

Q. What is the estimate cost according to the contract?—\$2,267,942.56.

Q. What is the estimated cost supposing earth is substituted for trestle-work?—\$2,517,417.84, showing that the excess of cost if earth is put in instead of trestle-work, would be \$249,475.28. I thought it was but right I should make a short statement in connection with that, and which I have written as a note at the bottom of this schedule.

(*Vide* "Note" at end of foregoing schedule.)

Q. I should like to know to what extent the change you have made there has increased the quantities of work?—None at all, so far as I know. Of course loose rock is an uncertain quantity, but the solid rock remains unchanged whether you put in trestle-work or whether you put in earth-work. It is the earth-work that will be changed, if you abandon the trestle-work, and I can answer you here right off, what the change in that respect would be. Under the contract, the quantity of earth would be over 24,138 yards, and if trestle-work is abandoned all through the contract, and changed from the original plan, the quantity of earth would be 1,657,420 yards. The difference in money would be from \$84,931.06 to \$613,245.

Q. So that if there had been no change made in the mode of construction, the earth would have increased over the estimated quantity of 80,000 yards to 224,138 yards?—Yes.

Q. That is adhering to the trestle-work system?—Yes.

Q. But if the solid bank mode should be adopted, it would be increased to 1,657,420 yards?—Yes.

Q. Can you give us the same statement with respect to rock excavation. The quantity in the original schedule was 300,000 yards?—Yes.

Q. If there had been no change in the mode of carrying on the work, what would have been the quantity of rock as now estimated?—The quantity would have been 525,646 yards of solid rock if there had been no change. And if solid embankments should be adopted, the quantity will be just the same. Whether the banks are made of trestle-work or solid earth, it makes no difference in the quantity of rock.

Q. How is loose rock?—The loose rock is not changed either. Nothing was known as to the quantity until we came on it. It is estimated at 30,000 yards.

Q. It is estimated in the revised estimate at 46,000 yards. Can you explain that?—It is because we have got an increased quantity.

Q. Is the item 46,000 yards in the revised estimate correct?—No, there will be more. It will be largely in excess of that, and it is due to other causes.

Q. When was it first expected that there would be a change made in the character of the construction of the work?—I think the first time it was expected was when I explained to Mr. Smith what my views were on the subject, and endeavored to lay before him the general advantage that there would be in the substitution of rock sides instead of building rock bases, when he was in Winnipeg in October, 1877.

Q. At the same time it was proposed to carry these solid embankments across the dry voids?—That was subsequent to Mr. Smith's approval of making the banks across the water voids. The embankments across the water-voids were approved of first of all, and then the proposition was made by the contractor to do away with trestle-work everywhere, and that if we would follow that plan of construction he would furnish the material, no matter how far he had to haul it, free of extra cost. He was asked to submit that in writing, which he did.

By the Honorable Mr. Cornwall:—

Q. That proposition was made in Mr. Smith's presence?—Yes; it was made to him in my presence in Manitoba.

By the Honorable Mr. Macpherson:—

Q. Was it generally expected that the change would be made?—Yes. I have no hesitation in saying I was in great hopes that the change would be made.