

other Provinces that prevail in the Province of Quebec.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Will my hon. friend explain why those words are introduced in clause 51—"but it shall not, except in the Province of Quebec, be necessary to note or protest any such bill in order to preserve the recourse against the drawer or endorser." How is the drawer or the endorser to be held unless he is notified?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I put that question to those who drew the Bill, and the explanation is satisfactory to a certain extent. There is another clause in the Bill which provides that if an inland bill is dishonored notice must be given to the endorser and the drawer, but they do not insist on the formality of a protest. That is what is dispensed with in the practice in Ontario. Noting means notarial notation, which is completed by protest.

HON. MR. SCOTT—I think those words are simply confusing.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I propose to add after the word "but," in the third line, "subject to the provisions of this Act with respect to motives of dishonor."

HON. MR. SCOTT—The clause means nothing, and should be struck out altogether.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—This clause deals with the protesting of bills, and it says that inland bills need not be protested. I understand that that is the law in England, and it makes the law uniform throughout the Provinces, except the Province of Quebec.

HON. MR. REESOR—The notice of dishonor would not entail the expense of a notarial protest.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—It would not. The amendments I propose to make to this clause are, after the word "but," in the third line, to add "subject to the provisions of this Act with respect to notice of dishonor."

HON. MR. POWER—That is clear from the provisions of the Act.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My theory about legislation is that we should endeavor to put it in such a form that persons will not be liable to be misled by it. I must con-

cess that I was misled by this for some time, and imagined that the bill rendered it unnecessary to take any proceeding whatever with regard to inland bills of exchange, and one would naturally think so, reading the clause by itself. Therefore, as this amendment will make it quite clear, I think it will be better to adopt it.

The amendment was adopted.

HON. MR. SANFORD—Do I understand that the portion referring to the Province of Quebec is struck out?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—No. Why should my hon. friend take such an interest in the Province of Quebec?

HON. MR. SANFORD—I take a considerable interest in the Province of Quebec. If this exception is permitted, anyone whose business extends to the Province of Quebec would have to keep in his employ somebody specially to watch these matters in that Province. We are legislating for the Dominion, and I cannot see why a law which is applicable to the other Provinces should not be suitable for the Province of Quebec. I am not alone in taking this view of it. Many who are doing business in different sections of Canada feel as I do on this question. If we have one uniform law for all the Provinces we will avoid serious mistakes and embarrassing losses.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I hope my hon. friend will move that inland bills be protested notarially in other Provinces as well as in Quebec. I think it is a better system. There is really no change in the principle of the law whatever. It is only a minor proceeding, and I do not see why we should not indulge the Province of Quebec in this matter. I should like to know whether I am expressing correctly the feelings of representatives from Quebec in saying that they desire to retain this mode of procedure in the event of a bill being dishonored. I think it is hard to deny it to them, inasmuch as it does not materially affect the other Provinces.

HON. MR. DRUMMOND—It is quite impossible to say that a special regulation affecting Quebec does not affect other parts of the Dominion. In this case the notarial protest should be dispensed with if it is found unnecessary elsewhere. If the suggestion of the hon. leader of the House, that the other parts of the Dominion