

On the 14th October I was informed that my letter, immediately on its receipt, had been submitted to the Minister of Justice.

On the 9th November I again wrote to the Secretary demanding a reply. On the 10th November I enclosed a copy of the correspondence to Sir John Macdonald, the First Minister, adding "that I take this course from the unjust treatment I am experiencing at the hands of Mr. Langevin, so that in the event of my being forced to appeal to the justice of the House of Commons you will not be without knowledge of the circumstances under which that appeal will be made."

On the 30th of November I posted a letter dated the 1st of December, reviewing my case, stating that I should appeal to the people of Canada through their representatives in Parliament, and I should write no more letters to the Department of Public Works.

On the 2nd of December I received a letter dated 1st December, informing me that the opinion of the Minister of Justice was that I had no legal claim; but after consideration of the equitable view of the case, the Minister (Mr. Langevin) had obtained authority to pay me \$1,650 as a gratuity for my loss of employment.

The Minister of Justice had, therefore, taken from the 26th of September to the end of November to give an opinion that an annual engagement running from year to year, with three years' life, can be terminated at ten o'clock on the last day of the year without claim for damage on either side.

I accepted this offer—not from a sense of its justice or friendliness. Well-read lawyers tell me the point has not been formally determined. All, however, that I have spoken to agree that a party in my position has a legal claim. All hesitate to define the extent to which that legal claim would be determined in the Courts.

But I was tired of delay. Nine months had passed since my first letter was written. The Government had shown itself so inimical to me. It had treated me so harshly, and so at variance with every right principle, that I was convinced that if I had recourse to a petition of right delays would have been interposed and difficulties created. It was almost a rule of three sum. If it took seventy days for an opinion like this to be given, how long would it take to have the case decided in a Court of law. I accepted the offer accordingly, and in my letter of acceptance of the 3rd December I stated plainly under what conditions I did so. Moreover, I felt that even when I obtained the verdict there was nothing to enforce the amount appearing in the Estimates. I felt my impotence to contend against the Government in this form. Technical law is not my weapon. If I have to battle I prefer the field where I can protect myself.

But weigh the treatment I received by the practice followed when a public servant under fair and legitimate conditions is no longer required, or when the fortunes of a favorite have to be furthered. I had nine years' service. I can confidently refer to their record. When I think of the men who have received high gratuities and full consideration, of the back allowances granted and the courtesy given, I turn to the illiberal mode in which my claim was treated, and I see how fit a continuation it is of the injustice with which I was dismissed.

I owe it to Mr. Mackenzie to thank him for his reference to my case in the House of Commons. Mr. Langevin did not attempt to say that I had neglected my duties, or that I was a political partisan of the late Government, as two years ago he wrote to Sir Charles Tupper. That such a report was spread, that falsehoods the most systematic were uttered by men to whom I did not speak to suit their own ends, I have reason to know. I heard all these things and treated them with contempt. During Mr. Mackenzie's rule I was on several occasions reported to him as acting in the interests of the Conservative party and that I was endeavoring to embarrass him. Every Government engineer knows it is a mode with a class of contractors and their agents to prosecute