

no direct voice in the legislation of Great Britain, notwithstanding we have a right to venture our counsel and express our views. We have a right respectfully to approach our Sovereign and strengthen the hands of Her Prime Minister whose sentiments are not hostile to reform. We have a right to give the influence of 4,000,000 of British subjects to the redress of grievances too long maintained, to attainment of rights too long denied, and so to enlarge the strength and increase the unity of the mighty Empire of which we form a part.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I can congratulate my hon. friend from Victoria, on the manner in which he introduced the resolution now under consideration. His tone and manner were unexceptionable. With his usual modesty he disclaimed the idea of using any rhetorical artifice. No rhetoric can be so effective in this House or country, as plain, unvarnished statements, such as made by my hon. friend, in the fullness of his heart and in the exercise of his reason; and notwithstanding his overflowing sympathy with his countrymen in Ireland, his speech clearly, loyally and logically forced itself effectively upon the calm consideration of every member. It must have in the House and out of the House, a greater influence than if he had adopted a different and a stronger tone, but this he has always followed in taking up a question of any kind, showing sincerity in his advocacy of any question. He had no sinister object, political or otherwise. But his object, his sole reason for addressing the House was that his proposition, sincerely offered, should be carried out. How different is the appeal, the carefully prepared, the elaborate address of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, spoken, or rather read with great vigor and energy to this House. The object of the one hon. gentleman was quite different from the other. The one wanted to secure the object of his resolution, and the other wished to make political capital. When this resolution was first placed on the notice paper, I am free to confess I looked at them with considerable apprehension of the consequences that might arise from the discussion in this House and Parliament. But in carefully looking at the resolutions even as they were originally prepared, and still more as they have been modified by my hon. friend, I can see no objection in the world, but much good, from an expression of the opinion of this House of Parliament. The hon. member for West Durham speaks disapprovingly, almost sneeringly at the emasculated resolutions—of the changes that have been made in them by my hon. friend. Then again you can see the difference in the objects of the two hon. gentlemen. The mover of these resolutions wished to draw them in such a manner as to attract the strongest, the most united vote of the House, a unanimous vote to secure for them the greatest influence on the converts of England. What does the hon. gentleman opposite care whether Home Rule is carried in Ireland or not? What does he care whether the suspects are kept in gaol for this, or next, or for many years? He would rather there should be a crying grievance that he might address, as he has done to-night, a speech to the Irish Catholics of the Dominion, to produce an effect on their minds, without the most distant care or consideration of the mischievous effects his speech would have in England and with the British Government. What was the object of my hon. friend for Victoria? He knew that he was powerless to force the matter in this Address upon Her Majesty's Government or the Parliament of England, so he desired in the first place that we should, by a moderate, calm statement of the fact that we had good, prosperous Home Rule in Canada, and by the statement that we hoped that as Her Majesty would find it opposed to the disintegration of the Empire, she would grant the same mode of self-government to Ireland as similar to ours as the different circumstances would permit. He asked that as the notion of force with the British Government is out of the question,

Mr. BLAKE.

that we should pass a resolution praying the British Government and Parliament to adopt a somewhat similar system to that which happily prevails in Canada. For that purpose language of presumption must not be used, but language of approbation so far as we could approve of the course of Her Majesty's Government in that direction—but not language of disapprobation. While the hon. gentleman spoke with great laudation of the ability of Mr. Gladstone—an opinion in which every one shares—he has told us that he has withdrawn his confidence from Mr. Gladstone, although two years ago he was the greatest statesman in the world, and now the hon. gentleman tells us that every one of his measures was ineffectual, from one cause or another—one, the Land Act of 1870, being too late, the other, the disendowment of the Irish Church, being inadequate; and last of all, the present land system on which Mr. Gladstone has pledged the standing and status of his Government by a perfunctory measure, which is destined to be as unsuccessful as every other measure has been for the relief of Ireland, and must be followed by more drastic measures. That hon. gentleman holds a position too high in Canada, and holds it deservedly from his great ability, not to warrant us in believing that the words which have fallen from his mouth will be read by the members of the British Government and the House of Commons and generally in England. Mr. Gladstone is human, and, like every leader, is strong in his opinions, and does not receive kindly anything like disapprobation of his measures. When, therefore, this measure goes to England, if it does go, as I hope it will, the commentary will be that all Mr. Gladstone's measures will be failures, because in that one instance they were too late and in the other imperfect; and Mr. Gladstone's Government will not meet with much favor resolutions propounded and carried in that spirit. But they are not and will not be carried in that spirit. The moderate tone, the loyal tone, the beseeching tone of my hon. friend asking for sympathy for his fellow-countrymen, asking for what he considers to be for the good of his country, will be contrasted with the mischief that would be caused by that strong disapprobatory speech of the leader of the Opposition, of all that has been done by English statesmen. It will do much to neutralize it, and I believe that the good sense and moderation and the generous tone that will be adopted in this discussion, will wipe out to a great extent the mischievous and improper language of the hon. gentleman. Suppose that the hon. gentleman had moved these resolutions in the place of my hon. friend from Victoria; suppose that no other person had spoken on that debate but he, and these resolutions had gone home with the hon. gentleman's speech as a commentary, what chance would there be that any attention would be paid to an Address based upon and supported by the one support of a speech like that of the hon. gentleman. Why, they would have been thrown at once to one side, because, on reading through the lines of the hon. gentleman's speech, its object appears to be solely to secure political advantage by keeping up distractions in Canada. The hon. gentleman quoted some portion of my speech in 1869 in sympathy with the motion for the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and says he hopes that since then I have learned something. I approve of every word of my speech, and under the same circumstances, on the same measure, I would take the same course I did in 1869. The measure for the disestablishment of the Anglican Church in Ireland was safe. It had, in effect, passed. It was known it was safe. It required no expression of approbation or sympathy from the people of Canada. That measure was destined for good or evil to become the law of the land. Therefore, the late Sir George Cartier and I objected to the motion because its object was