

not say that after all the experiences we have had, after all the experiences we have had ourselves as a confederacy, we are not in a position to go further than simply confirm what we did in 1882. We have had ourselves four years more experience. We enjoy a measure of home rule, which has been a real advantage. It is conceded by each of the Provinces, notwithstanding unfortunate interferences that have taken place between the Dominion Government and the Provinces from time to time, that our condition is better than it was prior to Confederation. Well, then, after having those experiences, and after having seen what we have seen in regard to Ireland, are we not in a position to go further than to re-affirm what we did in 1882. I think we ought to be able to go further, and we are not discharging our duty as fellow-subjects with the people of Ireland if we are not prepared to do so. I would ask if the statesmen of England are not holding different opinions to-day to what they did in 1882. Are not the public men who were hostile to Home Rule then, who characterised it as breaking up the empire and even worse, admitting that some change is necessary? Is Mr. Gladstone of the same mind to-day as he was four years ago? He is not. He has come to the conclusion that the change is necessary. We have been eye-witnesses of those experiences in Ireland, and if we are not in a position to go further than simply confirm what we did in 1882 we have not been sensible of the incidents that have transpired in the meantime and not been faithful observers of what has passed before our eyes. I contend that we should go even further than the resolution itself. If the amendment had added force to the resolution it should have been seriously considered. I must again express regret that the question has not been approached in a spirit of liberality and fairness by hon. gentlemen opposite. I am sorry to think that little political bitternesses should influence members on this great question and should interfere with the decision of this House with respect to it. Simply because hon. gentlemen opposite think the leader of the Opposition might make a little capital out of this question, they interfere and actually risk the chance of reaching a conclusion on it such as would be satisfactory to our friends on the other side of the water and such as would in some measure strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone. I hope, whatever bitterness may have characterised the discussions so far, we will abandon those little political bickerings and deal with the question fairly, and let us get over the matter with that measure of credit to ourselves which we should like to claim. We may contend about our own political questions, but when a subject of this kind affecting a portion of the Empire is brought forward we should be able to bury our political differences and deal with it in a spirit of generosity, kindness and British fair play. Holding that feeling; and being deirous as an Irishman to do everything in my power to aid the efforts being put forth by Mr. Gladstone in favor of Home Rule, I beg to move in amendment to the amendment:

To leave out all the words in the amendment after "that" and insert the following words in addition thereto, after the word "adhesion:"

And that this House is confirmed and strengthened by the events which have occurred since the passage of the said address in its convictions that the true interests both of Ireland and the rest of the Empire will be served in the highest degree by the granting of Home Rule to Ireland.

Mr. BURNS. I am afraid, notwithstanding all the professions made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that his actions are not entirely uninfluenced by party considerations. The whole tenor and temper of the speech of the hon. gentleman could only leave the impression on one's mind that political considerations were largely at the bottom of his action and statements. I shall not in any way try to disprove what the hon. gentleman has stated, when he said he was actuated by the desire to secure as far as possible the passage of some measure which would

Mr. McMULLEN.

go to strengthen the hands of those who are now endeavoring to strike the chains from off the feet of Ireland; but while giving him credit for being influenced by that motive, I cannot divest myself of the idea that within and behind there are also political considerations. The observations which he addressed to the House can leave no other impression on my mind, and because that impression is on my mind, I must so express myself. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his speech, has charged the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue with being derelict in his duty to his countryman in not bringing forward, for the consideration of the House, some resolution of this kind. It comes with very ill grace from the hon. gentleman, or from any hon. gentleman in this House, to charge the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue with being now or of ever having been derelict in his duty to his countryman. The record of that hon. gentleman, as an Irishman, stands to-day as high as that of any Irishman, or any man in the Dominion of Canada. In the Province to which he belongs, no name carries with it greater weight than the name of John Costigan, the Minister of Inland Revenue. He has from time to time proved his devotedness to his countrymen on every occasion which presented itself, he was not slow in advocating their interest when attacked. In 1882, in the face of opposition from his own party, he introduced into this House a series of resolutions, which were carried unanimously, or almost unanimously. What has the hon. gentleman to gain by the introduction of those resolutions? No political advantage for himself; he never sought for any political advantage—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BURNS. No, he never did. If he had sought for political advantages for himself these advantages might have accrued to him long before that. He was actuated, I am sure, by the sole desire of serving in some way the country he claimed as his own, though he was not a native of it. Prior to 1882 it can be said of him that he proved his devotedness to his countrymen, to their interests—their religious interests especially—on every occasion when they were attacked. Then, I say, it comes with a very poor grace from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down to charge the Minister of Inland Revenue with having in any way deserted his country, or the cause of his country. The facts are as stated by the Minister, that it was suggested to him that resolutions of this kind should be introduced, but after consultation with those with whom he was associated, with his countrymen if you will, it was deemed inexpedient, or unnecessary rather, that resolutions of this nature should be introduced, and why? Because in 1882 the Parliament of Canada had passed resolutions, and we knew the treatment they received. We know the reply which was given to the address; and therefore, in face of that fact, it was deemed unnecessary now, with that record of the opinion of the Canadian Parliament standing before the Imperial Government, to re-introduce similar resolutions. It was because of the conclusion arrived at that the hon. Minister deemed it unnecessary, I say, to take action in the matter. Was the action of the hon. leader of the Opposition a spontaneous action? He said in his speech that he had waited until the last moment, waited to hear from this side of the House. One would be led to infer from that statement that the action of the hon. gentleman was a spontaneous one. I would ask was it not after that hon. gentleman had been waited upon and asked to move those resolutions, that they were introduced. Was the action one of his own motion? I leave the question to him to answer. At all events current rumor has it that he did not move until he was moved, and we know that as the leader of a great party in the Dominion of Canada, he was very likely to be influenced by political considerations, if he thought his political interest and the interest of his party could be