

a view to the company going under the Creditors' Arrangement Act. He told the creditors the Act did not apply to a registered partnership.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. Mr. Piper, is there any objection to stating the name of the company?—

A. Well, sir, I must leave that in your hands. I am in the hands of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Does Mr. Reilley identify the case?

Mr. KINLEY: I think the case should be identified.

Mr. MARTIN: I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the committee desire identification?

*By Mr. Bertrand:*

Q. Is it not a fact, Mr. Piper, that between the incorporation of the company and the time that the petition was made part of the assets were used to pay to the bank the loans that were guaranteed by the ex-partners?—A. I have no information on that.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. What is the name of the company?

Mr. MARTIN: Apparently they did not act legally.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot see any objection to the name being given.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: If you are going to bring a number of these forward, all right; but if you are going to bring only one company forward, why state its name? If we are going to put their names on the record, we ought to bring in a number of the companies.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Piper is giving evidence of the abuse of the Act, and it is a purely theoretical statement unless we have identification of the company. However, I will not press the question.

Mr. LANDERYOU: Mr. Chairman, full information would have to be disclosed, the amount of the assets and everything else. We would have to go into the whole thing.

The CHAIRMAN: I feel that to mention a case of that kind without giving the name is of questionable value. However, if you care to put it in in that form, it will stand for what it is worth.

Mr. KINLEY: The Creditors' Arrangement Act is supposed to be an improvement on an Act which has been criticized and which is a very cumbersome thing, that is, the Bankruptcy Act. Now, if these men who are giving expert evidence here would tell us wherein it is an improvement on the other Act, and compare the two, if we are going to destroy this one, we are going back to the Bankruptcy Act, and I think it is important to know, if we destroy this one, what we are going back to. They should have that in mind in presenting this to the company.

Mr. BERTRAND: I think they have that in mind. In 1921 it was even better than what we have to-day, but that part of the Bankruptcy Act was repealed because at that time there was no superintendent of bankruptcy, and it was found out that a certain number of trustees, as soon as they would see that somebody was being sued, would go to these persons and ask them to settle with their creditors by virtue of this Act. It was so bad that the government had to repeal that part of the Act, and later on the superintendent of bankruptcy was named. If we had had the superintendent of bankruptcy in 1921 it would not have been necessary to withdraw that part of the Act.