

second reading, I suggested that in view of the fact that the committee on Public Accounts might have under consideration certain other amendments to the Income War Tax Act, it might be advisable to leave the bill over until those other possible amendments could be incorporated with the present bill. Since then I have had some conversation with the Acting Minister of Finance, and I understand that he is quite willing that any recommendations coming from the committee, when it is empowered to consider the matter, will be given sympathetic consideration by the government. I have already given notice of a motion to authorize the committee to consider amendments to the act, but I should like before the third reading of this bill is gone on with to have some assurance from the minister that the motion of which I have given notice will not be opposed by the government, and that the government is prepared to consider sympathetically any suggestions that may come from the committee. I have no opposition to the present bill so far as it goes, and my only reason for asking for delay is that there may be other amendments which we might wish to incorporate in this bill. I would like to have a statement from the Acting Minister of Finance on that.

Mr. ROBB: It is quite true, as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) says, that he came to me and discussed this matter, and I think I convinced him that it was important that this legislation at least should go through. I would not like to commit myself to saying that the government will support any recommendation that is brought in. My recollection is that I said to my hon. friend that it seemed to me a request for an extension of the reference to the committee on Public Accounts should come from the committee itself, and not from individual members of the committee, and I assured him that I would be prepared to consider that when it was submitted in that way through the chairman of the Public Accounts committee.

Mr. GOOD: The chairman of the committee is here. I understood the motion of which notice was given in the House yesterday, was agreed to by the chairman.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

#### BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 146, to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Marcell in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. CAMPBELL: No copies of this bill have been distributed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh yes. They have been on the files for two weeks.

Mr. STEVENS: It is a Senate bill.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Interpretation.

Mr. GOOD: There has been some little difficulty in locating this bill, Mr. Chairman. I would ask the Minister of Justice, who is in charge of the bill, whether this is the amendment that was recommended by the Banking and Commerce committee at the close of last session.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not this section.

Mr. GOOD: What section are we on? I cannot hear the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I have just read section 2.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Appointment of interim receiver.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we should have an explanation of this section, it seems to be unnecessary.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is to prevent a conflict which has happened on some occasions. When an authorized assignment is made, the official receiver appoints a custodian. Now, nothing prevents a creditor from presenting a petition afterwards to declare the debtor bankrupt, and then under section 5 of the act an interim receiver may be appointed. A contest then develops between the interim receiver and the custodian. Their duties are the same, and there is no necessity or even justification, for appointing an interim receiver when a custodian has been already appointed by the official receiver. This is suggested by Mr. Justice Panneton, a judge in bankruptcy in Montreal, and many others.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I entirely agree with what my hon. friend says. It is the height of ridiculousness to have two officials, and to have duplication and two sets of costs. Suppose the section were to read thus?—

The court may, if it be shown to be necessary for the protection of the estate. . . . appoint an interim receiver.