

infamy a new form of government on a reluctant and protesting nation, has vitiated the whole course of Irish opinion." We believe that much of the discontent has had its origin there, that Ireland was deprived of her Legislature against her own will at that particular time and through means which were unfair. Is it to be wondered at that the memories of bye-gone wrongs and the recollection of former greatness should be a constant source of humiliation and irritation to a people who are imbued with a strong feeling of national pride? In legislating for any people, it is the duty of the statesmen to take into consideration the character of the people for whom the legislation is proposed, and we believe that Ireland has been governed since that time by English ideas and without a proper study of the Irish character. There have been so many quarrels on this account in Ireland, that her people have obtained a reputation abroad as a quarrelsome nation. This reminds me of the Irishman who landed in New York about the time of a political campaign, and who, when asked what his politics were, said: "I am agin the Government anyhow, and I have no politics." That does not apply to the people generally. We find that everyone is ready to acknowledge—and Irishmen are pretty well represented on this side of the House as well as on the other, and we wish they were more on this side of the House—that the Irish character is that of a most genial spirit and nature, accompanied with the tenderest of passions, but as the plant of delicate and luxurious growth nipped by the frost completely dies, so in this case whatever loyalty may have existed in the hearts of Irishmen may possibly be destroyed by this kind of oppression. When Ireland has asked for freedom she has received a tightening of the chains; when coercion has failed it was said to be because the measure was not coercive enough. An objection is raised on the question of the separation of Ireland, but that has been already answered. I do not think that anyone in this House would believe that the Irish people would wish to be separated from England. Their interests are with the Mother Country, and they hope to remain in connection with it. Another great objection, and the strongest, seems to be Catholic domination. In other Catholic countries, in France and in Austria, where Catholics predominate, we see there is no such thing. Why then should this predominance of Catholics affect Irishmen more than any others? We notice that the domination of catholicism and the downfall of protestantism seems to have a peculiar history. The ebb and flow of this cry seems to accord with the vicissitudes of the great Tory party. We are aware that the Conservative or Tory party in England at present owe their term of office to this feeling and this fear which exists, with the support of a few traitors who have deserted their post and swallowed their principles and betrayed their party in order to gratify an insatiable ambition. Lord Hartington also accuses Mr. Gladstone of frequently changing his mind. Sir, I admire a man who changes his mind according to his own convictions, and so expresses himself. It is said that a wise man changes his mind once in a while, but a fool never. Lord Hartington says again, that there is a revolutionary party which must first be overthrown. Well, all the speeches which we have heard from hon. gentlemen who oppose the resolution of the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) seem to take it for granted, as was stated by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), that the minority would not submit to Home Rule if it were granted. Then it is the minority which is the revolutionary party; which is to become disloyal. Those who are in favor of Home Rule have never yet said that they would not continue loyal to the British Crown, although it may be doubtful—the time may come when patience ceases to be a virtue. I think that the Irish people have exercised a vast amount of patience. They have been more peaceable than we could have hoped, and I trust that in the future they will be obedient

and submissive and avoid any bloodshed or rebellion. It is said by an eminent historian that rebellion is never raised for motives of aggression, but it has always arisen from long and unendurable oppression. It is quite consistent for the Tory party, especially in this country, to maintain that there is no possibility of anyone being loyal except themselves. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Mc Carthy) in speaking on this question referred amidst the lively cheering of his friends, to the legislation of 1877, by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and the object of which has been fully explained to-night, and fully defended. I will not discuss the merits of that legislation, but I must say that the hon. member for North Simcoe, in bringing that forward, had recourse to a far-fetched argument. He said what was fair for the goose was fair for the gander, and I presume you will allow me to use the same argument. But I will not go back any farther than 1882. He is referring to that legislation as radical and objectionable. Why, Sir, we will take the Gerrymander Act of 1882, the Franchise Bill of 1885, and I say there is no act on the Statute-book that is so tyrannical in principle and so cowardly in purpose.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BRIEN. I presume that those hon. gentlemen find my remarks distasteful. You know that if you give food to children which they are not accustomed to, it is liable to make them sick. These hon. gentlemen seem to be displeased, I presume, because I am a new member with not much parliamentary experience, and I am very likely to tell the truth, and the whole truth, and that is what they do not like. But I wish to notice a remark made the other day by the Minister of Inland Revenue who was trying to conciliate the action of himself and his friends last year, and make it in accordance with the feeling of those who are anxious for Home Rule. The hon. gentleman was referring to his vote last Session on the Home Rule resolutions. Well, I have an article here from the *Irish Canadian* newspaper, supposed to be written by the editor of that paper. The article, by which he tried to show that his action was in accordance with the Irish people, was not an editorial which appeared before the true state of affairs were made known. A letter had appeared in the *Irish Canadian* by Mr. Jas. Brady, in which the writer stated that Mr. O'Brien, when passing through St. Thomas, Ont., on his way to the Chicago Convention, had told Father Flannery that it was a great misfortune that Mr. Blake's resolution, as first introduced, had not passed. The veracity of this statement having been in question, Mr. Brady wrote to Father Flannery. Here is the latter's on testimony:

"St. THOMAS, 18th September.

"JAMES BRADY, Esq.,
"Ingersoll.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to yours of the 14th inst., requesting me to state in writing what I told you of the conversation I had with Mr. Wm. O'Brien, ex-M.P., of Tyrone, on the railway platform here, I have merely to reiterate the statement that, in my presence and the hearing of Dr. Wilson, M.P., and of many others, Mr. O'Brien said: 'It was a very great pity and misfortune the resolution, as introduced by Mr. Edward Blake, did not pass the House of Commons of Canada, as it would have strengthened our hands very materially in the Home Rule debate.'

"I am, dear Sir,

"Yours very respectfully,
"W. F. FLANNERY, P.P."

Justin McCarthy, speaking at Toronto on 24th November last, said:

"I thank my friend, Mr. Blake, for the manner in which he has spoken out for Home Rule, and we know that this is not the first time he has given his eloquence and his earnestness and his influence to champion that cause, and that at a time when it had far fewer supporters than it is lucky enough to have at present."

Mr. Michael Davitt, speaking at Montreal on 26th November last, said:

"You will understand that I stand here on non-political grounds, recognising neither parties (hear, hear), but I can assure you that the