

language, I think perhaps it did credit, if not to his head, certainly to his heart. His Excellency the Governor General is to a certain extent, if not altogether, in the position of a man who cannot defend himself in this country. He is in the position of a man who cannot take the platform and answer William O'Brien, or state his side of the case, and it is on a subject with which we are unfamiliar, and about which the people of this country are not perhaps very well capable of forming a correct judgment. And what will William O'Brien say when he gets here? When we have heard what has to be said, perhaps he will find that the atmosphere of free Canada recognises the rights of both sides, and does not wholly disregard the rights of a man because he happens to occupy a position of authority. Speaking of Lord Lansdowne these were his words:

"Lord Lansdowne thinks he can safely snap his fingers at you because he is 4000 miles away Governor General of Canada. I tell you here to-day that the voice of the Irish nation is loud enough and strong enough to reach him in his palace gates in Ottawa, aye, or if he were to go into the deepest backwoods of an English settlement to hide himself. I warn them here to-day that if French dare to lay a robber hand upon any house of the honest man in the Queen's county, we will carry the war into Canada, we will meet him at his palace gate, and we will make the air ring with his fame as an evictor and an exterminator. We will teach him night and day the wide world over, and from one end of that Dominion of Canada to the other I promise him on the part of the Irish in Canada that wherever he goes he will find Irish hearts and Irish throats that will hoot him and boycott him and hunt him with execrations out of that great and free land."

Is there an hon. member in this House who has read that speech and can say, as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has said to-night, that he hopes he will have a patient hearing, and will not be disturbed. I confess I am not able to understand from whence that hope springs. I think that such a statement as that was calculated to arouse the blood of every honest member of this House and of every man who reads it in this country. But, perhaps it is only a specimen of the manner in which the war is being conducted on the other side of the Atlantic; and if that be so, we may not wonder so much at the way in which the law requires amendment. I have endeavored to give the grounds for the conclusion to which I invite this House to arrive. I have only to say now that I have not made an attempt to emulate my hon. friend the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) in his able address; I have not made any attempt to follow the hon. member for North Bruce, (Mr. McNeill), whose speech was an ornament to this House, and a credit to the hon. member himself; I have endeavored to lay down what I believe to be safe principles for our guidance and governance, and I think this House will find that if we depart from the principle of self-government we enjoy, if we invade the rights of other representations, if we undertake to do more than govern ourselves, we shall be bringing trouble on ourselves which, by-and-bye we may have cause to regret. Do we remember—and it is the last observation I propose to make on this subject—that those rents which are so much complained about were fixed by and under the Gladstone Bill in 1881, or could have been fixed. Do we not remember that the judicial settlement, as it were, of the rents is what is now complained of? Do we not know that these tenants enjoy more and better rights and greater privileges than any other tenantry in the world? Do we not know that their tenant right is made as fixed and certain and definite as the landlord's right is, and in many cases is more valuable? Do we not know that, while I admit that that rent, owing to the fall of prices, is higher now than possibly in some cases can be paid, in most instances the landlords are willing, and are bound of necessity, to meet the tenants half way? Then where are the great grievances of which we hear? The contracts were made and I acknowledge that these poor peasants were not in a position to make free contracts with their landlords. I acknowledge that, from their land hunger, as it may be called, their bidding against one an-

other to such an extent in the desire to acquire land, they were agreeing to pay rents which had become impossible to pay. But do we not know that that was the reform effected by Mr. Gladstone's Bill? Do we not know that Mr. Gladstone said, since this is so the courts will settle a fair rent, and they were settled on what was supposed to be a fair basis? To-day it is said that the rents are too high, but so are the rents of every man in this country who made his bargain five or six years ago, because if prices fell there prices have fallen here, and perhaps to a still greater extent. But does that form an excuse for crime? because that and that only is the pertinent point, so far as the present position of affairs is concerned. Now we are asked to send these resolutions, not to our Gracious Sovereign, because we have been told by Mr. Gladstone himself in very plain and unmistakable language, that he wants none of our advice. I saw a statement in a newspaper the other day that Mr. Gladstone invited the opinion of Americans upon this question of Home Rule. But we know that Mr. Gladstone sometimes speaks with greater freedom and with less responsibility than at others. We know he has had to excuse his statements and utterances in that way, but we have a formal statement, not as the hon. member for West Durham said, of a Colonial Secretary merely, but the formal statement of the Government of Mr. Gladstone, telling us in answer to the most respectful resolutions which it was possible for a Parliament to frame or pass on the question of Home Rule, or any other matter, that:

"Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the Parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs; but with respect to the questions referred to in the Address Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the Imperial Parliament and Ministers, to whom all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain."

We have taken that hint. We do not address Her Majesty any longer, but like respectful subjects, we get around it and address the Prime Minister. But we propose not only to address the Prime Minister, but to address also the leader of the Opposition and, as there is another minor opposition, Mr. Parnell is to have our opinions as well. I do not know why it is that Lord Hartington, whose following is quite as large as that of Mr. Parnell, is not to be favored with our views on this question; perhaps he is to be put in too. I think we hardly have regard to our own position. I think the great Parliament of this free country, if not at liberty to address the Crown, ought not to be called on to pass an address to any particular individual. I think it better behooves our dignity to omit that last passage. If we must pass an address, if we know so much about this question, if we are so full of burning zeal and knowledge as to press our views on the Parliament of Great Britain, I think we had better allow them to reach the persons for whom they are intended in some other way than this. But for my part, to whomsoever else it may be sent, I shall most certainly vote against sending it to Mr. Parnell. I am not going to say that Mr. Parnell is the associate of murderers, as we are told he is. I am not going to accuse him of having written that letter which, if he did write it, must always make him the most contemptible of all mankind; because we are told that he came down to the House of Commons arrayed in mourning to express his regret for the assassinations in Phoenix Park. And if at that moment he was in communication with the society which had done these men to death, no language I can use, or that any member of this House can use, would be too strong to condemn Mr. Parnell from whatever point of view he may be looked at. But I do say that it hardly agrees with the position we hold to send an address of this kind to Mr. Parnell, who has not taken, up to the last intelligence we have received, the means of freeing himself from the stain which has been cast upon him. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for West Dur-