

missal was causeless, and dictated only by the emergencies of Sir H. Langevin to provide for others by removing myself and my staff: a feeling sustained by enmities of wounded vanity and personal feeling in other quarters, so that this wrong could be perpetrated. But this private view is lost in the public injury to good government. It needs to be but looked upon abstractedly to show the course was unjustifiable. Here on a frivolous pretext of a new organization, a permanent officer, with eight years' service, is removed from his duties, and another person is named to perform them. That I held that position is conceded. Sir H. Langevin made the admission to this effect in the House of Commons, and the payment of the money is accounted for by the fact, not by good feeling to myself. The position I held was known in the Department. The neglect of Mr. Baillairgé to produce the papers is personally discreditable to him. He was my contemporary in the old Department, and could not but know my *status*. He never had any love for me, or any of my staff. I always fancied he thought that I was in his way. If he had desired to act with straightforwardness and justice, he could have crossed the hall and asked the Deputy-Minister of the old Department what was the nature of my engagement. Or the inquiry could have been made directly of myself, how I established my claim. It is hard for me to think these papers were unknown. Long after I gave the references for their production, my case remained unnoticed and unconsidered. It will be seen that at no time I gave no new facts to sustain my cause. My argument was in November what it was in March. There was no special proof to be obtained, no inquiry called for. But whatever the stage, and whatever the date, there was the same dogged refusal to consider the evidence at the disposal of the Department, and the same determination to refuse me justice and right.

No one at all cognizant of the working of the Department can recognise any other conclusion than that the statement of Sir H. Langevin 'that the special work for which he [Mr. Kingsford] was employed was no longer required under the new arrangement of the Department' is at variance with truth. In what does Mr. Perley's present work differ from mine? In no respect. Take one marked example, Captain Eads, who has been bought in to examine Toronto Harbour. Whose survey and reports were put before him? Mine. The work throughout my old district, where it was surveyed and examined, and designs made, has been carried on according to these designs. In my letter I enter into the number of Engineers employed in 1880. Independently of Mr. Perley, few of them did any work of any public utility, and I allude to the childish comparison of Sir. H. Langevin of the average cost of a survey. The old work has been carried on as I traced it. I except Owen Sound Harbour work, which I could not way have recommended. But I know no instance