

only to deal with Nova Scotia and one or two other provinces. As to Nova Scotia, I have very little doubt but that a bill containing similar provisions to those of the Ontario Act will be passed at the next session of the local legislature. It passed the House of Assembly during the late session and was killed in the council just at the close of the session, largely because there was not time to look after it, and the government were taken by surprise. It was killed by gentlemen who really did not understand, I believe, the effect of their action. It has been stated already and is undoubtedly true that those local acts are suited to the wants of each province. The province of Quebec has a law which satisfies its own people admirably. Ontario has a law which satisfies her people admirably, and I think the local acts satisfy the people better than any general law could.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—No, no.

Hon. Mr. POWER—As a matter of fact, I think the law which prevails in Quebec would not probably satisfy all the other provinces, and the laws which prevail in the other provinces would not satisfy Quebec so well. The Ontario law is likely to be enacted in all the other provinces, and you will have practically a uniform law everywhere except in the province of Quebec. There is this other reason why we should not interfere—the insolvent law was repealed in 1880, now fifteen years ago. The Dominion Government and Parliament have stood by and allowed the local legislatures to enact laws for the purpose of dealing with insolvent estates, and these laws deal with them in a satisfactory way, and to come in now at the eleventh hour and enact a law which we failed to enact when it might have been looked for, is uncalled for and unwise. It is not a proper course of action to take at all. It should be taken only in the presence of something approaching absolute necessity. There has not been any evidence whatever produced that there is any such necessity now. This is a bill which, if it became law, would be likely to disturb the business relations of the whole country, and the presumption is, judging from our experience with former insolvent laws, that it would disturb business with injurious results. There is no necessity for it, no demand for

it, and therefore, I think Parliament would not be justified in passing it.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—It was my intention to support the motion made by the hon. member from Welland with regard to the six months' hoist, but as I have been put down as a seconder of the motion of my hon. friend for the adjournment of the debate, I think that that, probably, is the most sensible course that we could pursue at present. We should never do anything in haste. This is an important question, the question of bringing our whole relations as regards debtor and creditor under an Act, and it should not be disposed of hastily. As far as I am able to judge of public opinion, I have not seen any particular demand since we met last year for this Insolvency Act, and it would do no harm if the bill were thrown over from one year to another until a demand does spring up. If it would improve our credit in the markets of the old world, from a free trade standpoint, I say that anything that will assist in that direction is desirable, and an insolvency bill probably is more for the purpose of improving our commercial credit abroad so as to bring the whole of our commercial interests into one uniform channel. In that respect it commends itself to my mind. But, in the absence of any public demand, or expression of opinion, with regard to the desirability of this legislation, I think it is probably premature to bring the measure before the country at the present moment, and in the best interests of the country, it would be desirable to support the motion for the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. REESOR—I prefer that the debate should be adjourned to give members an opportunity of discussing it, but if a division is forced on the six months' hoist I shall vote for that. I have no expectation myself that the bill could be so amended that I would support it. I agree with the arguments of those who say that the public are satisfied with the laws that the local legislatures can make for themselves and my impression is that the people of Ontario are quite satisfied with the laws that they have. At the same time, a bill that has had so much supervision should be allowed to stand over—it should go to the committee with the reservation that we shall vote as we like after that.