

CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE AT WASHINGTON

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I should like to direct the attention of the government to a despatch which appeared in the daily press this week to the effect that the delay in naming Canada's envoy at Washington is due to pressure from the Imperial authorities at London. It is stated that this question will be taken up at the forthcoming Imperial Conference at London, and that an interchange of correspondence has taken place between this government and London with respect to the matter. Is the government in a position to give us any information.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The report is wholly without foundation as respects any one of the features mentioned by my hon. friend.

SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT VANCOUVER EMPLOYEES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St John City): I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Beland) to an answer that was given in reply to certain questions of mine. I refer the minister to Hansard at page 2297. The first question I asked was:

Were the services of any men in the employ of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment at Vancouver, British Columbia, dispensed with on or about March 1st, 1923?

The answer to that question was: "No." I have in my hand a communication stating that the following: Captain R. C. Cruik, Captain W. R. Flewin, M.C., Mr. H. Irvine and Mr. W. A. Beattie were given notice and left the service on February 28. They were all married men with dependents; they were of good overseas' service, and, as I state, they were given notice and left the service on February 28. Would the minister be good enough to look into the matter and ascertain if there has not been some inaccuracy in the answer?

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): The answer was prepared by officials of the department. I shall be glad to make an inquiry as to the apparent inaccuracy in the answer given.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 139, to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

He said: When introducing the bill I explained the purposes of the amendments. The main amendment is to change the system as to the trustees. Under the present law we have authorized trustees who are appointed by the Governor in Council. We propose to have the trustees chosen by the creditors. Under the present law the debtor assigns to the trustees. We change this system; we propose that a debtor should assign to the creditors. He will assign willingly through an official receiver who will be a judicial officer in one or another of the different provinces, or he will be forced to assign on a petition granted by the court. In either case a custodian will be appointed—by the receiver when the assignment is made willingly, and by the judge on petition. The duties of the custodian are to take charge of the assets of the estate and to call the creditors to appoint the trustee. We propose to amend the law for various reasons, among others for the purpose of authorizing the sale of real estate properties that are subject to hypothec in the province of Quebec in the same mode as we now proceed in that province in connection with sales by the sheriff. Another amendment is to restore to the landlords the privileges which they enjoyed, before the law of 1919, under the legislation of the different provinces. We propose also to provide that the debtor shall not be authorized to propose a composition between his creditors and himself until after the assignment; while another authorizes the official receiver to compel the appearance of the debtor before him for examination in regard to the causes of his assignment, the disposal of his property, and so forth. There are minor amendments, consequent upon the main ones which I have just outlined.

Mr. W. A. BOYS (South Simcoe): In committee I shall probably have more to say than on the present occasion, but I desire to take the opportunity now of making an observation or two upon the proposed amendments. It seems to me that if what the minister suggests is carried out we might just as well go back to the provincial law as it previously obtained in the various provinces. We were getting along fairly well in Ontario, and the only thing we required was a law providing for discharge, which has been the feature of the bankruptcy law, so far as I know. I hold in my hand the act as originally introduced, together with a mass of amendments; now we have a further bill, with another extensive collection of amendments. If the law is to be changed so frequently and extensively it seems to me