

Then followed the rebellion of 1837 and 1838, in Ontario, in Upper Canada led by a mountebank agitator, who had been a man of no character in his own country, Scotland, and had come out here. He had heard of responsible government in the old land, he did not know anything about the constitutional methods to be pursued, he gathered a few innocent people near Toronto, and the muskets being short-ranged in those days, the bullets could hardly reach them, they ran so fast.

In Quebec another man, clever and brilliant in many ways, but a man fitted for anything in the world almost rather than for leadership, gathered together a lot of poor, innocent fellows from various parts of the province and they met with disaster also. But history records that not one of the solitary grievances has ever been put in type that could not have been settled infinitely better by constitutional means as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) pointed out the other night that Nova Scotia settled her grievances without much fuss—a gentle hint to those so-called heroes of 1837 and 1838 in Ontario and Quebec that they were wrong in their agitation was all that was necessary. The aim in both provinces was independence. But, we have heard of other grievances. I can well remember the time when I sat in this House long years ago, and when gentlemen who occupy seats in the Senate, and who were appointed before they had ceased for a year to be members of parliament, stood up at these desks and declared that a law should be passed making it illegal for a member of parliament to hold a seat in the Senate, or a position anywhere else under the government, within a year after his retirement from the House. They demanded that the land should be kept for the settler in the Northwest. They said that we should have free trade in this new land of Canada, and they declaimed against robbers great and robbers small up and down the country. They also demanded that the Senate should be reformed. Most of them are in there now and it is pretty well reformed. They demanded rigid economy. There was almost a rebellion in the country because the Conservative party had an expenditure below \$40,000,000, while these gentlemen have run it up to over \$120,000,000. They demanded that we should have purity in public life and we have a splendid illustration of it in the government of the day. They also demanded that the question of prohibition should be placed before the public, that the people should vote on it and that it should be carried, but their voices are dumb to-day on that question and we hear no more about it. Then we have this laudation of rebellion, but as that has been referred to before, I will not take any more time discussing it. All I will say is this, that the right

hon. the First Minister and his colleagues who are ever prone to glorify the so-called patriots of 1837-38, both of Upper and Lower Canada, are the men who forced upon a free people, people accustomed to responsible government, which the people of 1837-38 were not, upon the free men of Saskatchewan and Alberta, in 1905, an iniquitous measure which should have brought about rebellion among free men in that country if anything could have done so. What was the policy of the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues in that regard? One of the demands in 1837-38 was that the assembly should have control of the revenues from the land, timber, mines and water-powers. The chief thing that the government restrained the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta from was the exercise of their rights with regard to the control of the land, mines, timber or water-powers. In 1837-38 it was right to rebel because the assembly, composed of men in both provinces who did not understand responsible government, were not given absolute control of these natural resources, while it was wrong in 1905 with a free people skilled in government. They took their rights away from them and they doled them out a pittance every year the same as a remittance man here receives from his father in the old country. Under the constitution, education belongs to the provinces, and yet this government that pretends to be Liberal, took from the people of these two provinces, in 1905, the right to control their education. Yet they will talk of the heroes of 1837-38 who had not one ground upon which to base any objection to the legislation of the time, and they will preach autonomy and responsible government. I have often thought that in their hearts they must despise these free men of Alberta and Saskatchewan for tamely submitting to these iniquities, while being ready to glorify the men of 1837.

I have not heard either of the last two speakers indulge in this criticism—perhaps the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) will when he goes away down alone by the sea—but the criticism has been made of the Conservative party that we joined hand in hand with the hon. gentlemen opposite in passing the resolution one year ago and then have gone back upon it. Such is the language of the First Minister. Let us examine it man to man and see what we have done. The resolution reads:

This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

Have we gone back on that? We are standing by it to-day.

2. That this House reaffirms the opinion, repeatedly expressed by representatives of Canada, that under the present constitutional