

and the welfare of Canada herself. (Cheers.)

Time passed; the Irish masses obtained popular representation, and as a result four-fifths of the Irish seats were taken by Nationalist representatives. (Applause.) Mr. Gladstone acted, and in 1886, in a Parliament not elected on the question, and in a condition of public opinion not ripened for action upon it, he brought in the Bill of that year. I could not give my assent to some of the provisions of that bill, notably to that which excluded the Irish from the Westminster Parliament—(hear, hear, and applause)—and many British Liberals were of the same opinion. But Mr. Gladstone's offer, as to the terms upon which he asked that the second reading should be acceded to by the supporters of Home Rule, was substantially that it should be taken as a simple agreement to the general principle of an efficient measure of local government for Ireland, reserving all details, including that very important detail of the representation at Westminster. The question, notwithstanding, hung in the balance. The decision of those who later became, as they called themselves, Liberal Unionists, but as I believe, disunionists and separatists—(hear, hear, and applause)—was at that time still uncertain.

I thought the occasion critical and our help morally important. A new Canadian Parliament had in the meantime been chosen. I moved accordingly; and my friend, Mr. Costigan, who had since the former occasion succeeded to Ministerial honors, carried an amendment—not, I once again confess, in my opinion, an improvement. I dare say I was a little partial to the child of my own brains; but he carried what he called an amendment. That having been carried, I voted for the proposition as so amended, in concert with the whole recorded vote of the House save only six members. One of them voted against the resolution, not because he was not a friend of

Home Rule, but because he thought the amended resolution was not strong enough. That was my friend Mr. Mitchell, who is on the platform here. (Laughter and applause.) The other five I am afraid did not vote for that reason, and I fancy the greater part of them belonged to the association to which I have referred—(laughter)—though, on the other hand, I am glad to say that many prominent members of that association voted with the majority on that occasion. (Cheers.)

Thus, by a practically unanimous resolution in the year 1886 we re-stated and re-affirmed our resolution of 1882, and thus a second Canadian House of Commons spoke in the same sense, with all the advantage given by four years' consideration, by a fresh election, by the advance that the question had made throughout the world meantime, and by the circumstance that an Imperial Bill was on the carpet. During that debate I took occasion to state my principle of action on this question, and I quote it to you now so that you may see how early it was stated and how sedulously it has been guarded since. I said this:

"What is required is the assurance not of one, but of all classes; not of a section, but of the people; not of a Minister of the Crown, but of the Commons of Canada; not of the Irish Catholic members, but of the French and English, Scotch, Irish and German, of all creeds and of all nationalities. * * * I therefore speak, but not as a Reformer or as a party leader; I speak as a Canadian and a citizen of the empire to brother Canadians and fellow-citizens of the Empire. This is not a Protestant or Catholic question; they are enemies of their country who would make it so. It should not be, in Canada at all events, a Conservative or Reform measure. I regard those as enemies of their country who would try to make it so. I hope that we may, by our own action this day, show ourselves united in the redress of