

*Ques. 447.* You have spoken of the alignment of the Railway between Montreal and Toronto, and of the importance of connecting it with the water at every practicable point. Are you not aware that it was the opinion of the Hon. John Young and many others in Montreal, that the water should be avoided entirely between Toronto and Montreal?—*Ans.* I never had any conversation with the Hon. John Young, nor am I aware what his opinion was, or that of any other parties were on the subject

*Ques. 448.* Was not the trial line, as run before the contract was taken by Peto and Company, the inland line?—*Ans.* I cannot say.

*Ques. 449.* When the Grand Trunk Charter was introduced to Parliament in 1852, was there any restriction to prevent the line being carried inland, and was not the restriction of the line to pass through the several places in the charter, an amendment introduced into the Bill before it was finally passed, and upon the proposal of the members living along the front of the St. Lawrence, who were supporting the Bill?—*Ans.* When the Grand Trunk Charter was introduced in the Parliament of 1852, I remember there were strong opposing opinions expressed regarding the line, whether it should run inland or communicate with the River, and Lake Towns; the advocates for the latter in the end prevailed.

*Ques. 450.* Be good enough to read over the contract for the Montreal and Toronto section, and say whether you find anything in the contract about going to the water, and building wharves at Toronto, Montreal, or any other intermediate point or place on the line?—*Ans.* I do not find any provision for going to the water in the contract, or that the contractors should build wharves, but the contract does say they shall make and equip a Railway from the City of Toronto through the Towns of Port Hope, Cobourg and Belleville, and to the City of Kingston, thence through the Towns of Brockville and Prescott to a point in the Eastern boundary of the line of the Township of Osnabruck, and then as near a direct line as practicable to St. Raphaels, &c. No part of the previous evidence given by me conveys a meaning that I considered the contractors were bound to build wharves; what I stated was that they were bound in my opinion to run the line into or through the towns named, so as to secure to the Company the advantage of communicating with the water at the points named.

*Ques. 451.* Would not such a provision, if added to the contract, have necessarily increased largely the mileage cost of the Railway, beyond the sum fixed by the contract?—*Ans.* Of course, had the road run into the Towns named, the cost to the contractors would have greatly exceeded that which they have incurred by carrying the line back of the roads; nevertheless, I consider they were bound to do so, and moreover I consider it was, under the terms of the contract, the course which they ought to have been compelled to adopt.

*Ques. 452.* Do you remember a conversation had between you, Mr. Crawford, and myself, in 1854, respecting the details upon which the Engineer's certificates were based, and that Mr. Crawford, when the Board met, asked Mr. A. M. Ross to lay the details before the Board at its next meeting?—*Ans.* I do not remember.

*Ques. 453.* Did not Mr. A. M. Ross comply with the request of the Board, and submit at its next meeting full statements, and details connected with his estimates and certificates thereon over every section?—*Ans.* It may have been so but I have no recollection of it.

*Ques. 454.* Did not Mr. Ross then state to the Board, that his office was open