

Q. Are you of the opinion, considering the requirements of the Pacific Railway, that the point selected is the best?—That is a very broad question. (It is a very pertinent one.) I am not prepared to give a decided opinion at this moment. I think Fort William will answer for the terminus very well for many years to come. I think the day will come when there will be business done at Nepigon.

Q. Speaking of this result from the conference between yourself and others, are we to understand that there was no influence or pressure brought to bear upon you to select that terminus?—No undue pressure.

Q. When was it selected as the point for the terminus?—I think it was in the winter of 1874-5.

Q. In fixing upon that point, did you take into full consideration the cost of dredging at the mouth of the river and making the river navigable for such vessel as navigate Lake Superior?—According to the information we obtained from surveys of the river, inside the bar at the mouth, is quite navigable for vessels that navigate the lakes. There is a bar at the mouth which, it is reported, would not be difficult to remove, and which has been partially removed since the terminus was adopted.

Q. You took into consideration the removal of the bar and the keeping of the channel open?—Yes; that was considered.

Q. Is not the river very narrow at the terminus; too narrow to allow lake vessels to turn?—The river is narrow, but it can be widened. There is a branch or inlet immediately opposite the terminus, which could be increased in size, for turning vessels or for any other purpose. If you will allow me, I will show you a plan of the river, made in 1873 before the terminus was fixed upon, and also a plan of the town plot of Fort William. (Plan produced, with the land purchased for railway purposes marked in red.)

Q. What is the width of the river opposite the terminus?—It is in the neighbourhood of four hundred feet, judging by the eye.

Q. What is the depth of water?—It ranges from twelve to twenty feet. It is, according to the soundings on the plan, thirty feet, immediately opposite the town plot of Fort William. It is thirty feet in the middle and sufficiently deep at the edge to allow vessels to come alongside. The river is very deep in some places. I think it is shallower near the mouth than further up.

Q. Have you made any plans for the widening of the river?—We have not. There is one place spoken of for a turning basin.

Q. A year ago did not one of the Beatty line of steamers with three hundred tons of rails run up there?—I did not see it, but I know we have landed a quantity of rails there by lake vessels. I fancy that any vessels that would pass through the locks—even the large locks at Sault Ste. Marie—would turn in this river. I speak of the existing lock, not the new one that is in course of building.

Q. What is the length of that lock?—I do not know.

Q. Did you make any estimate of the cost of removing the bar at the mouth of the river?—I did not.

Q. When Fort William was fixed upon as the terminus, did you expect the ground would cost any considerable sum? You saw what it is said to have cost—over \$51,000—did it strike you as being an extravagant price?—I was very much surprised to see it.

Q. Do you consider Kaminstiquia possesses decided advantages over Prince Arthur's Landing for the terminus?—I never favoured Prince Arthur's Landing for the terminus, I was more in favour of Nepigon. I think Kaminstiquia is much better than Prince Arthur's Landing, because it is perfectly smooth water, sheltered in every way. Prince Arthur's Landing is on the edge of a large sheet of water, and there must be some little sea there at times.

Q. Do you know if there is anything more than a little sea?—I know very well that the width of Thunder Bay is very much greater than that of Toronto Harbour, and I know that vessels will be disturbed during a heavy wind at the wharfs in Toronto Harbour.

Q. What would be the width of Thunder Bay at Prince Arthur's Landing?—It