

I may afterwards." What does that mean? That was a hint for the boys: "Put your names down, you won't be called upon for any amounts, but I will take care of it afterwards." At that celebrated meeting, according to the witness, the order of proceedings was: the chair was taken at 10; at 11 there were pigs' feet passed around; at 11.30, Mr. Hyman, and at 12 the beer was tapped. They had a band, speeches with music, pigs' feet and beer at intervals, "a feast of reason and a flow of soul" for this pure candidate who is now whining because he was defeated, and who is now endeavouring to disgrace a judge.

Mr. LISTER. Was Judge Elliott there?

Mr. TISDALE. Judge Elliott was not there, Judge Elliott does not attend this sort of thing. These meetings are reserved for those who take pleasure in that sort of thing, and who attempt to destroy a man's character, if they cannot reach their end in any other way.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I presume jealousy arose because the beer was not Carling's?

Mr. TISDALE. Probably you think so. You are a very good judge of some things, Doctor. I dare say your heart would have swelled with joy if you had been there.

An hon. MEMBER. With beer.

Mr. TISDALE. Then there was another bit of evidence given. There was a collector of election funds engaged and he collected \$2,000. That is a very small sum compared with what must have been expended. Now, does any sensible man think that a candidate wants \$2,000 to pay the legitimate expenses of an election campaign?

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Yes.

Mr. TISDALE. At all events we would think it a great deal up in the Province of Ontario. Down by the sea you have different methods.

An hon. MEMBER. Carling's election cost \$10,000.

Mr. TISDALE. Some gentlemen know a great deal about expenses, I have no doubt. Over in Welland there is another place where large sums were said to have been expended.

Mr. LISTER. What about the railroad?

Mr. TISDALE. When the hon. gentleman was speaking the other day I allowed him to pursue his remarks without any undue interruption.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You did not gerrymander him in his speech.

Mr. TISDALE. If some of you would gerrymander the parts of your body that you talk with, I might get on a little faster.

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. gentlemen will please not interrupt, and the hon. gentleman will please address the Chair.

Mr. TISDALE. Now, there was another significant thing according to this evidence, in connection with this gentleman who collected the funds, and that was that he kept no account. He had no memory, he could not remember what he did with any of the money. Further than that, when he found there was a protest, he destroyed all the books and papers so that if the case ever came into court, there would be no papers to expose him. What was the result of that trial? Many other dis-

Mr. TISDALE.

closures were made, and the result was that Mr. Hyman finally consented to accept unseating on the evidence, to agree not to appeal, and to pay the costs. This was accepted on the other side rather than go on with personal disqualification and allow him to appeal and hold the seat much longer. I have no doubt from the disclosures made that Mr. Hyman would have gone the way of John Walker even then, if this compromise had not been arrived at. This brings us to 1892, and it is in regard to this election that all the row has been kicked up. To my mind it has been entirely brought about to cover the disgraceful tactics resorted to by Mr. Hyman and his committee and to draw public attention away from them, and those gentlemen have vented their disappointment by attacking the judge and seeking to compel him either to give a judgment to suit them or else they would try and ruin his character. I would say nothing about what happened at this election if Mr. Hyman had acted, as the Conservatives did in London both times they were defeated, filed a petition and brought forward disclosures, if there were any, and subject himself to the cross-fire of a petition. But, I will mention some matters that were of public notoriety in London, in order to give hon. members in this House, who do not know London, and did not follow the papers in that connection, some information. The first thing they did was to openly declare that Mr. Hyman was to be elected at all hazards, no matter what means had to be resorted to or what it might cost. This alarmed our party, I do not deny. What next happened? They established an organized betting ring, that wagered tens of thousands of dollars on the result of the election, and out of this betting fund they expended large sums in corrupting and debauching the electors. They circulated a bogus circular among the employes of one of the largest corporations in London, employing 500 or 600 voters, and by that means they tried to make the employes of that corporation believe that the head officials of it were in favour of Mr. Hyman, though in the offices and shops of the corporation a circular was issued by the general manager stating that in this election they were to vote as they pleased and the management was entirely neutral. In the third place they organized a body of ruffians—I use the word advisedly—to traverse the streets of London and attack and maltreat in the nighttime different supporters of Mr. Carling. They went so far as to attack Mr. Meredith, the leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature, who went to a house, and if he had not been well known as a man of great physical capacity he would have been injured. These are facts which the citizens of London well know. On polling day scores of voters were hired to leave London for the day without voting. Down the river, about four miles, they hired a summer hotel, which happened to be vacant, and a large number of men were made drunk and taken down there and kept drunk until after the poll had closed. An army of personators invaded the city. These are facts which are notorious in London; they are some of the means resorted to, connected with the conspiracy which I charge was attempted to wrest London from Mr. Carling and the Conservative party. When they found their machinations fail and their schemes were in vain, then, in their anger, what did they do? Did they do what the Conservative party had done at previous elections when they