

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. I forget the tenure of his office. He was for a very long time employed in the public service. Why was he dismissed?

MR. LANGEVIN. Mr. Kingsford was employed for a long time in the department, but the special work for which he was employed was no longer required under the new arrangement of the department. We, therefore, dispensed with his services, and the question of compensation came up. He claimed compensation on account of his having been discharged. The tenure of his office was not very clearly explained by papers in the department, and Mr. Kingsford produced a letter from the late head of the department to show that, though he was not a permanent officer, nevertheless the Government of the day had thought he should have some more firm position than an ordinary clerk or engineer, and, therefore, he was paid by the year. Mr. Kingsford having claimed a year's salary the matter was referred by us to the hon. Minister of Justice in order to know how far I could go in that direction. The hon. Minister of Justice reported that Mr. Kingsford had no legal claim; nevertheless, after considering the matter, I thought some compensation should be given, and I recommended accordingly that Mr. Kingsford should be paid six months' salary.

MR. MACKENZIE. Then no fault was found with him.

MR. LANGEVIN. I made no complaint against Mr. Kingsford; he was discharged because of the changes in the department.

MR. MACKENZIE. Is no one employed to do work at the harbors of Quebec and Ontario?

MR. LANGEVIN. The Chief Engineer of the Department now does that work. We have not any special engineer to look after the engineers in Quebec and Ontario, as Mr. Kingsford was employed; now the Chief Engineer does it.

MR. MACKENZIE. Who is the Chief Engineer?

MR. LANGEVIN. Mr. Perley.

MR. MACKENZIE. And who does the work that Mr. Perley formerly did in the Lower Provinces?

MR. LANGEVIN. Mr. Boyd has been employed during the summer to superintend the works there, but after the season he returned to headquarters and assisted Mr. Perley in preparing plans.

MR. MACKENZIE. Can the hon. gentleman give a statement of the expenditure on engineering surveys in Quebec and Ontario last year.

MR. LANGEVIN. I have a comparative statement of the cost of those surveys in 1878, 1879 and 1880. In 1878, under the old *regime*, Mr. Kingsford being then employed, the staff numbered nine, number of surveys eleven, total expenditure \$14,715, cost of each survey \$1,387. In 1879, after the change had taken place staff numbered twelve, surveys thirteen, total expenditure \$16,007, cost of each survey \$1,231. In 1880 the staff was increased to sixteen, engineers and assistants, surveys forty-four, amount expended \$19,794, cost of each survey \$449. Hon. gentlemen will see that, though the expenditure was larger, the number of surveys was also largely increased, while the average cost was reduced, and that was the object desired to be accomplished in making the change.

MR. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman talks about the number of surveys, but it entirely depends on what the surveys were. There have been a large number of a very trifling character. The fact remains that the hon. gentleman dismissed an old and faithful servant and took on a new man.

MR. LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman should not say that, because it is not so. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman says that because he does not know better. Mr. Kingsford has not had any successor. The men employed were the ordinary surveyors or engineers that were employed in the time of the hon. gentleman. We did not employ