

schools that are really public schools. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Messrs. Fielding, Sifton and Paterson tell us what they are. We must accept their declaration, and we must admit that there is no difference between the public schools in the Northwest and the separate schools. They are exactly the same thing. Those schools were made public or separate schools when the Autonomy Bill was passed. I said then that the Catholic majority or the majority in any school division or any school riding in the province had a right to have the schools of their choice. That was the Act of 1875. Well, if the minority in a school riding happened to be Catholic or French, they could have a French school or a Catholic school. That would be a denominational school. But that was their right. The British North America Act was changed. The legislation of 1905 not only gave an Autonomy Bill to the provinces, but they changed the British North America Act in substituting the word 'separate' in the British North America Act for the word 'denominational.' That was an alternation of the British North America Act for that purpose, let it be constitutional or not. That is not now the question before us, but I want to say that the money that at that time would have been divided between the separate schools and the public schools would have gone to the separate schools. Then the separate schools being wiped out, nobody could claim the money that otherwise would have gone to Roman Catholic schools. I contend that they have a right to share in that money, and this question is not settled; but if it is settled, it is settled in a way by which the minority claim an injustice has been done. It is for these reasons I recall the rights of the minority to a measure of justice of which they are deprived by the legislation of 1905. If that legislation is constitutional, well and good, I have no more to say. If it is not constitutional, I will not bother bringing it before the court; it is none of my business, but the constitution of that Act may be attacked by the interested parties. If they are not interested enough to do that, I shall certainly not do so.

The amendment was declared lost on division.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed.

#### PROPRIETARY MEDICINES BILL.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

The House resumed in Committee of the Whole consideration of Bill (146) An Act respecting Proprietary or Patent Medicines.

(In the Committee.)

Hon. Mr. DERBYSHIRE—I am satisfied to accept the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman from Wellington, adding the words in clause 17, after the word 'Act' the following: 'In respect of the sale of any patent or proprietary medicine in the hands of the retail merchant at the time of the passing of this Act.'

The CHAIRMAN—The question is on the amendment of the hon. gentleman from Toronto, to substitute the words, 'In stock' for the words 'In the hands.'

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I should like to ask what would be the meaning of that? If goods were ordered, actually purchased, they would not be in the hands, but would they be in stock? I do not think they would, under the reading. It seems to me that an order for goods should not be cancelled by an Act of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—The Minister of Inland Revenue dictated that amendment, and if he were to make it open to admit goods that were ordered, he would be giving unlimited permission to parties in the retail business to stock themselves up, so that they would be enabled to sell goods for a long period. I do not think we should add a protection to those who have ordered stock.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL—I think it would be easy to frame the amendment so that it would pass. I do not see why it is confined to retail merchants. I do not think the wholesale man's goods should be confiscated—any goods which the wholesale man has on hand, or which is in a retail store or is in process of manufacture.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—The wholesale men can recast and remodel their medi-