

want, give them all they desire, give them, it is said, Home Rule, and then you will not require the Coercion Bill, the ordinary criminal law would be sufficient for the suppression of crime. I have only to point out—I am not standing here as the justifier of Lord Salisbury's Government, but it is only fair that it should be mentioned—that at the same time that a Bill for the enforcement of criminal law is passing through the House of Commons, in the House of Lords there is a Bill to relieve the over-burdened, as some would call them, the rack-rented tenants. But here again, when we look at statistics what do we find? We are astonished to find how much is made of the rack-rented tenants. Sir, there are over half a million tenants in Ireland, and I am speaking by authority when I say that in the last quarter of last year the number of evictions were 522. What percentage is 522 evictions out of half a million tenants? Out of those we have the heartrending picture of the Glenbigh evictions, we have those about which we are to hear more from the emissary who is now on his way here to enlighten the people of Canada. But if we will only look at home have we no sympathy for our overburdened farmers, those men, who, sometimes, have been paying to building societies out of which some hon. members have grown wealthy, 15, 16 and 17 per cent. for money, borrowing at 10 per cent, with fines added on, until it has grown, as we have known in some cases, to 15, 16 and 17 per cent.? We know that would have been impossible in Ireland, and we know that it was only the increase in the value of property in Canada that enabled the farmers to pay these exorbitant rates. Well, is it to be said that we would countenance them in banding together, the honest yeomanry of this country, to resist such payment? It is true, it may be said, that they had promised to pay this interest. That was their contract, and although the rise in the value of the property has enabled them to pay it, would we justify them in banding together and refusing to pay? I think we ought, under these circumstances, to be careful what we are about to do. Now, the position I ask this House to adopt, and the proposition I propose, before I sit down, to place formally in the Speaker's hand, is on the lines of the observations I have endeavored to make. But, I desire it to be perfectly well understood that I am not taking a position for or against this Coercion Bill. I have stated one side, because there have been a number of the members of this House who have told us the other. I have pointed out what this law is. If we are told to deal with the law, if we are to offer an opinion about it, certainly it is only right that we should consider it well, and clearly understand what we are doing. Now, we have obtained our own freedom and our right to govern ourselves, and it behooves us not to invite, by meddling with the affairs of other people, interference in our own concerns. I want to know how any hon. member in this House can undertake to pass such a resolution as this, saying that a particular measure submitted to the British Parliament ought not to be passed—I would like to know what that hon. member will by-and-bye say if the British Parliament, with greater power and authority, pass a resolution which will affect our dearest interests and interfere with our local concerns. Surely, if we have a right, with our delegated power under the British North America Act, to say to them: You are wrong in passing that Bill, can we with any consistency deny to the British Parliament the right to deal with our affairs when they think proper? Surely what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; surely it is a poor rule that will not work both ways; surely we will find ourselves in a difficult position. But this is to be said: While our resolution is practically ineffective, while our resolution sent home to Lord Salisbury, if you are going to send it, and to Mr. Parnell and to Mr. Gladstone, will get into the papers and be read and possibly thrown into the

Mr. McCARTHY.

paper basket, their resolutions will have practically the effect of law.

Mr. CURRAN. No, no.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman is wrong, if he will allow me to say so, when he says "no, no," to that statement. What the Parliament of Great Britain enacts overrides the laws passed by this Parliament. They could determine by statute what our Customs law should be.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to see them try it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not think they will.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think so.

Mr. McCARTHY. I agree that they will not try it, but if they were to try it, I do not know very much what we could say—

Mr. MITCHELL. We are remonstrating.

Mr. McCARTHY. We are doing a little more. We are asked to say by this resolution:

"That this House has learned, with profound regret, of the introduction into the Imperial House of Commons of the Coercion Bill above mentioned, and protests against its adoption, as being subversive of the rights and liberties of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland."

That is what we are asked here to vote upon.

Mr. MITCHELL. We will alter that.

Mr. McCARTHY. There has been no suggestion of alteration.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, there has.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the way the matter stands before us now. No matter how we alter it, we shall all find ourselves in this difficulty: You have the right to govern yourselves, nobody is interfering with it; but you are not satisfied with that, you want to govern somebody else to whom you are not responsible.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then this means nothing. It is no good, and it is not intended to effect any result. Is it for the people out of doors? Are we passing these resolutions, are we making these speeches about liberty and right and freedom for Ireland and all the rest of it, for the people out of doors here, and not with any intention of doing the people of Ireland any good? It must be one way or the other, and the hon. member can accept either horn of the dilemma he pleases.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How about yourself?

Mr. McCARTHY. I say we should not interfere. I am making what the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) perfectly well knows is not a popular speech.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. What the hon. gentleman with his knowledge of the constituencies of Ontario from which we both come, would not make, though, perhaps, I am speaking his sentiments. But I say this, that I will not stand here as the representative of my constituency under any false colors or false representations. While I have a large Irish population in my constituency, the confidence of many of whom I have the honor to enjoy, I am not afraid to speak to those men and argue this question fairly and squarely before them, and I think they will agree that the course I propose to ask the House to adopt is after all the best one in the interest of this Dominion. A word has been said against the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), a rebuke has been administered to him for the language used by him with respect to Mr. William O'Brien who is about to come to talk to us and tell us of the iniquities of His Excellency the Governor General. Sir, if the hon. member for Muskoka used strong