

remarks I had intended to make, called forth by certain statements made during last election. An opportunity for investigating those matters may perhaps occur again. But for myself I say—and I think I am as sincerely concerned in promoting the interests of the British Empire as any man on the floor—I say, and I believe, that it is in the very highest degree in the interests of the people of Great Britain and Ireland, it is in the very highest degree in the interest of every English-speaking man in the British Empire to see that the claims of Ireland are satisfied in a rational and reasonable way. Sir, if ground were wanting for the action we are taking, or are going to take this night in this House, it may be found in the fact that our own census returns show that there are 957,000 persons of Irish origin in the Dominion of Canada—a larger number, let me tell the House, than have reported themselves as of either English or Scottish origin; while, Sir, in the United States of America, of Irish origin, I believe there are to be found to-day at least ten times that number—probably nine or ten millions in all. Now, we know that for a very long time back a very large number, though not all of these persons, have been to all intents and purposes hostile to the British Empire. Sir, I have always hoped to see a better state of things brought about, and I say that no true statesman, either in England or Canada, can render a greater service to the Empire at large than by promoting measures which are calculated to remove any just grievances that may exist in those people's minds. I say that when a statesman rises in England who understands, as I think Mr. Gladstone does, how important that is to the welfare of the Empire and the welfare of our whole race, such a statesman may do very great things indeed for England. And I say, Sir, that when that hostility is removed very much greater things are possible to be done for the welfare of the Empire than can be done by either or any of the schemes now on foot for promoting what is called Imperial Federation. But I may say this, that I do not believe that the passage of the eighty-seventh Coercion Bill is at all likely to pave the way to harmony. There are two ways, and there have been for hundreds of years two ways, in which Ireland can be governed. I admit that the mode—I will not say foreshadowed by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), but I think partially foreshadowed by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), is one way. You have your choice. On the one side is Lord Salisbury and his Coercion Bill—the Cromwellian settlement of Ireland, as it used to be called—and martial law, and on the other there is Mr. Gladstone's proposal to allow Irishmen to manage Irish affairs. For my part I heartily concur with the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) and the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on that side. I believe the true way to pacify Ireland, and to remove those grievances to which I have alluded—the true way, in my opinion, to bring about such a state of things as will remove one of the greatest stumbling-blocks which has existed for these many years to the cordial alliance and good will which ought to prevail between the two great branches of the English race—is to grant such a measure of Home Rule to the Irish as will enable them completely and entirely to manage their own affairs at least as fully as we, in the various Provinces, are able to manage our local affairs. And as the hon. gentleman has consented to accept the wise suggestion of my hon. friend for West Durham (Mr. Blake), I have to say that I will have great pleasure in supporting his motion, as amended.

Mr. IVES. I think it is much to be regretted, indeed, that within a moment after this House has, by a majority of nearly one hundred votes, adopted a resolution which is supposed to be in the interests of Home Rule, when irrespective of party both sides of the House, with practical unanimity, with as great unanimity as can be expected on

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

any question of this character, have voted in favor of this message from the Parliament of Canada to the Parliament of England—I say I think it is very much to be regretted that within a moment after the recording of that enormous majority the hon. member who has just spoken should rise with a view of seizing some petty party advantage from the fact of the absence of one or two members of the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Four of them.

Mr. IVES. It only shows that the hon. gentleman and those who have voted with him in the division which has just been taken have been actuated by the same motives on this occasion that, as far as we can judge from the ground they took on the occasion of the last general election, actuated them with reference to the conduct they pursued in this House at the last Session. I have stood up in my place and have recorded my vote in favor of Home Rule for Ireland on every occasion when a proposition of that kind has been made since I have had the honor of a seat in this House. But notwithstanding that fact, notwithstanding that my course has been consistent from first to last, I was charged during the late election with being an enemy to Ireland, with being opposed to any measure of Home Rule, charged with being an Orangeman; and other false accusations were brought against me, in the endeavor to satisfy the people that, so far from being a friend of Ireland, I was an enemy of Ireland. Friends of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat went so far as to obtain the subornation of perjury to defeat me at the last election, notwithstanding the fact that I have been as consistent a supporter of Home Rule as my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), or my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake.) The hon. gentleman has seen fit to refer to those Ministers who were not present when the last vote was taken as bolters. Now it seems to me that the member of Parliament who can properly be charged with being a bolter is not the one who was absent when the question was read, and remains absent during the division, but the name rather applies to one who is here when the motion is read from the Chair and then runs out to escape the division. Now in my experience in this House, before the leadership of the Opposition was put in the hands of a syndicate, before it was put in commission, I have seen the leader of the Opposition act the part of a bolter by leaving the House after the question was read. Now that the Opposition is lead by a syndicate, now that the leadership has been put in commission, I have been curious—seeing that the charge was made that members of the Government were absent—to see how many of the syndicate were absent. I find that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has bolted, if the term is a proper one in such connection; the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Langelier) was absent; the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) is absent; and if members of the Government are to be called bolters who were not in their seats when the question was put, then in the same fairness these hon. gentlemen deserve that term. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies)—another member of the commission—has not come to the House at all this Session, and I have as much right to say that he has remained out of Parliament altogether until the question was disposed of as the hon. member has to say that the Premier or the Minister of Finance left the House, or did not come to the House, for the sake of avoiding this vote. We are discussing a question which ought not to be a party question, which is not a party question, when we are stretching our powers so far in order to lend a helping hand to the people of Ireland, I do think it is a very inappropriate occasion for the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to endeavor to gain a party advantage, the first occasion which has presented itself during this discussion.