

out of ten saves expense. For these reasons I hope the amendment moved by my hon. friend will not be accepted. I may add, that if the House is under the impression that because I am a notary myself I am working strongly in my own favor, I may say that I have been a notary for eighteen years, and I don't believe that I have protested five notes during that time, and I do not expect that I shall protest as many more during the remainder of my life.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I do not see why the holder of an inland bill should not be allowed to protest it by notary or not, as he pleased. Why should we create this exception in the law relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes? I do not see why the Province of Quebec should be exempted from a commercial law that applies to the rest of the Dominion. It is quite evident that this clause has been drafted in the interest of the notarial profession. We have the hon. gentleman from Montreal (Mr. Drummond), representing one of the largest trade centres in the Dominion, saying that it is the desire of the banks and of the board of trade that this exception should not be made, and I cannot for the life of me see why Quebec should be excepted from the rule which governs all transactions of this kind in the other Provinces. It is most desirable that the law relating to commerce should be uniform throughout the Dominion. Why we should force the holder of a note, against his will, to go to a notary to have it protested, I cannot see. If he desires to risk more expense to prove dishonor he has to bear it himself, and why it should be otherwise in Quebec from what it is in any other part of the Dominion, I cannot understand. I have yet to see any argument to justify it.

HON. MR. PELLETIER—I regret that the hon. gentleman from Montreal persists in his amendment, for I say positively that it does not represent public opinion in the Province of Quebec. Before he gave notice of that amendment there was no complaint, either before Parliament or elsewhere. Last year a Bill, similar to the one now before us, was submitted to the House, but was not carried through. In that Bill the Province of Quebec was not excepted in the manner of protesting notes, but the banks of Quebec and the merchants, seeing

that an amendment was to be made in the law that had worked for so many years satisfactorily, protested against the change. A deputation was sent from Quebec, from the Board of Trade and the banks, and Hon. Justice Casault was asked to draw up a memorandum to send it to the Minister of Justice. He did so, and presented it to the Minister of Justice, who was so convinced thereby that the amendment would be injurious to the system in Quebec that he stated that it would not be changed, and the Bill this year has been prepared so as to exempt Quebec from the operation of this clause. The reason that no representation was made from the Board of Trade of Quebec this year is, that when the hon. gentleman from Montreal gave his notice the other day it was not thought in Quebec that it would meet with any support, because it was supposed that the Bill would go through as it is. The moment that notice of this amendment was given, another deputation came from Quebec, and was delayed here two or three days, but the Bill was postponed until to-day, and they had to return. The notaries from Quebec came here with representations quite different from that mentioned by the hon. gentleman from Montreal. I met their representative myself, and either I misunderstood him or the hon. gentleman from Montreal misunderstood him, for to me he did not seem to be in favor of the amendment at all. I would like to see one notary from Quebec who is in favor of it, I am sure the hon. gentleman could not name one. One feature that must strike the House is that the complaint against this clause has come only at this late stage of the Bill. It was never mentioned in the House of Commons, because there the Minister of Justice admitted that the Province of Quebec, had been under this system for many years, and it was working so well there that there was no reason to change it. The hon. gentleman mentioned that this amendment would come in conflict with several clauses of the Civil Code of Quebec, which would have to be changed, and it was only when the hon. gentleman gave his notice that members from the other Provinces came to his rescue. I do not see why they should. It does not affect them. The expenses of notarial protest in Quebec are not more than the cost of protest in other Provinces, because as a