

spoken and the name of the person who attested them, so that the accused may have a fair chance to answer or else the judge will not put him on trial. For that reason, the petition does not, in substance, amount to any charge that a man should plead to or answer. I was a little surprised to hear the way the hon. member for York spoke of the respectable citizens of London who signed this petition. How many do you think signed it? Forty-five persons out of the one hundred thousand over whom Judge Elliott has presided for twenty-five years in the county and in the city of London the district his court covers. And who are these men who signed the petition? Sixteen of them are irresponsible clerks, whose employers would not sign, as mentioned by the hon. member for East Lambton. Seventeen are merchants and small dealers, strong partisans, and hon. gentlemen from Ontario will understand how strong partisans they are, by the explanation that every one of them furnishes the London Asylum with supplies. Hon. members for Ontario know what that means, but I will explain it to other hon. gentlemen. Under the Reform Government in Ontario, we have the same individuals, year after year, supplying our different public institutions, which are under the control of our Local House, with hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of supplies, and in no case are these contracts put up to public tender despite the frequent protests of the Opposition in the Local House. And so it comes these seventeen favoured gentlemen, thus encouraged by public contracts, had no hesitation in signing this petition. Who else signed it? Four liquor dealers. I do not blame these poor fellows for they have no other resource. In Ontario we have not the secret ballot. No, they will not give us, corrupt Tories, the secret ballot. A mark is put on every ballot and although these ballots are sealed up, when the election is over, they are in the control of the people in power, and they either open them afterwards or else they tell falsehoods in the matter, because they have told people in my riding that they knew how they voted. It is in their power to know how, and they either exercise that power or at any rate threaten people with its exercise. What has happened? There was a time when we used to have some municipal control. The glory of Ontario was her municipal institutions, and the old Reformers who helped to get them for us deserved as much credit as, and perhaps a little more, than the Conservatives, but the people now in power in Ontario have restricted those municipal rights. The municipal councils used to decide who should have liquor licenses, but now this pure Government which runs Ontario took that power away into their own hands, and the greater part of the money paid for them also which used to go to the municipalities. They appoint license commissioners and an inspector, the latter generally being a political heeler for the riding, and who goes around earning the salary the public pay him by looking after the elections and looking after the lists of voters, and as a result, every hotel keeper almost is now a Grit. There used to be a large majority of them Conservatives in Ontario, but to-day you cannot find one Conservative in ten. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but what I tell them is true, and I can prove it. The hotel keeper has either to vote straight under the coercion of this ballot, which is not secret, or he cannot get a license. Four of them have signed the peti-

Mr. TISDALE.

tion. Who else? Two license commissioners, and last, but not least, the three witnesses my hon. friend referred to. Who are these three witnesses. One is the man who collected \$2,000 for election expenses, who kept no accounts, destroyed the books, and had no memory. The others are conveners of meetings of electors to be addressed by Mr. Hyman, at which speeches, cigars, beer and music were furnished at intervals. That is the class of men who signed this petition. Mr. Hyman had too much sense of self-respect himself to sign it. Mr. Gibbons, the great lawyer in London, of whom the hon. member for North York spoke dare not sign it. There is not a lawyer, a doctor, a clergyman or a professional man, or any citizen ever known or heard of ten miles from the city of London, who could be got to sign it. More than that, there is not an affidavit connected with it. There is no affirmation of any person, and it contains nothing for which any county magistrate would send up the meanest citizen for trial. What is the object? We all know that there are men, beings in the form of men, who are so foul that they will go around telling scandals about innocent women. No matter how innocent a woman may be when this occurs, when these reptiles once whisper their tales about her, be she ever so innocent, she cannot recover from the insinuations made against her. We all know the system of blackmail is reduced to a science in some of the large cities of the continent, and every day we hear of innocent and most estimable, moral and christian men who, rather than face the public scandal and the talk which would result, become the prey of these vampires, and the more innocent they are and the more godly they are, the more they tremble at being accused of vicious courses, and we sometimes even see them driven to suicide when they are made the subjects of such charges though perfectly innocent. So it is when a judge is put on his trial. In one of the large cities of this continent since the commencement of this discussion, an eminent divine preached on this subject, and, with the permission of the House, I will give a few extracts from what he said:

"You have heard that 'the men brought up an evil report of the land which they had gone to view,' albeit evidence to the contrary was in their own hands. But facts make no difference with the man determined to blacken a character. He will pervert evidence, distort proofs, cast suspicion upon motives and twist testimony to his sinister purpose.

"The human ear and mind seem to be especially adapted for the reception of 'evil reports.' For the good we demand proofs many and strong, and unless favourably predisposed remain sceptical in spite of them. Why should it be so hard for us to think well of others and so easy to believe evil? Is it because we shrink from confessing ourselves inferiors? Is it because the admission implies a reproach? How is it that good actions are uninteresting, while failings and wrong-doings carry with them a spice that makes them palatable? Certain it is that 'evil reports' spread like wildfire through the length and breadth of our gossiping society, while the best deeds and noblest efforts find so few to do them homage.

"The rabbis of old denied paradise to those who refrained not from backbiting, and held it better for man to throw himself into a fiery furnace than to commit the sin of 'lashonhara'—i. e., the evil tongue—and Schiller says in "Don Carlos" that tale-bearers have caused more suffering in the world than poison or dagger in the murderer's hands."

Now, that is the object: They wish to put this judge upon his trial here. They have not charged him, but still they wish to put him on his trial. I ask any fair-minded man to say if a judge, once put upon