

from the dumping of United States goods. Give us a Bill, nine or ten carats.'

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Did they make their representation to the government?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Could that not be made before the Senate?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—They wrote the government and sent deputations to interview the government.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I understood that the retailers and manufacturers had mutually agreed upon the different clauses of the Bill, minus the question of the 9 or 9½ or 10 carat gold. Then I asked whether a memorial had been sent to the government to that effect, and if so whether they would lay that before the Senate so that the members of the Senate could read it and form their own opinion as to the terms of the agreement into which they entered.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I do not know that it was in the form of a memorial. There were letters addressed to the different members of the government and the principal opposing parties, a large firm in Hamilton, whose view the hon. senator from Beamsville wanted to sustain, which was in favour of nine carats. That manufacturer called on me with one of the members for the city of Toronto.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—McNaught.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—And they both then and there said: 'We want the Bill put through. We have not ourselves agreed whether the standard should be nine or ten carats. We are leaving it to the government to decide, but we are willing to take the Bill at nine or ten.'

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—When we are reading the Bill the second time, we must know whether it is going to be nine or ten carats. We must be reading the Bill in some form, and we must have that point settled before we can read it a second time.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I cannot decide now. The Bill is in the printer's hands.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—If this notice covers the Bill as it is now on the statute-

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

book, but not now in operation—that is what the hon. member means by this Bill.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Yes, they have made some changes in detail upon which they are able to agree, but the main difference is in reference to the standard.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—But if we have not the Bill before us—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Oh, well, let the order be discharged.

The order of the day was discharged.

#### CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (NN) An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

(In the Committee.)

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—The attention of the department has been called to an accidental omission which was made in the Revised Statutes and on which they sent me this memorandum:

At the present time there is no penalty for employing an uncertificated master or mate on inland waters or on the minor waters both of which are described in the interpretation clause, for serving as such master or mate.

Section 96 prohibits that, but in the Revised Statutes the penalty was omitted, and they desire to correct the omission in the Revised Statutes and restore the law to what it was before the amendment was made. The section they propose to insert is as follows:

(a) Every person who, having been engaged to serve as master or mate of any ship trading on the inland waters of Canada or on the minor waters of Canada, or on coasting voyages, as the case may be, the master or mate whereof is by this parliament required to have such certificate of competence or service, sails or takes such ship from any port or place in Canada in any such voyage, as such master or mate, without being at the time entitled to and possessed of such certificate as by this parliament required, or who employs any person as master or mate of any such ship on any such voyage, without first ascertaining that he is at the time entitled to and possessed of such certificate, &c.

As this merely replaces the law as it was before the Revised Statutes was passed, my hon. friend will not object to me introducing it now.