

Ireland charged with political offences, with a view to extending to them your Most Gracious Majesty's royal clemency, so that with their release, the inestimable blessings of civil liberty may be once more restored to all parts of your Majesty's Empire."

Clearly this last prayer for the restoration of civil liberty to Ireland was a prayer for the suspension or repeal of the Coercion Act. Now, Sir, in the motion that was actually proposed, we find this :

"We would further express the hope that the time has come when Your Majesty's clemency may, without injury to the interests of the United Kingdom, be extended to those persons who are now imprisoned in Ireland charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessings of personal liberty restored to them."

This was merely a request that Her Majesty would be pleased to exercise clemency to those individuals who were imprisoned, and justly so, so far as you could infer from the words of the motion itself. The leader of the Opposition objected to these changes of wording. He said :

"Now, I heard the hon. gentleman's resolution with some regret, for one reason that I find it emasculated. I find it very much weaker than the resolution which he put on the paper in the first instance. In some particulars it does not legislatively suit my view. He has fallen into something like the error ascribed to Mr. Gladstone, and not willing myself to repeat that error, I would prefer to vote for the best resolution we can get. Yet, I will vote with reluctance for the measure which hypothetically refers to the grant of a measure of self-government to Ireland. The hon. gentleman says, in his altered resolution :

"And we would venture to express a hope that if consistent with the integrity and well-being of the Empire, and if the rights and status of the minority are fully protected and secured, sure means may be found of meeting the express desire of so many of your Irish subjects in that regard.

"We would further express a hope that the time has come when Your Majesty's clemency may, without injury to the interests of the United Kingdom, be extended to those persons who are now imprisoned in Ireland, charged with political offences only, and the inestimable blessing of personal liberty restored to them."

"We have no idea that the rights and interests of the minority will be other than fully protected and secured. I believe that its best security is to be found in a united Irish people, managing their own affairs. I say that the possession of such a measure is essential to the maintenance of the Empire. There ought to be no ifs or ands in the expression of the views of the Canadian people upon this most important subject. It is only upon the theory, only upon the strong view that the possession of such a law is essential to the integrity of the Empire that we can agitate or act with effect in dealing with this matter. I am not disposed to deal with this question with ifs and ands. I am willing to advise conciliatory measures and ample justice to Ireland. I should like the Canadian people, through their representatives in Parliament, to say to the Imperial Government politely, that in their opinion, as four millions of British subjects, they believe that the integrity of the Empire demands self-government for Ireland."

So much in reference to the people who were imprisoned. The leader of the Opposition objected to acting hypothetically in regard to them, urging that the right of *habeas corpus* should be recognised by this House. I have proven by the authority of the leader of the House, that a motion to go into Committee of Supply is not a proper occasion to bring up a motion of this kind. I have proven, by the authority of the Minister of Inland Revenue, that it is proper to propose to this House, not only a motion of which no notice has been given, but still more, a motion different from that of which notice had been given, and therefore a much greater surprise to the House than a totally new motion could be. But then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) has declared that this motion is brought up for political purposes. If the Minister of Inland Revenue will admit that he was moved by political motives when he introduced his resolution in 1882, then he may agree that we have political motives in bringing up this question now. If the hon. gentleman is not willing to admit that he cannot charge anyone on this side with that offence, for it is absurd to say such a motion must necessarily be made for political purposes. This is not a party question, it is not a national question; it is a question just as vital to the people of Canada, just as germane to their interests as to those of the people of Ireland, and it is just as natural for a motion in regard to it to come from a Canadian as from an Irishman. It is not an Irish motion. The Minister of Inland Revenue has tried to make it an Irish motion, and has endeavored to

constitute himself the head and front of the movement in favor of Home Rule in Ireland, and he considers it should be necessarily conducted and supported by Irishmen. It is a Canadian national movement; it is just as much a Canadian movement as an Irish movement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CASEY. I notice a few hon. members on the other side of the House make remarks suggesting dissent from what I say. If they wish to say they are not in favor of Home Rule, I deny their right to call themselves loyal Canadians. I deny the right of any man in Canada who is not in favor of Home Rule to call himself a loyal Canadian.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CASEY. Some hon. gentlemen are again making dulcet noises, but the only inference I can draw is, that they do not think Home Rule is a necessary belief for a Canadian. I hope they will prove my mistake in that respect on a later occasion, if I have made a mistake. I cannot resume my seat without referring to a statement made by the Minister of Inland Revenue in regard to his telegram. He said by that telegram he had made every Irishman in the House responsible for and as giving their adhesion to and re-endorsement of his former resolution. What Irishmen on this side did he consult about that telegram? He never consulted me.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not say that I made every hon. gentleman responsible. I said I presumed to act on the authority of every Irishman.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman had no right to presume to act for any Irishman he had not consulted. I have declared, and I will declare on Thursday, my endorsement of the resolution; but I dispute the right of any hon. gentleman to speak for all Irishmen as to the terms in which a message of that kind is conveyed until the hon. gentleman has consulted those members. No doubt he consulted with his friends on that side of the House as to the terms of that telegram. Why didn't he ask those whom he had asked to advise on the former resolution, to advise him in framing the terms of that telegram, and advise as to whether such a telegram should be sent? I argue that an expression of this House, composed of men of all nationalities, will have infinitely greater weight than even the representations of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and that the telegram of any individual Minister, is not the sort of manifesto that we should send to the representatives of the people of England. I argue that a motion is a better way of acting than by telegram. He wants to know what was the great haste. He suggests that it is because of his telegram that we are in such a hurry to take up this matter. Well, I am afraid that he is attaching too much importance in his own mind to that telegram. I have no doubt the minds of these members of the Liberal party who intended to support a motion of this kind was made up long before they heard of that telegram.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Then if it was not a political move, why were we not informed of it, if you made up your minds long ago?

Mr. CASEY. I did not say that we had made up our minds long ago to propose a resolution. I said that the minds of the members of the Liberal party were quite as clearly made up to support a motion of this kind as they were to-day, and it is quite as evident that the hon. gentleman's mind is not as clear with reference to this matter just now as it was some time ago. He says there is no change in him since 1882, but it looks as if there was. He was then eager to rush into the fray, to ask the advice of hon. gentlemen on both sides, and I do him the credit that he did ask the advice: he was eager to have a motion passed on this subject. Is there no change