

it is liable to be amended, and all that the member for Muskoka has objected to in that respect—and that is the principal objection he used to the measure—is likely to be amended so that Irishmen will represent Ireland in the Imperial Parliament. The hearts of the Old Country people in this country and the hearts of the Canadians in this country go up in fervid accord, a united people in this country outside of this House, in hoping that Gladstone may be sustained and that his arms may be strengthened so that he may be enabled to give to Ireland what she has asked for many years past. It is the desire of every patriotic man in this House that the wrongs under which Ireland has suffered shall be redressed, that the landlordism that has existed and that has oppressed the poor tenants in that country shall be done away with, that eviction and coercious of every kind shall be taken away from the law that governs Ireland, and Ireland shall yet be free, shall have her own Parliament, shall make her own laws, shall have her own Home Rule in effect. Well, this is natural, that we should sympathise with the distinguished statesman who has brought in this measure, a measure which, by reason of the traditions, by reason of those conditions that have existed in the hearts of other parts of the British Empire—traditions that have been formed, prejudices that have been grounded in the people—has met with much opposition; but it is the desire of true Canadians and true Britons that Ireland may receive that measure of justice which she has clamored for, which she has demanded, and which she has a right to expect. Are the Irish people, because they ask liberty, to be stamped out as rebels? Are the Canadians who desire a change in our constitution to be said to be rebels? Are those who are now in this country seeking a change in our constitution and desiring Imperial Federation rebels? The First Minister himself is advocating radical changes in the constitution of this country, and for that is he a rebel? And is Mr. Gladstone, when he is redressing wrongs, stamping out injuries which have existed for centuries in Ireland, not deserving the support, the united support of this Parliament in the most important dependency of the British Empire, supposed to be represented by those who are true to the parent stem from whence we sprung? Now, Sir, in reference to the resolution introduced here some years ago, strongly as I felt that the wrongs of Ireland should be redressed, I saw that there was no practicable measure before the Imperial Parliament, and I thought it was inexpedient to introduce the question here, it appeared to me to be devised for the purpose of securing popularity to those who introduced it. It would not look to be a sincere and an honest thing. But to-day, when there is a practicable scheme, we see the author of the resolution in 1882 now shrinking from enforcing the principles he professes to admire. The member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) says he is a Home Ruler, and to-day he fears to urge this measure lest it might do some harm in one quarter or another. If the hon. gentleman was sincere in his efforts then for Home Rule and liberty to Ireland, he should be more so now, when there is a reasonable probability that the wrongs under which Ireland has labored so long are about to be redressed by the Liberal and enlightened measure of the distinguished statesman of Great Britain. When the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) spoke on that measure, he made a speech that will cause his name to live wherever the English language is spoken for all time to come. He based his speech on a broad and liberal platform, and it was characterised by that broad view which he brings to bear upon every question, and showed that he had made such an elaborate research into the affairs of Ireland, that it has endeared me to that hon. gentleman with stronger ties than ever I felt before. Well, Sir, the Minister of Inland Revenue was not in the Government then: He was then a humble follower, a private in

Mr. LANDERKIN.

the ranks. He introduced this resolution, and shortly afterwards, he entered the Government. Now, he thinks that all this should cease, that there is no necessity now for this House endeavoring to strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone and his Government, in the face of the opposition they meet with. At that time, there was no practical scheme before the British Parliament for the amelioration of the condition of Ireland, and yet that hon. gentleman moved the resolution. His utterances, to-day, give me an idea that he is not sincere, and that so soon as that gentleman got into office, the wrongs that had cried out for redress for a century, might continue to cry so long as that hon. gentleman enjoyed the spoils of office. Does it not look like that? So soon as he was transferred from the ranks into the Government, to use the words of one of Ireland's poets:

"He forgot the dust from whence he grew,
And thinks himself—the Lord knows who."

Now, that is the difference caused by the sweets of office, and it is a lamentable thing. I am glad the hon. gentleman is not entirely Irish. I would hate to see an Irishman give up the struggle for Ireland so long as a single wrong remained unredressed, and it is my great consolation to know that the Minister of Inland Revenue is not truly an Irishman, for otherwise he would not allow the charms of office, with the emoluments of office, to make him forget the wrongs that have cried out for redress so long. Now, Sir, Mr. Gladstone's scheme is capable of amendment. Mr. Gladstone indicates that it may be amended in committee, and that the principle of representation without taxation shall not be maintained. There is not an hon. gentleman opposite who should oppose the measure upon that ground. They have taxed the people in the North-West from year to year without representation. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), opposes that. The hon. member supports a Government that allowed that condition of things to exist until it bred rebellion in that country, and still he had not a single word to say against the Government that permitted that system. And here he condemns Mr. Gladstone, who has since stated, and other distinguished members of his Government have stated, that modifications may be made in order to meet the wishes of the people of Great Britain and Ireland. Now, Sir, when a society sent a deputation to wait on the Minister of Inland Revenue, he told them that it would be injudicious to introduce this measure now.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, I did not. If the hon. gentleman had been in the House he would have heard me correct that statement made by the newspapers. I made no such statement.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have just read it in the *Ottawa Citizen*, and that is the excuse given. I did not hear him deny that he had made that statement. Then if he had not this good excuse, in heaven's name, what excuse had he? What other excuse could he bring, when the wrongs of Ireland had gone on unredressed so long? If he had had the virtue of clinging to that excuse I would have given him some credit, but now he has taken away all the merit he might have, and has no other reason to offer than the fact that he is now in office and that it might possibly hurt the Government if he went on with it. Then the Government are responsible for what he did. He thinks this is extraordinary statesmanship, endorsed, no doubt, by the Premier, and the Minister of Public Works who seconded his amendment. They sent a telegram to Mr. Parnell. Parnell is not introducing this measure. Why not send it to Mr. Gladstone? If they do not desire to give it a party significance, why not approach the foot of the Throne? If ever the First Minister grows eloquent it is when he talks about the "foot of the Throne." I wonder why he did not lay this grievance at the foot of the Throne,