

will be at variance with custom. No antecedent inquiry has been made as to its expediency. No difficulty requiring ability and experience higher than mine has presented itself. Certainly, if such were the case, neither would be found in the person to whom this transfer over my head has been suggested. The proceeding would be unjust to myself. No one can conceive that the change has taken place causelessly. The inference will be that it has been called for by my misconduct, my mismanagement, or my inability.

I have seven years' service in the Department. I hold respectfully they should give weight to my representations. Of the character of this service I venture to appeal to yourself. I leave its epitaph in your hands, and I have to ask, as the course most expedient to the Department, and as an act of justice to myself, that the contemplated change be not made.

Believe me,

Sincerely yours,

T. TRUDEAU, Esq.,
Deputy Minister.

WILLIAM KINGSFORD,
Engineer-in-Charge.

As was natural in such circumstances I addressed myself to friends with political influence, and asked their intervention. It is a matter of some delicacy in any way to allude to what happened, and little can be said about it. So far, however, I think it may with propriety be stated that my friends behaved with great kindness to me. They intervened powerfully in my favour. At this period it became publicly known that the Department of Public Works was to be divided into the present divisions of Railways and Canals and Public Works; the latter to consist of the Architect's Department, Harbours, and Slides or River Works: that is to say it would embrace the work of the then Chief Architect, Mr. Scott, that of Mr. Perley, the Engineer in charge of harbours, Maritime Provinces, and my work, which included the harbours in Quebec and Ontario. The river works exact but little *surveillance*.

The division was carried out on this principle: a fact of importance when considered with Sir H. Langevin's statement in the House of Commons that the special work for which he [Mr. Kingsford] was employed was no longer required under the new arrangement of the Department. Mr. Mackenzie correctly stated the case: "Here is a gentleman dismissed who confessedly is an able engineer, dismissed unceremoniously, and for a reason that is not an honest reason. . . . The hon. gentleman goes through the farce of changing the arrangements in his office, and so in his small way legislates Mr. Kingsford out of his position and employs other engineers after that, who have been employed to this day. This is the sort of usage that is meted out to men who have rendered good service to their country. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman is not ashamed of the treatment he has meted out to that gentleman, and to several others in the department."