

vation of the British Empire; I would like to see them contribute, as no doubt they will be able to contribute, to the support of the British army and navy; and I would like to see Irishmen join with Scotchmen and Englishmen, and all the other peoples that constitute the Empire, in sharing the glories of the British arms in defending the rights of British subjects. For that reason it is most essential to the prosperity of Ireland, most essential to the unity of the Empire, that there should be Irish representation in the British House of Commons. It is utterly impossible, considering the position which Ireland occupies, in such close proximity to England and Scotland, that she should be separated in the manner in which Mr. Gladstone proposes to separate her from England and Scotland. Therefore, Sir, I shall not vote for the resolution of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I say that the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is merely an addition to the resolution of his leader. It seems certainly a very singular position the hon. gentlemen occupy. First one hon. gentleman gets up and moves an amendment to his leader's resolution, and if that amendment means anything it means that he believes his leader is not in earnest, that he has not sufficiently strongly expressed his feelings in favor of Home Rule—the abstract principle of Home Rule—and he has moved this amendment to his leader's motion in order to make it more emphatic and perhaps more general in its character. Then again we find that another hon. gentleman on the same side has another objection. He objects to the expression of "Her Majesty's Irish subjects," and wants to give it a still broader meaning. Therefore, I say, that the position they occupy is not a united one; it is not one which is calculated to carry with it that weight and strength that such a resolution should do in this House and I must say that the amendment made by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is one we could all unite upon. It does not express approval of the exact character of the Home Rule introduced by Mr. Gladstone, but it does approve of a form of Home Rule which will unite Ireland more permanently to the British Crown, which will unite instead of trying to dis sever Ireland from the British Empire, and, therefore, I say, it is more thoroughly British in its character; it is more in the interests of Ireland, and it is more in accord with the sentiments and feelings of the vast majority of the people of this country, who desire to see Ireland enjoy the same liberty and freedom that we enjoy in Canada under the British flag.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House on this subject more than a very few moments. It is one with reference to which I should have liked to have addressed the House after having had some opportunity of considering what I was going to say about it. I think the magnitude of the question is such as to demand that it should be discussed with the best ability that all the members of this House are able, individually, to direct to it, and, therefore, I have no intention at the present time of attempting to make a speech on the subject. I wish, however, briefly to explain what my views are on this subject, how I shall vote, and why I shall vote as I do. Before doing so, however, I should like to congratulate the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, on at last having discovered a policy. I am sorry, however, that I cannot congratulate him on the nature of the policy he has discovered. That policy is a policy of discord. The hon. gentleman knows as well as he knows that a soul is in his body that the people of this country, the people of the Dominion of Canada, entertain views with reference to this question as wide as the poles asunder. The hon. gentleman knows that in his own city of Toronto, the other day a meeting was held, attended by some of the best informed and most influential men in

Mr. ORTON.

Canada, and that at that meeting views were expressed diametrically opposed to the views that hon. gentleman presented to us to-day. He knows, too, that the sentiments to which I have referred are sentiments which may very readily be stirred deeply in the breasts of the people of this country. He knows also that this question has excited such an agitation in England as neither he nor I have seen before. He knows that England, that Great Britain and Ireland are divided into hostile camps on this subject. He knows very well that Great Britain and Ireland are in the throes of such an agitation as they have never seen before, in reference to this very question, and that an agitation so fierce is in progress there that actually the fearful and awful words "civil war" are whispered from lip to lip.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but he knows that.

Mr. BLAKE. No, he does not.

Mr. McNEILL. Well, if he does not, he should read the newspapers or correspond with his friends in Ireland and he would know it. He knows that, and he knows how deeply that question may stir up feelings of animosity among men who are to-day neighbors and friends, and yet he had no hesitation in going out of his way to introduce this question and thrust it into the minds and hearts of the people of this country, irrespective altogether of the terrible results which may accrue. However, I do not mean to say the hon. gentleman is inconsistent, because we found the hon. gentleman the other day perfectly prepared to stir up or, at all events, to side with a movement which most people in this country deem likely to introduce inter-provincial strife in this country, and it is perfectly consistent with such a policy that the hon. gentleman should introduce into Canada the question and press home to the minds and hearts of the people the question which he has now introduced. Nevertheless, I think the hon. gentleman will find that he has not succeeded in doing anything so very clever as probably he supposes he is doing. At any rate, he has done something dangerous in the hope of doing something clever. Sir, I say the hon. gentleman has gone out of his way to do this, because on the last occasion when this question was before this House, at a time when it was very differently viewed and regarded both in this country and in the mother country from the manner in which it is regarded to-day, the Government of Mr. Gladstone, by the mouth of his Colonial Secretary, informed us that it was not a question with which we ought to intermeddle at all. Yet notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman proposes that we shall open up this question.

Mr. MILLS. He has changed his mind and we haven't.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes, Mr. Gladstone has changed his mind; and just because he has changed his mind under certain circumstances, we are now, forsooth, to go to him and say to him: Will you kindly allow us to advise you now, because it suits you, while before you told us in cool blood that it was not a thing we should meddle with? Mr. Gladstone at that time was able to advise us on the subject in cold blood. He finds himself to-day in a very different position. He finds that in his attempt introduce this question into the House of Commons, he has shattered his party in England; he has driven from his banner almost all the names that have shed lustre on the Liberal party of England during the latter part of this century. I ask: Where is Bright to be found to-day? Where is Hartington? Where is Chamberlain? Where is Mr. Gladstone's late Attorney-General, James? Where is Dilke? Where is Goschen? Where is Roundel Palmer, his Lord Chancellor? Where Derby and Argyle? Where is Mr. Gladstone's late Irish Secretary, Mr. Trevelyan? Where is