

by snow, while the Brockville and Ottawa, a broad gauge, had remained unobstructed, though he would not state that this was altogether on account of the difference of gauge. He thought that economy and convenience required that the old gauge should be adhered to, though when the time came that the Grand Trunk should change its gauge, the Intercolonial might be changed also.

Hon. Mr. McDOUGALL (Lanark North) was very glad the question was again before the House though he scarcely expected the resolution would be confirmed. As to the broad gauge lines encountering the winter season better than the narrow gauge lines such an idea had proved to be purely imaginary. He thought the matter should be thoroughly investigated as to which gauge was best, and the House would then be better able to decide whether the change should be made, and he would desire to have the matter referred to a committee of the House which could examine Engineers and Railway Managers, and ascertain the true facts of the matter.

He thought the argument of the last speaker that a broad gauge was more suitable to overcome the difficulties occasioned by snow, was met by his admission that the gauge would ultimately have to be narrow, for certainly time would not change the snow, and he believed the narrow gauge was equally able to contend against snow with the broad gauge for the increased breadth and consequent resistance. To him the question seemed a large one, involving a great outlay of money, and the public interest would be served by a thorough examination.

As to the argument that the Grand Trunk, being a broad gauge, required that the Intercolonial should be so also, he could not see its force, for he apprehended each road would have to use its own rolling stock and if so there might as well be a transfer from a broad to a narrow gauge car as from one broad gauge car to another. As to the cars already constructed he agreed with the suggestion that they could be used on other Government broad gauge roads. The whole question was one for investigation, calculation, and decision on evidence, and the House was not in a position to decide the matter now.

It would be very awkward if, in some years to come, it was found that in the face of the whole experience of the railways of America and Western Canada the House had continued a construction of a gauge altogether inferior and more expensive. He had great confidence in private railways and he hoped that the House would not deal with the question on party grounds, and that Government would not adhere to their previous decision if full enquiry should result in a decision in favour of a narrow gauge.

Mr. BLANCHET said his individual opinion was in favour of the narrow gauge, but he could not take the responsibility of involving the country in so great an expense as was implied in a change of gauge under present circumstances. Moreover he could not admit that the narrow gauge was the gauge of the continent. The railways of the Northern States had a wide gauge, and those of the

Southern States had generally the same gauge.

It being six o'clock the House rose.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of **Mr. COLBY** for the Second Reading of the Act to repeal the Insolvency Laws, and the motion of the **Hon. Mr. CAMERON (Peel)**, in amendment thereto.

Mr. MAGILL said he was in favour of the repeal of the Insolvency Law. After an experience in business, extending over a period of thirty-one years, it was his candid opinion that the law tended to demoralize honest traders and worked to the advantage of the dishonest and fraudulent. Men should be made to feel the responsibility of their obligations, and not to be allowed to fall back upon the Insolvency Law. He thought that any man who could show an honest record would be liberally dealt with by his creditors. He was satisfied that every honest trader was in favor of the repeal of the law, and he would hold every man responsible for the obligations he entered into.

Mr. SCRIVER, from experience, had arrived at the conclusion that the law in force had a great many imperfections. He had seen many instances in which estates, when wound up, had not produced the satisfactory results hoped for, but, at the same time, he thought an insolvency law was necessary in order that creditors should be protected. Should the law be repealed altogether, the fortunate creditor who might happen to be on the spot would get the lion's share, and the others would have to take what they could get. The hon. mover of the motion had in effect acknowledged that such a measure was judicious and proper.

He would have preferred having the measure referred to a select committee, in the belief that they would be more likely to get a report than from a committee having so much business as that of Banking and Commerce. He would prefer seeing the law amended in some particulars, but would not support the motion of the member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby).

Mr. YOUNG remembered something of the state of things prevailing throughout Ontario before the present law, those were the days of preferential assignment when a single creditor seized the whole of the goods. He thought the motion was altogether too sweeping; they should endeavor to correct the errors in the law, but not reject the principle altogether.

One hon. gentleman had stated that cases of insolvency were increasing rapidly, and where there were five hundred insolvents before the passing of the law there are a thousand now, but the hon. gentleman must have drawn on his imagination, as there were only