

while the details were to be modified at a later period. In this country we are told by public speakers and by the press that Mr. Gladstone, as leader of the Liberal party, did all he could to carry a measure of Home Rule for Ireland. Although I hold that the Liberal party, and the Conservative party, until a very recent date, were equally responsible for the misgovernment of Ireland, I am pleased to confess that Mr. Gladstone, in taking the stand he did and becoming the advocate of Home Rule, endeared himself to every man in Ireland, and he received from the Irish people all the credit he could reasonably expect, not only for his great efforts in placing that measure before the British Parliament, but for the great ability and energy he has displayed in seeking to effect the amelioration of the condition of Ireland. But while he is entitled, as leader of that great party, to the thanks of the Irish people for his honest, able and sincere efforts in that direction, I must say at the same time that a portion of the Liberal party, that portion which severed connection with Mr. Gladstone, and refused any longer to follow him as leader—that that is the political party and the political element in the Imperial Parliament which is responsible for the failure of Mr. Gladstone's measure, and are responsible to-day, owing to the support they gave to the present Government, for the absence of a Home Rule measure in the present Parliament. So, in speaking on this question, I think it only fair to put it in that way. I speak no more as a Conservative than as a Liberal, and without reference to any political position I hold in this country, but thinking only as to what will best promote the cause we are advocating, and I am bound to say that up to a recent period both political parties in England were equally responsible for the misgovernment of Ireland. To Mr. Gladstone is due the credit of having broken the ice, and introduced a measure of Home Rule for which he is entitled to the gratitude of Irishmen; but the portion of the Liberal party which deserted his ranks must be held responsible for the failure of that measure at that time. I say further that they are still responsible, while occupying their present position, for the absence of a Home Rule measure, and perhaps for the presence of this coercion measure now before the English Parliament. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), in stating his views upon that question, gave expression to them, as he generally does, with vigor and with warmth, and he perhaps used expressions that had better not have been used. If the hon. gentleman failed to establish his argument in favor of coercion, if he failed to convince this House that they ought to vote against the motion now before it, he certainly did not fail to convince me that he is a believer in coercion, because in alluding to Mr. Parnell, the leader of the Irish party in the English Parliament, and the Irishmen who form the Land League, he said they were convicted of complicity in the Phoenix Park murders, because the *London Times* said so, and he condemned that body, notwithstanding that the League, under the leadership of Mr. Parnell, has rendered as much service, and more service, in maintaining order and keeping the peace than all the police force sent to Ireland. The course urged by Mr. Parnell and his followers has been to advise the people to patiently endure their wrongs and to keep within constitutional bounds, and if they did so they were bound to ultimately succeed. And that idea has been acted on very generally by the Irish people. But the mover of the amendment, in order to show the necessity of coercion in Ireland, in order to prove what a deplorable condition the country was in and that the Government of England was justified in bringing that coercive measure before Parliament, quoted reports of certain judges in Ireland to show that the measure was absolutely necessary. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, by accident hit upon the reports of certain judges which were very strong in that direction and were not at all favorable to the Irish people. I have

a few extracts here; I have the report of other Irish judges of equal eminence to those quoted by the mover of the amendment, and they show a very different state of things from that presented by the hon. member. Their reports establish different facts entirely. I will read a few of them. Lord Justice Fitzgerald, at Meath, in addressing the jury at the Assizes, said:

"Gentlemen of the Grand Jury of the county of Meath:—The Crown solicitor's list for the present Assizes contains only four cases, one of which has laid over from the previous Assizes, and of the remaining three one was for larceny and receiving, and two for violent assault. In fact your county, as I am led to believe, is in its usual condition, that is to say, there is an absence of anything of the character of serious crime throughout the county, and that is the only subject with which we are at the present time dealing."

The report of that large county does not show a very bad state of affairs there. I have also the report respecting King's county from Judge Lawson, who was one of the judges quoted by the hon. gentleman, and who gave the very strongest report as to the existence of crime in different parts of Ireland. But this said Judge Lawson at the Assizes of King's county, though the reporter does not seem to have been able to follow his words clearly, gives the following:—

"Judge Lawson was heard with difficulty in his brief address to the grand jury. He was understood to say the business to go before them was extremely light. There were but five bills from the entire county, and none of them were of an important character. The county inspector had also reported that the county was in a satisfactory condition; so he had nothing more to do than congratulate them on the lightness of their work."

Sir Michael Morris, Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, opened the Assizes for Westmeath. Here is the verbatim report of the proceedings:

"The Lord Chief Justice, in addressing the Grand Jury, said: Mr. Handcock and gentlemen of the Grand Jury of the county of Westmeath, I am informed that there is but one bill to go before you, which will, I am sure, detain you for a very short time indeed. As there is one absent from your number, the majority of you will have to sign the bill. The grand jury then retired, and returned into court, finding 'no bill' in the only case submitted, which was a case of rape against a private soldier in the Royal Dublin Fusiliers, and the prisoner was accordingly discharged."

Then, in the county of Roscommon:

"The assizes for the county of Roscommon were opened by Judge Murphy. The grand jury having been called and re-sworn, his lordship congratulated them on the condition of their county, and said the bills to go before them were very few in number, and none of them calling for any comment from him."

In Sligo, where he was presented with a pair of white gloves, Judge Lawson addressed the grand jury as follows:—

"The business they had to discharge was exceedingly light. There were only three bills in all to go before them. The only case of any importance was a charge of stabbing, but in investigating that charge they would not require any assistance from him."

These are a few reports taken from the public press, and I dare say others might be added to their number, showing what the opinions of the judges were as to the state of the country, and they convey a very different impression from the reports which were quoted by the mover of the amendment. The arguments of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), who on this occasion, as on former occasions, has expressed his deep and warm sympathy with the Irish people, with the Home Rule movement, and with the motion which is now in your hands, would have been quite as strong if he could have refrained from throwing an insult across the floor of the House to myself, which can affect the question in no way, which can add no strength to his arguments or do any good in promoting the question which is now under discussion. If it pleases the hon. gentleman to take that line towards me, I consider it has done me no harm, and, as far as it personally affects myself, I am not going to intrude my own case before the consideration of this House when a question of such importance is under discussion. But I must refer to his remarks when dealing with the action of this House during last Session upon this same question, because that it is not a personal question at all, and because I do not wish that he should place the