

my position gave me authority to make the arrangement generally. In this case my special instructions even dictated the course. If I had employed an incompetent person and paid him extravagantly, if I had neglected my responsibilities, then the reproof could have been administered. As it stood it was an unworthy exhibition of that insolence of office classed among the serious fardels of life too many have to bear.

Another instance of gross and unjust discourtesy, equally objectionable is the memorandum of Mr. Langevin, dated the 17th December, relative to the balance available on Quebec piers, owing to the misunderstanding of the figures by Mr. Baillairge and himself, as clearly set forth in my memorandum in reply, No. 1,549.

These remarks were sent me a few days previous to my dismissal, and were but forerunners of it.

I know well the difficulty of getting this statement considered; but I trust there will be those who can recognize the important principle of public policy which underlies its merely personal element. Even if passed over and doffed aside for the moment, the historian may turn to it in the future and conceive that it presents a phase of official life which in a few sentences, he may deem it expedient to perpetuate.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

Ottawa, 12th April, 1881.

WILLIAM KINGSFORD.

The following is the debate in the House of Commons. The proceedings are taken from Hansard, the date being 15th March, 1881 (pp. 11-13). Sir H. Langevin's assertions are that my duties were no longer to be performed; that money was saved by my dismissal; that six months' pay was readily given me; that he had but a certain number of assistants; that my office had been abolished. They are untrue. It needed but his childish comparison of the cost of surveys to make them ridiculous, if a false statement in the House of Commons can be regarded in any other than a serious and a painful point of view. I must direct also attention to Mr. Kirkpatrick's part in this debate.

The latter member took upon himself to say that "a very satisfactory reason" was given for my removal, "an economic reason," "the saving of public money," and then at once he turned the issue of the debate on some other matter.

The general value of Mr. Kirkpatrick's assertions and the character of his support of his principal Sir H. Langevin are here clearly established by himself.

To pay Wm. Kingsford, Esq., Civil Engineer, as compensation
for loss of employment as Engineer in charge of Harbor and
River Works, Ontario and Quebec, &c., at the rate of \$3,300
per annum..... \$1,650 00

SIR RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT. Is this gentleman now employed by the department?

MR. LANGEVIN. No.