

This protest, which was served on the 15th of June, claims that the cashier in a letter of the 26th of November, 1838, instructed Furniss to procure the coins through Scholefield & Son, who had furnished those of 1837, and that they should "be similar in respect to weight and fineness of material," and the protest further claims that Furniss "had procured the copper coin from some other manufactory, that the said coins are . . . of base material different in all respects in the manufacture, coinage and workmanship from those manufactured the previous year, and are in fact utterly unworthy of issue and disreputable to the manufactory," and further "that inasmuch as the said coins were ordered and manufactured . . . for the special issue of the Bank of Montreal that none of (them) . . . should be issued . . . which would prove to the discredit of the institution."¹ Three days later Albert Furniss had a stronger protest served on Cotterill, Hill & Co., of Walsall, England,² to whom the order had been sent. Attached to this protest was a letter of instructions to the notary in which it is stated that "the coin is to be shipped for England to-morrow."³

These protests clear up some dark points in the history of this coinage. Why are specimens of this issue so scarce? Were they simply patterns for a contemplated coinage? Had the bank ever anything to do with them? No Canadian numismatist had any knowledge that such a large coinage had been struck, that it had really been imported into Canada and then rejected and returned to the makers.

This coinage is unofficial, as no authorization either from the Imperial or from the Provincial Governments was asked or obtained, and then it does not even bear the name of the province, while it has the name of the bank both on obverse and reverse.

A second unsuccessful attempt was made by Cotterill, Hill & Co. to satisfy the bank, for in the fall of the year 1839, according to the minute book, which states under date 19th November; "letter received from Mr. Furniss, also more coin but of lower grade than former shipment."⁴ This is the only record I have been able to discover respecting the coinage of 1839, but it is sufficient for us to gather that another shipment, of the same quantity as that of 1838, was struck from new dies and sent out expecting that the bank would accept it. The appearance of the coin does not bear out the bank's contention, that it was of "lower grade."

¹ Appendix D, No. 1.

² *Ibid.* No. 2.

³ *Ibid.* No. 3.

⁴ Appendix C.