

tradition Act ceased to be in force in Canada there is no provision for obtaining the testimony of witnesses in relation to any criminal matter pending in any Criminal Court or tribunal in a foreign state in like manner as may be obtained in relation to a civil matter. Our attention has been specially called by Her Majesty's Government to this omission from our Extradition Act. The Bill provides as follows:—

The testimony of any witness may be obtained in relation to any criminal matter pending in any court in any other of Her Majesty's Dominions or before any foreign tribunal in like manner as it may be obtained in relation to any civil matter under the Act 31 Vict., chap. 76, intitled: An Act to provide for taking evidence in Canada in relation to Civil and Commercial matters pending before courts of justice in any other of Her Majesty's Dominions or before Foreign Tribunals, and all the provisions of that Act shall be construed as if the term civil matter included a criminal matter and the term cause included a proceeding against a criminal: Provided that nothing in this Act shall apply in the case of any criminal matter of a political character.

Bill read the second time; considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

#### BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 135) relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes in the Province of Prince Edward Island, said: This Bill explains itself:

Whereas it is desirable to assimilate the laws of the Province of Prince Edward Island to the laws of the other Provinces of the Dominion, as regards the maturity of and the protesting of bills of exchange and promissory notes: Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. The Act passed in the thirty-fifth year of Her Majesty's reign, chapter ten, and intitled: An Act relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, shall, on and after the passing of this Act, extend and apply to the Province of Prince Edward Island.

2. From and after the first day of July next after the passing of this Act, all bills of exchange and promissory notes payable at any place in the Province of Prince Edward Island for the sum of forty dollars and upwards, may, on default of the acceptance or payment thereof, be protested by a Notary Public; and such protest shall, in any action on such bill or note, be *prima facie* evidence of presentation and dishonor, and also of service of notice of such presentation and dishonor as stated in such protest; for which protest there shall be charged a notarial fee of fifty cents for protest and twenty-five cents for each notice.

#### LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 136) to amend the law respecting lotteries, said: It has been recently decided by a magistrate in Ontario—I suppose properly—that our present law on lotteries will prevent the Art Union, an association of artists, from holding its annual distribution of paintings and drawings. By the payment of an annual subscription fee, a person becomes entitled to draw for the right of first choice from among the pictures contributed by the members. This cannot be held to be an evil, by the most strained interpretation of the law. The Bill is as follows:—

1. Nothing contained in any Statute, relating to lotteries, now in force in Canada, or in any Province thereof, shall be read or construed as making it an offence:—

(a) For any incorporated society, established for the encouragement of art, or for any officer or agent thereof, to distribute by lot among its members or ticket-holders, any paintings, drawings, or other works of art, produced by the labor of the members of, or published by or under the direction of such incorporated society; or

(b) For such member or ticket-holder to share in such distribution.

Bill read the second time, considered in Committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

#### After Recess.

#### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 132) respecting the sale of Intoxicating Liquors and the issuing of Licenses therefor.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 29,

Mr. FISHER. With reference to sub-section 7, I should say that the signing of a memorial ought to be sufficient without its being necessary to find the applicant. It might be difficult to find the applicant.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it is not too much to ask those who sign the memorial to find the applicant.

Mr. BLAKE. It may be quite impossible to find him.

Mr. McCARTHY. This only says a notice shall be given.

Mr. BLAKE. What kind of a notice?

Mr. McCARTHY. A reasonable notice served at his house for instance.

Mr. BLAKE. A four days' notice ought to be enough, describing the objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. It may describe many other things he may not be able to meet.

Mr. BLAKE. He ought to be able always to meet an attack on his character.

Mr. McCARTHY. By the eleventh sub-section a refusal on the grounds of character is final in its consequences, not only for that year, but for subsequent years. The disqualification for three years seems too long. I move that this sub-section be amended by substituting two for three years.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). One year ought to be enough.

Mr. BLAKE. He could not get his license for a year even without the provision.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 32,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not approve of this section because it introduces the principle of petitioning. I have little faith in the virtue of petitions signed as they usually are. I do not think the license should be subjected to the risk of the result of a petition of simply the majority of the electors of a sub-division. I would move to omit section thirty-two.

Mr. MITCHELL. I sustain the suggestion of my hon. friend. We know how petitions are got up. Almost anybody will sign one that has nothing particularly improper about it. Two weeks may be taken to get this done, and a respectable house is closed up under the authority of the sub-section.

Mr. BERGIN. There ought to be some other way of depriving a man of his license than under this system of petitioning. We all know that a petition asking almost to send a man to penitentiary, and probably even that, could be got up and signed by the majority of electors in almost any sub-division, if presented by a respectable man or a man looked upon as respectable; and we know that men taking strong views upon the temperance question would not hesitate at any time to close up houses even upon mere rumor. Besides there is a very great uncertainty as to