

ple lived here in content and happiness. (Cheers.) Home Rule in Ireland, he believed, would promote the

HAPPINESS AND UNITY

of the Empire. It was difficult to get attention in the British Parliament to local questions. The well-being of Ireland required a Legislature competent to deal with her own local affairs. The Irish people, as the resolutions stated, were proud and happy to believe that Ontario was a part of the British Empire. (Cheers.) If there was crime in Ireland, that was no reason for the passage of the Coercion Bill. Only a part of the Irish people had been guilty of crimes, but the bill applied to the whole people, guilty and innocent. The Coercion Act took away trial by jury and otherwise interfered with the liberty of the subject. Coercion might sometimes be necessary, but he contended that the causes leading to the crimes that made coercion necessary should be removed simultaneously with or prior to the

APPLICATION OF COERCION,

but the Act of the British Government proposed to apply coercion without removing those causes of crime and without promising to introduce any measure that would remove these causes. The resolutions had been drawn in such temperate language that it seemed difficult to suppose that any one should oppose them, as it would be a grand thing for Ontario if they were passed unanimously, and they had been drawn with that end in view. At all events he was fully of opinion that they would be of some service in promoting the welfare of Ireland, and the unity and prosperity of the empire. The resolutions were printed in THE GLOBE of April 13.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE said he did not desire to make political capital out of the discussion. This seemed to be the sole aim and object of the promoters of these resolutions. The Imperial Parliament was now dealing with this difficult subject, and he was entirely opposed to interfering in their deliberations. The recent elections in Great Britain were on the question of Home Rule, and were unfavorable to the cause of Home Rule in Ireland. If, then, they believed in the

PRINCIPLE OF THE MAJORITY

ruling, they should agree that the majority in Great Britain should be allowed to have their desire in this matter. Moreover, that majority surely was better able to judge of the advisability of granting Home Rule to Ireland than was a people four thousand miles away, who received all their news concerning the points in dispute through the medium of the American Associated Press. When a series of resolutions similar to those passed by the Dominion Parliament were transmitted to the Government of Great Britain, and had elicited a reply telling us that in these matters they would be guided by the responsible advisers of the Queen, Mr. Gladstone had expressed a similar view in the House of Commons. It might be said that Mr. Gladstone had changed his views in regard to this question. But it must also be remembered that the people of England, as shown by the last elections, had changed their opinions with regard to Mr. Gladstone. (Cheers.) He was opposed to coercion and repression of every kind. But he did not believe the Coercion Bill restrained the liberty of any of the peaceful and law-abiding people of Ireland. This Coercion Act was only intended

FOR THE LAWLESS,

for the assassins, the boycotters, those who maimed cattle and pulled down houses, those who had brought disgrace upon the name of

Ireland. Why should the House express disapproval of an Act to repress such crimes? — and that was all it was meant to do. The hon. member read extracts from letters and speeches written and uttered by justices of the peace in Ireland, including the opinions of Justices O'Brien and Lawson, two of the most eminent judges on the Irish Bench, who stated the condition of crime to be

ALMOST UNPRECEDENTED

throughout certain districts in Ireland. He had another reason for opposing the resolution. It was that he believed the motive of some, at least, of the Irish leaders, was not simply to obtain self-government for Ireland, but to obtain entire separation from England. It was said that all the opposition to Home Rule came from the Province of Ulster. That was not so. There was a strong minority opposed to it in other parts of the country. The Attorney-General said that the poverty prevailing in Ireland at the present time was very great. It was true that there was much poverty existing in the country, unhappily so. But he would draw the attention of the House to the fact that the members of the Belfast Chamber of Commerce at their annual meeting passed a resolution congratulating themselves upon the period of prosperity through which they had passed, and which had prevailed generally throughout all those parts of the country which were not affected by the agitation in favor of Home Rule. It was said again

that it was only the Conservatives—the Orange Tories of Ulster, that opposed Home Rule. That was not so. In no part of the United Kingdom had Mr. Gladstone more devoted followers than in Ulster, and the Liberal Union of that province had passed a resolution imploring him not to imperil his land legislation by promoting a

SEPARATE PARLIAMENT FOR IRELAND,

to which they were firmly opposed. The Protestants of Ireland had expressed their views on this topic. The Conferences and Synods which met in Ireland last year had expressed their views most strongly against Home Rule, and he would be

A RENEGADE AND A TRAITOR

to his blood and to his race if he did not endeavor to maintain their views. He cited here resolutions passed by Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Methodist bodies, representing in all 1,200,000 people. The University of Dublin had expressed itself most strongly in favor of the maintenance of the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland. The late Cardinal Cullen had said that he did not like this new movement for what was called Home Rule. He (the Cardinal) was convinced that the first attack upon the liberties and rights of the Church would come from a native parliament, and that the movement was the result of

A REVOLUTIONARY SPIRIT.

Quoting from speeches delivered in the United States by Mr. Ramell, the hon. member claimed to show that the leader of the Irish party was really striving after separation, and that he had frequently made utterances tending to inflame Irishmen to deeds of violence. He quoted to the same effect from speeches of Mr. T. P. O'Connor and Mr. William O'Brien, "the gentleman," said he, "who is said by the newspapers to be about to come to this country

TO PREACH A CRUSADE

against the representative of Her Majesty;" He criticised Mr. O'Brien's conduct and utterances among the Chicago convention a year or two ago, condemning them strongly. So far as he had seen, there had come from the peaceable and law-abiding people of Ireland