

precedent to be followed in the future, you will be depriving a very large section of the people of Canada of their constitutional liberties. The argument which has been put forth is an impossible one, and the position is an impossible one for the people of Canada to maintain.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman entirely ignores the fact that Canada cannot now change the constitution of Manitoba. It is only the Imperial Government that can do that. The constitution is an existing fact, and we cannot change it no matter how much we may desire to do so without the aid of the Imperial Government.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—I have already explained to the hon. the leader of the Opposition that the first decision of the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council distinctly declares that the exclusive right of legislating on educational matters belongs to the province of Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—You won't find that the British Parliament will be governed by that decision.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON.—Subject to restrictions, but what are those restrictions? Simply that the minority, if they feel unjustly treated, have the right to appeal to the Governor in Council, but the fact of their having that right does not tie Parliament. It does not compel Parliament to say "Since we in 1874 included the whole province of Manitoba under the operation of the legislation of 1870, we have now no power to repeal that legislation."

Hon. Mr. BERNIER.—What is the use of having the right to appeal if the minority cannot ask for anything further?

Hon. Mr. BOULTON.—I wish to draw a great distinction between the claim put forth on behalf of the minority and the question of a remedy. I do not deny for one moment that there is an inherent right in the minority to appeal to Parliament to obtain redress. I am not arguing against that, for I have not come to that point yet; but what I wish to do is to confine to their legitimate limits the rights which the minority possess and to define distinctly how

far it is right for the Parliament of Canada to say that the views of the minority in regard to education should be imposed on the people of the country. These rights do exist, but it is equally true that they are limited. I believe it is true that the people of the Selkirk settlement did enter into a treaty with the Parliament of Canada, and that Parliament entered into a treaty with them to guarantee them certain rights and privileges. To that extent I say the Parliament of Canada is properly and justly entitled to see that they are guaranteed the enjoyment of those rights and privileges. It is very much the same ground that I took in reply to the hon. member for St. Boniface some two or three years ago. The rights that were acquired, and which the Parliament of Canada have now to take into consideration, are only the rights of the population as it existed in 1871, and Parliament must deal with those rights without interfering in any shape or form with the constitutional rights of the province of Manitoba in regard to education. No one in the province is being deprived of his constitutional rights or privileges. The people may bring whatever constitutional influence they possess to bear upon the government of the province to have their views carried into effect in a constitutional way. That right is not being forbidden to them, and in this respect they possess exactly the same right as I possess, and they can exercise it in exactly the same way. But the fact is, a small minority are attempting to have things their own way, simply because certain legislation was passed at one time, irrespective altogether of the changes which have taken place since. In my opinion it would not be wise to urge that claim. What is the condition of the people of the province of Manitoba to-day? Take the county in which I reside—the constituency of Marquette. There are in that constituency 36,000 people of whom 1,900 are Roman Catholics; the balance are Protestants. In that constituency there are ninety-five churches; five of them are Catholic, the balance are Protestant. Now, the constituency of Marquette is entirely west of what is known as the Selkirk settlement. It has sprung up since 1871, being included in the added territory to which I have already referred. Now, are you going to bind down 36,000 people to the views of the 1,900 Roman Catholics in that constituency?