

else outside of the valley of the Red River. Outside of that valley, I submit with all deference—and I do not think my statement in that respect will be contradicted—there were no actual settlers. But it matters not who are the people who were represented at that time; it matters not whether they were the whole people of Rupert's Land or only the people of Red River colony. In the view of subsequent events, that matter was of little importance. I admit however that when they came here, they came as delegates professing to be the delegates from Rupert's Land; and they claimed for themselves at that time their right to separate schools and the use of the French language as an official language.

They claimed to be delegates for the whole territory of Rupert's Land. Whether they were the delegates of one portion of Rupert's Land only, or whether they were the delegates of the whole of Rupert's Land I am not prepared to say, but I am prepared to admit for the purposes of argument that they represented the whole of the people of Rupert's Land, and they claimed for the whole people of Rupert's Land, as they stated at all events, in the petitions which have been presented to this parliament, the French language and separate schools. Let there be no ambiguity. Let us state the facts exactly because if we do we always, under any circumstances, come to a better understanding. If their petition as presented had been adopted, the argument made to-day by my hon. friend would have been conclusive. It would have been paramount, but I may say to my hon. friend that the petition which was presented on that occasion for the whole people of Rupert's Land was not accepted by this parliament. That is a point which has been forgotten by my hon. friend and we have only to refer to the case to make it very plain. Here is the Bill of Rights. There have been several Bills of Rights, but it is not at all a point of any importance in this debate to ascertain which was the true Bill of Rights, whether it was the first, or the second, or the third or the fourth. I think there is very little use of going into this debate because all the Bills of Rights were practically the same and differed only in a very few and minor details. This is the Bill of Rights that was quoted here this afternoon by my hon. friend.

Mr. BERGERON. What is my hon. friend reading from?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am reading from Mr. Ewart's book, page 365. I am reading from Bills of Rights Numbers 3 and 4. Number 4:

That the Territory of the Northwest enter into the confederation of the Dominion of Canada as a province, with all the privileges common with all the different provinces in the Dominion.

Number 3:

That the Territories heretofore known as Rupert's Land and the Northwest shall not enter into the confederation, except as a province, to be styled and known as the province of Assiniboia, with all the rights and privileges common to the different provinces of the Dominion.

Between these two Bills of Rights there is very little difference. One asks that the whole of the Territories known as Rupert's Land and the Northwest shall enter into the confederation as a province to be styled the province of Assiniboia. The other does not say the territory known as Rupert's Land and the Northwest, but it says:

That the Territory of the Northwest enter into the confederation of the Dominion of Canada as a province, with all the privileges common with the different provinces in the Dominion.

It is a matter of history so well known that it is useless and vain for me to refer to it that the prayer of this petition was not granted. It was not the whole of the Northwest Territories or Rupert's Land which was admitted into the Dominion, but it was only a small portion of the territory and of Rupert's Land which was admitted into the Dominion and which became the province of Manitoba. When a petition of that kind is presented and is accepted in part it follows as a consequence, that what is not granted is rejected and therefore if the petition which was presented by the representatives of the whole of the people of the Northwest and Rupert's Land, if they can be said to have had representatives, had been accepted not for a portion of the Northwest, not for a portion of Rupert's Land, but for the whole of the Northwest and for the whole of Rupert's Land, it having been presented to cover the whole extent of what is to-day Manitoba, of what will be to-morrow Saskatchewan, of what will be to-morrow Alberta, what is still Mackenzie and a part of Keewatin, if not all, there would have been something in the argument of my hon. friend, but if under such circumstances, when a broad petition of that kind was presented, it was not accepted, but accepted only in part it follows that the concession made as to the schools and as to the French language was restricted simply to the province of Manitoba where it was granted. This seems to be so clear as not to be susceptible of any controversy. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, and my hon. friend from Beauharnois have agreed that the petition was granted for the whole of the Territories.

Mr. BERGERON. Upon what does my right hon. friend rely when he says that it was not granted. I do not see it here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend will not see it there, but I say this