

the Ontario Bar to know that one of the most sincere admirers Mr. Thompson had when he closed his speech, was the Hon. Edward Blake. This feeling was reciprocated by Sir John Thompson, who, in conversation with the writer a couple of years ago, said that Mr. Blake possessed the greatest legal mind he ever met, and expressed the opinion that Mr. Blake was very much misunderstood. The writer gathered the impression that there was a kindred feeling between the two men. This, probably, played no small part in the report on Charles Rykert, a session or two after, when Mr. Blake and Mr. Thompson were a sub-committee on that matter.

His next great argument was on the Constitutional questions involved in the Jesuits' Estates Act—here, again, he was not without experience, for no province, with the exception of Ontario, had so discussed the question of provincial rights as had Nova Scotia. His reply to Mr. D'Alton McCarthy on this occasion was a crushing one, and the Hon. Edward Blake crossed the floor to congratulate him, and the two greatest lawyers that ever adorned the House of Commons, clasped hands amid the applause of the entire House.

He had the faculty in an eminent degree of clothing in clear and concise language the most difficult and involved propositions of law; he could make questions so clear that they no longer appeared to have ever been difficult. This wonderful faculty was not for many years appreciated by his legal opponents. Case after case he won, and yet—after year he continued to be successful before the

courts. Yet to his opponents he did not appear to win by his ability—they put his success down to luck in always holding a brief on the easy side of the case. There never appeared to be any room to doubt the result; his side of the question was so right and simple it won on its merits, as it appeared to opposing counsel. His manner reminds me of the old story of a father taking his son, who was studying law, to hear a celebrated lawyer plead, and when they retired from the court, the father said "Well, son, what do you think of him?" and the son replied: "Why, father, he is not much of a speaker, I think I could do as well myself." The father replied: "Yes, son, but you noticed he got the verdict;" and so it was with Thompson, he got the verdict. He was not interested in impressing his auditors with his ability—as many counsels do who lose the verdict, but who impress the court or jury with their own cleverness, and convey the idea that they are trying to pull through a desperate case by sheer force of their great ability. These men do not wear a mask to hide their intellect, and they cannot believe that anyone else could do so. Some urged that he was not profound in law. He certainly was not, if to be profound was to be obscure. He had a clear, logical mind, and so expressed everything in the simplest manner. He could influence others without effort, and consequently they never felt his personality, and never felt they were being influenced by him. He was an orator simple, sincere and lucid. There is all the difference in the world between an orator and an elocutionist.