

not see how the member for the Yukon happened to miss it—they all eulogized the heroes of 1837, and by heroes they mean the cowardly men who went in for misleading the poor innocent habitant in the province of Quebec, and the innocent yeomen in Ontario, and inciting them to commit crimes which led to loss of life and destruction of property. These gentlemen have stood on the public platform, and even in this House in this very debate they have eulogized the rebels of '37 and '38. Why have these gentlemen stood up in this parliament and insidiously endorsed rebellion. The hon. member for Pictou, in his remarks the other day gave a very nice touch to the leader of the government in that regard. He showed how constitutional government had been obtained in the province of Nova Scotia, and, in censuring the member for Jacques Cartier he said:

I have the same rights here as my hon. friend, I come from a race of men—

How proud these gentlemen are of the race whence they sprung.

I come from a race of men who in the little province of Nova Scotia fought the battle of responsible government just as did my hon. friend's compatriots in the province of Quebec.

And now comes the gentle slap at the Postmaster General and the First Minister:

Our people in Nova Scotia won that battle and won it a little earlier and without any particular display, but we won it nevertheless and it is just as dear to us as it can possibly be to the people of any other province in the Dominion.

Then he refers to the 'heroes' in Quebec and the 'heroes' in Ontario. Why, Sir, what does history teach about these 'heroes'? I have the facts here, if any one disputes the statement I make. The truth is they deceived and misled the poor fellows who took up arms, and I say here to-day that no man can name a solitary wrong under which these people lived at that time that could not have been easily redressed by an appeal to constitutional methods. I go further and I say that one solitary wrong cannot be mentioned that these people laboured under at that time which could have justified in the slightest a recourse to arms. What was the conduct of the leaders in Ontario and Quebec? The moment they got the poor, innocent, misguided fellows into trouble, the moment the first shot was fired the leaders skiddaddled.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. Does the hon. member refer to Dr. Chenier?

Mr. HUGHES. Comment?

Mr. C. A. WILSON. Are you referring to Dr. Chenier of St. Eustache as a man who fled from the battle?

Mr. HUGHES. I am referring to Papineau, the leader of the rebellion in Lower Canada, and to Mackenzie, the leader of the rebellion in Upper Canada.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. That will please Mr. Bourassa, the friend of Mr. Monk.

Mr. HUGHES. They were leading Liberals for a great many years, and if the hon. gentleman disputes what I say I can give the reference.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. I will dispute it so far as Dr. Chenier is concerned.

Mr. HUGHES. So far as the leaders all over were concerned, they made quick time and left the poor fellows whom they incited to suffer from the evil effects of the rebellion.

Mr. C. A. WILSON. That is not history.

Mr. E. ROY. The member for L'Islet will answer that.

Mr. HUGHES. These gentlemen opposite endorsed not only the rebellion of 1837-38, but the Northwest rebellions of 1870 and 1885. These gentlemen opposite, in endorsing rebels, are getting the people of this country accustomed to believe, simply because the loyal men of the country do not care to come out and oppose them on every occasion, they are getting the loyal people of the country gradually to believe that there were some wrongs to be redressed in 1837 and 1885.

Mr. PAQUET. Is the hon. member prepared to prove that the people of Quebec were misrepresented as he says?

Mr. HUGHES. Which people?

Mr. PAQUET. The people of Quebec.

Mr. HUGHES. I don't understand you.

Mr. E. ROY. Would you tell us something about the rebellion of Cromwell?

Mr. HUGHES. Cromwell's rebellion was just; the United States rebellion was just; but here in Canada we had two or three rebellions and there was no justification for them at all.

Mr. E. ROY. They won responsible government for us.

Mr. HUGHES. I cannot hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman. These gentlemen have whistled that tune so long that they actually believe it. They have endeavoured so long to justify the rebellion of 1885 in the Northwest that they have actually come to believe that it was just.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that the American rebels were right?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, sure.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I merely wanted that admission from my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton.