

Canada to be independent of any other country. I want a roadway through our country that we can control at all times and under all circumstances. I do not want to be prevented, as we were in the case of the Sault Canal, from passing through any canal necessary for access to any part of the Dominion. I want a Canadian canal for the benefit of Canada. Just imagine the amount of traffic which will come down the Ottawa canal. The revelation will be so great that it will surprise people that it was not undertaken at an earlier period. However, better late than never. I know we have suffered, owing to the other great works which have been undertaken in other parts of the Dominion. I do not blame any government for it; they could not do otherwise. But now that the country is more prosperous they can afford to attend to the Ottawa route and develop this section of the country. These are the preliminary remarks I intended to make on this important subject, and I hope when I move for a committee it will be unanimously granted. It will afford us an opportunity of inquiring into the matter fully, and then the more the project is investigated and understood the more it will be appreciated. The next question to which I wish to refer is the matter of the insolvency bill. You are all aware that an insolvency bill for a commercial country is an absolute necessity. The commercial credit of the country has been suffering very considerably in England owing to the want of some uniform insolvency law. The conflicting decisions that are given now are extraordinary. I will give the hon. gentleman one illustration. The other day in the province of Quebec, it was held that after an assignment and after a curator had been appointed to the estate, that notwithstanding the assignment and the appointment of the curator and the abandonment of the estate, the judge decided on allowing a previous execution to come in, doing away with the assignment for the benefit of the creditors. It shows there is no uniformity and no knowing how a man is situated in this country as far as the creditor and debtor are concerned. The merchants of England are seriously considering this question, and some of them refuse to have anything to do with us as long as we are without a uniform insolvency law.

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—So much the better.

Hon. Mr. CLEMOV—But I want our credit to be good. I am perfectly satisfied that the more we manufacture and the less we buy, the better off we are. Still I do not want to see our credit impaired or injured in the English market. This matter was taken advantage of, and Mr. Fielding, Minister of Finance, was interviewed last year, when he was in England, and I am told that he gave them to understand that this matter would receive the attention and consideration at the present session. I hope the government will see its way to take action in the matter.

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—It is not mentioned in the speech from the Throne.

Hon. Mr. CLEMOV—No, but I hope the government will see the necessity of it. It was intended to call a meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade to consider this matter, but I do not know whether it would be an advantage or not. Some years ago an insolvency bill was passed. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition put a bill through this House which provided for every contingency in insolvency matters. Whether this bill will be reintroduced by the present government I do not know, but I think it is well worthy of consideration and might well have been one of the subjects mentioned in the speech from the Throne. I now intend to refer to a few paragraphs in the speech. First there is the prosperity of Canada. We are accustomed to that. We have always had prosperity in Canada, and at the present time this comes from the gentlemen who formerly saw nothing but blue ruin and decay in this country. I am glad they have changed their tactics and that they find the country is prosperous. The mover of the address wanted to take some credit to the government for this; he admitted that it was not altogether owing to the government, but to the policy that they had pursued, which was in fact the policy of the late government. This is the best vindication for the course of the late government in carrying on their policy for the 18 or 20 years they were in power, the best proof is that when the liberals came into power they found that with no other system could they carry on the affairs