

~~P 346.52~~

~~9m 9~~

—if a pitiable—explanation of their pusillanimous avoidance of discussion by a packed meeting called by nobody. So far as any can understand, their desire is repeal; pure, simple and immediate. Accepting that as correct, will these gentlemen explain to merchants, who still have something to lose, by what means they intend hereafter, to acquire control over the estate of a debtor in the Province of Quebec? How are they going to circumvent that beautiful institution, a bailiff's sale at nine o'clock in the morning, whereby assets are suddenly transferred to a wife, while liabilities stick to the husband? Who is to notify creditors of the intention to perform this piece of legerdemain? How are the Repealers going to secure the debts due to the debtor? (there will be no insolvents in the good time coming, of course not.) Is that cheap, speedy and effective instrument, a *saisie arrêt*, to be the weapon with which small debts are to be bagged? And, if so, what is the mode by which the existence of debts is to be ascertained? It may be news to some of those misled that, after having obtained judgment against a debtor at a "stunning" cost, there is not, in Quebec, anything in the nature of a judgment summons, under which a debtor can be examined as to his means of payment, and the creditor has the satisfaction of knowing that the debtor enjoys the debts, while a rather hollow judgment forms the creditor's portion. In effect, apart from the Insolvent Law, there is no remedy for a creditor in Quebec, unless the debtor is abundantly able to pay his debts, because during the time occupied in getting judgment, the assets vanish, and, should any "little effect" be left when execution is obtained, they are rapidly discussed by the lawyers, who file "oppositions" at a rate of something like—twenty dollars a piece.

Then how do matters stand in Ontario? What defence is there to Montreal merchants against judgments by