to exceed twenty-five dollars, authorize the employment of some qualified person to assist in the preparation of the statement.

We doubt whether $25 is at all an adequate figure, and we question whether any figure should be mentioned.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: Perhaps "a reasonable amount" would be better.

Mr. CRYSLER: Yes. The cost might run into hundreds of dollars, or even conceivably into thousands of dollars.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL: As in the Abitibi case, for instance.

Mr. CRYSLER: Section 137 (4)—Examination of bankrupt at meeting. The provision for the evidence of the bankrupt being taken down in shorthand is impractical. Many trustees would not be able to find a competent stenographer just when required. We doubt whether that subsection should be retained.

Section 143—Questions must be answered. That section in its present form appears to us to be rather unfair to the bankrupt.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: I was waiting for your comment on that.

Mr. CRYSLER: May I read the comment on this in our brief?:—

> The provision in section 143 that evidence taken on examinations may be given in evidence in subsequent proceedings should be limited to evidence given at the formal examination mentioned in sections 138, 139 and 142 (but not including examinations before the Official Receiver), of the Bill. It would be unfair to give in evidence, evidence taken at an informal examination.

We are told that often the best ends are achieved by a very informal examination, which actually is just a chat in the Official Receiver's office. We do not think it would be fair to report that and give it in evidence against a person. If that practice were followed a few times, it would probably result in bankrupts becoming very reticent in those little chats.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: It is a very dangerous principle to compel a person to answer questions and afterwards prefer a charge against him and read his answers in an effort to convict him.

Mr. CRYSLER: We agree, Senator. As stated in the brief, we would go so far as to support that if it were confined strictly to the evidence given at the formal examination mentioned in sections 138, 139 and 142, but not including examinations before the Official Receiver. The reason for that is that while we thoroughly subscribe to the principle you have mentioned, we also fully appreciate the kind of persons that trustees in bankruptcy often have to deal with, and the difficulty of getting any information out of them—indeed, in many cases it is almost impossible to get any information.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: This section is not on the point of getting information.

Mr. CRYSLER: I see your point, sir. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: It has to do with the further use of the answers.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: Yes.

Mr. CRYSLER: Quite frankly, sir, we would not go so far as to support that section, but we presume that the draftsman had some cogent reasons for putting it in and we would withdraw our opposition if the section were confined to the formal examination.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: It is not entirely new.

Mr. REILLEY: It is almost exactly as in the present act.

Hon. Mr. HAYDEN: That does not make it any better. I do not like it, but I am only one.

Mr. REILLEY: I have my doubts about it myself.