

ed the House yesterday, concluded an able and moderate speech which was directed mostly to establish the proposition that coercion in Ireland was necessary, by proposing a resolution to the effect that the Parliament of Canada should not express any opinion as to the course of Imperial legislation, because our Parliament had not the requisite information upon which to offer an opinion; but the hon. gentleman himself must have thought we had sufficient information, since he came to the conclusion, in his speech if not in his motion, that coercion was necessary for Ireland. On the other hand, the friends of Ireland, with the same information at their command as the hon. gentleman has, may come to a different conclusion, and believe that the true course to be followed is not the course of coercion, but that of freedom. But, moreover, Mr. Gladstone, fighting on behalf of the Irish people, invites all those who sympathise with Ireland to record their sympathy with the struggle now being made. In a late letter he speaks as follows:—

“I attach very high value and importance to the manifestations, now incessant, of American as well as Colonial sympathy with the Irish people in the crisis created by the causeless, insulting and insidious Bill at present before Parliament.”

Well, if the advice of the friends of Ireland may be of value to those who are now engaged in fighting her battle, it seems to me that the advice of all those subjects of Her Majesty, who have enjoyed the benefits of Home Rule for fifty years, may be of still greater value from their experience of the blessings of Home Rule; and in that view I say emphatically that the suggestions of no class of Her Majesty's colonial subjects, as to the blessings of Home Rule, may be more profitable than the suggestions of Her Majesty's subjects of French origin. And, speaking as a French Canadian, I cannot help comparing the history of my own country with the history of Ireland to-day. I see much similitude between the situation of Ireland to-day and the situation of Canada, and especially Lower Canada, fifty years ago. It seems to me that the public men who to-day have to deal with the cause of Ireland are hampered by a distrust of the Irish people in the same way as the public men who had to deal with the cause of Canada fifty years ago were hampered by a distrust of the people of Canada. There are only two ways of governing men—by despotism, or coercion if you choose to call it by that name, or by freedom. You can coerce an inferior and an uncivilised race, but never a proud and self-respecting people. Coercion has been tried, not once or twice, but times almost without number, in Ireland, and it has failed every time; and, if tried again, it must fail as it did before. The Irish people would not be the proud people that they are, if they were to be cowered by coercion into abandoning one single iota of what they deem to be their just rights. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said yesterday that coercion had been successful. At least I understood him to say so in regard to the last Coercion Bill, that it suppressed crime. How can such language be held? If coercion had been successful in Ireland, how is it that the fate of Ireland is what it is to-day? The hon. gentleman himself devoted the greater part of his speech to demonstrate that crime to-day is rampant in Ireland. Coercion can punish crime, it can crush out all expressions of public opinion, it can choke in the throat even before they are uttered all words of complaint or remonstrance, but it cannot breed contentment and affection in the hearts of the people for the Government, it cannot induce that cheerfulness and allegiance which should be the aim towards which every Government should tend. What is wanted to-day in Ireland is not a law to punish crime, but a state of things which will suppress crime by suppressing the motive for crime, the motive for agrarian crime, which is the only crime existing in Ireland. What is wanted is a state of things which will bring con-

tentment to the hearts of the people, a state of things which will make the people happy and proud of their allegiance. This is what is wanted to-day in Ireland, and, since it is proved, and proved, it seems to me, beyond dispute, that coercion has failed as often as it has been tried, I ask of those who to-day support coercion, not only in this Parliament but out of this Parliament, if it would not be well to try the other method of governing men, the method of freedom? Strange to say, all those who to-day oppose Home Rule, whether on this continent or on the other continent, all those who to-day advocate coercion must admit, and they do admit with more or less reluctance, that some kind of local government should be granted to Ireland. Even the hon. gentleman who placed in your hands the amendment you now have, though his speech was devoted to the proposition that coercion was necessary, still in his amendment adhered to the resolutions in favor of Home Rule which were passed by this House. This is not unusual. All these statesmen, as far as my knowledge goes, in England or out of England, who have treated that subject and have come to the conclusion that coercion was necessary, at the same time have said that, after all, the present state of things was intolerable, and that some kind of local government should be devised for Ireland. At the same time they are misty in their views. While stating that in one breath, they stifle it in the next; whilst admitting that Ireland should have some kind of local administration, still they all conclude their utterances by stating that, after all, the Imperial Parliament should have absolute control even over local matters. And what is the secret of it all? The secret is that the men who deal with that question and oppose Mr. Gladstone at this moment, distrust the people of Ireland, and one and all believe that, if anything like legislative independence were given to the people of Ireland, the people of Ireland would simply make it a stepping stone towards effecting complete separation from the Empire. As far as that goes, I am reminded of the history of my own country, of the history of Canada, and especially of Lower Canada. The hon. gentleman who seconded the Address the other day, the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in an able and well-tempered speech, referred to the fact, that in the first year of Her Majesty's reign there was rebellion in these Provinces. He took some pride in saying that there had been no rebellion in the Maritime Provinces. That is so. There was no rebellion in the Maritime Provinces, but there was discontent in the Maritime Provinces, there was agitation in the Maritime Provinces, and what was the cause of it? The discontent and the agitation arose from the fact that the people of the Maritime Provinces, in common with the people of all the British Provinces, demanded at that time more extended local liberty. There was the same discontent throughout the length and breadth of Upper Canada. There was even rebellion in Upper Canada, though it was restricted within narrow limits. But there was rebellion throughout Lower Canada, rebellion which was profound, bitter and deep-rooted. We have heard of late that rebellion may exist without cause, that it may exist out of sheer malice, and mere wantonness; but the Government of England did not believe so. The Government of England thought that, since the people of the British colonies had risen in arms against the Government, there must be some cause for that uprising, and they sent out one of the most eminent men of his day, Lord Durham, to investigate the cause of that rebellion. Lord Durham came here, he did his work, and he did it well, he investigated the causes which had led to the rebellion in Lower Canada, and to the rebellion in Upper Canada, and which had spread discontent all over British territory in America, and he reported to his Government. It is not my duty to-day to review the report of Lord Durham at length. If that were my duty,