

istration on political grounds. The remark led to a contradiction, and explanations were given of the cause of the proceeding. Mr. Kirkpatrick succeeded perfectly—the debate wandered from the first issue—it was closed. Nothing more was said. In what does this conduct differ from the worst spirit of faction, which in the common interest of a personal combination justifies all injustice and all wrong.

I have mentioned Sir Charles Tupper's name. I saw much of him officially. I owe it to him to say that he was invariably courteous. I found him a man of a high order of ability, capable of grasping a subject in all its bearings, who could see his way through the mazes of contradictory arguments and assertions and so-called facts. I shall always retain a kindly memory of him. *Quippe benignus erat.* I cannot say this for Mr. Langevin. His discourtesy was most marked.

I will give two instances. The Riviere du Loup restoration had been carried on under my direction for three years. The superintendent was Mr. Ferdinand Chamberland. He was capable, careful, and had much experience in crib work. There was no complaint against him. On the contrary, he had performed his work admirably. In July, 1879, when the work was to be commenced, I received written instructions to appoint one Mr. Elzear Marquis as superintendent, the nominee of the member Dr. Grandbois. On my arrival at Riviere du Loup, Chamberland called on me. I explained to him my positive orders to appoint Marquis, and that I had no alternative but to do so. At the same time Dr. Grandbois had his brother-in-law, Mr. Pelletier, a storekeeper of Riviere du Loup, named paymaster, thus throwing the whole control of the men in the hands of the storekeeper, a proceeding in every way objectionable. The practice had hitherto been to detail the Postmaster to pay the men on occasions when the Paymaster could not attend. Mr. Jarvis, the agent of a bank, I think Molsons, had so acted at Riviere du Loup, but he had not the slightest power of interference with the men. I never heard of Chamberland having taken any part in politics. On the St. Lawrence all our attention had been given to do the best we could with the little money we had for the restoration of the several piers—in this case confined to Riviere du Loup.

On the 12th July, 1879, I had received instructions to examine Rimouski Pier, and to give an estimate of the cost of repairs, it having been represented that it had been greatly damaged by storms. It was accordingly necessary to send a reliable man to examine in detail the various timbers represented to be injured. Having confidence in Chamberland, and knowing that it was work he thoroughly understood, I detached him to this duty. He worked four days or so; he was paid his time and his travelling expenses, which amounted to about \$16, I think. I followed him to Rimouski in a couple of days, and I found that the pier required no restoration, and so reported. I did so with the greatest confidence, as the examination had been thorough.

In October, 1879, I received a minute to the effect that the Minister wished to know why Mr. Kingsford took Chamberland down to Rimouski. I had heard at Riviere du Loup that the proceeding had with a clique received unfavorable comment. But I paid no heed to the affair. I had simply done my duty in sending a capable man to do what was required, and so saved the Department further expense and trouble. The matter indeed had been closed by my operations, and I had forgotten the whole circumstance when this minute was sent to me. I replied to it 9th October, 1879, No. 101 in the Department, setting forth the facts of the case. It was returned to me the same day, with the remark in the caligraphy of Mr. Langevin. "This man should not have been employed without the previous permission of the Ministry." This censure for employing a worthy and competent man, who had worked three seasons in the Department on necessary work, for which he was perfectly fitted, at a fair wage, is a marked discourtesy, and so intended. It is more than a violation of propriety—it is a departure from truth; for