

which do not require to be protested in Upper Canada. I suppose the next step will be to insist that we shall abandon our system and adopt the plan which may prevail in Ontario and Nova Scotia of which we know nothing, and which we do not care about learning. But if hon. gentlemen are so determined that the law shall be uniform why is Lower Canada to be sacrificed? Why should they take away the laws of Lower Canada and force upon us the laws of another Province? Why not take away the laws of another Province and force upon it the laws of Quebec? The reason is just as good in one case as in the other, and it is very bad in both. It is not a question of commercial law properly so-called at all. It is a question of procedure, nothing more, just as much a question of procedure as the mode we adopt in suing in Quebec.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—So is half the Bill a question of procedure.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—This is as much a portion of the procedure for recovery from parties liable for a note, as the issuing of a writ from the Superior Court to compel its payment. So it does not follow, if my hon. friend's argument were sound, which I think it is not, that it comes within that principle at all. The whole question comes to this: shall we keep a mode of procedure which we have enjoyed from time immemorial in Lower Canada, which we understand, and in which we have confidence; shall we have that taken forcibly from us by a majority of Parliament composed of persons who have been equally habituated to a different law? I say that is not in accordance with the principle that has prevailed in this Dominion so far—the principle which has led to the amity and friendship which prevail throughout the country between the inhabitants of the different Provinces. If at any time hon. gentlemen in this House belonging to the different Provinces take it into their heads that their law is better than the law of Quebec, surely they are not going to bring a Bill into this House and say, "we think this law is better than the law of Quebec, therefore we insist that your law shall be taken from you and our laws forced upon you." I think that is the most unreasonable proposition that I ever heard in this House.

HON. MR. MACINNES (Burlington)—I want to understand this question, and I do not want to be unfair to the Province of Quebec. Is not this Bill brought in by the Government for the purpose of making the law on this subject uniform throughout the whole Dominion?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—No.

HON. MR. MACINNES (Burlington)—What is it for, then?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—The purpose of the Bill is to make a law on promissory notes and bills. There is nothing in the recital or anywhere else which enacts that the purpose of this Bill is to make a uniform law for notes and bills. We all know that the object is to make the law as uniform as we can. We agree to that; we think it expedient that the law should be as uniform as possible, but I do not agree, and I am sure that my hon. friends in the Province of Quebec do not agree, that the object of this Bill is to force on the Lower Canadians a system of procedure which they do not approve of and under which they do not desire to live.

HON. MR. POWER—As I understand the proposal of the hon. gentleman from Montreal it is not to force anything on the people of Lower Canada.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—What my hon. friend from Montreal says is that there is no obligation on the holder to protest or not to protest; he says that a man may protest or not as he likes. Then what about a note which is held by a man who does not choose to protest? At whose mercy does the man who endorses that note in Lower Canada stand? He stands in a position that he does not wish to occupy. He stands in the position of having no authentic evidence that his note was properly presented for payment in due time and in the proper manner. He is obliged to take evidence of that in which he has no confidence, so that it is not at all what my hon. friend would convey, that it cannot possibly do harm to the people of Lower Canada, and may do a great deal of good to other people. The man who endorses a note wishes to know whether it has been properly presented, if it is protested for non-payment. If he is told by any person who may be picked up on the street for the purpose that the note