

very lightly last evening upon the question of contract between Canada and the Territory of Rupert's Land, that came in as Manitoba. The hon. gentleman said we might imply, we might presume, there was an understanding with them, because they lived for twenty years under the provisions of this statute of 1872. Well, Sir, that is a very poor thing to go on to show a contract and treaty between Canada and the district that came in under the Act of 1872 as a province. We are entitled to something more than that. Is that all the information there is to be had about this matter? Perhaps the Minister of Justice was wise in touching on it so gingerly, because he and this House know how contradictory the statements are on that point. The House will remember there were a great many bills of rights upon which on one or all of them it is said the legislation and treaty was based between Manitoba and Canada. There was one bill of rights called bill No. 4, and I should like the Minister of Justice to tell the House what he thinks of it. Has he evidence that it should have full weight or not? At all events, we know perfectly well that there is great dispute as to whether it was applicable at all to this question; and that is a very material point we should know about. In the argument, at page 48 of the blue-book, Mr. McCarthy, in reply, said:

Dealing with it in that way the question of fact must arise as to whether bill of rights No. 4 was ever brought here or not, and there being no trial of that question of fact, you will plainly see how difficult it would be to come to a conclusion with regard to it either one way or another. On that question all the official papers seem to be one way and the statement of the Rev. Father Ritchot in the other direction.

Well, Mr. McCarthy may be right or wrong. That is the statement made by him before the Ministers, and I believe that undoubtedly a state of confusion exists on that very important question. The parties are not dead. The hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) was himself an active party during the negotiations for the creation of the province of Manitoba. Father Ritchot is alive. He could be examined; Sir Donald Smith could be examined, and a dozen more witnesses could be examined, and documents could be examined, and then we would not be presuming something in regard to an Act of Parliament, but there would be actual evidence as to how much weight should be attached to the conditions respecting separate schools, and regarding bill of rights No. 4. None of the members of this House at the present time possess this knowledge, and yet we are asked to vote for the second and third reading of the Bill.

Another question of dispute on a very material point I may refer to: it is this. In his argument before the Privy Council, at page 23, Mr. Ewart introduced a very important statement of fact. He said:

My fourth argument is nearly allied to the third. It is based upon promises made by the Greenway government (after its accession to office) to His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface, and to various other persons, in order to enable him to obtain for his Cabinet a representative of the Roman Catholics and to carry the general elections of 1888. In support of this I read the affidavits of the Rev. Vicar-General Allard and Mr. W. F. Alloway.

These affidavits were all afterwards withdrawn by Mr. Ewart. However, that is the state of affairs. We find at page 62, Mr. McCarthy said, when speaking in reply:

I am instructed to-day by the Attorney General, and that is all I propose to say about it,—that the alleged agreement between Mr. Greenway and the archbishop has been repeatedly denied. I am not denying it now, but it has been repeatedly denied, and I gather from the statement read yesterday that it had been denied.

Can anything be more solemn and important than the promise made by the then and present Prime Minister of Manitoba to the late Archbishop of St. Boniface, in the capacity of representative of the minority; and yet that fact is absolutely in dispute, and we are offered no evidence about it. Sir, if I had time I could find many other most important facts which are essentially necessary to inform this House before we are called upon to take this responsible action; facts which are absolutely in dispute, which are not admitted, and in relation to which no inquiry has been made. Still, Sir, in the absence of such information, we are asked to go on with the second reading of this Bill.

Now, I think I can show that some members of this Administration have had it in their mind that an inquiry was necessary. I do not see the Minister of Railways in his seat, but his colleagues who were there will probably remember this circumstance which occurred in the argument before them, prior to the remedial order. Mr. Ewart was about to conclude his argument when this conversation occurred:

Hon. Mr. Haggart—I suppose you intend to produce evidence to show how the Acts of 1890 interfered with the rights and privileges you had acquired?

This was addressed by one of the court, as those gentlemen of the Canadian Privy Council called themselves, when they were hearing the representative of the province of Manitoba, and the representative of the minority. This question was addressed by the Minister of Railways to the counsel representing the minority. What was Mr. Ewart's answer to that? How did Mr. Ewart get out of it? He simply said this:

That is established sufficiently by the judgment. That must be taken as conclusive upon that point. And the matter went no further. But, if we turn to the judgment, we find how easily Mr. Ewart was let off. Because these facts were not proved before the