

1674. Do you know whether Mr. Brydges did this with the approval of the Government of the day?—I cannot tell.

Mr. Schreiber is employed to finish up sections taken out of the hands of the contractor. He was first sent over the line last fall, but I do not know what his instructions were. At the present moment I understand he is engaged in finishing up the section which the contractors have failed to do.

1675. Does he take his instructions from you?—He has not as yet.

1676. You have given Mr. Schreiber no instructions yet?—None.

1677. You stated, I think, if any works had been returned by Mr. Buck or any other engineer that had not actually been done, that that was wrong. Mr. Buck, for instance, returned 311 yards of masonry, where other work was substituted?—I think it was a mistake doing so. Mr. Light informed me of the fact. Mr. Buck ought to have returned substituted work as ditching, and not returned it as masonry; and Mr. Light seems to concur in that view.

1678. Suppose Mr. Fitzgerald returned masonry as done that was not done. Would you consider that would be right?—I should say it would be wrong.

By Mr. Mitchell:—

1679. Will you state what staff is under the Assistant Engineer in this section?—Generally an assistant and a rodman. In some cases where the work required it, there would be two assistants and two rodmen.

1680. Are there any axemen allowed in this case?—An axeman is generally allowed in each case to the engineer and to the assistant.

1681. Do you know an axeman by the name of Samuel Roy?—I do not. I do not know the names of any of the axemen.

1682. Suppose there had been from four to eight axemen returned upon that section after the work of construction had been commenced, would you consider it excessive?—I would consider it very excessive.

1683. Suppose we should prove Mr. Fitzgerald returned four or five axemen—without a single one appearing on the work—and took the pay himself, what would you say to that?—I should think that would be very dishonest.

1684. If Mr. Fitzgerald returned one axeman, and drew the pay for him, and he did not appear on the work, would you consider that wrong?—Certainly.

The Sub-Committee then adjourned.

COMMITTEE ROOM,
WEDNESDAY, 20th May, 1874.

Sub-Committee met.

Messrs. Gough, Fitzgerald, Light, Garden, Buck, Hazlewood, Fleming, and McLellan were in attendance.

Mr. Gough further examined

By Mr. Mitchell:—

1685. Portion of these reports and letters of Mr. Fitzgerald have been flatly contradicted by Messrs. Light, Fleming, Hazlewood, Garden and Buck. Can you point out any other inaccuracies?—In the first place I find from the printed report of Mr. Fitzgerald's evidence that he states that he found the quantities of rock returned as excavated where no rock existed. This is incorrect, because in the places to which he refers rock was really excavated, although of a loose nature. Also, that rough stone was returned as dressed; this is a positive mis-statement. Also a general expression of opinion that the quantity of earth returned in June, 1872, was in excess of actual work done; this is another positive mis-statement, especially as Mr. Fitzgerald never measured a yard of the work. Mr. Fitzgerald also stated in his letter to Mr. Light, 21st October, 1872, that the work was not well together, and he doubted if a finished half-mile could be picked out on its length; this is another positive mis-statement, as I can show to the Committee on the