

has been duly presented, he is not now bound to accept that statement and he declines to accept it. He wants evidence of presentation given by a trustworthy person. The motion means that the Lower Canadian endorser shall be compelled to deal with this note as if it had been duly presented or in due course, though he may believe it never was presented at all and he is obliged to submit to this alien system of protest, in which he has no confidence. And for what purpose is this House asked to force on the whole population of Lower Canada, with a very trifling exception, a system of law which they do not want? The object is to save a couple of shillings on one note in 100 notes. Is that enough cause to exasperate the feelings between the two Provinces? There is no opinion we hold more sacred in Lower Canada than our own right to our own laws; no predilection which is stronger than to our own laws. We do not want them taken from us except by our own consent, and every hon. gentleman can see that if this innovation is sanctioned by the House, it is against the consent of every Lower Canadian who sits in the Senate except one or possibly two. So that for the purpose of saving two or three shillings on one protest out of 100 we are to have this serious innovation upon our system, which if continued, can by no possibility do any other harm than perpetuate this trifling addition to the costs of protest; but which on the other hand will give confidence to a whole people in the administration of their commercial law. One of the hon. gentlemen made an admission which appeared to me very significant indeed and very appropriately illustrated the argument I have been using. He says that a man who has a negotiable piece of paper wants to hold it over for a day or two to suit the convenience of the parties. That would be a fraud. If the notarial system prevailed he could not do it: He has no right to hold a note over for two or three days after it becomes due; he must present it at once, or he loses the recourse against the endorsers. Yet the opportunity of tampering with the liability of the endorsers is one of the objects which an hon. gentleman wished to attain by adopting this system. How is a man who does that, to preserve his rights against the endorser? If he puts the fact on the Bill or notice of dishonor that it was presented two or

three days too late, he loses his recourse against the endorser. Does any one suppose that he will lose his recourse; that he will not find some office boy or street arab to certify that he presented the note on the proper day?

HON. MR. POWER—Is that the way they do things in Quebec?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Perhaps it might be if the law were changed. The other Provinces may have that immaculate character, that there is no body to be found in them who would tell an untruth; but, at all events, in Quebec we want proper evidence of the presentation of the note, and we venture to doubt that there is any pre-eminence of veracity in the other provinces. I think it would be one of the most unreasonable, one of the hardest, and one of the most disintegrating propositions that could possibly be carried by this House, to refuse to the whole Province of Quebec its own mode, the mode it earnestly desires, of protecting itself on its negotiable paper, on any ground and for any purpose; but still more so when it is to save two or three shillings on one note in 100. I hope the House will leave the clause as it is. It has received the most careful consideration from everybody. All the *pros* and *cons* have been thought of and it is satisfactory to our friends. Why should we treat our friends in Lower Canada as they would be treated by forcing on them a law which is distasteful to them, which they do not want, and under which they do not desire to live.

HON. MR. POWER—Does not the hon. gentleman from Montreal think it wiser to withdraw his amendment, inasmuch as it appears that the apparently harmless and trifling change that he proposes to this Bill is likely to endanger the whole fabric of Confederation? The hon. gentleman had better withdraw the amendment than run the risk of a catastrophe such as that.

HON. MR. DRUMMOND—After the speech of the leader, and the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from Halifax, I withdraw the amendment of which I had given notice, and I must say that I never had in contemplation any of the murderous purposes which have been suggested

The motion was withdrawn.