

same subject in this House. If the hon. gentleman believed that we could do no possible good by voting for such a motion as that which has been submitted by the hon. member for Montreal Centre, why did not the hon. gentleman express in 1882 the sentiments which he has addressed to the House to-night? The hon. gentleman tells us that this is a measure of discord thrown in amongst the population of this country. Did the hon. gentleman not know what the views of the people of Canada, those who settled in this country from the North of Ireland, were in 1882 as well as he knows them to-day? What new light has the hon. gentleman received upon this question which has induced him at the present time to declare to the House and to the country that a motion recommending Home Rule for the people of Ireland will do serious damage to the interests of the people of this country? If the hon. gentleman was sincere in 1882, I must say that the position he has taken to-night was a most extraordinary one. But we know what the hon. gentleman's sentiments were. We know that when the measure of Confederation was carried, he declared that he was in favor of legislative union.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I did not.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has forgotten what he said; I remember it. The House will see that the hon. gentleman was opposed to the principle of a federal union, that he was opposed to a principle of provincial autonomy and local self government. These were the sentiments of the hon. gentleman; but, before the elections of 1882 and the elections of 1887, they were not prudent sentiments to give expression to in this country. The hon. gentleman knows that the elections are now over, and, having no confidence in the breed, it is easy to assume a position of independence and to give expression to that feeling of hostility which it is well known he has long entertained. The hon. gentleman says now that Mr. Gladstone has declared that this is none of our business. We know that Mr. Gladstone or his Government declared that, and I admit that Mr. Gladstone was responsible for the views communicated in Lord Kimberley's despatch. But that was known before the hon. gentleman supported a motion in favor of Home Rule last year. Why did he not at that time put forward the views which he has put forth to-night? He had the information last year as well as he has it to-night. What new light has the hon. gentleman received since then? Has Lord Salisbury communicated to the hon. gentleman his strong disapprobation of any measure of Home Rule, and is the hon. gentleman too much devoted to the Tory party in England and to their policy of coercion to permit this House to express any view hostile to that policy? He says that this measure which has been introduced by Mr. Balfour is one relating to the administration of the criminal law, and why should we express any view upon it? Why did the hon. gentleman express an opinion in 1882 in reference to the Kilmainham imprisonment? Where is the difference? Was not that a particular case under the criminal law? Was not that a case of the confinement of men upon the evidence of which he had no means of forming an opinion? And yet, knowing the drift of public opinion, knowing that the opinion of this country was in favor of conceding to the Irish self-government, and knowing well, as he does, that the disorder grew out of the want of Home Rule, he was prepared to recommend the release of those parties, as well as a measure of Home Rule, on that occasion. If the measure of Home Rule were conceded to the people of Ireland, if justice were done them, if the Government would concede to them what has been obtained by the people of Canada and has produced content out of disorder here, then this measure of coercion, this new law procedure, would have been altogether unnecessary, and it is because of the absence of Home Rule in Ireland

Mr. MILLS.

that a measure of coercion has been found necessary. It is not necessary for us to consider whether the Irish people have been guilty of criminal conduct or not. We know well the origin of the misconduct, if there has been misconduct. We know that it originated in the maladministration of the Government. We know that maladministration will continue until the people of Ireland control their own affairs, and remove the cause of this bitterness, the cause of this misconduct, and then a measure of coercion will be altogether unnecessary. Now, I am opposed, I need not say, to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). That purports to be an amendment in favor of Home Rule. I would like to know what member here can be deluded into such a view after the speech of the leader of the Government. Was that a Home Rule speech? Was it in favor of the principle of conceding Home Rule to Ireland? Was it in favor of the interference on the part of this House in that direction? Not at all. The hon. gentleman knows that that measure if carried, will be quoted by the enemies of Home Rule as an evidence of the hostile sentiments of the people of Canada, and of their representatives in our Parliament, and therefore he can safely support such a proposition. There is no danger of offending Lord Salisbury or his Government. It is only necessary to examine that amendment to see that it admits in the first place, that coercion is necessary. We deny that proposition. In the next place it proposes that if Home Rule is granted, it shall be a minimum of Home Rule, not what the people of Ireland desire, but what the enemies of Ireland are ready to concede. Then it misrepresents the public opinion of this country by intimating that all these restrictions that Mr. Chamberlain and the Liberal dissentients in England have put forward are reasonable objections and ought to be considered before a measure of Home Rule is agreed to. In the last place, it ignores the friends and supporters of the principle of Home Rule altogether. To whom is it proposed to send this resolution? Why, to Lord Salisbury, to the man who declared that a measure of "Thorough" was necessary in the government of Ireland, that the people of Ireland ought to be arbitrarily governed for twenty years, and then, perhaps, they might be so disciplined under such a measure as that they might be entrusted with a larger share of self-government than they have had hitherto. There is no proposition to send this measure to Mr. Gladstone or to Mr. Parnell.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister for England when we voted on the subject last year, and the hon. gentleman proposed to send it to Lord Salisbury as well as Mr. Gladstone. Now, Mr. Gladstone is leading the Opposition. Mr. Gladstone, it is well known, is an ardent advocate of the principle of Home Rule, and it is proposed to send it to the enemy of Home Rule and not to its friend. Why, Sir, if this proposition was favorable to the principle of Home Rule, the hon. gentleman would not attempt to offend Lord Salisbury by sending him a resolution of this sort. It is because he knows it may be quoted by those who are enemies of Home Rule that he has made the proposition which he has done. I dare say that the hon. gentleman was familiar with this resolution before he read it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What resolution?

Mr. MILLS. The resolution of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that he is much mistaken. I saw it first when I got it from the Speaker's hand.

Mr. MILLS. Well, Sir, it seems exactly in accord with the sentiments the hon. gentleman has expressed to-night. The hon. member for West Assiniboia is to be congratulated.