

country is against this bill, and that it would be better for the country to withdraw it. I shall vote against the second reading.

Hon. Mr. CLEW—There seems to be a great diversity of opinion this session as compared with last session. Last year I thought the opinion of this House was favourable to an insolvency law of some kind. There has been an agitation for such a law for some years. The people of this country have been calling for some Act whereby the honest trader would get a discharge from his liabilities. The people of this country consider that its credit has been injured in England for the want of some such law. Last year, it is true, I opposed a great many clauses of the bill. I agreed with the hon. gentleman from De Lanaudière that the farmer should not be included, but it was carried against me. On the general principle, however, I think it was admitted very generally that the country required some such act whereby the honest man would get a discharge from his liabilities. It has been urged that there is a law in Ontario which takes a man's estate from him and distributes it among his creditors, but there was no power to give that man his discharge, and that was one of the principal causes for this bill. The Dominion Parliament is the only authority to carry such an act into effect. I am sorry to see such a feeling prevailing to-day, and possibly it would be better to adjourn the debate and give time for further consideration. I believe firmly that a great many people of this country are desirous of having some such measure. Whether this bill meets their views or not, I am not in a position to say. It does not meet my view entirely, but we must give and take and we made the very best possible bill that we could, and took a great deal of time to consider it, and it is rather a strange thing that we should now cavalierly dispose of the bill. I therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I am surprised at the motion made by the hon. gentleman from Rideau. The hon. gentleman seems to think that by some mysterious influence the minds of hon. gentlemen will be changed between to-day and to-morrow. The members of the House have had a whole year to consider this bill and ascertain the feelings of the people of the different parts of the

country. I do not think there is any ground at all for a postponement of the decision. I was also surprised to hear the hon. gentleman from Rideau tell this House that for a long time the people of this country had been clamouring for an insolvency law. The hon. gentleman is the only member who has heard even a loud whisper in favour of an insolvency law. The statement of the hon. gentleman from Monck is perfectly correct, that there was a feeling of relief when the original insolvency law, or the law as amended in 1875, was repealed in the session of 1880. There was a feeling that an incubus had been removed from the shoulders of the people in trade in this country, and there has never since then been any manifestation of a desire on the part of any large portion of the population for another insolvency law. It is perfectly correct to say that last session petitions were presented to this House coming from the boards of trade of certain cities, Montreal and Toronto more especially. My hon. friend from Monck is in error in supposing that the bankers made any especial request for the passage of an insolvency law.

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—I think one hon. gentleman addressing this House last session said that the committee had met the bankers.

Hon. Mr. POWER—When it was understood that the government intended to introduce an insolvency law, then the representatives of the banks came here to see that they got fair play. It has been suggested by an hon. gentleman in my neighbourhood, and there is a good deal in the suggestion, that considering that this bill was carefully considered in this House last session and sent to the other House, it would have been, on the whole, more appropriate to introduce it this year in the House of Commons. I cannot help making an observation on the ground taking by the hon. member from De Lanaudière, that while he was opposed to the principle of the bill, still he proposed to vote for its second reading. The hon. gentleman told us, and told us truly, that they have in the province of Quebec a law which suits the business men of that province admirably, and that they do not wish it changed. Does not the hon. gentleman realize that if this bill is passed, and he helps to pass it if he votes