

freedom. It was not intended to furnish facilities to any one to hold an arbitrary trial, or exercise arbitrary authority over him. It was not because there was any distrust of the ordinary tribunals of the country, it was not because any one claimed that justice could not be done, it was not because any one said that the people sympathised with the offenders and that it was impossible for the law to be administered through the ordinary channels. The position was entirely different. There is no analogy between the Act proposed by Mr. Balfour and the Act on the Statute-book. The hon. gentleman knew, he must have known, that such was the provision of the law. Why, then, did he conceal the fact that the party was not compelled to be tried summarily by two magistrates, but he had the option of being so tried if he thought proper to seek a trial in that way in order to obtain an early discharge? Why, Sir, there is an instance, an ancient Roman precedent, of trial by two magistrates. We have an account of a trial on one occasion by two magistrates in Judea. They did not sit together; Herod and Pilate sat separately, but their sitting separately, and sitting as judges in the same case, seemed to have had the effect of making them friends, and the necessary inference would be that these gentlemen afterwards sat together. And so the hon. gentleman might have found in sacred writ an instance of the summary trial of an innocent man by two magistrates, and he might have found in that instance a better illustration of that Bill, upon which he asks us to abstain from expressing an opinion, than in the Act of my hon. friend which he misrepresented and misquoted in this House. Now, we know what the intention of the Imperial Government is in introducing this Bill. Lord Salisbury has not left us in the dark, for more than a year ago he declared that arbitrary government established in Ireland for a period of twenty years might so educate and discipline the Irish people, that they would be fit for the ordinary government of a civilised community. Lord Salisbury proposed to revive the ancient system of "Thorough" in Ireland, and this Bill, it is clear, is simply carrying out the exact intention of his lordship. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) said in his speech that the Irish are better off than any other portion of the people of the British Isles, so far as their government is concerned. They are more favored. The hon. gentleman says that the Irish tenant is protected by the court from exorbitant charges. He admits that a man occupying the position of an ordinary Irish tenant, is not free to make a contract with his landlord; he admits that Mr. Gladstone, in his measure, properly interfered with the authority of the landlord; but the hon. gentleman says, having so interfered in carrying this measure, the Irish tenant is better off than a tenant either in England or Scotland. Now, the hon. gentleman seemed to forget that a very large portion of the Irish tenantry are not holders under Mr. Gladstone's Bill. It is only those who have complained and gone before the Land Courts and had their case adjudicated upon, that are so placed. Then, further than that, we know that there has been such a fall in the prices of agricultural produce that the tenant who has secured a reduction based upon prices as they were, is now no better, or little better off than he was before the Court interfered. The hon. gentleman has forgotten the opposition with which this measure was met. He has forgotten that men high in place denounced it as a robbery of the landlord. He seems to have forgotten the views that were expressed by the Duke of Argyll, by Lord Salisbury and other noblemen, who interfered on behalf of the landlord, and who altered and changed the Bill, and who made it a very much less beneficial measure than it was as it passed the House of Commons. He knows that they have exercised sleepless vigilance with a view to protecting what they claim to be their interests, against any possible concession to the vast majority of the Irish people; and knowing such to be the case, I think the hon. gentle-

man would have been warranted in coming to the conclusion that the Irish people had not been legislated for in their interests, and in the interests of the Empire, but their interests have been subordinated to those of the small minority who have long exercised a controlling and mischievous influence in the government of the country. The hon. gentleman said: Mr. Parnell and his associates are rebels, and the associates of assassins; that Mr. Parnell has sympathised with assassination; that a letter appears over his signature showing that to be the case; and that, until he purges himself of that accusation, this House ought not to express an opinion upon the question of Home Rule, nor our disapprobation of Mr. Balfour's Bill. How is Mr. Parnell to vindicate himself? The *Times* publishes a letter; that letter is in the possession of the *Times*. It is asserted, and I dare say, correctly so, that every expert in handwriting has been retained in the interest of the *Times*. Well, where will Mr. Parnell have this matter tried? Wherever he may go those paid witnesses will appear in court against him. There is not a place he can go where jurymen who have strong political feelings and prejudices might not be had. Although there might be eleven out of the twelve to pronounce him guilty and hold the letter to be a forgery, one jurymen would be sufficient to damn his reputation under the existing circumstances. We know with what fierce animosity Mr. Parnell is pursued by a very considerable portion of the people of the United Kingdom. The publication of the article in the *Times*, the challenge that has been put forward, all indicate the very strong feeling of animosity that actuates those who are attacking Mr. Parnell in this matter. But suppose Mr. Parnell were guilty, suppose it was true that he had written this letter and had associated himself with persons who were criminals, who were of as vile a character as the *Times* has asserted, is that any reason why the Irish people should be misgoverned and oppressed and deprived of local self government? Is that any reason why we should abstain from expressing an opinion upon the question? Everyone remembers the charge made against Mazzini, that he was accused of plotting the assassination of King Bomba and other petty tyrants in Italy, and yet the people of England did not abstain on that account from sympathising with the cause of Italian nationality. Take the case of Louis Napoleon. He was elected President of the French Republic, and swore to uphold and maintain the Republican Government in France. He, however, conspired to overturn that Government, and he did it by shooting down men, women and children in the streets of Paris and wading through the blood of those whom he ought to have protected to the throne; and when he got there Lord Palmerston sent him a letter of congratulation. It is true Lord Palmerston was dismissed from office. It was not, however, on account of the moral turpitude of his act, but because he did not agree with Baron Stockmar and Prince Albert. Afterwards the Government of Lord Aberdeen entered into an alliance with Napoleon and carried on the war with Russia. Did any public man in England, did any portion of the press denounce that alliance because of Napoleon's character. Napoleon was an ally of Count Cavour when he was seeking to secure the unification of Italy in 1859. We find when public men are dealing with important public questions, they do not stop to consider whether there may be men of bad reputation taking the same side. Why, if Christianity itself had been subjected to such a trial it could not have succeeded. That is not the rule. During the American war General Hooker was, for a short time, commander of the army of the Potomac, and General Jackson was a very prominent officer on the Confederate side. Hooker had the reputation of being a very profane man, and Jackson that of a man of very great piety and of unsullied private character. What would be thought if a northern man had proposed to desert Hooker because of his profanity