

more than one ringing defence on the floor of Parliament, and it was this Mr. Cameron who was the chosen chairman of the Pacific Scandal Committee. Had Sir John been alive, his consent to the publication of the letter would never have been obtained. If a second edition of the book is called for, it is to be hoped Mr. Pope will see the wisdom of excluding this unfortunate letter. No doubt he put it into print as a cook, with an insipid dish, introduces a sprinkling from the cruet stand, but he should have resisted the temptation. The letter was written when press copies of letters were unknown, nor had Sir John at that time a secretary to copy it for him. Such luxuries were unknown in the fifties. How then did this letter come to light? The reader shall know. When Captain Strachan's letters were overhauled, his executors found this letter, and sent it down to Sir John at Ottawa to show him how time sometimes changed opinions, and he desired him to burn it after perusal: instead, Sir John kept it, and his biographer, though made aware of the circumstances, and in spite of a caution to the contrary, unfortunately has the questionable taste to publish it.

Sir John has been praised for his statesmanship, and for this I, too, give him all praise. But his statesmanship was limited to two things: carrying on the government when no one else could do it and do it so well and so continuously, and forging the country together. He originated no great principle. He appropriated, however, freely from others when an opportunity offered, or when he thought another's idea would lead to or keep him in office. La Fontaine had greater and better ideas. The highest glory of our French-Canadian compatriots is the part they played, after La Fontaine's example, in working out a constitutional system for Canada, in agreeing to join together and trying to join together, in a loyalty to the constitution that has been unequalled

in any other portion of the Dominion. Mercierism is but an ephemeral backwash of the great movement begun by La Fontaine, aided by Cartier, furthered by Sir Hector Langevin, and in the realization of which none of these men hold a place inferior to Sir John. Indeed, he got many ideas from them. And on another great question, where Mr. Pope would have us believe that because he quotes one sentence of Sir John's early stump speeches wherein he declared for the encouragement of native industries, he was therefore originally and continuously a protectionist, he trifles with our memories and our knowledge. Sir John was timid unto death of Protection, had to be bullied into it, led into it, committed to it by others. But when he thought it grown, he used it as a bridge to reach the power he liked to wield. And when his hosts followed over, they cried, "Behold the bridge Sir John has built." But some of us know the work to be of other handiworkmen.

Of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the scandal in connection therewith, I shall say little on this occasion. That road is now Sir John's monument, next to Confederation. The scandal is something that can be condoned, but cannot be wiped out if we lay down a set of ethics that has never yet been realized in public life. In the language of the witness box, the money passed. Equally true also is it that the road was built. Posterity will extenuate the one in the light of the other, and pass a verdict on the two taken together. Sir John's name will come out of it with a lustre, and yet not without flecks.

Mr. Pope publishes a memorandum prepared by Sir John, and meant for his defence with posterity. The best defence of the transaction with Sir Hugh Allan was that published in the *Mail* newspaper, the day after the scandal was launched in the Toronto and Montreal papers. It was written by a man who, getting an inkling of