

if men versed in the law would be magistrates under this Coercion Act, the Minister answered no. My hon. friend would wish this Parliament to say that because there is no change in the definition of offences, the whole procedure might be done away with, all the rights of the prisoner might be swept away, and there would be nothing that this House could complain of or pronounce upon, and we have no knowledge that the rights of men in Ireland are to be invaded under the Bill. But there was something more. My hon. friend, in discussing the speech of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), stated :

"It is not correct to compare the situation of the people in this country before responsible government was granted to us, with that of the Irish people to-day. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) told us this afternoon that since we had been granted responsible government sullenness had disappeared from our midst, and peace, happiness and loyalty to the Crown prevailed throughout the land; but does not the hon. member forget that the Bill which gave him the right was forced upon the people of Lower Canada against their wishes?"

"Mr. LAURIER. It was the Act of Union they opposed.

"Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, and it is by the Act of Union that the hon. member got responsible government and the liberty to govern himself of which he has boasted, and which he says, has enabled his people to live happily and prosperously under the British flag. That Act was passed in the British Parliament, against the will of the people of Lower Canada, and yet that union with the people of Upper Canada which lasted until the time of Confederation, was found, as my hon. friend has had to admit, to confer happiness and peace and prosperity upon all of us."

Without referring to arguments that have been adduced by other hon. members to show the inaccuracy of this statement, I would say this: Suppose it were true that this Act was imposed on the people against their will, and that it gave them peace and happiness and prosperity, and produced loyalty in their hearts, the very statement made by the hon. gentleman shows that the Government of England to-day is singularly at fault. Why do they not come forward in response to the appeal of the majority of the people of Ireland, backed up by the urgent request of this Parliament and of the civilised world, and impose upon the people of Ireland some kind of Home Rule, some measure of fair play and justice; and although it might not, perhaps, be acceptable to the leaders of the Irish people, yet, if it were a just and comprehensive measure, calculated to develop the industries of the country and to promote its prosperity, even though it be imposed on them against their will or the will of their leaders to-day, may we not expect a result in Ireland similar to that which was so eloquently pointed out by the hon. member for Quebec East as having taken place in Lower Canada? And should the leaders of the Irish people to-day not acquiesce in it, but attempt to raise their voices against it, their fate will be the same as that of the Hon. Louis Joseph Papineau in this country, who, when he sought to raise a cry against the measure of self-government which his fellow-countrymen received, found that his influence had faded away, and the people would no longer hearken to his eloquent appeals and fiery denunciations. The people of Ireland would be found to accept any just measure of Home Rule that would be granted to them to-day in the same spirit as the French-Canadian people of Lower Canada. Now, Sir, in the course of this discussion, which has been singularly free from any allusion to Canadian politics, there were one or two gentlemen who did venture, I think very unfortunately indeed, to drag into it the conduct of certain gentlemen on this side of the House on a former occasion, and to endeavor to make political capital out of a question which I can assure every man in this House and this country, and before God, I have sought to deal with without any political or party desire whatever, but in order to cement together all the friends of the old land in one phalanx on this particular question, and to bury, if possible, the animosities of the past. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) told us that in my introductory remarks, I had mentioned the fact,

Mr. CURRAN.

and it is a fact, that no newspaper in this country of any importance, on either side of politics, had ever, within the past few years, written a line of editorial against Home Rule. But, he said, I had made a mistake, since the *Ottawa Citizen*, only a few days ago, had an article against Home Rule, whilst no Reform journal had written anything of the kind. That I can assure the hon. gentleman is an entirely false impression on his part. There was no such article in the *Citizen*, but there was a correspondence in that paper signed by the gentleman who wrote it, and to that correspondence I very briefly alluded. I think it is a great mistake for any man who professes to be a friend of Ireland in Canada and who wishes to strengthen the cause of Home Rule in Ireland, to go about searching for a journal opposed to Home Rule. It would seem to cast suspicion upon his own honesty in his advocacy of the Irish cause, because I, for one, am always prepared, and, I believe, the friends of Home Rule are everywhere prepared, to extend the right hand of friendship and fellowship to every one who labors for the cause. It is not friendly to point out that here, there or elsewhere, there is a weak spot or an attempt on the part of any person of influence to belittle the cause or deprive it of recruits. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) also alluded to this matter in the same connection, and I think in so doing he also made a great mistake. A proposition was laid down to-day by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which I think, no one can contradict, which, I think, every member of this House may study with a great deal of profit and perhaps no man more than the hon. gentleman who so eloquently laid it down. In discussing a public question he said, we do not stop to enquire into the opinions on other subjects of those who happen to be on the same side as ourselves. That is a sound doctrine. When men go together to vote on any particular question, it is the value of the cause itself, the value of the question at stake, the value of the proposition that is laid before the people, that should be discussed, and not the value of the man who casts his vote. One should not turn round at the poll and say to his neighbor: Sir, I must decline your assistance, although I desire that this cause should triumph, I beg of you, on account of your antecedents or opinions or on some other particular account, to abstain from voting, and let me carry this cause to success alone. In asking this House for permission to alter a few of the words of the resolutions I have proposed, I desire to say that I accept, in the spirit in which it was tendered, the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. He bears an Irish name, and so do I. Upon this question I hope that we shall always be found acting in unison, and that if in the past there has been anything done calculated to drive the friends of Ireland asunder, such things will be avoided in the future. I hope that no imputations will be made, and that such a line will be adopted as will enable us, to use the hon. gentleman's own words, to act together to secure the greatest unanimity. I make this allusion on account of what has taken place since we last met in this House, and I may be pardoned, having been the principal victim of a sort of conspiracy, as it were, of a systematic persecution, to say a few words as to what has taken place. In the second paragraph of this resolution, after reciting that in 1882 we passed resolutions favorable to Home Rule for Ireland, it is stated that in 1886 we passed a similar resolution, reiterating a hope that a measure of Home Rule will be given. I regret to say that, whatever may have been the opinions, whatever may have been the expressions of Reform journals in this country with regard to the cause of Home Rule, from the biggest down to the smallest in importance, there was not one that did not hound down the Minister of Inland Revenue and myself as having voted against Home Rule. This proposition which I bring forward