

been alleged by English merchants, and by merchants in other European countries, that there was no law in Canada by which they could be protected if they gave credit to Canadian merchants. The practice in the past has been, in too many cases, that where there were dishonest men, to whom my hon. friend from Monck referred so often, they have taken advantage of that Act and made assignments or effected settlements by which the European creditors were cheated out of every dollar that was due to them.

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—I do not think I said cheated.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman spoke of dishonest men.

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—And honest men too.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I will come to that presently—and that these men would take advantage of a bankruptcy law in order to cheat their creditors and undersell their competitors and thereby injure the trader who was pursuing an honest and legitimate business. That was one reason why it was thought in the interest of the credit of the country that a Bankruptcy Act should be placed upon the statute-book. One hon. gentleman objected to the bill because there were certain exceptions, or certain provisions which did not apply to the province of Quebec in the same manner that they applied to other provinces. Now that is a clause which does not in the least affect the principle of the bill; it is simply a provision to carry out the law as it exists in the province, in the advertising of and the disposition of the property and particularly of the real estate of the debtor. That is the only exception in the bill, and it cannot be considered at all fatal to its passage. I do not know what the hon. gentleman who spoke of the bill as not coming before the House in a legitimate manner meant. I should take it for granted that any bill introduced and going through its proper stages was legitimately before this House, and I object to the term that this bill is an illegitimate one in any sense.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I do not know whether the hon. gentleman refers to me, but I never used such an expression.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I have no recollection of attributing the expression to the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I said it did not come here in the ordinary way.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I took down the exact words that were used but I mentioned no names.

Hon. Mr. McCLELAN—I suppose the reference is to some remark of mine. I intimated that it was not presented in this chamber in the ordinary way that government measures are presented. It was brought here without the principle being discussed on the second reading in any way, and referred to committee, and it came rather, as I said, as the emanation of a committee of this House than as emanating from the government. I did not intend to apply it in the sense that the hon. the First Minister mentions. The hon. leader also made a reference to my objecting to the bill on account of there being a variation in it as far as relates to the province of Quebec. I made that observation, not as an objection to the bill, but because my hon. friend from Hamilton said it would be a uniform measure. I said it would not be uniform, because the same provision would not apply to Quebec as to the other provinces; I did not speak of it as an objection to the bill at all. Then my hon. friend alluded to me along with my hon. friend from Ottawa and my hon. friend from Halifax, alleging that I stated that the country was not now in a state of depression, and thereupon congratulating himself. I did not say that. I stated that I assumed that the bill was introduced last year on account of the state of depression in the country.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I have no objection to the interruption of the hon. member, although it is rather unusual to interrupt a speaker and make a second speech.

Hon. Mr. McCLELAN—I was correcting three misrepresentations with one interruption.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The hon. gentleman, like many others, has to explain what he really did say, or what he meant. It must also be gratify-