

fluencing their votes. So common had this custom become that a strong feeling had arisen in the country in favour of some such measure as this.

Mr. BETHUNE had intended to support this measure, but the reasoning of the hon. member for Grenville had convinced him of the inadvisability of passing such a law. He believed there should be some legislation on the subject, but thought the hon. mover had not considered the matter sufficiently well to avoid creating evils which were greater than the evils of betting. He therefore moved a six months' hoist.

Atty.-General MOWAT said the object of this Bill—the prevention of betting—was one which they must all approve. The only question was whether the means the hon. gentleman suggested were calculated to produce the desired result. He understood, from the observations of the hon. gentleman, that his special object was to prevent wholesale betting at elections. He had mentioned a case where a man bet \$700. He (Atty.-Gen.) did not think this Bill would prevent betting of that kind. A man who went into betting in that large way would not be deterred by the loss of his vote. The only effect of the Bill—it had any effect at all—would be to prevent small bets, in regard to which the hon. gentleman had not complained that any great evil existed. There had been some legislation in England, not yet adopted in this country, in regard to the illegality of wagering generally. The law in England, with regard to betting at elections, was that if a bet was made as a veil for a bribe then it was a corrupt practice, and would have the effect of voiding the election. He was afraid that so far from this Bill having the effect professedly desired it would be found to have an opposite effect. It would, he was afraid, give an impulse to betting. In the case of the man who betted \$700, his reasons for betting would be very much stronger, for every man with whom he could bet would thereby be prevented from voting. The only effect of the Bill would be to stimulate betting on a large scale. Betting of all kinds was bad; it was extremely important that it should be put down; but we must take care that our legislation did not have an opposite effect. His hon. friend had been able to find no legislation of this kind. In one of the States there was legislation declaring betting to be illegal, but making the vote void. He thought it required more consideration before they allowed this Bill to pass into law, and he hoped his hon. friend would withdraw this Bill.

Mr. WOOD asked if there was not already a penalty attached to betting.

Mr. CAMERON said there was no penalty in the statute law; there might, however, be in common law.

Mr. FRASER said it was very desirable that betting at elections should be prevented, but he did not think the Bill under discussion would have the effect desired. The Bill only related to the betting of electors, but it was well known that young men who had no vote, and whose names could not be found upon the assessment rolls, were in the habit of betting a good deal upon the result of elections, and the Bill would not affect such bets. He did not think that an elector betting upon the success of a man for whom he had throughout intended to vote was a corrupt practice, and he informed the House that there were laws already providing for corrupt betting at elections. For instance, if a man had determined to vote for a certain candidate, and a bet was offered that he would vote for another candidate, that would be a corrupt practice, for which the law already provided; and his hon. friend the member for East Toronto was incorrect when he stated that betting was not prohibited by statute law. If it had been the intention of the mover of the Bill to make all betting and wagering illegal, he (Mr. Fraser) would have supported it. The measure, however, was not calculated to repress the evil complained of, but to make it very much worse, and therefore he had great pleasure in supporting the amendment to the original resolution, and giving it his cordial approval.

Mr. MERRICK believed betting had a serious effect on elections. He thought the Bill would have a beneficial effect, because the fact that a bet made would invalidate a vote would deter many from betting. If the Bill were sent to Committee, amendments could be made in details.

Mr. CAMERON regretted to see the hon. member from Stormont having so little regard for his own views as to change them on account of anything said by the member for Grenville. He (Mr. Cameron) thought the arguments of that hon. gentleman very far-fetched. His own opinion was

that every person who voted for a candidate for any other reason than that his opinions were in accord with a candidate's should have this action discountenanced, and he believed that this Bill would have that tendency. If the Hon. Attorney-General thought the principle of the Bill correct, as he apparently did, why did he not allow the measure to pass, or else embody some such provisions in his election law?

Dr. CLARKE approved of declaring all betting illegal, but this was merely an attack upon a special kind of betting—a piece of clap-trap to hoodwink the people and embarrass the Government. Looking at the matter in this view, he would vote against the Bill.

Mr. FITZSIMMONS charged the members of the Government with inconsistency in opposing this Bill. He believed it was approved of by the country, and that it would have a good effect. In his riding the Reformers had been guilty of bribery at the last election, surpassing anything he had ever known before.

Mr. LAUDER thought the hon. member for Grenville was exercised by some local influence to oppose this measure, although he acknowledged, as the Premier had done, that the principle was correct.

Mr. FRASER denied that he had approved of the principle.

Atty-Gen. MOWAT said that he had not done so either, although he disapproved of betting.

Mr. LAUDER did not see how they could make the distinction between the principle and carrying of it out.

Hon. Mr. MCKELLAR said it was refreshing to hear hon. gentlemen opposite speak against bribery and corruption. During the summer, while the elections were going on, every hon. gentleman who had spoken which was indulging in the most nefarious actions, assisted in the East by the hon. member for Leeds. It was indeed refreshing to hear these gentlemen, who had aided in the vilest attempt to corrupt the constituencies of the country, attempt to raise a cry for purity at elections. These gentlemen might be told by their acts, not by their protestations. If they were actuated by a sincere desire to promote purity at elections they should vote against the party at Ottawa which was keeping bribery and corruption in vogue. He believed that there was at the last election an agent of that Government, with money in almost every constituency.

Mr. CALVIN had not heard any member state that the Bill was not a step in the right direction, and if it were a step in the right direction he thought it ought to go before a Select Committee, so that they might have the advantages of the deliberations of that Committee. He was in favour of the Bill, but he had not given the matter sufficient consideration to give it a definite support. He, however, thought the Bill ought to be defended, as it aimed a blow at the corrupt practices common at election, and therefore he intended to support it.

Mr. DEROCHE thought the Bill was a good one, and that it was his duty to support it. He thought that the tendency of this Bill would be to lessen corruption, and he was of the opinion that the members of that House should not vote down a measure which would tend to suppress corruption.

Mr. RYKERT thought that Mr. Mowat, if he considered the principle of the Bill good, should eliminate its objectionable features and support it. But that he would not do, as he saw the other members of his party were not with him, and therefore he opposed it altogether. In referring to Mr. Fraser's objections to the Bill, he made an allusion to the corrupt practices with which that gentleman had been charged.

Mr. FRASER asked if the hon. gentleman intended to charge him in the House with corrupt practices.

Mr. RYKERT said he had only referred to corrupt practices with which the hon. gentleman was charged, in consequence of which he was unseated.

Mr. FRASER indignantly denied that he was unseated on account of any charge of corrupt practices. On the contrary, the expression of the Court and counsel that decided the matter was, no kind of corrupt practices had been proved against him. He was entirely freed from the charge by the petitioners as well as the counsel. He thought, to say the least, it was very uncourteous to make a charge of that description in the House.

Mr. RYKERT asked if he was not charged in the petition with corrupt practices.

Mr. FRASER replied in the affirmative, but reminded the hon. gentleman that petitioners could make any charge they chose in