

feet be sufficient?—The depth and width you refer to is only a freshet, being perhaps for a day or two, and in a country like this, whatever freshet there might be in a sort of meadow-land, it would spread, not rise to any great height, but it would still have to go through. There would be still a certain current; the cross-section would be 20 feet or less, and the freshet would measure $23\frac{1}{4}$ feet.

1324. Would that be sufficient?—I think this was sufficient for the time.

By Mr. Metcalfe:—

1325. What was the amount of this contract?—As well as I can remember, \$206,000.

1326. I see by one statement that the reductions of the work in this contract amount to \$80,000; another statement makes it about \$90,000. Has it been usual on other contracts to reduce the work in proportion to the contract in the same ratio?—I cannot say.

1327. Is it usual to make immense reductions and then pay for them?—It all depends upon the general acceptance of the contract.

1328. Did you ever know a case where one-half of the work was reduced, and the whole paid for, as in this case?—I do not know. It is a matter that rests in the hands of the chief authorities.

1329. But you never knew a case where such immense reductions were made, and the contractors paid for the whole?—I never knew of any as yet.

1330. Then if there is any reduction made, there is a reduction from the price, and if there is an increase of work, the contractors are paid for it?—I think not. In the old country, contractors, after they take their contract, have their own contract engineer, and he is supposed to have the power to make these reductions.

1331. You never knew a case where such large reductions were made where they were paid for?—In lump sum contracts they are generally paid for.

1332. But in such large reductions?—Any reductions that were made, whether large or not, were always paid for.

1333. Do you know of any reductions made by Mr. Bain before he gave up his contract?—There were no reductions made by him at the time.

1334. Do you know of any bridges which he was engaged in constructing?—I do not.

By Mr. Mitchell:—

1335. You were asked a question about the reductions made in throwing out the culverts, whether that was to the advantage of the contractor? I understand you to say you considered the reductions made to the advantage of the contractor, and made compensation for the whole work?—Yes.

1336. But not full compensation; the changes you made on the road were not all to the advantage of the contractor?—These changes did not take place in my time.

1337. You recommended these ditches, which were extra work?—They were extra work, and required extra cost. There were water contingencies to contend with.

1338. And they required extra outlay to construct them?—Certainly.

1339. You have been asked by Mr. Mills if you knew Mr. Nicholson, and your answer was?—That he was a roadman.

1340. What other officers were there on the road?—Two rodmen and one assistant engineer.

1341. How many axemen?—Axemen were only required occasionally.

1342. How many axemen would be required for a staff on such a section as that?—From two to four.

1343. Is it customary for these axemen to be constantly employed?—No, I think not.

1344. What are their duties?—Attending on the Assistant Engineer.

1345. Are there any allotted to the divisional engineer?—Yes.

1346. How many?—I do not know; just as he requires them.

1347. Are they required anywhere else than on the work?—No, I should say not.

1348. Have you any allotted to you?—I have.

1349. How many?—Two.