

ple, and nothing that the people could do could wrest that power from their hands. Was that a state of affairs that any people with spunk in their constitution would willingly submit to? It was difficult to imagine how one would feel if he lived in a certain age—half a century ago—and he did not know what his individual predilections would have been if he had been living then, with the feeling of a grown-up man; but as often as he read the story of those 1837 troubles and what the people were called upon to endure and submit to in connection with those troubles his strongest sympathies had always been with those oppressed and against those whom he believed might fairly be called the oppressors of that time. (Applause.) He was not there to say that to take up arms against the constituted authority of the day was a meritorious thing, but he was there to deprecate, with all the emphasis of which his nature was capable, any such idea as the House passing a resolution which in its nature was a reflection upon those who were dissatisfied, and which necessarily involved an expression of disapprobation of the course taken by them at that time. They were not called upon to take such action. Fortunately that trouble had passed away, and it was the duty of the House to deprecate and frown down any attempt to revive those bygone issues. He was astonished at the effort made to revive those issues. Even within the short time of ten or fifteen years after these things took place the Parliament of this country was willing to let bygones be bygones, both as regards those who took up arms against the Government and those who took up arms in its defence, and to treat them in the same manner. They all knew that the Rebellion Losses Bill, which was adopted by the Parliament of that day, was not a bill for the indemnification alone of those who took up arms and those who suffered losses thereby, but for those also who were sympathisers with the rise, and who, many of them, had taken part as insurgents in that affair and who lost by it. The Rebellion Losses Bill provided for the payment of indemnity to the latter as well as the former. There was a disposition on the part of the people of this country, and certainly on the part of the majority of the people, as represented by the Parliament of that time—not to revive those issues, but to bury them out of sight—to treat all alike, insurgents as well as the others, living, as they then were, under the form of responsible government, and reaping, as they then were, the fruits of the crisis which had taken place and which had bestowed upon this country a constitution which was in spirit as well as in name a free and enlightened constitution. (Applause.) The Government of that day was willing to wipe out all these old scores, to bury the past, and to live in peace and amity—an example which the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution would have done well to follow.

#### REBELS OF A LATER DAY.

It was true that while the majority of the people were in favor of that course, and while the bill provided for the indemnification of all, there were those who at that time were the extremely loyal people of the country, and who did not hesitate to become the rebels of 1849. (Applause.) There were those who because the majority of the members of Parliament thought fit to pass a measure dealing with this subject were not above rebellion on their own account, they were not above exhibiting to this country and to the world the spectacle of a Governor-General being duly rotten-egged at their hands, and the Parliament buildings, then at Montreal, being burnt. He meant to say that, comparing those troubles of 1837 and 1849, he would infinitely prefer those who were called the insurgents of 1837 to those who refused to submit to an enlightened Government in 1849 and were parties to the outrages that then took place. (Applause.) He would read an extract from a speech delivered in Parliament at that time by a gentleman who certainly in the course of

that speech showed evidence of the highest eloquence, and probably that was not to be wondered at when he stated that that gentleman was the father of Hon. Edward Blake, who was himself a well-known orator. Mr. Blake said:—

That loyalty, which is ever ready to extend and strengthen the prerogative of the Crown by stinting and limiting the liberties of the people, is not loyalty, but slavery. It cannot result in strengthening the connection of this country with England, but must tend to weaken the allegiance of the people of this Province by depriving them of their rights as British subjects. I am not come here to learn lessons of loyalty from hon. gentlemen opposite. Loyalty to my Queen is the strongest and dearest feeling of my heart, and I trust my arm shall never be wanting when its aid may be required. . . . But I confess I have no sympathy with the would-be loyalty of hon. gentlemen opposite, which, while it at all times affects peculiar zeal for the prerogative of the Crown, is ever ready to sacrifice the liberty of the subject. That is not British loyalty, it is the spurious loyalty which at all periods of the world's history has lashed humanity into rebellion. . . . The expression "rebel" has been applied by the gallant knight opposite to some gentlemen on the other side, but their public conduct has proved that they are not rebels to their constitution and country.

In that eloquent speech the hon. gentleman called attention to the fact that there was such a thing as rebellion to the Crown and rebellion to the constitution. While there was one party known as those rebelling against the Crown, the other party had been constantly in rebellion against the constitution—against the constitution as the word is generally understood from a British point of view.

#### BELONGED TO THEM HIMSELF.

He felt a difficulty in addressing the House upon this subject, because it was one upon which he felt very warmly. He belonged to a family which was among those not satisfied with the state of things at that time—a family some of whom took an active part in the difficulties of the time. His own father was understood to be a sympathiser with the insurgents and was as such taken a prisoner. It was not likely, then, that he (the speaker) could take any course in the discussion of this question which would, impliedly or otherwise, express disapprobation of the course which his father had taken. (Applause.) He hated to hear people prate of loyalty or to blow their own trumpet, but he thought that as the son of an insurgent of 1837—or a rebel, if they should like to call it that—he was entitled to some consideration in the matter of loyalty. As he said before, he did not appreciate those who preached loyalty loudest or made the biggest professions of that sort of thing, but even if he was a son of one who was one of the malcontents of 1837, he probably had as satisfactory a record of his own to show to this House and country as any man who sat in the House or was to be found in this country. (Applause.) From his student days he had worn her Majesty's uniform, and had been among those sent out to do duty, not at a time when there was strife among ourselves, but when our borders were threatened by aliens from another land. He had taken his part then in preventing incalculable mischief and damage by a band of marauders. He had also in the subsequent troubles of 1885 been at the services of his country. He had seen over 30 years of service, and he was still in harness and ready to take up arms on behalf of this country for the purpose of defending it against foreign invaders, or to quell insubordination when called upon by his superior officers or the proper authority in that behalf. It was therefore very natural that he should be opposed to any action that would impliedly, even in the remotest degree, cast a reflection upon his ancestors or relatives connected with the troubles of 1837. Whatever might be said with regard to those troubles, no one could deny that great good had been the result. Anyone who read the report made by Lord Durham would agree with him that if the people of that day were to be a free people at all, they could not longer