

bonds at all, it having been patent that they had received them under false representations, and only because they were told that if they did not accept them that they could get nothing else, and would be compelled to forego their whole debt.

MR. MACKENZIE: It would be a dangerous thing for us to give certain bonds a preferential claim over others; it would be an unprecedented and perfectly monstrous class of legislation.

MR. TUPPER said it would, certainly, if it were done under ordinary circumstances; but he understood the proposal of his hon. friend from Kent to relate only to parties who could clearly establish the fact that these bonds had been forced on them, and not purchased as a matter of speculation, but forced upon them at a heavy discount.

MR. MACKENZIE. It is impossible they could be forced on them.

MR. TUPPER said he knew nothing, personally, of the facts. He understood by the statement of his hon. friend that certain parties had become creditors of the railway for supplies furnished to assist in running the road. There were no creditors so entitled to claim from the earnings or the means of any road or corporation as those who had furnished the means of keeping the road in operation. He understood his hon. friend to say that he only asked that those parties who had been compelled to take those bonds at a heavy discount or receive nothing in payment of their claims, should be treated as creditors who had not thus accepted bonds in settlement of their claims. Of course there would be some difficulty perhaps in establishing the claims of certain bond-holders over others, but that would have to be so guarded against as to confine the payment under this clause to those parties who could prove that they had furnished supplies to keep the road in operation, and had been obliged to accept these bonds at a certain rate of discount or nothing. This being done, there would be no wrong done to any person in putting those creditors in the most favourable position.

MR. STEPHENSON.

MR. MACKENZIE said, did the hon. member wish to have a Court of investigation established to enquire into the particular circumstances attending the purchase of every bond? or how could he ascertain that a certain class of bonds were to obtain some preferential claim? In order to legislate in that connection, the allegation should have been proved before a Committee that these people had been forced to take certain bonds, but nothing of the kind had been done. The bond-holders were all upon a certain footing, and it would be the most extraordinary piece of legislation ever perpetrated, to give a certain class of bond-holders preference over others. He could not conceive of a more mischievous kind of legislation. He could quite understand that many of these people, despairing of getting paid, agreed to take bonds, but the moment they took the bonds they became simply bond-holders.

MR. STEPHENSON: They were a little too simple before they took the bonds.

MR. MACKENZIE: And were not more entitled to full payment than any other parties who had taken the bonds. There had been a loss all over, and there was no reason why they should endeavour to discriminate, nor had they the material to discriminate. They would require to establish a Court for the purpose, to prepare a procedure, and embody it in the Bill. This would be a kind of procedure perfectly unprecedented. The conclusion he had arrived at was that the amendment was practically one which could not be carried out.

MR. TUPPER said he could hardly imagine the hon. the Minister of Public Works meant what he said when he stated to the Committee that he considered that bond-holders who had furnished supplies or labour in good faith, believing they would receive payment in money, and then were compelled to accept bonds at a heavy discount for the proceeds of their labour or supplies, had no greater claim on the company than the speculator who had purchased these bonds under the impression that he was doing a good business transaction which would yield