

then in session, or within seven days after the house meets, if it is not then sitting, and if it is disapproved of by the house the proclamation ceases. There is but to my mind—granting there is sufficient cause, as to which I have already said I am not to be the judge—and I do not pretend to state any opinion—there is to my mind only the objectionable feature to which the hon. member who last addressed the house referred. But this bill is not yet law. The principle of this bill, it is true, has been assented to upon the second reading; but the details of the measure have yet to undergo the scrutiny which no doubt they will receive in the committee of the whole; and how it may emerge from that committee, and finally pass the house of commons, we do not know. That provision is that, if there cannot be, upon the opinion of both the attorneys general of Ireland and England, a fair trial by a jury in Ireland—and, remember, that does not apply to political offences, but to murder, and offences of that class—if there be offences of that kind, if political feeling runs so high, if, in point of fact, the whole neighborhood are mixed up, as it were, with the men who are accused of the crime, if it be agrarian in character, where it is believed to have virtue and not a crime by those who have committed it and those who abet it, then in such a case there is power to do what? In the case of murder, arson and breaking and firing into dwelling houses, to have the trial take place in England. That is the proposition of Lord Salisbury's government, and what was the proposition of Mr. Gladstone's government? Mr. Gladstone's proposition was that these men should be tried, not by a jury in England, but by a bench of Irish judges. Which is the better of the two? And I noticed the other day that the home secretary for England, Mr. Matthews, thought it might be a good amendment to say that the prisoner should have his choice, either to take a bench of Irish judges, or take his trial in England, just as he pleased. But is it so certain that fair play cannot be had before a jury at the old Bailey? Are the people of

England so united anywhere against Irishmen, when we are told that 150,000 of them went out the other day to Hyde Park to protest against this bill—are they also unanimously of the opinion that Irishmen ought to be hanged at all events, that there is no hope of fair play to be found before an English jury? I ask again, not venturing an opinion myself, what are the responsible advisers of the crown to do? What happened the other day in Dublin? What happened at the assizes referred to by my hon. friend from North Eruce (Mr. McNeill)? Simply, no contradiction of facts, no dispute as to the law. I have an extract here of the charge that was given by Mr. Justice Murphy, and perhaps it may be taken as a sample of the whole. The judge stated to the jury: The case is clear, you are privileged, you can do as you please, the evidence is perfectly uncontradicted, but the privilege is yours of disregarding the evidence. After half-an-hour's deliberation, the jury returned a verdict of not guilty. Gentlemen, said the judge, your verdict is contrary to the evidence, but it is your privilege to disregard your evidence and your oaths. Now, if that is anything like what is happening in various parts of Ireland, owing to these political agitations and this agrarian feeling, then the law is paralyzed, the ordinary means of convicting those who have been guilty of crime are found not to be effectual, and some other means must be discovered, that means is to offer them a trial in England, or before a commission or bench of Irish judges. There is the bill which is called a coercion bill. But what is it a coercion bill for? It is a bill altering, speaking generally, the procedure in criminal cases for the purpose of enforcing the criminal law of the land. That is undoubtedly one means of doing it. Another means is, give them what they want, give them all they desire, give them 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—that I am not standing here as the justifier of Lord Salisbury's government, but it is only fair that it should