

expression of opinion which this House gave in 1882 quite sufficient?" If the hon. gentleman asks me for reasons why we should renew that expression of opinion, I have plenty to give him. First, because this is a new Parliament. After that expression of opinion in 1882 the members of this House went to their constituents, and if the constituents objected to the course taken in 1882 they had means of showing it. I do not think there is anything in the result of that election to show that they did object to that expression of opinion. But we do wish to put on record the fact that this House of Commons, after the expression of opinion given by the former House of Commons and after consulting the constituencies, entertains the same opinion that the House held four years ago. That is one reason for renewing the expression of opinion. Another reason, and still stronger one, is, because now Home Rule is a practical issue. When we spoke before we were only urging the Government of Great Britain to take a step which it seemed almost hopeless to hope they would take so soon as they have taken it, for although my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition did express the almost certainty that the accession to power of the Liberal Government in Great Britain would bring about this result, it seemed more hopeless to the rest of us. We are glad to find that he has proved a truer prophet than our own fears. The accession of that Government to power has had the result which the hon. gentleman anticipated. At that time, I say, the resolution passed by this House was merely an expression of the vague opinion that something of the kind should be done and a vague hope that it might be done. Now, it is a practical issue; now, something has been proposed; now, a measure, however defective some of us may think it, has been submitted to the British House of Commons, and apparently it has a possibility, at least, of being adopted in principle, a measure adopting, at all events, the great theory of Home Rule, however we may differ from the details proposed in that measure. Now I say is the time when our renewed expression of opinion will be useful. The old resolution might possibly have been regarded as having been got up for a political object.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I say it might have been regarded at that time, when Home Rule was not a practical issue, as having been got up for a political object; but now, when Home Rule has ripened, when Home Rule is in process of being granted to Ireland, an expression of opinion coming from this House, of which the great majority is known to be Conservative, would not be looked upon as a political dodge, but as a sincere and earnest attempt to strengthen the hands of those who are working for justice to Ireland. And it would have that effect if it had come, in the first place, from the Minister of Inland Revenue, just as much as it will now, when the proposal has come from the leader on this side of the House. I deeply regret that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) has seen fit to throw objections in the way of approving a motion of this kind, and has repeated on the floor of this House his objections given to the deputation, and thereby weakened most appreciably the effect that will be produced by the resolution when it is adopted. After having told us that we should not have discussed the question at all, after having refused to introduce a proposal of this kind in the House, yet after the proposal has been introduced by another hon. member, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue goes on to propose an amendment to the resolution. That is not the course we would have expected him to adopt, from the language he used when the question was up on Tuesday. When the leader of the Opposition proposed this resolution, the Minister of Inland Revenue asked for time to consider the resolution, and time to consult with the leader of the Opposition upon a form of words which would be acceptable to

Mr. CASEY.

the whole House, if the form then proposed was not acceptable. The hon. gentleman asked for time, and he asked for liberty to make suggestions. The time was granted by the mover of the resolution; the liberty to make suggestions was also granted. Nay, he was invited to do so, and I certainly understood from the tenor of the Minister's remarks, that he was only waiting for an opportunity to make suggestions. Has he made suggestions? I do not know. Has he asked the leader of the Opposition to consult with him as to the wording of the resolution? I do not know; but it does not look like it. If he had consulted the leader of the Opposition, he would probably have stated so; if there had been differences as to the forms of words he would, no doubt, have stated so. But instead of taking advantage of the opportunity for which he asked, he has come down with an amendment proposing to proceed in a different manner from that proposed by the leader of the Opposition. I think this conduct is inconsistent with the expressions he used on Tuesday; inconsistent with his duty as one who has taken a prominent part in promoting the principle of Home Rule, and whose duty it is to see that everything should be done in such a manner as to secure the largest possible support to any legislation that could be introduced to secure that unanimity. He tells us that is his object in introducing this amendment. But, Sir, if he had that object in view intelligently, he must have seen that the way to secure unanimity, was not to bring in an amendment, of which no notice has been given to this side of the House, at this period of the discussion, but to consult with the leader of the Opposition, who had introduced the original motion, and try to agree with him on such a form of words as the House would unanimously accept. Of course, I am in no position to say whether the mover of the resolution will accept the amendment or not, but, without regard to anything he may do, I desire to express my own disapprobation of it, and my preference for the original motion. The sole reason which the hon. gentleman alleged for this change is contained in the Kimberley message, which he has incorporated in his amendment. Now, Sir, what is the effect of that resolution incorporating that message? I have not had time to carefully weigh and ponder every word in it, but it seems to me to amount to some such statement as this, to the British Government: "We asserted in 1882 our right to petition the Throne, in regard to a matter which we declared to be of Imperial significance, but which we declared to have material bearings on the prosperity of Canada as well. You snubbed us, and now we accept the snub. We accept the statement that we have no right to petition the Throne; we accept the position of outsiders, in which that message appears to put us." I say that the acceptance of that resolution by this House, appears to me to be an acceptance of the snub which was administered to this House by the then Secretary for the Colonies, at the time we sent the former resolution. If the hon. Minister does not mean it for that, it must have another signification. It must be an expression of sulkiness on the part of this House. If he does not mean to say: "We accept the snub," he can only mean: "You would not hear us before, when we offered advice on this subject; now your Premier has actually invited an expression of opinion from similar bodies, has rejoiced in receiving them not only from the Colonies but from outside of the Empire, and now, when you are willing to hear our advice, and when our advice is invited by the Premier and the English Government, we will get on our high horse and sulkily refuse an address to you. Instead of putting our opinions in the form of an address, directed to the quarter where they will have most effect, we will raise our eyes to Heaven and express a vague namby pamby hope that the Government of England will be led by the help of Providence, without assistance on our part, to do that which will be best for Ireland and the Empire." Now, I object to