

Before Judge Elliott knew that his decision was necessary in order to seat Mr. Carling, he had decided that the revising officer was perfectly within the law in allowing the amendments and adjourning the court, and having so decided, he had decided also that the revising officer was perfectly within the law when on his court reassembling he had disallowed the 128 votes which Judge Elliott afterwards allowed. But, when after the election, these 128 votes had found their way into the ballot box, and it became necessary to have them counted in order to seat Mr. Carling, Judge Elliott not only had to overrule the Superior Court, but he also had to overrule himself, and he who on the 20th November had decided that there was no appeal to him from the revising barrister, who had allowed the amendments, and threw out these fagot votes; afterwards, on the 9th of March, a couple of weeks after the election, he decided in favour of Mr. Carling and decided against himself. Now, Sir, how comes it that his mind underwent such a change? Was he throughout these whole proceedings, so conducting himself that he was able to deliver an impartial judgment, and in this connection I shall treat of the newspaper articles. In the city of London is published a daily newspaper called the *Free Press* the Conservative organ there. This bye-election commenced about the month of January, when I understand Mr. Hyman was unseated, and on the 5th day of February there appeared in the *London Free Press* the following item:—

“REASONS FOR VOTING FOR CARLING.

“1. Carling is a Cabinet Minister and is powerful with the Government to help in promoting the prosperity of London.

“2. He asserts that to surrender our tariff system to the States, is hostile to our position, as part of the British Empire, and must inevitably lead to political annexation.”

I think we have heard a certain political party in this House, and out of the House, advance similar arguments against another party.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. Do you know that Judge Elliott wrote that?

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure that Judge Elliott wrote this article.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. That is not what I asked you.

Mr. MULOCK. I was told so; and I am reading this article as Judge Elliott's.

Mr. TUPPER. You were told so.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, told so, and I believe so, and I have sworn evidence that it is so. I am not a witness now. I am a member of this House, and I am stating what I believe to be true; and if any hon. gentleman does not believe it to be true, why does he not take the chance of disproving it? I accuse Judge Elliott of having written it.

Mr. TUPPER. That is another thing.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has assured me that Judge Elliott has written these articles which I am about to quote, and I have in my possession sworn testimony that he did write these articles. It is said that so particular was he that there should be no errors in these articles that he corrected the proofs with his own hand, and that the manuscript of every one of these articles was in his own handwriting, and was delivered in his own handwriting.

Mr. MULOCK

to the *London Free Press*; and if hon. gentlemen think that he did not write these articles and can prove that he did not, will they not place those who say he did in a nice position? He is accused on the floor of this House of having written these articles; and now perhaps the hon. gentlemen having recovered from their excitement, will allow me to proceed with my quotations from this nice bit of literature. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Moncrieff) invited me to do this, and I suppose he will regard me as meeting his views. I go on to quote the reasons which Judge Elliott advanced for voting against Mr. Hyman:

“First, he has neither ability nor power to help the city.”

That is a patriotic, a judicial sentiment.—

“His want of ability is shown by his silly conduct by which the city lost the car-works. 2nd. He is for surrendering our fiscal policy to the States, yet professing to go against political annexation which Mr. Blake has announced must inevitably follow.”

Well, about the same time, on the 5th of February last, there began a series of articles in the same paper, the *London Free Press*, which hon. gentlemen will find under the heading, “Questions by a Liberal Voter and Answers:” and I may say that this series of articles will be found in the issues of that paper of the following days: the 5th of February, the 6th of February, the 8th of February, and the 9th of February. Judge Elliott, as the author of these articles, has purported to represent a Liberal questioning him upon the political issues of the day. Perhaps he can show that there was a Liberal who put these questions to him, or perhaps he was personating a Liberal and putting questions in order to answer them. I am sure that no hon. gentleman would desire me to read these various columns of articles.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. MULOCK. I have given the dates, and hon. gentlemen can read them for themselves. They are questions and answers dealing with the great political issues of the day, principally the great trade question. Hon. gentlemen ask me to read them. The first question is:

“Have you seen Mr. Gibbons's address on the trade question?—Yes.”

So it goes on, and the last question is:

“There are some other points to which I would like to refer, but not at present.—I should be happy to hear you, and I think I have seen no argument urged on behalf of the Liberal party in furtherance of their scheme of commercial or political union with the States which cannot be refuted.”

There we accuse Judge Elliott of having insinuated that the Liberal party is in favour of political union with the United States. I will not quote the article of the 6th of February, but will leave that pleasure for hon. gentlemen opposite. The one on the 8th appears to be a little over a column in length and is made up of questions and answers of the same kind containing arguments against the Liberal party, the regular stock arguments used by the Conservative party in the campaign. For example, this imaginary Liberal is supposed to have put this question:

“But, do you say there is not justice in the assertion that the Liberal party are for free trade?—I say that when they assert free trade is their object in seeking to have the American tariff to rule, they talk the veriest nonsense. I must say that it is a dishonest cry, and those who ask for such an assimilation of tariffs and say it is for free trade, must know that the cry is unfounded and dishonest.”