Hon. Mr. SCOTT—That would be one law for one place, and another law for another.

Hon. Mr. POWER—Certainly, and there is good reason for a difference. The condition of things on the lakes is different from the condition of things on the coast. By a clause like the one I have suggested, you can avoid the difficulty of applying the same rule to both.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—Under the clause as drafted, the minister is given discretion, and, therefore, the suggested clause would not add anything to that discretion. He may refuse or permit the examination to be made.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The minister could not issue instructions in each particular case. That is not to be supposed. The minister could not say in the case of two Norwegians applying to be examined for certificates in Halifax that he would deal with each case separately. He must have some general rule on which to go.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I am quite willing to let the clause stand. I want to confer with the minister about it.

The clause was allowed to stand.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The attention of some members of the other House was called to clause 4, and they said it would be most mischievous and injurious in the lower provinces and they hoped that the minister would reconsider it. I do not know whether any of those gentlemen have sought an interview with the minister or not.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL — If this were imperative, the objections might be as strong as they are represented to be ; but if the minister has discretion to say yes or no, the objections do not apply. It is left entirely with the minister to act on the information which he may receive from those who are interested. If the law said distinctly that no one except a person domiciled in the country for a certain length of time should receive a certificate, I could understand the objection of the hon. senator from Halifax ; but if he has any confidence in the minister, under such circumstances, I think the clause is wide enough, giving him discretionary power to be exercised either for good or evil.

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—The hon. senator from Hastings takes the correct view of it. If two foreigners should come up for examination and the minister should be influenced, rightly or wrongly, against one and in favour of the other, it would be an illustration of the old scriptural remark, one would be grinding at the mill and the other would be left. I hope the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, so long as he is in the cabinet, shall use his influence to prevent clauses 4 and 6 coming into force. Canada is continually talking about its loyalty, and it is a very improper thing indeed for a British colony to put such legislation in force as against British ships.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—These two clauses can only come into force after being approved by the British government.

Hon. Mr. ELLIS—I was just going to mention some great men who were never naturalized. Take the case of the two Cabots. Then Christopher Columbus remained an Italian, though he founded the glory of Spain on this continent. There are hundreds of cases where men have entered the service of foreign countries, and so with British ships, as long as they have good, strict laws of their own, we should not make the restrictions on our own ships apply to them. We should be more liberal.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I agree with the hon. gentleman that we should be more liberal as to the application of clauses 4 and 6 but I cannot agree with him or the hon. senator from Hastings as to the amending of clause 3. The new clause is as follows :

The minister may refuse to admit to the examination mentioned in the two preceding sections any person domiciled in Canada who is a subject or citizen of a country in which British subjects do not enjoy similar privileges in respect of such examinations.

It is clear that the objection is not on the ground of illiteracy but because these people belong to countries where British subjects do not enjoy the same privileges. I have pointed out that we are in need of more qualified officers in the lower provinces.