

giving was not an honest reason. I do not think that is very complimentary to any member of Parliament. I never treated the hon. gentleman in that way.

MR. MACKENZIE. I have no complaint to make of the hon. gentleman's statement, and I do not think he has much reason to complain of my treatment of him. The reason why I said it was not an honest reason, was that I believed that Mr. Kingsford was treated precisely as the inspectors were—that the arrangement was changed for the purpose of getting rid of him.

MR. LANGEVIN. No.

MR. MACKENZIE. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement of course.

MR. LANGEVIN. Mr. Kingsford has not been replaced; if he had been, the hon. gentleman would be right in his assertion. I have saved his salary. I have saved a great deal in the other provinces also by getting rid of the staff that were there with those local engineers. I do not think the hon. gentleman knew that; I only knew it after I had been a certain time in the department. When I found that they had nothing to do, and were a source of expense in many ways, I got rid of them all.

MR. MACKENZIE. Where?

MR. LANGEVIN. In New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Ontario.

MR. MACKENZIE. I was not aware of any engineers in New Brunswick.

MR. LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman did not know it. I did not know it for several months, but as soon as I discovered it I dismissed them all.

MR. MACKENZIE. I would like to know where they were.

MR. LANGEVIN. In St. John and Halifax, the staff of Mr. Kingsford.

MR. MACKENZIE. There were none in Halifax that I am aware of. We paid none in Halifax. I think there were two assistants to Mr. Perley in St. John, but I am not aware of any other engineers. I think the hon. gentleman is wrong.

MR. LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman wishes I will give him a statement.

MR. MACKENZIE. Then I hope he will bring a statement. In the meantime we find his economy results in this way: In my last year this business cost \$14,000; in the next year, under the hon. gentleman, it costs \$16,000—I give the round figures. In this last year it cost \$19,000. This is economy going backwards.

MR. LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman says that in his last year he expended \$14,000, and that in the next two years I expended \$16,000 and \$19,000. That is perfectly correct, but the hon. gentleman should add that the number of surveys for his \$14,000 were eleven; for my \$16,000, thirteen; and now that the system has been perfected, for \$19,000, I had forty-four surveys. The surveys in the time of the hon. gentleman cost \$1,337 each, while they now cost \$449 each.

MR. MACKENZIE. But one survey may be equal to a dozen, and no doubt in this case it is so.

MR. KIRKPATRICK. I am glad to hear the hon. member for Lambton complain of the dismissal of public servants without just cause; but I do not think he has found an example in the case of Mr. Kingsford. The Hon. Minister of Public Works has given a very satisfactory reason for the removal of that officer—an economic reason; he has shown that he has saved public money. But the hon. member for Lambton forgets that he himself dismissed a public servant for the simple reason that he would not need the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) on a certain occasion—I refer to the case of Dr. Strange—and re-appointed an officer to replace him without any trial or enquiry. He dismissed him in a manner most obnoxious to a volunteer officer—by stating that Her Majesty had no longer need for his services. I think it does not lie in

* See in Hansard? "heed."