

their trade and interest pointing in that way. Hence again, he protested against being understood as favouring any such policy on the part of the Government in carrying out the public works of united Canada.

HON. MR. SCOTT said he had been told on the very best authority that the distance from Lake Nipissing was only 25 miles instead of 35 or 40 miles. He had this from an officer who was familiar with the distance, and who had gone over the ground. Government had authority under the Act to select the most convenient point in the interests of the public. Nobody ever pretended for a moment that they were bound to touch the waters of Lake Nipissing. The question was discussed and it was generally admitted in the other House that Government had discretion to place it at any point in the vicinity and south-east of the lake.

HON. MR. FLINT did not consider that in adopting the motion before the House they would be turning the Government out and placing the Opposition in power. He had always been in favour of allowing the present Government an opportunity of going their length, and letting the country see whether they were capable of managing its affairs. He condemned the Government in proposing to expend a vast amount of money upon a line of road which for a long number of years could be of no use.

The members were then called in, and the Hon. Mr. Bellerose's amendment to the amendment was put, and lost by 8 to 27, on the following vote:—

CONTENTS — The Honorable Messieurs Bellerose, Chapais, Chinic, Dumouchel, Flint, Guevremont, Ryan, Trudel—8.

NON-CONTENTS—The Honorable Messieurs Aikins, Allan, Archibald, Benson, Bureau, Chaffers, Christie, (Speaker), Cormier, Cornwall, Glasier, Haythorne, Howlan, Leonard, Letellier de St. Just, McMaster, Macdonald, Macfarlane, Macpherson, Montgomery, Pâquet, Penny, Read, Scott, Simpson, Skoad, Vidal, Wark—27.

HON. MR. DICKEY'S amendment was then put and carried, by 23 to 18, on the following vote:—

CONTENTS — The Honorable Messieurs Aikins, Alexander, Allan, Ben-

son, Bourinot, Chapais, Cornwall, Dever, Dickey, Dumouchel, Flint, Hamilton (Kingston), Howlan, Kaulbach, Macfarlane, Macpherson, Muirhead, Price, Read, Ryan, Seymour, Trudel, Vidal—23.

NON-CONTENTS—The Honorable Messieurs Archibald, Bureau, Chaffers, Christie (Speaker), Cormier, Glasier, Haythorne, Leonard, Letellier de St. Just, McMaster, Macdonald, Montgomery, Pâquet, Penny, Scott, Simpson, Skoad, Wark—18.

The main motion, as thus amended, was then put and carried.

#### THE AMENDED INSOLVENCY BILL.

On motion for the second reading,

HON. MR. SCOTT said the bill of which the present formed a basis, was introduced into the Parliament of Canada in 1864. At that time the persons who became subject to its provisions were those who were in trade as well as others who were not in trade. At that period a very large number of persons in Ontario became embarrassed and great pressure was brought to bear upon the Legislature, when an exceptional Insolvency Bill was passed which enabled any person to make an assignment and become an insolvent. In the Province of Quebec that law was limited to traders. So the law stood until 1869 when amendments were made in it confining its provisions to traders, but as to who were traders was never clearly defined. The present bill had the advantage that while it confined the law to traders it also very clearly laid down who should be embraced within its provisions. Another important change in the present bill was that of abolishing voluntary assignments. It had been felt that the power of making an assignment induced a number of small traders to go into insolvency without having any understanding with their creditors. Men allowed their estates to run down and then made an assignment, the creditors being called in to divide an estate that was not really worth anything. Another important change was the selection of assignees. At present the assignees were appointed by the Boards of Trade, but the present bill proposed that the powers of assignees should be considerably