

What did those gentlemen do to expose them to the nefarious imputation? They simply refused to be lured by Mr. Blake's disingenuous appeals to follow an odious example and to desert their leader. They preferred, one and all, to adhere to what they considered the path of patriotism. Mr. Blake ought to be aware that, if he charged gentlemen in Parliament with being swayed in the discharge of their highest duties by improper "preponderating influences," he would import into our Legislative Halls the enactment of scenes such as we read of occurring elsewhere, and deplore. He must have meant that the influences he referred to were improper, or he would not have prefaced the insult by saying that "he did not speak without having weighed his words."

If Mr. Blake had meant it to be understood, for instance, that Sir John Macdonald had exerted so "preponderating an influence" in his party that it defied him (Mr. Blake) to break their phalanx, he would have alluded only to the exercise of a legitimate influence, and, therefore, the remark would have been inoffensive and would not have required the pre-weighing of his words; but the declared pre-weighing of words proves that Mr. Blake intended by them to convey a deliberate insult.

Can it be that Mr. Blake's vile insinuations were suggested by reminiscences of experiences in his own political career?

It is quite true that the gentlemen who support the Government in both Houses of Parliament were most anxious that the provisions of so important a contract, as that for building the Canadian Pacific Railway, should be free from all ambiguity and open, as little as possible, to the misrepresentations of the ingenuous, the unscrupulous, and the unpatriotic among their opponents; and, in deference to the wishes of the friends of the Ministry the Syndicate signified that they agreed in the construction which the Government had placed upon the contract, and thus all reasonable objections to it were satisfactorily removed.

These important facts Mr. Blake saw fit to withhold from his audience at Montreal, and thereby committed an act of *suppressio veri* inconsistent with the example of scrupulous candor which might have been expected from one of his position and pretensions, when addressing a society of young Reformers. But, if he had stated the facts, he must have denied himself the gratification of uttering an inuendo, by means of which he tried figuratively to stab his opponents in the back.

Mr. Blake appears prone to reticence under circumstances which would seem to require perfect frankness. A remarkable instance of this occurred in a speech to his then constituents delivered at Teeswater, in the County of Bruce, in 1877. When comparing the expenses of the Department of Justice, at Ottawa, under himself with the same when under Sir John Macdonald, and apparently desiring to prove (what the Public Accounts did not bear out), that his Administration was the more economical of the two, he actually omitted the salaries of Sir John Macdonald and himself, and thus suppressed the fact that his own salary as Minister of Justice was \$7,000 a year, being \$2,000 a