

Table, shows, if you will read it, that I am right in this matter. I have done my duty, and the Government will do theirs when they dismiss those guilty officials from the Welland Canal.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—There is a further word I omitted to say, and it is this: As the hon. gentleman is so familiar with the evidence that has been taken, I have been commissioned by my right hon. friend to say to him that if he will favor him with any notes of the salient portions of this great mass of evidence he will take it as a favor, and consider it along with the evidence itself.

HON. MR. McCALLUM—Do I understand that he wants notes of the evidence? He has the Commissioner's report before him: he has any amount of able men at his disposal, and certainly I am not going to teach the right hon. Premier of this country what his duty is. I will be glad to do anything I can, but I do not want for a moment to say that he shall be governed by anything I would state. He might think that I am prejudiced. I have done enough in this case. I gave four months of my time last year on behalf of this country, and I am not going to do much more. Let them take the responsibility of it: I wash my hands of it until next session of Parliament, and then I will move for the evidence.

The motion was withdrawn.

## NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES BILL.

### THIRD READING.

The Order of the Day being called,—Third reading Bill (V) "An Act to amend the Acts respecting the North-West Territories."

HON. MR. ABBOTT said: I am under the impression there was nothing reserved at the last stage of this Bill. There was, however, a suggestion made on the subject of the 13th section. It appears to me that this clause is too wide, and that there should be an exception of the innocent holder for value of negotiable paper, and I move that this Bill be not now read the third time, but that the following words be added to sub-section 2 of clause 13:—

Except in the hands of a holder in due course for value, within the meaning of the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890.

HON. MR. REESOR—Would not that have the effect of enabling a party to put his claim in such a shape that he could collect it, whether it was for intoxicants or not?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Of course it is possible to act fraudulently with respect to any of these laws. The provision of the Promissory Notes Act, which gives a *bonâ fide* third holder special rights, can be abused in the same way. Practically, it does not turn out to be of much importance, because if a defence of illegal consideration is set up, the holder who sues upon the paper can be brought up to show what value he gave for it, and whether he is an innocent holder for value or not; and though there is a possibility, there is very little probability of such frauds being successfully committed if properly resisted.

HON. MR. REESOR—Would the last holder of the note who sued upon it have recourse against the first party?

HON. MR. SCOTT—Yes; if he was a holder for value.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—The holder for value without notice of the consideration would have his remedy against everybody previous to him, but if the maker of the note were to plead that he had given the note in consideration of a gambling debt, and that it was therefore null, and that the holder was not a *bonâ fide* holder, and if he could prove that, then the holder's claim would be defeated; and he could put the holder or anybody else who could give evidence upon it in the box to prove his plea.

HON. MR. SCOTT—He must have taken it before it became due. Does the Interpretation Act carry with it these two points?

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Yes; I have gone over the matter carefully, and the language I suggest brings the matter within the new Bills Act, which protects all interests.

The motion was agreed to.

HON. MR. ABBOTT moved the third reading of the Bill.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—In moving the amendment of which I have given notice, I have no intention to make a speech. The