

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Simply for the accuracy of debate would the hon. gentleman be good enough to point out those words in anything I said.

Mr. BOURASSA. I simply said that the hon. gentleman quoted that as one of the proofs, I did not say that he had stated that; I said he intimated it because he quoted it as one source of engagement on the school question. His words were:

The imperial authorities of that day, to their credit be it said, faithful to the traditions of the imperial parliament, the mother of parliaments, the parliament of that people who have always held sacred their covenants, acting through their representative, Lord Granville, sent to the Governor General of Canada a cablegram on the 5th of March, 1870, which reads as follows:

The proposed military assistance will be given if reasonable terms are given to the Roman Catholic settlers, and if Canadian government enable Her Majesty's government to proclaim transfer simultaneous with movement of troops.

I have quoted the words of the Minister of Justice to prove that the whole of these negotiations which had in view the same insurrection, which covered the same lands, were concluded by the same pledge, the only one pledge based on the only one Bill of Rights, which pledge was invoked by the Minister of Justice as one of the reasons why there had been a compact made by this government and the former settlers of the Territories.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It was never referred to once in the course of the debate on the Bill of Rights.

Mr. BOURASSA. The hon. gentleman need not protest. I have not said that he made these statements. I said he quoted Earl Granville's despatch with reference to the pledges taken between this parliament and the settlers of the Northwest to prove that engagements had been made with those people. We were discussing the rights of those people with respect to separate schools and it was stated that we had to consider the despatches of the imperial government with respect to separate schools and to consider the moral obligations of the imperial government and the Canadian parliament. How is it now that such pledge should be left aside as it does not apply when it comes to another subject contained in the same petition, one of those subjects for which the same people came here and wanted the Dominion parliament to grant justice and to take a pledge in their favour? As far as the Minister of Inland Revenue is concerned there is no doubt whatever as to the construction he put upon the agreement which was made. This afternoon the Solicitor General made an address in which he said there was no compact whatever be-

Mr. BOURASSA.

cause Rupert's Land or the delegates from Rupert's Land spoke only for what now is termed Manitoba, which did not cover the rest of the Northwest Territories. I have brought the parliamentary documents here, the titles of the Hudson Bay Company, the imperial statute of 1867 and the Canadian statute of 1869, to prove to the hon. gentleman that he had forgotten to learn the first elements of the geographical condition of that country. The argument by the First Minister this evening spares me that trouble and completely destroys the argument of my hon. friend, the Solicitor General. The right hon. gentleman proves what should be known by everybody who has the most elementary notions of that country, that Rupert's Land included not only part of what is Manitoba, to-day, but a large section of the Territories. Further, in the statute of 1868, adopted previous to the Bill of Rights presented by the Northwest Delegates, it is most clearly stated in the second clause:

For the purpose of this Act the term Rupert's Land shall include the whole of the lands and territories held or claimed to be held by the said governor and company.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Has my hon. friend read clause 146 of the British North America Act, which says:

It shall be lawful for the Queen, by and with the advice of Her Majesty's most honourable Privy Council, on addresses from the Houses of parliament of Canada . . . to admit Rupert's Land and the Northwestern territory or either of them into the union.

According to that, Rupert's Land and the Territory are two different things.

Mr. BOURASSA. That is what I said, but a year later another imperial statute declared that, for the purposes of the union, Rupert's Land shall include that country and the whole of the Territories. As a matter of fact, Rupert's Land is named in the British North America Act, but it is defined in the letters patent granted by Charles the Second to the Hudson Company; and the limit of Manitoba, as created a province by this parliament in 1870, had nothing to do with the Rupert's Land as defined by the letters patent granted by Charles the Second two centuries previous. It was never imagined then that the parliament of Canada would subsequently carve a province out of that territory to be called Manitoba and set limits to it. As stated by the right hon. the First Minister this evening, and by the hon. the Minister of Justice on the second reading of the Bill, Rupert's Land formerly included all the territories whose waters flowed to Hudson bay; and after the company had secured their legal title to the occupation of those lands and the exercise of the prerogatives of government therein, they occu-