

grievances, and that she has instructed me to hear and consider any complaints that may be made or desires that may be expressed to me as Governor General.

At the same time she has charged me to exercise all the power and authority with which she has entrusted me in the support of order and the suppression of unlawful disturbance.

By Her Majesty's authority, I do therefore assure you that on the union with Canada all your civil and religious rights and privileges will be respected, your property secured to you, and that your country will be governed as in the past under British laws and in the spirit of British justice.

I do further under her authority entreat and command those of you who are still assembled and banded together in defiance of law, peacefully to disperse and return to your homes under the penalties of the law in case of disobedience.

I do lastly inform you that in case of your immediate and peaceable obedience and dispersion I shall order that no legal proceedings be taken against any parties implicated in those unfortunate breaches of the law.

Given under my hand and seal at arms at Ottawa this sixth day of November in the year of our Lord, 1869, and in the thirty-third year of Her Majesty's reign.

(Sgd.) JOHN YOUNG.

Now, Sir, I do not wish unnecessarily to take up the time of the House, but I would like to refer also to a letter to the present Lord Strathcona, then Mr. Donald A. Smith, dated 12th of December, 1869. I will read only this portion of it:

In my capacity as Her Majesty's representative in the British North American possessions I have addressed letters to Governor McTavish, the Protestant Bishop of Rupert's Land, and the Vicar General who acts in lieu of the Roman Catholic Bishop during his presence in Rome.

Then the letter goes on at some length, and winds up in this way:

You may state with the utmost confidence that the imperial government has no intention of acting otherwise or permitting others to act otherwise than in perfect good faith towards the inhabitants of the Red river district of the Northwest.

The people may rely upon it that respect and protection will be extended to the different religious persuasions, that titles to every description of property will be perfectly guarded, and all the franchises which have existed or which the people may prove themselves qualified to exercise, shall be duly continued or liberally conferred. In declaring the desire and determination of Her Majesty's cabinet you may safely use the terms of the ancient formula, 'Right shall be done in all cases.'

Then Mr. Donald A. Smith, as we all know, fulfilled his mission. He went to the Northwest Territories and conferred with the people there, and in his narrative of what took place at that time he states:

I may mention that at the time the schools were voluntary or separate schools, that is the Roman Catholics had their schools and the Protestants had theirs, and there were certain grants of money given to each. The Hudson

Bay Company, then the governing body, made a grant to the Roman Catholic bishop. There was a grant given to one and to the other, a money grant as well as a grant of land for school purposes. It is true that not much was said about schools at that time, but it was distinctly understood by the people there, and the promise was made to them, that they would have every privilege in joining Canada which they possessed at that time.

We know what followed. We know that there was a provincial government formed in the province of Manitoba. We know that there were delegates equal in number, representing not only the French Canadian population but the English speaking population of that country; and we have records of the Bills of Rights which were submitted and upon which the Manitoba Act was subsequently framed. I will not take up very much time with the Bills of Rights. Let me refer to Bill of Rights No. 4, which is one of those that was given in evidence in the Lepine trial which took place some years afterwards. In clause 7 of that Bill of Rights, this is the language used:

That the schools be separate, and that the public money for schools be distributed among the different religious denominations in proportion to their respective population, according to the system of the province of Quebec.

Then we find in the original Bill of Rights in the handwriting of Mr. Richot, one of the delegates sent to Ottawa the following. It is in French, but I give it the English translation:

This clause being the same as the British North America Act, confers, so I interpret it, as fundamental principle, the privileges of separate schools to the fullest extent, and in that is in conformity with article 7 of our instructions.

So, it was evident that these delegates from the authorities in the province of Manitoba understood that the clause in the Manitoba Act protected them in their privileges in their separate schools. Now, just before I go any further, let me say that there was a gentleman who took a prominent part—

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pringle) aware that the fourth Bill of Rights was never accepted as authentic?

Mr. PRINGLE. I will not say that I am aware that the fourth Bill of Rights was never accepted as authentic. I say that there is internal evidence in support of Mr. Richot's statement. Paragraph 1 of this Bill of Rights No. 4 demands a Senate for the new province, and a Senate was granted, though the expense of it was much objected to. Bill of Rights No. 3 says nothing about the Senate. If Bill of Rights No. 4 was not authentic, why was the Senate granted? But further this Bill of Rights No. 4, paragraph 7, demands that the schools be separate. And this was inserted in the Manitoba Act and the Schools Act was