

MR. DECOSMOS said he trusted the Committee would take into consideration the question whether it would not be much better to allow hon. gentlemen who desired to revise their speeches, to have a printed proof of their speeches instead of manuscript that was exceedingly difficult to decipher.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that to his certain knowledge, in the *Hansard* of last Session, two or three rather important statements were omitted. He knew that the reporters experienced great difficulty in following the proceedings, and particularly interjections; but occasionally statements were made from one side of the House to the other that, to a very large extent, bore on the question at issue. Now, it must be understood that the *Hansard*, although very reasonably faithful as showing the general tenor of the speeches, and very often giving the exact language, could not, as it was at present, be regarded as an absolutely authentic record.

Motion agreed to.

INSOLVENCY LAW REPEAL.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL PROPOSED.

MR. BARTHE moved for leave to introduce a Bill to repeal the Insolvency Law now in force in the Dominion.

MR. TUPPER said he would like, in this connection, to enquire of the hon. the First Minister if the report was authentic which stated that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, on the occasion of his appeal to his constituents in Drummond and Arthabaska, had stated that it was the intention of the Government to repeal the Insolvency Law.

MR. LAURIER said he thought he could appeal to his hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) as to the fact that he never made such a statement. He never stated that it was the intention of the Government to repeal the Insolvency Law or any other Act. He had been sworn in the day before, and it was only natural for him to make no statement of that or any other kind as to the future policy of the Government. He said there, as he had

stated elsewhere, that, as far as his own personal sentiments went, he was in favour of the repeal of the Insolvency Law. Even if he did make the statement attributed to him, and he did not think that he did, he spoke of his own sentiments and not of the policy of the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not think it fair that any hon. gentleman should ask such a question without previous notice.

MR. MASSON said the hon. gentleman need not have answered the question, but he did. He was sorry the hon. gentleman had made an appeal to him. He had only gone into the country twice. As the hon. gentleman said he had not made the statement, of course he could believe that he did not intend to make it, but he had understood him to say that he was opposed to the Insolvency Law; that it would not be repealed at this Session, but probably at the next Session. He remembered it particularly, because he had spoken of it to his friends at the time.

MR. MACKENZIE said he really must ask hon. members not to discuss in that House things said by others in another place.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, with regard to the remarks which had fallen from his hon. friend the member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) there was a motion before the Chair, and it was quite germane to ask if certain remarks in reference to this subject had been made by the Minister of Inland Revenue at any time. Notice would be required of the question put to the Premier, because, without it, he could not have the opportunity of enquiring of his colleague. This was a discussion on the first reading of a Bill, and perhaps it was unusual to introduce a Bill at all, except the measure which was always introduced to assert the rights of Parliament, until the Speech from the Throne had been answered. But, the motion having been made, the discussion was quite in order.

MR. MASSON said it was painful to see hon. members who had been known always to speak the truth, holding different opinions on matters of fact. It was painful to him to again refer to

Mr. Ross.