

ently of my own feelings, for I consider that an important principle has been attacked in my person, on which the well-being of the whole Civil Service depends.

I have to ask your indulgence to make this statement in your columns. I trust that the extent to which I will have to trespass on your consideration will not dictate the refusal of my request. Equally I hope that if you are good enough to meet my views the ordinary reader will not be deterred by the length of my remarks from reading them. I will be as brief as I can.

Mr. Langevin's explanation is that the office I held was abolished; that there was some question as to the tenure of my position, which was submitted to the Minister of Justice, who reported that I had no legal claim for compensation. "Nevertheless, I thought," added Mr. Langevin, "some compensation should be given, so I recommended accordingly that Mr. Kingsford should be paid six months' salary!" Anyone accepting this statement must say that nothing can appear fairer, and it would seem mere querulousness to make objections to it.

Mr. Langevin spoke of the comparative cost of the surveys made under my directions, and those carried on last season, claiming that the new arrangements were less costly, inferentially leading to the idea that my work was unnecessarily expensive. He spoke also of the average cost of each survey under the two systems. Such a comparison is childish and absurd. As well compare, as the test of value, the weight of a George III. copper penny piece and a Victoria gold sovereign. Mr. Langevin recognizes himself the fallacy of any such argument by placing in the Estimates \$2,000 for the survey of the Neebish Rapids, and \$500 for the survey of the Perce waters, Bay of Chaleurs—two surveys, I may remark, to me inexplicable. It will be difficult to establish their *raison d'être*.

The harbour staff in 1879 consisted of one assistant engineer and nine junior assistants and clerks of works, my work extending from the Bay of Chaleurs to the frontier line of Lake Superior. Of this number five or six acted as clerks of works where work was in progress. The surveying party consisted of one assistant engineer, with three or four junior assistants. We were absent generally from May to December, when we returned to Ottawa to assist in the Department in all work assigned us; and I wrote the Minister's Annual Report to be submitted by the Governor-General to Parliament, a duty I performed for seven consecutive years.

Mr. Perley had charge of the harbour works in the Maritime Provinces. He came to Ottawa only when Parliament was sitting. His duties were confined to the works under his direction which called for his constant presence in the Maritime Provinces.

Whereas in addition to my duties as Engineer in charge of harbours, I was a general drudge of all work. I was so quite willingly. My services were always at the disposal of the Department. My position was made in every way agreeable to me. My work was pleasant under all aspects. I took a pride in it; and the constant kindness and consideration I received led me to think nothing a toil. During the eight years I was in the Department I had only six days' leave.

What is the character of the organization of to-day? Mr. Perley is the Chief Engineer, and has theoretically a general supervision of the whole works. Actually, however, he directs the work in Ontario and Quebec. Mr. Boyd, who superintends the work in the Maritime Provinces, is not a young man. On the contrary, he is an engineer of experience. Practically it amounts to this:—Mr. Perley directs my old work, and Mr. Boyd directs that of Mr. Perley. But there is this distinction:—In my time the whole work was done under a fixed and regular system. Last year the parties sent out were without the influence of Mr. Perley, for they received their instructions from the Secretary—at least so I learned from one of themselves.