

and to replace them by a fresh and stringent Coercion Act? Who is there who does not know that the obstacle to the remedy and to the relief for Ireland for many years has been the block of public opinion in England and Scotland? And who could not tell such a transaction was the very thing to shock such opinion and render, perhaps, a Coercion Act the only Act you could propose to the Imperial Legislature. Therefore, altogether apart from those feelings of head and heart, which, I am convinced, would have caused Mr. Parnell to shun, and deprecate, and dread, and have nought to do with such a dreadful deed, those who charge him with the slightest complicity in, or favor of, this deed must give him very little credit indeed for the qualities he possesses, in a very uncommon measure, of shrewdness, steadiness, sound judgment, far-sightedness, and a persistent, steady, but not impulsive determination. Therefore, the whole thing is, I think, unworthy of the great journal in which it appeared, and very much more unworthy to be repeated here as a reason why we should stay our hands to seek relief for the Irish people. But another name, after all, is concerned than Mr. Parnell's, in the effort to stay the hand of the Imperial Parliament in passing this Bill—the great name of Gladstone. Therefore, from that point of view, we are to remember that it is not merely the chief of the Irish parliamentary party who is posing, but the chief of the great body of English Liberals, the man whose illustrious life, if it be but prolonged some few years, we may hope will be crowned by a grand measure of justice to Ireland. Then the hon. gentleman dragged into the controversy, the question of the announced visit of Mr. O'Brien here, to discuss some particular cases of eviction. I do not really see that that has anything to do with the question. I regret, if it be the case, that that particular visit, with that particular purpose is to take place. I think it would be a mistake on the part of those in Canada, who desire, as all true friends of Ireland must desire, to avoid any circumstance which may chill the sympathies of the other classes of the population—I say they would act wisely if they would defer or end that visit. I am not here to enter, I think it would be hardly decent to enter, into the slightest discussion of the transactions concerning the tenantry of the illustrious nobleman, with whose case Mr. O'Brien proposes to deal. He is here in a representative capacity. He is the representative of our Sovereign, and I think that if there be examples of evil-dealings on the part of landlords with tenants, those examples which might be presented with the best proof, and with least possible difficulty resulting to the Canadian people, would be examples drawn from other estates than those drawn from those of the Governor General. While I say that, I regretted to hear the observation of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). He said, alluding to a statement which I observe in the papers, that the Government of the day has cabled that Mr. O'Brien will be under police surveillance if he should come here, that he would be more in need of police protection. I do not believe that, if Mr. O'Brien came here, he would require either police surveillance or police protection. I am delighted to be able to say that we have been able to discuss this exciting question, in communities in which there is a very great difference of opinion upon it, in the most satisfactory way, without one particle of disturbance. We have had great meetings in the city from which I come on both sides of the question. The views which have been brought forward on each side have been heard without disturbance, without any attempt to prevent the free utterance and expression of the views of each side. The people have been informed of what the views of each side were, and a great step has been gained in the way of tolerant discussion and proper handling of exciting questions. I have no doubt that, in whatever taste we may consider the visit of Mr. O'Brien and his discussion of the affairs of one particular landlord to be, he

will have in Canada—I hope so, at any rate—freedom of speech; he will not be, in the first place, under police surveillance, and, in the next place, that he will require no police protection to enable him to say his say, whatever that say may be. I hope that we shall not import anything of that description which is suggested by the hon. gentleman into our dealing with this matter; but it is of a piece with some other suggestions. We are told by the hon. gentleman, dealing with the question of Home Rule, that Home Rule such as is indicated cannot be obtained without civil war. The advocates of peace, of law, of order declare by their spokesman here that they will not obey a law of the Imperial Parliament should such a law be passed, and the reason is, forsooth, that the Irish are not a homogeneous people. No, they are not a homogeneous people, but a people not homogeneous has lived in peace and amity, in personal, in cordial, in political relations as one country often before; and although I am not here to deny that the bitternesses of this long controversy, complicated as it has been by differences of race, by differences of creed, more and most of all by the land question, and the fact that you have a minority of one race and of one creed very largely the possessors of the soil, and a majority of another race and another creed who are tenants of theirs under very exceptional circumstances, still we have to trust to the Irish people to manage this matter. I do not speak of the Irish people in the sense of the Irish Roman Catholics—I say the whole Irish people. I regard them as one people after all, and I have no doubt, for my part, that an example of tolerance, of generosity, of magnanimity will be set by the numerical majority, and that their natural measure of ascendancy due, not to their possessions, but to their intelligence, their education and their power, will be awarded with a liberal hand to the minority when the measure of Home Rule takes place. These prophets of civil war said something of the same kind when the Church Disestablishment question was in vogue. We were told that the waters of the Boyne were to be reddened with blood; but the Church was disestablished and there was not a shot fired; all was peace, and I believe the cause of Protestantism and the cause of religion benefited greatly. They say that separation is the goal. You may make separation the goal if you persist. It may be that the Irish people may at last despair, as many of them have despaired in the past, and that despair may produce the feeling to which hon. gentlemen referred when they spoke of that feeling of hostility. But I say that separation is not now the goal of the mass of the Irish people. They are simply making a demand for those rights which are their due and for a fair share of self-government and a tolerable condition of existence upon the soil upon which they were born and on which they desire to live. I ask you to listen to the eloquent words in which Mr. Gladstone combatted this argument, because I know it is a plausible and specious one, and I believe that to agree in it would be fatal to the cause it would be designed to serve. If we shrink on this ground, we will be sure to precipitate some effort, abortive it may be, but hardly less calamitous, towards the separation which you dread. Mr. Gladstone says:

“What is there in separation that would tend to make it advantageous to Ireland? As an island with many hundreds of miles of coasts, with a weak marine, and a people far more military than nautical in its habits, of small population and limited in her present resources; why should she expose herself to the risks of invasion and to the certainty of enormous cost in the creation and maintenance of a navy for defence, rather than remain under the shield of the greatest maritime power in the world, bound by every consideration of honor and of interest to guard her? Why should she be supposed desirous to forego the advantage of an absolute community of trade with the greatest among all commercial countries, to become an alien to the market which consumes, say nine-tenths of her produce, and instead of using the broad and universal paths of enterprise now open to her, to carve out for herself new and narrow ways as a third rate state? Why, when her children have now, man by man, the free run of the vast British Empire, upon terms of absolute