

kingly office of prerogative. Hence the confident assumption that the complaint when made will be forgotten by the world, while the political bravo is ready to stigmatize the accusation as slanderous and unfounded, or if quieter language be sufficient, as captious, untrue and unjust.

But there are occasions when so important a principle lies at the base of individual wrong when it is established on irrefragable evidence that the whole heart of the community is stirred and awakened, and its sense of justice so called forth that it cannot be turned aside by evasion and equivocation. The dispute ceases to be a tournament between two persons, each having his supporters, with the possibility of advancing pleasing and plausible arguments. Or put it the other way : one having only his cause and truth to sustain him ; the other in office, with power, with Ministers at his side interested in his character being cleared, with a political party to whitewash him by a vote, with a numerous class of retainers and adherents ready and obsequious to do his bidding. It is then that the point at issue rises above the appeal against personal wrong and pushes aside the purchased support which the accused puts forward to stifle investigation. The question becomes one of public import and morality, and its consideration a public issue. In this case the point to be considered is definite and clear. It is : is the public service to be made a convenience for a Minister to purchase adherents, or satisfy enmities at the public expense and to the public detriment ? Is the tenure of public duty to be no higher or firmer than as the will or the fancies of the man of the hour—the Minister of the day—may regulate its life ? Whether the possession of office confers the right to model and form the department for the profit and benefit of its holder ? Whether he shall possess the power to remove as rubbish old and competent public servants ? To commit deliberate acts of injustice ? Or whether the public service is to be conducted honestly, ably and justly, to the benefit of the State, and to the advancement of good government and the public interest ? Whether men who, loyally fulfilling their obligations, are to be protected by the aegis of public opinion, in their position, so long as they perform their duty honorably and satisfactorily ?

This is the question which is contained in the papers I am making public, and I ask for it the consideration it may justly claim. I ask a calm and judicial enquiry into the action of Sir H. Langevin with regard to myself, and especially that an investigation be made as to the truth of the explanations given by him in the House of Commons when called upon by Mr. Mackenzie to justify his proceeding.

There can be but one response to any such enquiry—that Sir H. Langevin abused his powers by summarily dismissing me without cause for his own purposes—from the position I had held for eight years—after these years of honest and efficient service and assigning my duties to