

where change has been made. And what is the new work of the last two years? Precisely of the same kind and character as that I carried on, proving that the services of an Engineer like myself have been called for, and there is no ground for the statement made by Sir H. Langevin in the House of Commons.

To those friends who kindly undertook the advocacy of my case, and I have warmly to thank them for doing so, no unfavourable criticism was made of me professionally and personally. I was given to understand my transfer to the Department of Railways and Canals was assured. But influences intervened, and I have my theories what those influences were. Indeed the personal character, the weight and influence of my friends were such that I hardly think Sir H. Langevin would have dared to ignore them unless he had been sustained by some extraordinarily strong influence which was felt and not seen.

Even admitting that my services were no longer called for, that the work had been terminated, and as often happens in our pleasant and happy but uncertain profession, there was nothing more to be done, and we had to shake hands. The course to be observed towards me was simple enough. I should have been told that the work I was engaged on had ceased; that it appeared that I considered I had an annual engagement, and that from my long and good service, I would receive the benefit of the doubt and be paid in full for the year without delay. After a courteous sentence of regret that the connection had terminated, with an expression of thanks for past efforts and services, and some good wishes for the future, a separation takes place without bitterness or bad feeling. Such is the treatment which custom and decency have long established.

It was the opposite to what I received. No one of any right feeling can justify the treatment extended to me. Indeed many of my Toronto friends joined in a letter to Sir J. Macdonald, calling his attention to my case, and asking in regard to my past good services, I should be replaced in the Department of Railways and Canals under Sir Charles Tupper. This joint letter was, after some days, acknowledged by Sir J. Macdonald, and his reply was to the effect *that he had referred it to Sir H. Langevin*. Such was the result of the appeal to the First Minister for justice and consideration, by some of the most distinguished and estimable men of Toronto.

All the facts, and published letters establish that Sir H. Langevin felt that he had the power to remove me, and had determined to do so, from the earliest formation of the Ministry. The letter of Mr. Austin, was forwarded by him when he was Postmaster General. The fact plainly shows that the false statements of Mr. Austin were written with his concurrence and his own note is neither more nor less than a demand that an