

his trial, is not subject to disgrace and indignity, and those who come after him also. I say the independent members of this House should not allow themselves to be made the "lashonhara" or "evil tongue" of disappointed partisans. I think we should stand up here and should not allow the high privileges of this Parliament to be distorted to such partisan ends. At all events, we should say: You shall not put any judge of this land upon his trial unless you make an accusation for such a matter and in such a way as would put the meanest citizen of this land on his trial. That is but simple justice and British fair-play, and I appeal to hon. members of this House to uphold that proposition and vote down this resolution.

Mr. FRASER. It is certainly an edifying sight to listen to the hon. gentleman's peroration where he talked about cursed reptiles and black-mailing, where he went into all the purlieus of scandal and spoke of partisan scandal, while the musical tones of his voice has not ceased to ring in the ears of hon. members when he tried to blacken the names of the 47 petitioners. He did not scorn to say that these men should not be listened to because 17 of them were clerks, a few were tailors, 4 were licensed dealers, and the rest were miserable mechanics.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman is wrong. I said nothing about "miserable mechanics." I said "merchants and small traders."

Mr. FRASER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon if he did not say "mechanics."

Mr. SPROULE. He said "mechanics," but not "miserable mechanics."

Mr. FRASER. He tried to show how disreputable they were by showing that there were no lawyers or doctors among them. I have known clerks and merchants and tailors and liquor dealers as respectable as some lawyers and doctors and clergymen, and I will venture to say that there are among these men those who would not do what Judge Elliott did. It was very easy to get up a sympathy against 47 men who are as respectable as the hon. gentleman or myself. The fact they are clerks or merchants supplying a certain asylum would not shut them out from their rights, or there are thousands of merchants who supply the Dominion Government who would be shut out. As to the liquor dealers, they must be in close affinity with the present member for London (Mr. Carling) who is in that business himself. Then the hon. gentleman indulged in a tirade, as usual, against the Mowat Government. I am not here to defend the Mowat Government and they need no defence. I observe that they seem to have been working into the heart of the strong Conservative constituencies in Ontario, and the people of Toronto must have gone mad, according to the hon. gentleman or they would not support so bad a Government. The hon. gentleman, in trying to make a case, had wandered away from the point under discussion, which is, whether Judge Elliott has so misconducted himself that an investigation should be demanded into his conduct. It will not do for the hon. gentleman to get wrathful at the sins of others, and to call down the imprecations of Heaven upon their heads, and then say that these charges should not be listened to here. If these petitioners have given us a case worthy of attention, we should not

refuse to hear them, and the hon. gentleman should be the last man to insinuate anything against the characters of these people. Surely he is not going to show their want of character by stating what their employment is. He is like a good many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who believe that only the favoured few are entitled to be heard, but that these men should not be listened to because they are poor clerks or tailors. The hon. gentleman would be a nice looking object in this House if he could not find a tailor. I submit that the characters of these people should not be judged according to their employment. Now, he was good enough, first, to speak upon the points of the law, then upon points of morals, and finally he wound up by speaking on a question of divinity. Let us see what he has to say upon the points of law? Are we here to discuss whether London has been Conservative for so many years? Or does his argument mean that because it has been Conservative so long, it should never be anything else, or that the electors of London have no right to elect any one else but a Conservative? That seems to be the hon. gentleman's idea. But I think the young men of London have got something to say upon the question as to who shall represent that city. The hon. gentleman and his friends think the constituency belongs to them, it is a hive, it is a preserve that has always belonged to Mr. Carling, and he is founding an argument upon that fact to show that London being Conservative, it could not possibly have been won by the Liberals. What have we to do just now with this barrel of beer, this basket of ale, this coloured meeting, these pigs' feet, this bogus circular, these ruffians who attacked Mr. Meredith? Did they affect the judgment of the court? Are they matters that ought to be taken into consideration in an enquiry as to whether that petition is sufficient for this House to accept as a basis upon which to order an enquiry? Does it make any difference whether the people of London feed upon the finest beef or upon pigs' feet? Does it make any difference to us whether they drink ale, beer, or wine, or anything else? The hon. gentleman likes to deal with questions of this kind, and he puts them into the scale in discussing the question as to whether the judge has done that which is right in his judicial capacity. Sir, we are here to look into the question as to whether the member who now sits for London, is here by the judgment of an unbiassed judge, who gave such a judgment as he ought to have given in that instance. I see the hon. member for South Norfolk has left his seat; unfortunately for his argument, the judge and he does not agree. He says the judge was right in disregarding the judgment that was given by the higher court because it was not a court in which the case could be entertained. Now, the judge himself did not think that. Here is a very nice tinted little pamphlet that was sent, I suppose, to all the members, containing the full text of Judge Elliott's judgment. It will be noticed that Judge Elliott does not pretend to say that that court had no jurisdiction and that he disregarded it for that reason. Here is the reason the judge gives:

"In the Court of Appeal to which the case was carried no judgment or costs were given, but three of the judges expressed an opinion that the notices given were sufficient. I entertain an unfeigned respect for opinions expressed by learned judges of that court, and I would gladly, if I could, shelter myself from inevitable odium by conform-