

in the opinion that it will be wise and prudent, with these heavy engagements, to maintain a steady moderate surplus, we shall probably have another \$1,000,000 per annum from that source, amounting to \$10,000,000 more."

From his dream of an annual surplus of \$2,000,000, Sir Richard awakened to discover an annual deficit of nearly that amount, and it may be well for the country that it was so, for, had not his Estimates of Revenue proved altogether fallacious, it is quite obvious now that the expenditure of the Government, of which he was a member, would have been even more recklessly prodigal than it was.

The speech which Mr. Blake delivered to the Young Men's Reform Club of Montreal, being in the nature of a political "pronunciamento," is deserving of more careful perusal than after-dinner speeches usually receive. It contains some passages that I feel bound to notice.

Mr. Blake is evidently amazed and mortified that his efforts against the ratification of the contract with the Syndicate for building the Canadian Pacific Railway bore no fruit beyond reducing by one the number of his usual followers in the House of Commons, and, instead of attributing his failure to the true cause, he insinuated at Montreal that it was due to some adverse "preponderating influence," which he did not define.

The following is an extract from his speech :—

"I do not speak without having weighed my words, when I say that my belief is that there was not merely outside that House but also within its walls, at one time, a preponderance of opinion adverse to that contract. (Hear, hear.) By what means? under what circumstances? By what pressure? I don't accuse any one of baseness; I don't accuse any one of impropriety, but there was a rallying to the support of the Government which deliberately chose to pledge itself to the carrying of that contract. What that preponderating influence may have been it is not for me to state; it is for the country to judge."

While Mr. Blake did not, and dared not charge any of the Ministerial supporters with baseness, he cast at them collectively a sweeping insinuation of infamy—at gentlemen who are unstained by, and incapable of dishonorable conduct. Will the future historian who may have access to the chronicles of the Legislature of Ontario be able to say as much of Mr. Blake?

If the Leader of the Opposition knows of one member of the House of Commons who yielded to improper influences, he ought to name him, and, if he did know of such a case, it is he who would proclaim it with a light heart. But since he does not know of an instance of dishonor, it is altogether unworthy of one occupying his position, insidiously to promulgate a covert, but most foul slander against a body of gentlemen, of whom, probably, no one would be willing to exchange political records with him.