

ham (Mr. Blake) have already decided in Mr. Parnell's favor. They have already pronounced that he is not the author of that letter, and various reasons are given for coming to that conclusion. I never understood that that letter implied or meant that Mr. Parnell had actually directed the assassination of these men. I apprehend that all that letter means is that Mr. Parnell was in communication with those who had done Lord Cavendish and Mr. Burke to death in Phoenix Park. I would like to know what Mr. Parnell's course is. The London *Times* has, with care and deliberation, published reasons for coming to the conclusion that Mr. Parnell and his associates—but I will read the deliberate words of the *Times* published in the early part of March :

"Be the ultimate goal of these men what it will, they are content to march towards it in the company of murderers; murderers provide their funds; murderers share their inmost councils; murderers have gone forth from the league offices to set their bloody work afoot and have presently returned to consult the constitutional leaders on the advancement of the cause."

This statement was made with deliberation; the conclusion was argued out for every man to read for himself—proved, so to speak, from the writings and speeches of these men themselves; the day and date and place of publication given to those who choose to study it. Mr. Parnell has been challenged, and there is no other way open to a man thus assailed than to bring the so-called libeller to justice; and finally these words—emphatic enough in all conscience, deliberate enough, clear enough, unmistakable in their meaning—have been followed up by the publication of the letter. And when Mr. Parnell gets up in the House of Commons and denies being the author of it, he is told by the great Thunderer: Mr. Parnell, your big words do not frighten us; we have not published this statement without care and without examination, and we challenge you to come into a place and give us your oath on the subject and undergo a cross-examination which will enable the people of England and the people of the world, no matter what the jury may do, to decide as to your guilt or innocence. And it has been pointed out to Mr. Parnell that he can bring that matter before an Irish jury, as we know that he can, before a Scotch jury or before an English jury, but Mr. Parnell refuses the ordeal. Then, Sir, if Mr. Parnell continues to refuse that, what will be the verdict of mankind? The hon. gentleman pronounced in advance in favor of his innocence; and certainly if Mr. Parnell took the course which I venture to say an honorable man ought to take, we ought to esteem him innocent until he is proved to be guilty; but if Mr. Parnell denies to his character the only means of its justification, the verdict of mankind and the verdict of posterity will be in favor of the charge being true. Under these circumstances ought we to send this document to Mr. Parnell? Ought we to show that we accept the *ipse dixit* of one or two gentlemen who seem to think they know all about this matter? Ought we not, at any rate, to obliterate his name from the resolution, even if we think proper to send it to the Prime Minister and to Mr. Gladstone? I think, perhaps, we would be doing more justice to ourselves if, in the event of the resolution receiving the assent of the House, that course should be adopted. I will therefore move, in amendment to the amendment:

That all the words after the word "That" in the main motion be struck out, and the following added instead thereof:—"this House, while justly jealous of any interference in the local affairs of Canada within the jurisdiction of this Parliament or of the Legislative Assemblies of the several Provinces of the Dominion, either by the Imperial Parliament or other Legislative body of the British Empire, cannot without inviting such interference fail to recognise it as within the exclusive right of the Imperial Parliament to legislate respecting matters solely appertaining to the domestic affairs of the United Kingdom; than which none can be more absolutely of local concern than the due and proper administration of the law within the bounds of Great Britain and Ireland."

"That, therefore, it is inexpedient and unwise for this House to express any opinion or in anywise to interfere with the Imperial Parliament."
Mr. MCCARTHY.

ment as to the course to be adopted by it respecting the Bill now before the House of Commons for the amendment of the Criminal Law and Procedure (Ireland) "

Mr. CLAYES. Just one word I desire to say in reply to the hon. member for North Simcoe. He opened his remarks by speaking of our duty and our relations to the Empire and the Home Government. Now, the hon. gentleman represents a political party which owes its strength and power largely to sentiments which have their origin in Imperial memories—sentiments which have to do with the honor of the Empire. I am not one of those who believe that that party dominates in this country because alone of the superior skill of its leader or because of the questionable influences which are said to be used and which I believe are used to move and determine the action of individuals; but I believe it dominates because the country as a whole believes that that party, being the Tory party and devoted to the past, is opposed to movement and to change, and distrust the Liberals because it is the party of progress, and progress involves change. It is because of that that the party is strong, and that the right hon. gentleman stands here representing, as he does with great ability, the Tory party. If that be true, and if a question comes up which involves the honor and integrity of the Empire, its peace and security, then I ask you, being a part of the Empire and being a people moved by sentiment, when sentiment has so much to do with our political action and opinions, whether it is not proper for us to approach the Home Government and ask them to consider what our experience has been in the way of Home Rule, and whether the history of the past is not such as to induce them to pause and question the propriety of passing another measure of coercion. I would ask them to pause before taking such action, in view of the fact that for 700 or 800 years Ireland has been treated to repeated policies of coercion, and time has repeatedly told the story of her people trodden down, outraged, their loyalty destroyed by virtue of that very policy which the present British Government proposes again to adopt. Is it not proper that we should approach the Government at home and say that we, like themselves, as citizens of the Empire, men capable of comprehending a question like this, appeal to them, from our own experience of the blessings of Home Rule, to adopt that policy which, in our opinion, would result in making a disloyal people loyal as it has done to the same people here. The hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Mc Carthy) said he did not believe we had the right to express our views upon this question. He said we had enough to do to mind our own affairs. He did not know enough about the question. Well, there is a certain knowledge of this question in which I think the hon. gentleman is wanting. He shows a knowledge of the technicalities of this question; he has stated them with great ability as a lawyer; but there is another knowledge which he does not possess, there is an ignorance for which there is no cure. It is the ignorance of heart. Now, Mr. Speaker, coercion has had its influence upon the character of Irishmen, and the hon. gentleman has given us an exhibition of that influence. He spoke as a representative of the oppressors of Ireland. He is a representative of the little minority of Irishmen who have been sustained in their oppression by the power of England, and who in a great measure have inspired the action of England in all its coercive measures. The hon. gentleman has expressed honestly and ably opinions thoroughly opposed to the welfare of the country as a whole. The hon. gentleman is one of those who perpetuate in this country the quarrels of the old? Why is it that these quarrels should be imported here? Why is it that we should have established here a powerful organisation, the organisation which I presume he represents, the Orange lodge? What ground is there here for such an institution—an institution that simply exists by virtue of ages of experience in Ireland,