their claims and to avoid their responsibility in this form. But we have to do our duty notwithstanding. This line of conduct took such form with regard to Cobourg pier, that I was unjustly giving returns of the work and striving to ruin the contractors, that Mr. Schreiber was deputed to measure up my work as a check upon me; and in a matter of some \$80,000, by a different mode of measurement, he made the total less by \$100 than my figures. On the lower St. Lawrence I was assailed in the same form for doing my duty, and I was reported to Mr. Mackenzie as having acted in the interest of the party of which Mr. Langevin is a member.

In February, 1880, I heard from a common friend that a gentleman from the Province of Quebec, unsolicited on my part, had interested himself on my behalf, and had taken up my case. I called to thank my kindly advocate. He told me that Mr. Langevin's objection to me was that I had taken a strong part in his county against him, and had otherwise injured him politically. I pointed out the intense absurdity of this statement, and asked for the slightest proof of its truth. Further, I pledged my word to the absence of even the least foundation for it. My friend repeated that such was Mr. Langevin's conviction. If Mr. Langevin will apply to me for the name of this gentleman I will give it him.

u E

p.

18

01 O

po

đ١

th

be no

du of

tio

tio

giv

Ch

to

exp

cou

SO

wh

Lo

110

was

ind

wh

me

ren

wit

and

wor

inte

I am aware how much that I write is weakened by the non-production of the correspondence. It will be seen by it when published that I understate my case. there can be but little interest about the writer, except with his own intimate friends. We are all soon to learn how utterly unimportant to the mass of men is individual suffering or privation. A wrong only makes the whole world kin when it is felt to affect an all-important principle. The wrong which I have suffered is of no public import, viewed as it affects the writer. But it strikes at the very condition and efficiency of a body of men of the first importance to the country. I have nothing to gain by what I say in any direction. I am a bad hater and I hope I will continue so. But I trust public attention will be awakened to the necessity of guarding the purity and efficiency of the public service, so that no man who holds a position of trust, or indeed, however humble he may be, can be remorselessly put into the street, be the cause what it may-whim, caprice, malignancy, hatred, pained vanity, or feminine full-blown pride and insolence. public service should be a l'abri of all such influence. It is one of the most serious questions of the day. For nothing can be more depressing and disheartening than the present condition of the service in Ottawa. There is no recognition of merit, no reward for an honorable career, no encouragement to industry, and to devotion to duty. pr zes are given to subserviency and political influence, to usefulness out of the sphere of duty, to amenities which form no part of official life, and which are looked for in a form which a proud and independent spirit cannot stoop to give. The most deserving keep on the noiseless tenor of their way, only sustained by their self-respect and sense of duty. Their "hopes lie drowned" in continued neglect and disregard.

When the debate in question came up in the House of Commons this question was distinctly raised by Mr. Mackenzie. One would think that anyone with the least generosity would have felt sympathy with a body of deserving men—for exceptions of unworthiness cannot take away the general merit of the class; that among the members of that House there were men who, having privately high views of duty and of honour would have uttered something in vindication of a great principle by which the public service should have been upheld. Mr. Mackenzie's own experience of the Department, and his knowledge of my case, told him how perfunctory Mr. Langevin's explanations were, and how at variance they were with fact. He took exception to what was being said, when Mr. Kirkpatrick rose up to turn the debate into another channel. He claimed that a gentleman in Central Canada had been dismissed unworthily by the late Admin-