

pied, I may say by usurpation, the rest of the territory, and the British government informally acknowledged that occupation, so that when we had to deal with that company the British parliament had to pass an Act, which not only covered the country legally known as Rupert's Land, but the whole of the Territories.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I must thank my hon. friend for this little lesson in geography. But if he would refer to the 'Hansard' of Monday last, he would see that I spoke of Riel and Bruce as representing the delegates of Rupert's Land, and speaking only of the colony of the Red River settlement.

Mr. BOURASSA. As stated by the First Minister a moment ago, the only permanent inhabitants, the only inhabitants who had settled in that country, were, most of them, settled along the Red river, but other establishments were made as far as Portage la Prairie. And if my hon. friend will refer to the debates that preceded the establishment of the province of Manitoba, he will find that there was a discussion in that parliament as to whether or not such portion of the territory as includes the Portage la Prairie district would be included in the new province of Manitoba.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Hon. Mr. Brown refused to accept the total claims made by the Hudson Bay Company.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It has never been accepted.

Mr. LEMIEUX. So my hon. friend might also learn something.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have a great deal to learn. But I generally try to know the subject upon which I have to speak. I say simply that there was nothing in the argument of the hon. gentleman this afternoon, who has tried to show that Rupert's Land was, as a matter of fact, the province of Manitoba.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understood that Riel and Bruce, in their list of articles, spoke of the Red River settlement. That is clear in the list of articles and the sessional papers.

Mr. BOURASSA. That does not alter the case. They represented the inhabitants who lived then in the Red River settlement; but when they came here to present their claims, they claimed to represent the whole of the inhabitants in the Northwest Territories. They asked such and such conditions to be granted on the admission of Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories. I now come to the point of the right hon. the First Minister, namely, that because this parliament, for the time being, confined Manitoba within certain limits, these basic conditions, which were asked for by the delegates from Red River, who claimed that these conditions should apply to the whole of Rupert's Land—that because the Dominion parlia-

ment limited the actual application of their claim to the then created province of Manitoba, that meant that this parliament did not want to give the application of those claims to the rest of the Territories. I do not see anything on record to show that because the Dominion government then created only one province, the parliament of Canada thereby refused to acknowledge the moral right of the people outside of that province, but within the same territory, to the use of their language and to their own schools, and that their descendants who should found settlements outside of that province should be deprived of the application of the same rights. I cannot believe that; and unless it be shown to me by the archives of this parliament, I cannot believe that Sir George Cartier, Sir John Macdonald—though I must say that they acted on that occasion, at least so far as certain details of that agreement are concerned, in such a way as to have profited by the good faith of the delegates—I cannot believe that because they gave certain limits to the province of Manitoba, they meant to deny for ever the claims of those people, who were speaking in the name of all the inhabitants of the Northwest, to their own language and schools, outside as well as within the limits of the new province. So far as that matter is concerned, I agree with the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) in thinking that the moral obligation of this parliament covered the whole of that territory. The province of Manitoba was created, and article 23 was introduced in the Manitoba Act of 1870. That article is well known no doubt to all the members of this House; it reads as follows:

Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of the legislature, and both these languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of those Houses; and either of those languages may be used by any person, in any pleading or process in or issuing from any court of Canada established under the British North America Act, 1867, or in or from all or any of the courts of the province. The Acts of the legislature shall be printed and published in both those languages.

It does not seem that the parliament of those days—and if I take the words of the hon. Minister of Justice, uttered some time ago, they had the full power to do what they did—were so scrupulous as is the parliament of to-day about imposing the use of the French language for all time to come on any province. There was no opposition in those days to the granting of a dual language for the province of Manitoba. Has the constitution changed since 1870? The men who framed the Act of Manitoba were, most of them, the men who framed the constitution of 1867. Will it be said that this provision, adopted unanimously by the parliament of 1870, constituted a breach of the constitution, which was then just fresh in