

istration the executive acts of the officers of the road are not subject to review by the Government; much less are the speeches of those officers. I do not say whether or not the facts are correctly stated, but I do say that the rates on primary products carried by the railroads of Canada are the lowest in the known world.

PRECIOUS METALS MARKING BILL SECOND READING

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN moved the second reading of Bill 2, an Act to amend the Precious Metals Marking Act, 1928.

Hon. Mr. BELAND: Explain.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I suggest the Bill be given second reading and then dealt with in Committee of the Whole. It is a technical measure, as are all amendments to the Act, and explanations can best be asked for and given in committee. I do not think the Bill is such as to require reference to a select committee, but if any honourable member would like it so referred, I shall be prepared to consider his suggestion.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: May I ask my right honourable friend if manufacturers of the articles covered by the Bill have made any representations to the Government with respect to the proposed amendments? The tendency of the earlier amendments has been towards protecting the public against false markings. It is only natural that this policy should be continued. However, in the past various members of the trades affected have appeared before our committees and suggested that the amendments then proposed were not opportune. It is not the practice of the House of Commons to send bills of this character to a committee.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The Bill in its every clause makes for further protection of the public. Each amendment is very plainly designed to further protect the public in the purchase of these articles—to see that the stamping and all the other requirements are made so plain and so specific that the public cannot well be deceived. This being the case, one would think it would be necessary only to ascertain whether or not those engaged in the manufacture and merchandising of the goods have any objection to the amendments, and I think that is what the question of the honourable senator is designed to elucidate.

The trade is represented by the Canadian Jewellers' Association. In a letter dated December 6, 1934, signed by Stuart H. Lees

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

and O. M. Ross, respectively President and Secretary, the Department of Trade and Commerce was advised that at a meeting of the Association these amendments were unanimously agreed to. At this meeting the silverware manufacturers and retail distributors from Toronto and Hamilton, representing practically the entire producing section of the industry and the larger retail houses, were present. That is my information as regards acceptability of the Bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the second time.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE

On motion of Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, the Senate went into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Gillis in the Chair.

On section 1—"mount":

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The explanation at the right is about as clear as any explanation can be of such a technical measure. The amendment is necessitated by changes of manufacturing conditions. The old Act said that a "mount" meant any part of an article of silver-plated ware "applied or attached to" the body of the article. A method has been devised of just stamping it on, which, strictly and legally speaking, was "applying" it. This was not in accordance with the intention of the original Act; so the amendment strikes out the words "applied or." Now, under the reading of the amendment the mount must be attached.

Section 1 was agreed to.

On section 2—"Sheffield Reproduction":

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 2 is of similar purport. It is to avoid evasions of the Act.

Section 2 was agreed to.

On section 3—marks "B.M." and "W.M.":

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: This is not quite of the same character. It is to enable a material to be used cheaper than what is known as hard metal, which must contain ninety per cent of tin, provided the dominating metal in this cheaper material is itself stamped on the article.

Section 3 was agreed to.

On section 4—limitation of time for complaint:

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: This section is quite different in intent. Under the law an action for infringement must be taken within