

AN OPEN LETTER

—TO THE—

HONORABLE EDWARD BLAKE, Q.C., EX-M.P.

* * * * *

(SECOND LETTER.)

SIR,—In the letter which I addressed to you in March last, I promised at a future time to deal more at length with the Cypress Hills timber limit investigation, in which you played the most conspicuous figure, the Minister of Justice ably assisting you in distorting the evidence and drawing conclusions which both of you well knew were not justified by the facts as presented to you.

You have not deigned to reply to my feeble effort to remind you of your vacillating course in respect to the charges made against me, or to clear your skirts of the several charges which I made against you. It was hardly to be expected that one who, in his own estimation, stands upon a higher pedestal of morality than other people, would for one moment condescend to notice so humble an individual as myself. Your dignified silence will not, however, prevent me from exposing the little game which you so successfully played, and in which you had so willing a coadjutor, as the gentleman, who first presented to the committee a report for its consideration which entirely exonerated me from any wrong doing, save the writing of private and confidential letters to a friend which were illegally dragged before parliament and with which parliament had nothing whatever to do.

The Ministerial press having been gagged for some unaccountable reason, and the organs which up to the fifth day of March were in sympathy with you having filled their columns with reckless and untruthful statements and charges against me, I am forced to deal with the action of parliament, for which you and the Minister of Justice are alone responsible, through the medium of correspondence which I do not pro-

pose to mark "private and confidential," like that which was unearthed and presented to the public, as I am informed, through the instrumentality of your office. One of the leading Grit papers of your city has suggested that you and I, having retired from parliament, our little differences should be buried, but I do not concur in that view, and shall not rest contented until I have thoroughly ventilated

THE DUPLICITY AND CUNNING

of yourself and others who took such a conspicuous course in trying to convince the people of Canada that I had been guilty of a high crime against parliament, although you laid down the broad proposition, in which they concurred, that unless I had been guilty of corruption in obtaining the limit for Mr. Adams, I was not within the bounds of parliamentary jurisdiction. You and the few insignificant members, who assisted you in violating every principle of evidence, may rest assured that I will not permit such an unjust sentence as the minority of parliament passed upon me, to remain unchallenged, without exposing your hypocrisy. If a mere tyro in the profession had so far displayed his ignorance of the application of facts to the law, or had exposed himself to the ridicule of every man of common sense in a matter similar to that with which I am dealing, you would have been the very first to condemn him, but when men of such distinguished ability as the Minister of Justice and yourself, and men, too, who have always prided themselves with having judicial minds, will for precisely opposite reasons, permit their names