

critical moment. That resolution passed unanimously, and was forwarded to Her Majesty. What was the answer of Mr. Gladstone? He said: Mind your own business; we are willing to take your advice on all matters connected with Canada, but on all Imperial affairs we can only consult the Imperial authority. He did not receive our address graciously, but now, owing to the skilful manner in which the agitation for Home Rule has been conducted by Mr. Parnell and his coadjutors, Mr. Gladstone is forced, by political exigencies, and not because of any strong feeling on his part for the Irish people, to introduce his measure. He has introduced it, mainly because he believed that Mr. Parnell would eventually force Home Rule on the Parliament of Britain, and that it was necessary to anticipate such an event. Believing that the resolution in 1882 was sent at a time when it would do the most benefit, I arrived at the conclusion, on consultation with other gentlemen of Irish extraction in this Parliament, that we should rest our record on that. We had there before the British Government the resolution of 1882, showing that the people of Canada were strongly in favor of Home Rule, and as no action has been taken since then, as our resolution has remained uncontradicted, we consider it was in the interests of Ireland that no resolution should now be introduced, which would not meet with unanimous support, as, instead of strengthening Mr. Gladstone's hands, such resolution would have a depressing effect. It was rather astonishing to find, the other evening, that the leader of the Opposition had introduced his motion as an amendment to go into Supply, and then compared his resolution with that of 1882. I maintain there is no comparison whatever. The Minister of Inland Revenue gave full notice of his resolution.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. HACKETT. The notice was considered sufficient.

Mr. MILLS. No, it was changed and another motion brought in.

Mr. HACKETT. Well, the motion affirmed the principle of Home Rule, and hon. gentlemen were fully aware it would be brought. It was found that owing to the business of the Session, it would be impossible to reach the motion in due course, and the right hon. the leader of the Government consented to allow the hon. gentleman to move it in amendment to Supply; but the leader of the Opposition introduced his resolution without giving notice. No hon. gentleman on this side had any intimation that the resolution would be introduced, but the hon. gentlemen asked: Why did not we consult with the Irish members of the Opposition. My experience of those gentlemen would not lead me to consult them on a matter of this kind. In 1882, when the Minister of Inland Revenue, in his zeal for the Irish cause, invited leading gentlemen on that side to meet him and discuss the matter, a meeting was held at which it was decided to appoint a committee composed of hon. gentlemen on both sides who would wait on the right hon. the leader of the Government and the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and endeavor to obtain their support to a resolution in favor of Home Rule. To our great surprise, when the committee was named, a prominent gentleman on that side, Mr. Anglin, who was placed on the committee said: I will have nothing further to do with you, and walked out of the room. That was the way a leading Irishman, who should have taken an active part in introducing the measure, acted. After being appointed to the committee to wait upon the leader of both great parties, the hon. gentleman would not consent to anything of the kind, and walked out of the room, leaving there gentlemen of less experience, and ability to endeavor, as best they could, to carry through this important resolution. Therefore I say the experience we had on that occasion would not lead

Mr. HACKETT.

us again to consult those hon. gentlemen on matters of so important a character. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue should have spoken now, that he should not have spoken before. Of course in that he was only repeating what was said by his leader. I say the time the resolution was sent over in 1882 was the most important time, that now when the victory is almost won, now at the very threshold of success, after they have been battling and contending with the great powers they had to contend against in Ireland, those gentlemen who have succeeded in obtaining this for Ireland, though we should congratulate them upon their great success, still 1882 was the time when they needed help and not now when they have almost obtained victory. Therefore, though the hon. gentleman is quite correct in that statement, that these resolutions may have a good effect, and may in some way strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone, the time to fight for liberty is not after the fetters have been struck off the feet of the slave; it is not then that you are to come forward to support him; the time to support him is when he is down, when he is struggling for liberty, and not when he has obtained it. The hon. gentlemen in opposition, pretend now to be very strongly in favor of Home Rule for Ireland; but during the five years they were in power what was done? Did they introduce a resolution in favor of Home Rule? Was not this question as important then as it is now? Did not Parnell in 1876, and Biggar, and those men who were contending with him at that time, and Mr. Butt, who was then the leader of the Home Rule movement, want that moral support from the people of Canada, and the whole world, that Gladstone wants now? Yes, they did. Those were the dark days, when every man in Ireland was struggling against the greatest odds. Those were the days when some support should have been given to them by the people of Canada. But during the five years that they were in power there was not one word about Home Rule; not one word in the Parliament of Canada to encourage those brave men who were fighting for Home Rule. But now they are boiling over with enthusiasm in favor of Home Rule, they are bursting with their fervor for Home Rule, after they see that Parnell and the men who co-operated with him have almost achieved success, when a measure has been introduced into the Imperial Parliament which will probably be carried through, although in its present shape it is not such a measure as I would care to see; because, I think, if the Irish people are not represented at Westminster, they are deprived of their representation in matters of great importance affecting their interests; and I hope to see before the Bill becomes law that it will be amended in that respect. I do not know that I need continue this subject further than to pass a remark on what was said by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). He spoke with great warmth, and I have no doubt with great sincerity. He said that no Protestant in Ireland was actually in favor of Home Rule. He must have read history astray. Is not Mr. Parnell a Protestant, as good a Protestant probably as the hon. member? Is he not the apostle of Home Rule in Ireland at this time? Is not Mr. Justin McCarthy a Protestant, and are not others of those who are battling for Home Rule in Ireland at this time, and fighting the battle with such great success, Protestants? They are Protestants, and it is for that reason that Irish Catholics should stand by them. There is, of course, a very respectable minority in Ireland opposed to Home Rule, but it is hoped and believed that this measure will afford to these people the same protection in their rights and privileges as is afforded to the minority in Quebec and to the minority in Ontario. It is a part of our Federal Government that could be very fairly put in force, and, with these amendments, I am sure that those people in the north of Ireland who are now opposed to Home Rule will be reconciled to it and will see eventually