ailicant to

pids of the urties have inderstated n that the provement , designed hey are to er in questhe others ind in my may meners below 00; Cap her Point t least ten e changes sioned the

t built by arch had the water upon the ained the happens water in, y about Water der can

farbour iled by ust the e would pupiled + 1 was the first person connected with the commission who gave that full credit to Capt. Bell, which he so well deserves, and which is to be found in my report. If Capt. Bell has "complained bitterly," to anybody else, which I cannot believe, he has always to me expressed his warmest acknowledgments of my notice of his labours. With respect to the discovery of the channel, I never claimed it—for the simple reason that there was no discovery. Captain Bayfield discovered all the channels of the St. Lawrence long before Capt. Bell or myself ever saw them.

4th. That I have endeavoured to deprive the American Engineers and the Hoa. Jno. Young of the credit due to their labours in connection with the Victoria Bridge. This is also a whelesate perversion of the facts of the case. A preface was written to my Report upon the Bridge, for the very purpose of noticing the labours of my predecessors; and the only report of an American Engineer on the subject, is printed in the appendix. Lastly, my report was addressed to the Hon. Jno. Young, was printed under his directions and at his expense, and if there had been any such omissions in it as the *Leader* charges, he could and would have expressed his dissatisfaction, which he certainly did not do; nay more, he could have prevented its publication altogether.

This is the sum of the *Leader's* attempt to break down my personal and professional character; and if he can find anything more to say upon the same subject, I have no doubt the exigencies of the Grand Trunk, or the revenge of its *victims*, will speedily produce it.

The Leader, in conclusion, gives two reasons for my appointment having been defeated by his owners; first, "my having shown a positive opposition to the Grand Trunk enterprise from the beginning." I am happy to be able to state, for the Leader's sake, that this part of his article, at least, has some truth in it. I did oppose that enterprise in 1852, and have seen many good reasons for doing so since—but the Company cannot charge me with having since written one word to damage an enterprise to which we were so irrevocably committed; nor until they had first attacked me, and after they had pleaded their own bankruptcy, and demanded that we shall pay their debts, finish their works, and let them