

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I do not pretend to know the Ontario law as well as my hon. friend does, but I may inform the hon. gentlemen that the general practice has been to mail the notice to the place at which the bill is dated, unless there be an indication of another address. It is all very well in a small place, or where there is a small business, to say that the notary shall make enquiry where the parties are, but where business is transacted on a large scale it is not easy to find out where each party is to be addressed, when there may be, perhaps, a hundred notes to be protested on the same day. It might give rise to an immense loss of security.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The whole Bill is conceived in the interest of the banks. It is quite apparent on the face of it.

HON. MR. DRUMMOND—Would it not be well to put in the word "endorser" after the word "bill," in the 9th line, section 4?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend will perceive that the endorsement does not usually bear the name of the place where it is made, but the law expressly provides that if the endorser choose to name the place, then the notice must be sent to that place.

The clause was agreed to.

On clause 51,—

HON. MR. DRUMMOND—Why should there be any distinction made between the Province of Quebec and other Provinces in the noting and protesting of an inland bill for non-acceptance and payment? I heard the opinion expressed within the last day or two, by a judge of the Province of Quebec, that it was injudicious and improper that there should be any distinction made. I submit that what is sufficient for one Province ought to be for the others.

HON. MR. POWER—I presume the secret of it is, that the notarial body is a very large and influential one in the Province of Quebec, and is also well represented in the House of Commons, and they have taken care that their fees shall not be taken away from them.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—The people of Quebec desire to have their law as it is,

and it seems to me, as it is only a matter of procedure and not of law, it is desirable to keep it as it is. It is a process that their forefathers have been accustomed to for centuries; they wish to retain it, and I can see no objection to allowing them to do so.

HON. MR. PELLETIER—I must believe the hon. gentleman from Montreal when he says that a judge there expressed the opinion that there should be no difference in the law in the Province of Quebec and elsewhere; but I am sure that that judge does not represent the opinion of the Province or of the Bar of the Province. I remember an occasion when an attempt was made to have a change in the law of Quebec in this respect, and not only the members of the Bar, but the Bench also, were opposed to it.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—It is desirable to have the law uniform—not only the law but the procedure.

HON. MR. PELLETIER—Then make it as it is in Quebec, and we will have no objection to it.

HON. MR. BOLDUC—I have now heard for the first time that a judge has made objections to the practice in the Province of Quebec. I have, on many occasions, heard those gentlemen state that the commercial law of Quebec was the best that could be had anywhere. Our people are used to the law as it exists in the Province, and the slightest change would work very prejudicially against them.

HON. MR. RESSOR—Will the hon. gentleman explain why notarial fees are more than twice as high in the Province of Quebec as they are in the Province of Ontario?

HON. MR. BOLDUC—That is a matter of detail. I do not think they are double, but protests are not so numerous in our Province as in other Provinces, in consequence of the high notarial fees.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend will perceive that in Quebec the notarial profession is a learned profession by itself. In the other Provinces any one may be a notary; it is an incident generally to some other profession, and there is no reason for paying a high price for services which are almost mechanical. There is no reason for making the same charges in the