

MR. LAFLAMME said he had no objection to communicate all the information possessed. The parties complaining, he might state, could, if the Banque Nationale had violated its charter, go before any competent tribunal and demand such remedy as the law granted. There was, he believed, at the present time, a case in Chancery arising out of some points connected with this matter. If such was the case, it would be very improper, on the part of Parliament, to interfere or do anything which might prejudice the decision to be given by the Court, which was the only competent tribunal to determine whether the law had been violated, as alleged by the hon. member for Carleton. It was alleged, on the other hand, also, that there had been no violation; that Latour was an insolvent, who transferred all his assets to the bank, which was a creditor on the estate for \$75,000. In order to obtain judgment on its claim, the bank very naturally endeavoured to sell the timber referred to.

MR. ROCHESTER said the Minister of Justice seemed to point out that any stockholder in the bank, who thought it had violated its character could have a remedy by raising an action. It was not likely, however, that a stockholder in any corporation which yielded him 10 or 15 per cent., would raise an action as suggested. He understood there was no way whereby redress could be obtained except by coming to the House, because the Minister of Justice had flatly refused to grant his fiat to enable the complainant to go to the Exchequer Court. He knew, to his cost, that Latour was an insolvent, and that his assets had been seized by the bank, because \$10,000 worth of property belonging to him (Mr. Rochester) had been transferred with other effects. This was done a month after Latour was made an insolvent, and then he came forward and offered one cent on the dollar. Under these circumstances he thought the House should step in and check this violation of the law. He was aware that the contract was for 1876-7, but the same works were carried on in 1877-8; and not only so, but the Banque Nationale had taken

up the lumber trade on the Black River as well. Now, was this to be allowed? He wanted the hon. gentleman to give those who considered themselves aggrieved, the opportunity of showing that they had wrongs to be redressed, and if the hon. gentleman would bring down those papers, that was all they asked.

MR. PALMER said he considered this a matter of very great importance, and it surely could not be that the Minister of Justice had taken upon himself to lay down the law with regard to it. It was bad enough to have a contract with an insolvent man, but that a bank should be allowed to carry on for two or three years, issuing their notes all over the country, was one of the most alarming statements he had yet heard in Parliament. The law said banking companies should not be allowed to do certain acts which might make their currency valueless, and this company had been trading in lumber, which was clearly against the law. If the charter of the company had been violated, the charter should be withdrawn, and it was for the Attorney-General to take this or other means to prevent the carrying on of this illegal trading.

MR. BLAKE said that he saw nothing more dangerous to the interests of the public than that the remedy proposed for this case should be applied. There were, he believed, three or four remedies besides this extreme one, which was a proceeding that should not be resorted to except in the most extreme circumstances possible, after a long continuance of the violation of their charter in essential particulars, and when it was obvious that it was a less evil to abolish that charter altogether. This exercise of such a summary power had almost gone into disuetude. There was another remedy which the Attorney-General could exercise on behalf of the Crown, without the intervention of the subject: he could restrain the bank from continuing to violate its charter. A similar course might be taken, he believed, by the intervention of a stockholder; and he also believed there was a fourth remedy by which a stockholder inter-