

board a notice of two murders in the Dominion of Canada. You can scarcely take up a paper without seeing that in some part of this Dominion some poor unfortunate wretch has, in a fit of passion, committed murder. Considering that there is such a lack of respect for institutions, such a lack of respect for professions and such a lack of respect for public honour, the mystery to me is that there is not more crime than that which is committed in the Dominion of Canada. Speaking of divorces, I was a little surprised that the right hon. First Minister should touch on that question. He knows very well that the cost in the Dominion of Canada is a barrier to divorces. He knows that the facility in this country is not as great as it is in many states of the union for divorces. He knows that in Canada mediation very often comes in. Friends of the persons concerned and church dignitaries step in and prevent a consummation of divorces; and he knows that if there is one thing that characterizes Canada, it is the goodness of the women of Canada in forgiving the derelictions of duty on the part of the men. I am sorry to say that there is some cause for divorce in Canada, and that, if the good women of this country wished it, they might have an opportunity of securing just as many divorces as they have in the United States. Then the right hon. First Minister read us a lecture on unity and harmony in his own gentlemanly way. He is always gentlemanly. He always throws down the gauntlet and leaves his radical friends behind him to create an agitation while he stands and looks on with calm and placid demeanour, regretting, of course, the excesses of his followers, and cries intolerance against those who oppose him. But we remember the conduct of the right hon. gentleman and his friends in 1885, which has been referred to by other hon. gentlemen in this House, when the right hon. First Minister himself threatened that if he had been on the banks of the Saskatchewan he would have shouldered his musket, because of the supposed wrongs of the half-breeds of that country. A lot of land grabbers and land sharks, knowing that the half-breeds had obtained their scrip in Manitoba after the first rebellion, knowing that these half-breeds had gone out and settled in certain other spots in the remote west and were claiming scrip again, and desiring to get control of that scrip, they kept urging them to raise a row and make a demand for the issue of the scrip. The government of that time, after consultation with the bishops and clergy of the Roman Catholic Church, they being the best educated men of that country in that time, and after consultation with the officers of the mounted police, determined, on the advice of and by the request of these officials and clergy, to issue no more scrip. They said: No; we will not issue scrip again. You will sell your scrip for a bottle of whisky, you will sell

it for a dollar or two, and at the end of the week you will be as poor as you were before; but we will give you your scrip on condition that you settle on the land. This was done at the request of the authorities of the church and the police. The only excuse they had for rebellion was that when they did settle on the land they wanted the old river survey instead of the mile-square survey proposed by the Dominion government; and from that hour to this these gentlemen have been unable to find one cause for rebellion other than as to the particular form the survey should take. But the right hon. the Prime Minister said on that occasion that if he had been on the banks of the Saskatchewan he would have shouldered his musket and fought for the liberties of the people.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He would not have written letters home about it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Prime Minister was reported as having said that. The hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) in his speech referred some fifteen or twenty times to the question of rebellion. Let me inform the Solicitor General that some of us who have done a little talk of rebellion have not been afraid and are not afraid to back up our opinions by facing the music; we do not simply stand away off in the province of Quebec at a safe distance from danger and do the talking and writing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam Hughes) must have known my brother who served Canada and the empire in South Africa, came back with his medals, but he did not write any self-glorifying letters from the battle fields.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am glad there are some loyal men in the family of the honourable gentleman in Quebec.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam Hughes) point out a single man in the province of Quebec who is not loyal? The hon. gentleman has taken the responsibility of saying that he was glad to know there were some loyal men in Quebec; does he know any disloyal men in Quebec?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does my hon. friend come from Quebec? I think he comes from Cape Breton.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I come from Cape Breton, and I am a Canadian, Sir, and I hope I am broad enough to treat my fellow Canadians everywhere with respect.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My hon. friend wants to know if you can tell us what is the law on the subject. The hon. gentleman (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) did not give us all his brief last night, and perhaps he wants to deal with that aspect of the case now.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. I will be very pleased at any time to deal very briefly with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes).

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.