

I will not further repeat here what was said in that debate, but I will ask all who are interested in the good order and efficiency of the Public Works Department to refer to it. They will see how the case was deliberately misrepresented by Sir H. Langevin in his place as Minister.

My friends saw Sir Charles Tupper, and I was then informed, and I have full authority so to speak, that Sir Charles Tupper had spoken of me kindly, and even complimentarily, and I must bear testimony to the courtesy and kindness I experienced from him. Influences—which I cannot set forth in writing, for I have no positive proof of them to justify me doing so—were exercised to overbear his good intentions towards me, but that there were such influences I am certain. My work also went on pleasantly with him, and he impressed me as a man of high ability, and great breadth of view. Whatever the cause I was made to feel, that the consideration I hoped to receive from the influence exercised in my behalf by my friends, or I will venture to say from a feeling personal to myself, that this consideration it was not in his power to extend. It is a relief in this statement of wrong to be able to bear tribute at least in one direction. I return to my subject.

Sir H. Langevin's letter which I have given was on record, and it had unmistakably shewn his feeling and his intentions towards me. The fact was pointed out by me to my friends with what force I could command. I distanced the removal of the dredge from my control, which an influence outside the Department, too powerful to be resisted, had insisted on. For I held it not simply as a public wrong, but as an insult to myself which could have only the meaning of evil augury. For the step itself was objectionable. No change in this direction was called for, except to gratify Mr. J. Arnoldi, if I set out of view the desire to strike a blow at myself. My friend informed me that he understood I was to be transferred to Railways and Canals, and that the assurance was plain that my position as a Superior Engineer should not be assailed.

No one of sense, writing a letter similar to that I have given, protesting against a line of conduct of an official superior, would take this course without carefully weighing every word, and asking the opinion of friends interested in him, on whose judgment as to the general context he could rely. Every one of course, must be the judge of what is due to his own character and honour, and must assume the responsibility of the line of conduct he may follow. But we all desire to avoid any false step. Ordinarily we ask those capable of giving us sound advice, if any phrase or word we have written can be held to be objectionable. From what I then heard, in view of my change to the Department of Railways and Canals, I accepted the opinion that it was inexpedient to place the letter on record. It was pointed out to me that I had made a respectful protest