

7

---

WINNIPEG, 27th March, 1890.

SIR,—On behalf of the honourable members for Carillon, Cartier, La Verandrye, Morris, and St. Boniface, and of myself, I beg leave to respectfully represent to Your Honour that the Legislative Assembly, at this present Session, being the third of the Seventh Legislature, has passed a Bill intituled, "An Act to provide that the English language shall be the official language of the Province of Manitoba," and to most humbly submit that the said Bill is *ultra vires*, for reasons more fully set forth in the memorandum hereto annexed.

I have the honour to be, sir, your most humble servant,

JAMES E. P. PRENDERGAST, *Member for Woodlands.*

To His Honour the Honourable JOHN SCHULTZ, Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba, etc., etc., etc., Government House, Winnipeg.

MEMORANDUM respecting a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide that the English language shall be the official language of the Province of Manitoba."

It is submitted that Section 133 of "The British North America Act, 1867," which applies to the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Quebec, is similar to, and drafted in the same words (*mutatis mutandis*) as clause 23 of "The Manitoba Act applying to the Legislature of Manitoba, and that any interpretation attaching to the former should also attach to the latter."

The British North America Act, 1867. Section 133 of the above Act reads as follows:—

"Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the House of Parliament of Canada and of the House of the Legislature of Quebec, and both these languages shall be used in the respective records or journals of those Houses, and either of those languages may be used by any person in any pleading or process. The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and of the Legislature of Quebec shall be printed and published in both languages."

The spirit which has presided to the enacting of the above clause is fully illustrated by the reports of the debate on Confederation.

Honourable Mr. Evanturel (page 943), says: "I wish to put a question to the Government. I acknowledge that if I confined myself to consulting my own ideas I should not put this question, but I do so in order to meet the wishes of several of my friends, both within this House and beyond its precincts. Those friends have expressed alarm in relation to one of the clauses of the resolutions, and have requested me to ask an explanation from the Honourable Attorney-General for Upper Canada as to the interpretation of that clause. I have therefore to ask him whether article 46 of the resolutions, which states that both the English and French language may be employed in the general Parliament and its proceedings, and in the local Legislature of Lower Canada is to be interpreted: "As placing the use of the two languages on an equal footing" in the Federal Parliament? In stating the apprehensions entertained by certain persons on this subject, I hope the Government will not impute to me any hostile intention, and will perceive that the course I adopt is to their interest, as it will give them an opportunity of dissipating the apprehensions in question." (Hear, hear.)

Honourable Attorney-General Macdonald answers as follows:—

"I have very great pleasure in answering the question put to me by my honourable friend for the County of Quebec. I may state that the meaning of one of the resolutions adopted by the Conference is this: That the right of the French Canadian members as to the status of their language, in the Federal Legislature, should be "precisely the same as they now are in the Provincial Legislature of Canada in every possible respect." I have still further pleasure in stating that the moment this was mentioned in Conference, the members of the deputation from the Lower Provinces unanimously stated that it was right and just, and without one dissentient voice gave their adhesion to the reasonableness of the proposition, that the status of the French language as regards "the procedure in Parliament, the printing of