

Gibbs (South Ontario), Ross (West Middlesex),
 Gillies, Ross (Prince Edward),
 Goudge, Rymal,
 Greenway, Scatcherd,
 Guthrie, Scriver,
 Higinbotham, Shibley,
 Horton, Sinclair,
 Kerr, Skinner,
 Kirk, Smith (Westmoreland),
 Kirkpatrick, Thompson (Haldimand),
 Landerkin, Trow,
 Macdonald (Kingston), Tupper,
 Macdonald (Centre Wood,
 Toronto), Young.—70.

NAYS :
 Messieurs

Barthe,	Jetté,
Béchar, d,	Laflamme,
Benoit,	LaJoie,
Bernier,	Langevin,
Blanchet,	Lanthier,
Bolduc,	Macdonald (Cornwall),
Bourassa,	McDonald (Cape
Brooks,	Breton),
Brown,	McDougall (Three
Caron,	Rivers),
Casgrain,	McIsaac,
Cheval,	Malouin,
Cimon,	Masson,
Costigan,	Methot,
Coupal,	Montplaisir,
Currier,	Mousseau,
Cuthbert,	Quimet,
Delorme,	Pinsonneault,
Desjardins,	Pope (Compton),
De St. Georges,	Robillard,
Devlin,	Robitaille,
Donahue,	Rouleau,
Forbes,	Roy,
Geoffrion,	Short,
Gill,	Stephenson,
Harwood,	Taschereau,
Hurteau,	Wallace (South Nor-
Irving,	folk).—53.

Bill read the first time.

INSOLVENT LAW REPEAL BILL.

[Bill No. 2.]

(Mr. Barthe.)

SECOND READING PROPOSED.

Order for second reading read.

MR. BARTHE said, last year he had introduced the same Bill, but, to the regret of the majority of the people of this country, it was defeated, and in reintroducing it this year, he believed the opinion of the majority of the people of this Dominion was favourable to it. This was not a question of politics, though it was his humble opinion that the Government should have a policy on this subject. He submitted respectfully to the House and the Government that, on so important a subject as this

MR. MCCARTHY.

one, the Government should be prepared to state whether they were in favour of such an insolvent law or of its repeal. If the Government was not ready to express such opinion, as this question was not a political one, but one of general advantage, he held the leaders on both sides of the House ought to put it in that shape before this House and the country. The majority of the people were in favour of the repeal of the law, because experience taught them that the more it had been amended, the more unsatisfactory it had become. The discussion last year, on both sides, was important. The reasons for the existence of the law and for its repeal had been given very eloquently. He would not repeat what had been said in favour of the repeal of the law last year, but would say this: that the reason his Bill was defeated last year was on account of the amendment proposed by the Government. The Government had then proposed an amendment which, in the opinion of many hon. members, would be a panacea, a remedy for the evils of the law as it existed. The amendment proposed by the then hon. Minister of Justice was that no insolvent who could not pay fifty cents on the dollar should get a discharge. The law was intended to be stringent, that every estate should give to the creditors fifty cents on the dollar or no discharge should be granted. They had had an experience of the amended law for one year, during which time only one estate in the Province of Quebec had paid a dividend of 50c. on the dollar, and that was very recently. He had the official statistics of the Government and also those of Dun, Wiman & Co., which showed that so far from estates having paid 50c., the average dividend was less than 14c. over the insolvent estates of the Dominion. Here was what the *Journal of Commerce*, which was an authority on different subjects, said.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BARTHE said he did not refer to that journal as a political, but as a commercial authority.

MR. MACKENZIE: And political.