

This is a quite ingenious, but most disingenuous argument; so much so indeed, as to suggest that Mr. Ewart felt this phase of his case to be a very unsatisfactory one. In the first place, there is no analogy between the abandonment of the first two Bills of Rights, and the alleged abandonment of the third. Mr. Ewart himself supplies reasons for the abandonment of Bills No. 1 and No. 2, but he does not, and cannot, supply any reason for the abandonment of Bill of Rights No. 3. Under the circumstances, the onus is not on the believers in Bill No. 3, to show that it was not "superseded," but on Mr. Ewart's clients to show that it was. Mr. Ewart adroitly endeavors to shift the onus. Whilst not under obligation, by the rules of argument, to do so, the opponents of separate schools may safely undertake to prove that No. 3 was not "superseded."

Now, the Bill of Rights No. 3, found amongst Mr. Bunn's papers, was dated March 23, 1870, or the very day on which the delegates left for Ottawa. They had evidently been awaiting the completion of the list, and started immediately thereafter. How could this list have been "superseded" and the substituted list still be presented at Ottawa by the delegates, who left on the day the supposedly "superseded" one had been completed? Why should it have been "superseded" by the Provisional Government, none of whose members did at any time express the slightest concern about separate schools?

Powerful evidence (although not the most conclusive that will be produced) that the bill was not "superseded," is presented by the fact that the provisional government on the day the delegates left, printed in French, and circulated amongst the French speaking people a copy of the instructions given to the delegates, and of Bill of Rights No. 3, as the list of the demands which were being made by the delegates on behalf of the provisional government, and the people of the Northwest. Is it credible that this body would have circulated as an official document, a list of rights which had been "superseded," whilst saying not one word about the substitute? Printed copies of this bill, published by the Riel government, are in existence, and in possession of the Librarian of the Province of Manitoba, as is also the original document found amongst the papers of Mr. Bunn.

No wonder, indeed, that Mr. Begg (not "although careful and trust-

worthy," but because "careful and trustworthy") gives list No. 3 as the true one.

But Mr. Ewart says he "may have been misled through not having heard of a subsequent list." How could he have heard of a subsequent list, when no member of the public, or of any government or legislature of Manitoba, knew of the existence of such a list, till Dec. 27, 1889, when the late Archbishop Tache referred to it in a letter to the Free Press of Winnipeg.

Mr. Ewart says "the best and only direct evidence . . . is the sworn testimony of Rev. Mr. Ritchot, etc".

Mr. Ritchot's part in this most mysterious episode, has yet to be explained. He must know a great deal more than he has ever told the public, and he has some inexorable facts to confront, which, as we shall see, require a deal of explanation, and that from him. Mr. Ewart says that at the trial of Lepine, Rev. Mr. Ritchot produced list No. 4, and swore it was the list given to him as a delegate.

Now it is a very remarkable fact that the document which Mr. Ritchot did produce at the Lepine trial, is not anywhere to be found. It is not on file with the papers in the case. It has been lost or stolen, from the records of the court. This is a most unfortunate, as well as mysterious and suggestive, circumstance. If the document which Father Ritchot produced at that trial could be produced now, it would afford a solution of the mystery. If it turned out to be Bill No. 4; if it were, like Bill No. 3, in the handwriting of Mr. Bunn, the secretary of the provisional government; if it were signed by the president and Mr. Bunn; then this very disagreeable and very disquieting mystery would be unravelled. But if that document should have turned out to be Bill No. 3; or, if Bill No. 4, if it had turned out not to be a document written or signed by the provisional government officers, but a mere copy which might have been made up anywhere, say Ottawa for instance, it would have been very unpleasant for certain parties. But that document is non est. Whither it has disappeared, and who or what was the cause of its disappearance, nobody knows, at least nobody who cares to tell.

Mr. Ewart argues that no one could have any object in misstating the facts at the Lepine trial. This is an altogether too sweeping assumption. If any person had had any object in substituting a spurious Bill of Rights