

\$52,000,000 annually. This is a very large sum of money, and, when we consider that the average sum has been collected from those people in the shape of rents for the last eighty years, we may well wonder how the resources, the frugality and the struggling efforts of those people have been equal to the task of producing such an amount annually. Is it to be wondered at that there is poverty and wretchedness in that country to a degree not found in many others? It is evident that the very large amount collected in the way of exorbitant rents is what is crushing those people down, keeping them in a condition of poverty and wretchedness, and causing a great deal of the trouble, the uneasiness and the disloyalty which have been exhibited from year to year. In the introductory remarks made by the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), he said he was glad to notice that none of the press of Canada was opposed to Home Rule, that the united press of the country was in favor of that principle. The hon. gentleman surely had not read the *Ottawa Citizen* of the day on which he made his speech, or he would have found a very pointed article in that paper in opposition to Home Rule. I do not think there is in the Dominion a Reform journal in opposition to Home Rule. I do not know of one, but the hon. gentleman will find a very pointed article in opposition to Home Rule in the columns of the *Ottawa Citizen*. We have a system of Home Rule in Canada, and I believe that, if Ireland had such a system as we have, a Government to control her own local affairs, but amenable to the powers held in London by the Queen, it would be a system under which they would conduct their affairs quietly and peaceably. We conduct our own affairs in the several Provinces, and, of course, we are responsible to the Federal Head for the laws we pass, which can be disallowed by the Federal Head. We have got along pretty fairly under that system. We have had some jarring, but we have got along pretty fairly after all, and I think that if Ireland had such a system it would be, at all events, more suitable for her than to continue in the position she is in at present. We know that when we got Home Rule in Canada some members of the English Parliament were pointedly opposed to any such system as we have now. Lord Derby declared that if Canada was granted the measure of self-government she asked, it would lead to one of two things, either total separation of the colony from the Mother Country, or the establishment of another Republic on the Continent of America. We have had Home Rule here, and have carried it on very successfully, and I do not think the people of this Dominion are getting more disloyal because they enjoy that Home Rule. I believe we are just as loyal as any colony belonging to the British Empire, so that the prognostications of Lord Derby were no more fulfilled than would be the ideas expressed with regard to the separation of Ireland from Great Britain if she obtained Home Rule. It has been said during this discussion that Mr. Gladstone's Bill was very objectionable, that it did not contain the necessary provision to protect the rights of the minority, that there were some things in that Bill that could not be accepted. Well, Mr. Gladstone, when he introduced that Bill, and during the discussion of the measure, stated that only the principle of the measure was at issue and invited suggestions from both sides of the House in regard to details. When he went before the country he said he was prepared, in the spirit of fair play, to accept from anyone that wished to make suggestions anything that might be thought of advantage to complete that Bill. That was his position and it was a very creditable position. So, when any person attempts to show that that Bill was decidedly objectionable and should be rejected on that account, it is hardly fair, in view of what Mr. Gladstone stated, to say that he brought forward a cast-iron measure which must be accepted in the shape in which he presented it, for it was rather a measure in regard to the

Mr. McMULLEN.

details of which he was prepared to consider the views of those who were disposed to differ with him on that question. I cannot close my remarks without saying something in regard to the course the hon. the leader of the Opposition has taken on this occasion. If he had followed out the course that hon. gentlemen opposite who have been taking an active part in this matter took in 1886, he might have moved an amendment which might have seriously interfered with the unanimous decision of this House in regard to this question. He has not done that, but has shown his earnest and honest desire to meet the case fairly and honorably, and to do what he can in the cause of Home Rule for Ireland. If the hon. gentleman opposite had taken the same course in 1886, I have not the slightest doubt that possibly we might have been able to send home a unanimous resolution, and under the very advantageous circumstances in which the country was then placed in being governed by Mr. Gladstone, placed it in his hands, and asked that Home Rule should be granted to Ireland; but, simply because they thought it might be a means of his securing part of the laurels they were anxious to secure, they interfered and tried to cripple and destroy the effect of that resolution by amendments. I remember that on that occasion the leader of the Opposition invited the Minister of Inland Revenue to interview him and to give him an opportunity of meeting him fairly and agreeing upon the wording and the shape of the resolution. It was understood, when the leader of the Government appointed a day for the discussion, that Mr. Blake invited anyone who took an interest in the question to suggest any change that might be made in order as far as possible to have unanimous action upon it, but in the time that elapsed from the introduction of the question until it was finally disposed of, instead of meeting the honorable and candid invitation extended by the leader of the Opposition, they took advantage of the time to move an amendment and, if possible, to interfere with the united action he was anxious should be secured. I think, had they taken the course which they should have taken upon that occasion, we might have been able very materially to strengthen the hands of Mr. Gladstone, who was then struggling to carry this measure through Parliament. Now, on this occasion the hon. leader of the Opposition has shown that he is not disposed to interfere with the hon. mover in his course, but he has suggested certain things which, I believe, the House as a whole will endorse, and these suggestions, I am glad to know, have been largely accepted, and I hope that this House will come to a unanimous decision in favor of the resolutions. Any person who has travelled through Ireland and has seen the circumstances of the people, the poverty and wretchedness that he meets on every hand, must feel that there is something wrong in the condition of that country. He sees that although the soil is so rich, the climate so salubrious, and the population so evidently healthy, there must be something wrong in the government of that country, or the condition of the people would be better than it is. He sees on all hands evidences of ancient greatness that are being obliterated from year to year, and the country is becoming more pauperised every year. Now, I think when we come to consider all these facts, it is our duty, while we enjoy all the advantages of self government, humbly to express, in a courteous manner, our sincere desire that those across the waters with whom we sympathise should be granted the same measure of self-government which we enjoy. When I was home in Ireland a few years ago, I was quite surprised to find the amount of ignorance that prevails in that country with regard to England and English affairs. I believe that in this country there are more men, in proportion to the population, who have been to London and travelled through England, than there are in Ireland who have crossed the channel. You