

in operation in Ontario, except as to the County of York, and I do not think the Dominion Government owns any land in that county.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—The hon. gentleman will see, with regard to that point, in the third clause it is limited to Dominion lands, Ordnance or Admiralty lands, Indian lands, and all other lands which are the property of Canada, or of which the Government of Canada has power to dispose.

HON. MR. POWER—Take, for instance, the Indian lands in the County of Haldimand. The Torrens system of land conveying and registration is not in operation in that county. Why should the lands which the Dominion Government may grant there be under a different law from the lands in other counties?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—That is the objection taken by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa, and the one which requires explanation. If the committee will pass the Bill through this present stage, I will be in a position to give an answer to that question at the third reading.

HON. MR. POWER—As to the second clause, the twenty-third line says that the grant shall be "taken and held to have operated as a conveyance to such personal representative of an estate in fee simple or an equivalent estate in such lands." It appears to me that there should be some words to show—I do not know that they are absolutely necessary—that they are conveyed to him as such personal representative, and that the administrator does not take them for himself.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—The preliminary sentence of the clause makes that clear. I do not think there is anything in that point.

HON. MR. DRUMMOND, from the committee, reported the Bill without amendment.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT BILL. IN COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (X) "An Act to amend Chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, entitled: 'An Act respecting Interest.'"

(In the Committee.)

HON. MR. ABBOTT said: I desire to improve this Bill by adding a clause to repeal two sections of the Revised Statutes, which should not have been allowed to remain in force, and which are only productive of trouble and worry to understand what they mean. I refer to sections 10 and 11 of the law respecting interest, both of which are inconsistent with all the legislation we have had with reference to interest, and have become entirely obsolete. In some extraordinary manner these clauses escaped the notice of the legislators, and found their way into the Revised Statutes. It was intended last Session to repeal these two sections, but the Bill relating to interest came up at too late a stage of the Session. I move that a clause be added to the Bill to repeal sections 10 and 11. If the committee accept this amendment, I propose to let the third reading be postponed for two or three days, so that hon. members may see what the effect of the amendment is.

HON. MR. POWER—While I think that the first sub-section of section 10 appears objectionable, it strikes me that there should be some limitation to the amount of interest that should be chargeable in these cases; but looking at the remainder of this chapter I do not see that, apart from those two sections, there is any limitation of the rate of interest, and it occurs to me that there ought to be some limitation. I do not think that in the case of bills and notes, for instance, more than 8 per cent. should be collectable.

HON. MR. DEVER—I do not see why there should be any limitation of the rate of interest any more than in anything else that is the subject of bargain and sale. It is not the case in New Brunswick.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—The policy has been to relieve the dealing in money of any restriction, leaving it perfectly free to people to make whatever bargain they please, except in special cases, where there is a special exception created by charter or Act.

HON. MR. DEVER—Where there is no bargain, there should be limitation of interest.

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman from St. John has undertaken to con-