapers of the impressions of the leading organs of public opinion and of those who take most interest in following public measures, and you find it impossible to say what the fate of the principle of Home Rule—because that is what Mr. Gladstone says he holds to be at stake on the second reading of the Bill—is to be; and, Sir, if there was no reason why some further action should be taken to-day by those who acted before, I want to know why the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue telegraphed to Mr. Parnell that he and the Irish members of this House still abided by that address. He gave Mr. Parnell that encouraging and flattering assurance, that assurance so calculated to cheer and elevate his mind, that the Irish Catholic members were really still true to Home Rule! What was the inference to be drawn from that message? Why, the inference was that of the other members he could not say the same. What other inference can you draw? He says to Mr. Parnell that the Irish members, by which I understand him to mean the Irish members of his own creed—nay, those of them who sit on his own side of the House—are of the same opinion as before. He treats it as an Irish Catholic question, as the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) treated it—

Mr. CURRAN. I beg your pardon, Sir. I did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; and so treating it, they got together a body of gentlemen from the Senate and the House of Commons who are Irish Catholics—no, not the Irish Catholics, but the Tory Irish Catholics. Did the hon. gentleman invite Senator Power to that meeting? Did he invite Senator Scott? Were they there? Did they take part in it? No; the Irish Tory Catholic clique meet together, in a little assembly, and they say, this is so purely an Irish Catholic question, and a Tory Irish Catholic question, that we alone are to decide whether a resolution is safe, or prudent, or advantageous to be introduced into the House. Sir, if there be a step which is calculated to prejudice the cause of Home Rule at home or abroad, so far as we can do it, it is this treatment of it by hon. gentlemen in the hon. member's position as an Irish Catholic question—as if it was not a general question in which all lovers of liberty throughout the world have an equal interest.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. HESSON. Where are the Irish Catholics on your side?

Mr. BLAKE. I have mentioned two Irish Catholics on my side of politics, members of Parliament, whom the hon. gentleman did not consult.

Mr. HESSON. Not members of this House.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say members of this House; I said members of Parliament. Now, Sir, I ask what inference must be drawn from the state of things to which I have referred. In 1882 an address passed unanimously by the Commons of Canada in favor of Home Rule. In 1886, the question being in a critical condition, in which the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue feels it necessary that something should be said on behalf of some portion of the Commons of Canada on the subject, to show that they are still true to the views they formerly expressed, he despatches his utterance on behalf of the Irish members of the Parliament of Canada. Now, here is the contrast that would be drawn. The enemies of the cause would say: Oh, in 1882, the Canadian Parliament, unanimously in the Commons and by a very large majority in the Senate, passed resolutions in favor of Home Rule. In 1886 a Minister of the Crown, the same Irish Catholic who moved before, is afraid to move a resolution in favor of Home Rule, and he sends forward, forsooth, his own cable despatch to Mr. Parnell, which is to be taken as equivalent to the voice of the Commons of Canada. No, it could not be equivalent. Is it a substitute? No, but it is a declaration by inference, that the other members of this House, beyond those for whom the hon. gentleman, by what authority I do not pretend to say, chose to speak, would not say what he said. I ask, did he apply to any of them to allow him to speak for a larger constituency than those for whom he assumed to speak? If he did, what answer did he get which discouraged him from speaking for more? That is the position in which the hon. gentleman's action put the question, so that the enemies of Home Rule could say: Canada will no longer speak in favor of that measure, and the best proof of that is, that the Minister who moved the resolution in 1882, does not move another resolution to-day, and does not profess to aver that the Canadian Parliament believes as it did then. Now we know the reason. The hon. gentleman stated it would be a dangerous thing to move again, because there would be some dissent, although he limits the dissentients to three or four. Again, the hon. gentleman says: "Oh, then, there is the difficulty about the form of another address which deterred me;" but still that does not appear to have been a very serious difficulty, because the hon. gentleman has found another form which gets rid of that difficulty to-night, so that that could not have prevented him from earlier action, unless his wit has been spurred by the exigencies of the last day or two, and his zeal for the Irish cause was not sufficiently potent to enable him to find out what, under the pressure of necessity, which we all know is a powerful lever, he has since ascertained. He has proposed a method, he says, of getting over the difficulty. But circumstances now differ. We are not, under my motion, now doing what Lord Kimberley, unadvisedly, in my opinion, told us in effect we ought not to do; we are not now tendering advice to Her Majesty's Ministers as to the policy they ought to accomplish; but we propose to cheer and encourage them on in the course they have declared they will pursue. We are not offering advice, but we are adding the moral force and support of this House to them, to aid them in the course they are themselves pursuing.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I hope it won't.

Mr. BLAKE. Ah! there is one of the dissentients.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I have always been one.