

1798, will see how close was the correspondence between the Irish leaders of that day and the Directory in France. Then, again, if you give her a local Government her material interests are bound up with those of England. She exports at the present moment to the extent of £20,000,000 sterling, about \$100,000,000 worth. And how much of that goes to England? £19,250,000. So that if she wanted to separate, what would she have to do? She has not got a ship, she cannot become a naval power; and she would have to make a navy to destroy her best customer, and to destroy the navy of the greatest naval power in the world. So, Sir, I think we need not be alarmed on that score. Now, let me say one word in regard to the Coercion Bill. But for the word "exciting," but for the provision in regard to exciting in the Coercion Bill, I do not see there is much to object to. And the two magistrates—that is a thing, I confess, knowing Ireland as I do, to make one pause; because these two magistrates, would, in nine cases out of ten, belong to the landlord class, and we know the state of mind that class is in at present. I am afraid that, under these circumstances, a man accused, to use an expressive though not very elegant phrase, might be "going to law with the devil in the court of hell." But, Sir, there is crime in Ireland. In the telegram that arrived this morning, which tells us that Mr. O'Brien is not coming here—and I think he does very well not to come here—there is a statement that persons will not be allowed to take a certain course. A circular is sent around Ireland telling the rack-renters to beware of sharpshooters. Well, Sir, of course the state of things in which crime, menace and threatening obtain, is not a state of liberty. The moment the law is paralysed the people are under a tyranny. I have here a few words from Lord Littleton on this subject, which, with the permission of the House, I will read. Remember, that at the present time freedom in all parts of the British Empire is no longer in danger from the encroachments of the Crown; it is in danger, if anything, from the people themselves. Lord Littleton says:

"In order to preserve the independence of Parliament against any future violation on the part of the Crown, it will be necessary to preserve the reputation of Parliament in the minds of the people, and the love of it in their hearts. How, my Lords, can this be done if they find it an obstacle to their equal justice, which is their birth-right and their safety? Upon the whole I am confident your Lordships will, on no account, depart from that maxim, which is the corner stone of all Government, that justice should have its course without stop or impediment. *Jus, fas, lex, potentissima sint.* This, my Lords, is the very soul and essence of freedom. Obstruct this, and you immediately open a door to all violence and confusion; to all iniquity and all the cruelties of private revenge; to the destruction of private peace, the dissolution of public order, and in the end, to an unlimited and despotic authority which we must be forced to submit to as a remedy against such intolerable evils. The dominion of law is the dominion of liberty. Privilege against law in matters of high concernment to the public is oppression, is tyranny, wheresoever it exists."

And, Sir, any secret society threatening people, any system or state of society in which crimes such as we hear of are perpetrated, that is a condition in which the people are subjected to the worst of all possible tyrannies. I confess it is very hard to resist the clear, cold logic of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). If the Imperial Parliament, a Parliament under which we live and move and have our being, were to lecture us on our legislation in this House we should kick like an overfed steer. If we should regard it as impertinent on their part to interfere with us, *a fortiori* it is impertinent on our part to play the legislative pedagogue to them. They are responsible; they know all the facts. It is a serious thing to interfere with a Government dealing with the suppression of crime. It is a very serious thing to take any course under such circumstances which will weaken the Executive. I have in my hand a few sentences from Mr. Justin McCarthy's work, "The History of our own Time," on this point. Speaking of the interference of England with the Chinese Government, he says:

Mr. DAVIN.

"It was no business of ours to ask ourselves whether the Chinese Government were perfectly sincere in their professions of lofty morality, or whether they, unlike all other Governments that have ever been known, were influenced by one sole motive in the making of their regulations. All that had nothing to do with the question. States are not at liberty to help the subjects of other States to break the laws of their own Governments. Especially when these laws profess to concern questions of morals, is it the duty of foreign States not to interfere with the regulations which a Government sees it necessary to impose for the protection of its people."

So that, Sir, we take a very grave responsibility upon us. I find, on reading the debates of the English Parliament, from time to time—and I have an instance of it in my hands in *Hansard*—that speakers in that Parliament constantly refer to opinions in the States, and here and make arguments from those opinions; and if a Cabinet Minister—and I have here an instance where a Cabinet Minister actually made an argument from the opinion of the States and Canada—so acts, then it may be, after all, a proper and right thing for us to give our opinion in regard to the Coercion Bill and Home Rule, notwithstanding Mr. Gladstone's snub as quoted by the hon. member for Simcoe. There are a large number of Irishmen and their descendants in Canada, and it is to their credit that they take a deep interest in the rock whence they were hewn, provided they do not allow their interest in Ireland to override their duty to Canada, provided they keep intact their interest and devote the necessary portion of their time to Canadian affairs—it is to their credit that they do not forget Ireland and still take an interest in her affairs. And, therefore, under these circumstances it may be not inappropriate that we in this House should do what many hon. members and many people outside think is wasting the time of Canada. But, as I say, the speech of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) is, in my opinion, unanswerable as a piece of logic. If we were dealing with a matter of law, if we were dealing with anything but human beings, the speech of that hon. gentleman is unanswerable. But brilliant, logical, clear, strong as it was, it had one defect. It was defective in sympathy; and being defective in sympathy, I could not go with him and with his motion. But, Sir, we cannot afford—I speak now as an Irishman—Irishmen here and in the States cannot afford to do otherwise than to protest in the strongest possible manner against such crimes as are taking place in Ireland. An Englishman, a Scotchman, a Frenchman, may philosophise an excuse, if he likes, for such crimes; but there is one man that cannot do so, and that is an Irishman who is jealous for the honor of Ireland and for his own. He can find no excuse for these crimes, and the men that perpetrate them are the greatest enemies to the local government of Ireland and to Ireland's prosperity, for they are driving capital away from the country; and I learn there is great depression in Dublin in consequence of these matters. And, therefore, while I cannot sympathise with the motion of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), yet in his attitude that those crimes must be denounced and put down I entirely agree. As to giving advice to English statesmen, I think, from one point of view, we are in a good position to do so. We live in a new country which emancipates us from Old World prejudices. In England and Ireland feudal structures anomalously linger in luxurious pomp or proud decay and prejudices cling round them like ivy round the long disused battlement. Under those circumstances a statesman like Lord Salisbury, or any English statesman, may actually not have so good a standpoint from which to arrive at a just conclusion on political questions, as have the people who breathe the broader and freer air of this continent. I confess, from what we know English statesmen have done for Canada, we cannot feel they are above the possibility of error; and looking back, as far as my reading of history goes, to the great names, as I suppose they will be called, the great statesmen who have ruled England, only three or four really understood how to deal