

others ; and that in the House of Commons he gave an untrue and dishonest explanation of the matter.

I write this with deliberation, with a full sense of the character of my language. If I make an unadvised and calumnious accusation, I should be criminally prosecuted, and I hold myself at the disposal of Sir H. Langevin to answer him as he may call upon me.

But when what I write is established as truth, what should be the verdict with regard to Sir H. Langevin ? That is best left to the people of the Dominion, to that great soul of the world which is so just.

In the month of April of last year I published the following letter in *The Globe*, which the Editor, notwithstanding its length, was good enough to print. It will be seen that I then explained that the length of the correspondence prevented its being appended—and that on a future occasion I would publish it. As I consider this period opportune for its production, I give it in its entirety. There are some additional letters, but they are unimportant, having only a bearing on the time when the payment to me should be made of the money given me by order in Council. The Auditor-General objected to any payment being made without a vote of the House of Commons of the sum in the Estimates, and the Department declined to take any steps to meet this objection. The money was eventually paid, and it seems to me that nothing further need be said on this point, for it is without present importance, and it is in no way connected with the main argument I have advanced. If it be held desirable that this branch of the correspondence be published, the papers can be obtained in the usual way. To my mind they have but secondary connection with the facts I am setting forth, and in no way need consideration with them.

THE HON. H. LANGEVIN, M.P., MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, AND
MR. KINGSFORD, C.E.

(*To the Editor of The Globe.*)

SIR,—The tone of the debate of the Committee of the House of Commons on the 15th March, when the vote to pay me six months' pay—\$1,650—as compensation for loss of employment as engineer in charge of harbour and river works, Quebec and Ontario, was submitted, leads me to ask your permission to set forth my views on the subject. For I do not admit the statement of Mr. Langevin, the Minister of Public Works, to be in accordance with fact.

The proper mode of establishing this view is to publish the correspondence and documents bearing upon the case. But they exact so much space that it is not possible to produce them in a newspaper. It is my intention to bring them out in pamphlet form, with the remarks necessary to make them intelligible. I am led to this course independ-