

and it was ventilated in the public press. I think a resolution was passed by an assemblage of clergymen, and there were interviews with both the Premier and the Attorney-General with regard to it, and they both said it could not be remedied. Now, there is no wrong without a remedy under British law—(Hear, hear, and applause)—and I say it can be remedied, and I say it will be remedied in spite of the Government of the Province of Ontario, and their declarations to the contrary.

#### PUNISHMENT OF BRIBERS.

Now, then, I want to touch upon a question which I have often dilated upon, and, therefore, I have that feeling of hesitation which is felt by all modest men like myself, to repeat it, and it is with relation to certain bribery bills introduced by me. Now, I had some experience in this sort of thing; I was defeated the first time I ran, unseated my opponent, and within twelve months was re-elected, and you and I have seen within the last two years very large and florid statements by members of the Government to the effect that they were the first persons who ever prosecuted anybody for bribery. There were three or four persons prosecuted by me, and each fined \$200, one-half of which went in the coffers of the Government of the Province of Ontario. That was in 1888. In 1889 I introduced a bill in which it was provided that bribery should be punished by imprisonment, as well as by fine. I had had correspondence with the late Mr. Gladstone on the question, and with the then Attorney-General of England, now the Lord Chief Justice, Sir Richard Webster, and with Sir William Harcourt, and they agreed that the working of the English law was complete. The English law is that if a man is found guilty of bribery he shall be fined £200 (\$1,000), and imprisoned for six months. Without pursuing it any further, I wanted the bribers to be punished with imprisonment, whereas there was no punishment of imprisonment on the statute books of the province, but it was voted down. One member on the Government side voted with me, but next year voted against my bill. One distinguished member of the Government said as one of the reasons why he voted against it that it would not do to trust the liberty of the subject to two judges instead of juries, and he would vote against the bill, because these men were to be deprived of trial by jury. So he and his followers voted the bill down.

Next year I introduced the very same bill with this change, that I put in it the proviso that there should be trial by jury, and the very same Minister got up from the very same chair and stood in the very same tracks, and declared that his principal objection to this bill was that it contained a provision in favor of trial by jury. (Laughter and applause.) He said:—"These people will have sympathizers on the jury, and the juries will never convict them." And so the bill was voted down a second time. I brought it up the third time, but the Government then were about to condense and revise the election law, and the gentleman who is now the Premier of Ontario had charge of that bill, and he spoke to me privately in the corridor of the House, and told me what it was I wanted to bring about by this bill of mine, and I told him. "Well," he said, "we are going to do something for you in the bill I am going to bring in." They did something so small that it is not worth speaking about, but I do not wish to conceal the fact that he did propose to follow my lead in this regard, even to the small extent he did. But in 1899 I introduced a bill which went a little further, and that bill, they say—it is possible there was some misunderstanding—they say I did not wish to push. At any rate, during the last hours of the session—an opportunity of bringing it up before was prevented by the action of the gentlemen on the Government benches—I was practically jockeyed out of the opportunity to move it. But of course it would have been voted down all the same.

Now, after all the West Elgin and North Waterloo disclosures, and after the other hideous pictures which have been held up to the gaze of the civilized