

seeing how they live, how they are treated, and of seeing and dealing with all classes of society in Ireland; and I may venture to say, Sir, if the hon. the First Minister himself had ever resided in Ireland but for a few weeks, if he had seen anything of the condition of the Irish people, he would not have used the language he has seen fit to use on this present occasion. Sir, that hon. gentleman talked of the contrast between the hon. member who introduced this resolution and the speech of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). I think, Sir, every member who listened to him must have been drawing a contrast between the statesmanlike mode in which my hon. friend beside me handled the question and the evasions to which the hon. gentleman had recourse. Sir, that hon. gentleman dared to charge my hon. friend with insincerity. He talked of his being a popular demagogue, and of his taking up this question for political effect—that he held no honest and true motive in it. Who is the man who makes this charge of insincerity, when dealing with questions of this kind, against my hon. friend? Why, Sir, it is not so many years ago that there was a burning question in this country, when all classes of people were irritated to a very great degree by reason of troubles in the North-West, and I can recollect the hon. gentleman after expressing a wish to his Maker that he might succeed in capturing Mr. Riel, deliberately turned round and charged my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) with having induced that person to leave the country, to the great danger of Canada. That is one reason. I have the record here, but I will not mar the occasion by referring to the facts, but I will remind the man who talks of insincerity on the part of my hon. friend that eighteen months had barely elapsed before he, before a Committee of the House, was obliged to confess that he had furnished Riel with money to enable him to leave the country. That is the man who talks of insincerity, who talks of being influenced by a desire to make political capital. Sir, he alleged that my hon. friend had lost confidence in Mr. Gladstone. He told us that my hon. friend thought poorly of Mr. Gladstone's statesmanship; but the whole argument he addressed to this House was intended to show how powerless Mr. Gladstone was to carry out his desires for the benefit of the Irish people, by reason of the fact that their affairs had to be dealt with in the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, and he showed conclusively, I think, how it was that proper attention was never paid to the affairs of Ireland until they had passed a stage at which it was almost impossible to remove the evils complained of. Is that my hon. friend's opinion alone? Is it not the opinion of every man who has written with any degree of care on the affairs of Ireland for the past thirty years at least. He threatens us with the displeasure of Mr. Gladstone if we presume in our capacity of Canadian legislators to deal with a subject which affects the interests as well as the sentiments of a very large number of the people of Canada. The hon. Minister paid an involuntary compliment to my hon. friend when he mentioned that he would not likely be swayed from the path of his duty when he thought anything was to be done which the interest of Canada required him to do, by the desire to propitiate the Ministers of Great Britain. That has not always, I fear, been the course pursued by that hon. gentleman himself. I think I could name more than one instance in which he has sacrificed our interests, and in sacrificing our interest, has sacrificed the highest interest of the Empire itself, for the purpose of currying favor for a time with Mr. Gladstone or some of Mr. Gladstone's colleagues. Sir, he talks of the eloquent language of my hon. friend as mischievous and improper. I would like to know is there one Irishman in this House, is there one man of Irish parentage or Irish descent in Canada who, when he peruses those words, will echo the sentiments of the hon. gentleman; and if there is,

I would like to know that man's name, and I think the Irishmen of Canada would like to know it too. He talks, Sir, of the disestablishment of the Irish Church as an act of spoliation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. It meant nothing else.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said nothing of the kind.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The language used by the hon. gentleman could have no other meaning. He used language which implied that he meant that the Irish Church, by being disestablished, were deprived of the property which properly belonged to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said nothing of the kind. I said it involved this endowment as well; I neither expressed an opinion for or against the disestablishment, but I said the two went together.

Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman's language went further and meant more. If he simply means that they ceased to be an established church, he said the truth; but if he means that they were improperly deprived of any property, then I say no church was ever more liberally dealt with than the Irish Church when it ceased to be the nominal church of the nation—a thing which the hon. gentleman well knows it never was really; and we know that a very large proportion of the funds that belonged to it were assigned to the individual members of it. Sir, I do not believe there ever has been found a case in which, under similar circumstances, the members of any church were more liberally dealt with than the members of the Irish Church; and any man who has seen the mode in which the services of that church was administered, and the mode in which that establishment was kept up, knows that it was a crying shame and injustice to the majority of the people of Ireland that that course had not been taken long before. He tells us, Sir, that he looked with apprehension on the resolutions as they were originally framed, and he goes on to tell us that no doubt the hon. member member for Victoria was well advised when he amended them. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman makes that statement with cause; I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman, when he calls them well advised, speaks with proper respect to the advice which he himself gave; I have no doubt that they were carefully and well considered over by the hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Victoria, and although I do not question the motives of that hon. gentleman, still I say that in the main I agree with my hon. friend beside me, that the resolutions as he originally proposed them were better adapted to his purpose, and likely to have more effect than the weaker ones which he has subsequently submitted. The hon. gentleman tells us that my hon. friend beside me had no business whatever to make any attack on the land system of Ireland or on the landlords who ruled Ireland; and he tells us, with a certain amount of truth, that it may be ill-advised to do so, because the Parliament of Great Britain is almost entirely dominated in both branches by the landlord interest. Sir, could there be a stronger argument advanced than the argument used by that hon. gentleman in favor of the proposition of Home Rule for Ireland? Does he not know that at this present moment the landlords are on one side and the vast majority of the Irish people on the other? Does he not know that of the 108 Irish representatives on the floor of Parliament, a large portion are not landlords or representatives of landlords, and are pledged to Home Rule? And if he be correct, although I do not think he is, in saying that the landlord interest is paramount in the House of Commons, he supplies, I repeat, the strongest argument that could possibly be supplied, why the destinies of the Irish people should not be left to depend entirely on