

ages of opposition and ages of oppression to a great and powerful Church, which, in Ireland, has been subjected to the greatest suffering. These men come here and keep up their organisation, because they must have something to remind them of the state of things that existed at home. The question before us is whether we ought not to send our voices over to England, asking the people of that country to adopt a policy for Ireland, which in this country has operated so admirably in making Irishmen the most loyal people in the Empire. Some of them, in fact, have not only become loyal to the Empire, but have completely forgotten the authors of the wrongs their country has suffered. They have forgotten the fact that the Tory party in England—of which the Tory party in this country has inherited all the traditions—has been the instrument of all the wrongs from which Ireland has suffered. They not only become loyal and bow the head, but they forget the old story and become of Tories the best in the land. Three or four of them have spoken here to-day. We have had the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), and an hon. gentleman from away over on the Pacific, and an hon. gentleman from half way there—all of whom have joined the Tory party and all of whom are Irishmen, and Celts and Catholics. Why, their memory of the wrongs their country has suffered has completely faded away. Not only have they become loyal to the Empire, but they have become loyal to the party of oppression. Surely after that experience, we ought more than ever to feel it to be our duty to go to England and tell the people of that country what a wonderful transformation Home Rule in Canada has effected.

Mr. DAVIN. I had hoped not to have addressed the House on this question. I had hoped that we should have reached a division half-an-hour ago; but, after the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I find myself compelled to make a remark or two; and, as I have risen to my feet, I may possibly venture to ask the indulgence of the House while I enter into the question which has been already discussed at some length. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down is laboring under a complete delusion. He begins by identifying in many respects the Liberal-Conservative party here with the Tory party in England, and he is also under a historical mistake in supposing that all the oppression he deplors as having been dealt out to Ireland was dealt out to it by the Tory party, because the Whig party, which I suppose he would identify himself with, was in power in England at the time most of the Coercion Acts were passed. I rather think that the speech of the hon. gentleman, and indeed, if I may be bold enough to say so, many of the speeches which have been made on this question, seem to me to show a complete misapprehension of what is the disease from which Ireland suffers. Hon. gentlemen seem to think that if a Home Rule Bill were passed, if Home Rule were given to Ireland, you would then minister to her diseased mind and pluck from her memory its rooted sorrow; but if you had Home Rule in Ireland to-morrow, you would have there the same number of tenants as exist to-day, you would have about the same number of landlords. By merely passing a Home Rule Bill, you could not execute a transformation scene, and change the whole political and social condition of Ireland. Does any man suppose that the mere fact of having Home Rule would make the peasant who is now discontented, contented, would make the peasant who now thinks he ought not to pay his rent, pay it?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Bothwell says yes; but I notice that when my hon. friend says yes to anything, it generally turns out that facts do not justify his affirma-

tion. The disease in Ireland is a complicated one. It is inherited from successive confiscations; it is inherited from a state of things by which men, different in religion, different in race and different in social instincts, were placed by an unhappy fate to govern a country, a large portion of the population divided from them by this triple wall, and, if the condition of Ireland is to be dealt with in such a way as to make that country peaceful, as to make it happy, as to make it prosperous, then you must go deeper into the evils than by merely passing a Home Rule measure. I think it is not undesirable to make remarks like these, because it is hardly creditable to this Dominion of Canada, and to a great Parliament such as this, a Parliament which my hon. friend the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) very properly described as the first Parliament after the Imperial Parliament itself, it is not creditable that we should discuss a question like this large Irish question and not go deeper than the surface, and think, like people orating in a debating society, that, by passing a measure like this, all the ills that afflict Ireland would be swept away. I am of opinion that it is desirable that a measure of local self-government should be given to Ireland, but I think, before any local self-government is given to the country, the Imperial Parliament should pass such measures as would help to get rid of the real causes of the discontent, because, if it be left to the local government—supposing you had a constitution there which would leave it to the local government to deal with these evils between landlord and tenant, of which we hear so much—then I am afraid that there would not be that measure of justice dealt out to the one side which would be desirable. Therefore, it would be, in my opinion, very improper to pass a Home Rule measure, unless you also have a measure dealing with the land. A comprehensive measure dealing with the land should accompany any measure of Home Rule, and, of course, I think that any measure which should be passed, dealing with Home Rule, ought carefully to guard the rights and liberties of the minority, so that when we are asked to send a message across the water to have a Home Rule measure passed, we are asking a thing to be done that is complicated, difficult, onerous, and requiring the greatest reflection and care.—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. member will pardon my interrupting him, I believe that a number of members on both sides of the House are anxious to leave to-night on the 11 o'clock train. That being the case, I do not think there is any chance of this debate being finished to night, unless those gentlemen were obliged to remain. I would, therefore, if my hon. friend will pardon the suggestion, ask him to allow the debate to be adjourned, and to stand over till Monday, and be the first Order of the Day, if that meets the view of the House.

Mr. DAVIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned, to stand the first Order for Monday.

PAPERS IN REGARD TO THE FISHERY QUESTION.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the house. He said: I may say that my hon. friend the Minister of Fisheries promised the papers relating to the fisheries question to-day, or on Monday at the latest. We have only to-day obtained permission to bring down the last papers which we have. We have obtained that permission to-day, so that all the papers will be laid on the Table on Monday.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11 p.m.