r sinking assertion into how done this the Comwrought. e, the one r was not level, and vere taken hat the 25 ed from a und which gine shaft. e mouth of ney would and might The only g a certain shaft, and horizontal underlie of assertion art for the und as une is to be ects, with

ter do not s, and the re to rise, ed, I dont I believe, the water both Mr. duct it in launders or troughs along the sides at a sufficient height from the bottom, to prevent injury, and which is the only course by which it can be conveyed across any shafts that may be sunk, and which it must otherwise fill before reaching the pumping shaft. Besides, how is the bottom of the level to be stoped out if it is to be used as a water course ?

There is only one more statement in this part of your Report which I need notice. It is that, having endeavoured to ascertain the number of fathoms of ground actually cut and the number paid for, and having entirely failed in procuring anything like a positive result, you "have reason to be-" lieve, however, that the Company have paid for much "more than has been cut." I cannot suppose that you could make such a statement as this, which, if true, amounts to a charge very like embezzlement, and if untrue, to a gross calumny upon all who have held the office of Captain of the Bruce Mines during the past five years, unless you had some substantial and convincing proof of these alleged over-payments; and having this, I am surprised that you did not state the grounds upon which you appear to have formed so decided an opinion. Were any of those implicated by the statement still in Canada, I should leave to them to refute what I believe to be an unjust aspersion on their character; but such not being the case, I feel obliged to state my belief that the Company have not "paid for much more (ground) " than has been cut," excepting so far r3 is unavoidable in measuring, and when the benefit of fractions is generally, as a rule, given to the men. This, however, applies only to stopes and not to shafts or levels. But perhaps I am unnecessarily defending the absent; indeed I almost think the accusation itself is the strongest reason that can be adduced for a verdict of not guilty. You state that you had endeavoured to ascertain whether the number of fathoms cut agreed with the number paid for, and you distinctly admit that you had most signally failed in " procuring anything like a positive result." In order to have ar-