

fair one in every sense. It does not prejudge or accuse, but it simply asks as follows :—

"That a copy of the petition laid upon the Table of this House from Thomas Hobbs and others, complaining of the conduct of William Elliott, Esquire, County Judge of Middlesex, in relation to the revision of the voter's list for the Electoral District of the City of London, be forthwith furnished him for his information and to enable him to make such statement or answer to the charges therein contained as he may deem proper, and that the said petition and any such answer as the said judge may make be referred to a special committee of this House, to inquire into the truth of the several allegations therein, with a view of finding whether such charges should be investigated by a commission."

That preliminary investigation I think it was the duty of Parliament to make. Hon. gentlemen, perhaps, would like me to present them with the affidavit verifying the extracts I have read. I do not intend to do so. I do not intend at this stage to give them that bit of information. I am willing, however, if it is desired, to place the affidavit and the information in regard to this evidence in the hands of Mr. Speaker to be retained by him in a confidential way. I believe in the absolute truth of the charges in question as to Judge Elliott having written these articles in the press. My hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) said that these charges were vague. Let me again read them for the information of the House, and it will then be for the House and the country to say whether if these charges were not sufficiently definite to enable Judge Elliott to know what he was accused of. I think they must be sufficiently explicit for every member of this House to understand, except my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff), who thinks them vague and not specific. Paragraphs 17, 18, and 19 are as follows :—

"17. The said William Elliott, during the said election and while the said appeals were pending before him, contributed editorially and also under an assumed name to the London *Free Press* newspaper, articles of a violent and partisan character bearing upon the said revision of the voters' list and political questions of the day, and particularly upon the said election for the said electoral district and in support of the candidature of the said Carling and against the said Hyman.

"18. After the said election and before deciding said appeals the said William Elliott in strong and violent language denounced the said Hyman and his supporters and stated to several electors of the said city that the said Carling would certainly get the seat in the House of Commons for the said electoral district.

"19. That the conduct of the said William Elliott, in writing the said newspaper articles pending the said appeals, and in making the said oral declarations and in afterwards carrying out the spirit of such articles and declarations by overruling the judgment of the said Queen's Bench Division and the express decision of the said judges of the Court of Appeal, show him to be a violent political partisan incapable of giving an honest or unbiased judgment on the subject-matter of such appeals."

I think that language is plain enough to be understood. I do not think any person who desires to know the meaning of the charges cannot gratify his desires by reading that section of the petition. There you find plain, serious and outspoken language which demands the serious consideration of this House.

Mr. TISDALE. I confess I am somewhat at a loss, taking the latter part of the hon. gentleman's address, to decide as to what he means or what he intends the House to deal with. If he intends or contends for a moment that these newspaper articles which he has read have anything to do with this discussion, I must totally disagree with him, and I shall decline to discuss them, because

Mr. MULLOCK.

the only thing I can say in regard to them is that it is the highest compliment the hon. gentleman can pay to the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) whose argument the other day he attempted to disparage, because, if he means that these are the charges now under discussion, he must admit beyond contradiction that his friends have abandoned the motion which is now before the House. He cannot contend that these articles have anything to do with the matter at all. What we have to vote upon and decide here is the petition and the charges contained in that petition. I apprehend that there can be no two opinions about that in the position in which we stand. If the hon. gentleman proposes to found a charge on those papers, let him do so, but let us not waste time in discussing them on this motion. If he says, we abandon the petition, let him do so. Hon. gentlemen may smile, but let us get at sense and propriety and at some rules in the discussion of these matters. I understand the motion now is not to send these newspaper articles or anything connected with them to a committee, but that this petition is under discussion and, in the words of the hon. gentleman himself, the petition makes no accusation and no charge.

Mr. MULLOCK. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. TISDALE. He said it contains grave matter which should be considered, but it contained no charge against the judge.

Mr. MULLOCK. I said the petition makes grave charges against the judge.

Mr. TISDALE. Then he repeats the bald charges against the judge, and he said, in substance, that it was not a matter of accusation against the judge, but simply something to put him on a preliminary enquiry. I propose now to discuss the matter before the House. I must confess that I am disappointed with my hon. friend, if he means that he has a charge to bring, and that these newspaper articles are sufficient to be dealt with by the House. We are not dealing with that part of the question now. Let some person who is responsible, such as the hon. gentleman himself, make the charge and it will be dealt with. I wish to make one correction of a statement of the hon. gentleman before taking up the time I intend to take in connection with the matter before the House. The hon. gentleman was either not fully advised of Judge Elliott's decision on the 20th November, or he misinformed the House in regard to it. I wish to correct him on that point, or let him correct me. What Judge Elliott decided was not only what the hon. gentleman said, but a great deal more. The hon. gentleman says that, when the matter first came before him, the judge decided that the revising officer was within the law, and that was all he said.

Mr. MULLOCK. I did not say that.

Mr. TISDALE. What Judge Elliott decided comprised two things. The first was in reference to the power of the revising officer to make an amendment, and, that being a matter of procedure, he decided that he had no jurisdiction; but he decided then and there that the notice was bad, and the hon. gentleman said that Judge Elliott's