

to throw the apple of discord among the people of Canada. It was moved, simply, for the sake of trying to get a vote that would either irritate the Irish Protestants or the Irish Catholics. The object was so clear that the lamented Sir George Cartier and I joined in saying, by moving the previous question, that we should not express any opinion on that subject, as it could only do mischief by increasing dissensions on a religious question, and could do no possible good. The hon. gentleman says that the conclusion the House came to on that motion that the question be not now put, was not in accordance with the feelings of the majority of the people of Canada. No man is more mistaken than he. You know that the disestablishment of the Anglican Church involved the deprivation of the Anglican Church of all its property, of all its endowments. The two went together, and the whole of the Roman Catholic population of Lower Canada, the whole body of French Canadians who were yet a quasi-established church under the Treaty of Paris, who have got legal rights that cannot be affected, who have got large estates and endowments that are secured to them by the Treaty of Paris, and the arrangements between France and England when this became a British colony, the whole Catholic hierarchy felt that if the representatives voted for a measure of this kind, the next thing they might expect was their disestablishment and disendowment, the taking away of their own property. The whole of the hierarchy and the priesthood of the Roman Catholic laity felt that if they voted for a measure of this kind, praying for the disestablishment and the deprivation of the property of an established church, that if their representatives did that in the Parliament of Canada they might next expect their own disestablishment and disendowment, the robbing and taking away of their own property as a consequence. And so I say now with the same confidence that the people of Canada would say, if a similar question of this kind arose in England, we cannot and ought not to allow this question to be brought up in Canada. That is the ground Sir George Cartier and I took, the plainly sensible ground, and it met with the cordial approval of Parliament; and, Sir, the attempt failed—the wretched attempt to introduce religious dissension amongst us, and God knows we have enough of it, even in this free country—and we heard no more about it. But, Sir, while I say that if that same question, involving the same consequences and the same disturbance of public opinion, were brought up now, I would take the same ground. The question in these resolutions is not a question of that nature. I said a little while ago that the hon. gentleman has voted want of confidence in Mr. Gladstone, certainly he has no want of confidence in himself. The hon. gentleman says that he disapproves altogether of what Mr. Gladstone did. He read a paragraph of his speech made the other day, and said he was wrong, that it was a fatal error—unhappy man that he was in not having the hon. gentleman opposite at his elbow to advise him—when Mr. Gladstone said, and he still adheres to that opinion—that when parties proclaim they have a grievance and desire to have it redressed, the grievance being admitted, the answer is this: “Well, you claim you have been aggrieved, what remedy do you propose?” That is what Mr. Gladstone said, and what any man of common sense would say. But it does not meet the views of the hon. gentleman, and he pooh-poohs, he sneers at the weakness, the folly, the want of statesmanlike wisdom in Mr. Gladstone, because he says: “Well, if you want a thing tell us what you do want.” Sir, I said before that at first I looked with apprehension upon the consequences of these resolutions, but I think they can do no harm—they may do much good. In the first place, they are based on the one single object of doing good to Ireland by their effect on the British Government in legislation for Ireland, and that is a businesslike foundation. The hon.

gentleman is kind enough to approve the motion. It says, and truly, that we do not get a fair proportion of the emigration from Ireland. That is an unfortunate fact. It states that these fellow-subjects of ours, the strength of the Empire, are going to a foreign nation, and it may be, in the course of events, a hostile nation. It states that fact, and it regrets it, it regrets it on the best grounds, because while we can improve the condition of the distressed who come to this country, at the same time it adds to the strength of the Dominion, and if it adds to the strength of the Dominion it *pro tanto* adds to the strength of the Empire. This is a proper ground, the ground of self-interest, the interest we have in having peace, prosperity and satisfaction restored to Ireland, and a position of unity and affection restored between Her Majesty and Her advisers and the population of Ireland. Then, that basis being laid down, the resolution goes on and asks a favor of the British Government. The hon. gentleman who moves the resolution has no selfish object, he does not desire to raise himself at the expense of the Irish people in Ireland, to raise himself up as a great leader among the Irish in the Dominion, not desiring to make political capital out of it, not desiring to place himself at the head of a popular movement amongst his countrymen here, nor with a single mind to carry out the object of his address. Above all things he assures Her Majesty and the people of Ireland, that the Irish people in Canada are happy, contented and loyal subjects of Her Majesty, as desirous, as we are, to remain under Her beneficent rule, as ready as we are and others are, not of that race, to shed our blood in defence of the old flag which is alluded to expressly in the resolution, and if need be on our soil in Canada, in America, to renew the glories which Irishmen have earned on every field of battle where Englishmen have been martialled against a foreign foe. The hon. gentleman might have made himself a popular demagogue, he might have pursued the same political objects which moved the hon. gentleman opposite with scarcely a disguise, not a thin veil to hide the nakedness of that object—he might have raised himself up as a demagogue and might have ranged his countrymen under him to take extreme measures in the politics of Canada. But my hon. friend desired that one thing, and Sir, he will succeed, notwithstanding the speech of the hon. gentleman which, I dare say, may have disinclined many hon. gentlemen in this House who have heard him to vote for this resolution, who without that speech, might perhaps have had no hesitation. I hope and believe that these resolutions will be adopted by this House; I hope that Ireland will in some way be advantaged. How we cannot see, how we do not venture to dictate, how it would be folly in us to dictate, not having the same infallible confidence in our own opinion as the hon. gentleman, not having the same ability to settle the whole question. But we hope it will be settled in some way to the benefit of Ireland, and consistent with the integrity of the British Empire, but so that the Irish people may be governed according to their own wishes, and governed by Irishmen so far as is consistent with our common good and the integrity of the whole Empire. It is easy to see the difference between a demagogic speech and a patriotic speech. My hon. friend, in his resolution, asks for Home Rule in Ireland in so far as is consistent with the interests and well-being of the Empire, that the rights of the minority shall be fully protected and secured. My hon. friend is an Irish Catholic. From his great ability and long parliamentary experience, and from the general sense of his political and personal honesty he stands high among his countrymen, and yet he knows he is more than an Irish Catholic; he is an Irishman and he desires the happiness and peace of all Ireland. He knows that there is a powerful and wealthy and intelligent minority, and he, a Catholic, asks that the Protestant minority, as Gladstone asks, that