

HON. MR. SCOTT—Altogether. The man might be away in Europe.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I have had some conversation with some gentlemen who moved the amendment in the Lower House and supported it, and with my hon. colleague, the Minister of Justice, who took part in the debate; and I find that if we were to substitute the same period in their amendment which we put in our own amendment—that is, a year—it would probably be accepted, and it seems to me that the best way of remedying the difficulty is just to substitute a year for a month; the effect of which would be to restore the Bill to pretty much the form in which it left this House. I move that the amendment be not now concurred in, but that it be further amended by inserting the word “year” instead of “month” in the amendment.

HON. MR. DRUMMOND—I think, in view of that amendment, the cheques should be returned frequently. It is not the practice of men in business to require their cheques to be returned to them oftener than once a year.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—The forgery would be noticed in the bank book.

HON. MR. DRUMMOND—Some people do not get their bank books back very often.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—If the banks wish to relieve themselves of the responsibility they can send back the cheques.

HON. MR. DRUMMOND—The suggestion that I was about to make was, that they should send back the cheques, say at the end of every month.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. ABBOTT moved :

That the said Bill be returned to the House of Commons, by one of the Masters in Chancery, together with a Message to acquaint that House that the Senate does not concur in the amendment made by the House of Commons to the amendments made by the Senate to the said Bill, for the following reason :—

Because the limitation of the right of action by the drawer against the drawee provided for by the amend-

ment of the House of Commons to the amendments made by the Senate to clause 24 of the said Bill, to the period of one month after the drawer has acquired notice of such forgery, is too short for the proper protection of his rights and of the rights and interests of other parties who may be affected by such limitation; and further to acquaint that House that, for the said reason, the Senate hath amended the said amendment made by the House of Commons, by substituting therein the word “year” for the word “month,” to which amendment the Senate doth desire the concurrence of that House.

The motion was agreed to.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

HON. MR. ABBOTT moved the third reading of Bill (BB) “An Act further to amend the Indian Act.” He said: The only point that was left for discussion when this Bill passed through the Committee of the Whole House was whether we should persevere in the provision against missionaries trading. I have discussed that question with my colleagues and have learned a good deal on the subject which I did not know on the former occasion and I am sorry to say that they are all agreed against accepting the proposition of my hon. friend from British Columbia, that missionaries should be allowed to trade under any circumstances whatever. They think that the fact that missionaries have been in the habit of trading, and more especially in some places in British Columbia, has been the cause of a great deal of trouble and disturbance, and that it has had a decidedly deleterious effect there. That is the only place where they have traded to any extent, and we are indisposed to relax the rule that missionaries and persons in holy orders shall abstain from trading with the Indians.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B. C.)—The best missionary they ever had in British Columbia was Mr. Duncan, and he found it an absolute necessity to supply the Indians; otherwise, they would have been obliged to go abroad for supplies, and thus would get into bad habits. No trader was allowed on the reserve, and therefore it was absolutely necessary, if the Indians were to be kept on the reserve, that they should be able to get supplies there. Mr. Duncan has left the country, but there are