

result is owing. As I am writing of those eight years of my life, is it an indiscretion for me to add how admirably he was seconded by the Secretary, Mr. Braun?

Knowing no one could be more friendly to me, or more sensitive on the points when personal honour and character have to be considered, I replied that I would meet his wishes in anything, as I always had a pleasure in doing. I returned to the office. I did what Mr. Fleming asked of my hands, and I faced the work Mr. Trudeau set before me. The latter is known as *precis* writing. It gives the facts of a claim, the arguments of the claimant, and the contra views of the Department; a duty better performed by one having a knowledge of work, and acquainted with its difficulties. The record room will show the cases I cleared off. I do not think I ever worked better.

One morning, however, I received a private note from Mr. Trudeau to the effect that the Minister had sent him word by Mr. Bradly that my engagement terminated with the Pacific Railway work. Inquiry on my part established that this decision was final. I saw Mr. Fleming. His own position was then threatened. Nothing could be done. I did not again see Sir Charles Tupper. I felt it to be useless. For then, as now, I thought that this termination of my services was from the interference of an outer influence too powerful to be overcome. I have my own theories of its value and character.

I have now cleared the way to deal with Mr. Langevin's statement in Parliament, given in the first part of this letter.

On the 1st of March I addressed the Secretary of Public Works complaining of the treatment I had received, stating that I had an annual engagement, offering a year's service or claiming a year's pay.

On the 12th of March my letter was acknowledged, and I was informed it would be referred to the Minister of Public Works.

On the 15th July I called attention to my letter of the 1st March.

On the 22nd July I was informed that the matter was under consideration.

On the 20th August I addressed Mr. Langevin, directly protesting against the unjust treatment I was receiving.

On the 16th September I was informed that "repeated but unsuccessful search had been made * * * for any letter or document which might show your engagement to have been an annual one from the 1st January, 1877, and that your claim cannot be allowed."

Six months had elapsed since my first letter. That the documents exist, Mr. Langevin's remark in the House of Commons itself establishes. They must have been known to the Deputy-Minister of Public Works, Mr. Baillairge, who had been my contemporary in the old Department, and was hence cognizant of my position. In any case a few minutes' conversation with Mr. Trudeau would have set him right, and if Mr. Langevin had desired to do justice to me he would have written to the previous Minister, Mr. Mackenzie, to whom I referred him.

What Mr. Langevin would not do in the cause of right and justice I did myself. I applied to Mr. Mackenzie. Mr. Mackenzie, with that high sense of honesty and right which the most factious of his political adversaries cannot dispute, at once acted as his antecedents would suggest. He wrote to Mr. Langevin establishing fully my claim to an annual engagement.

On the 25th September I wrote again to the Secretary. I pointed out by number and date the documents establishing my claim, which the repeated but unsuccessful search had failed to find, and I asked a reconsideration of the decision contained in his letter of the 10th September, on the ground that the reason assigned for it was at variance with the facts of the case.