

was it not your duty to report it to the Engineer-in-Chief?—It was reported in every monthly estimate.

Q. But there was no special attention called to it?—No.

Q. Was it not your duty to call attention to it?—Yes, if I thought the contractor did not intend to carry out his contract.

Q. I ask you whether your faith was in the change being made, or in the contractor? Did you believe the change would be made?—I thought so. I thought it was to the advantage of the work to do so.

Q. Had you any other reason besides your own opinion as to the advantage of the change?—No.

By the Honorable Mr. Haythorne :—

Q. Did you know that the proposal had been made by the contractors?—Mr. Rowan's letter informed me of that fact; that is all.

Q. That was in 1877?—Yes.

By the Honorable Mr. McLelan :—

Q. Mr. Smith made the statement that one of the reasons that led him to suppose that the change was being made was, that no preparation was made for trestle-work. Would an engineer going along the work consider that a reason that the change was being made?—The trestle-work cannot be put up until the dumps are finished. You cannot put up a rough trestle and dump rock against it without knocking it down, and it would put the contractor to great expense. For instance, if you put up a 30 ft. bent and dump large rocks against it, it will knock it down like bowling-pins. Where we have to fill up with rock around these culverts, the rock has to be hand laid around the bents to keep them from being knocked down. It would be a great expense to the contractors to put the bents up first and lay the rock between them.

By the Honorable Mr. Macpherson :—

Q. Has not timber-work been made with a view to carrying out the changed plan?—Yes, at Cross Lake.

Q. That is, at the water crossings only?—Yes; that is the further west.

Q. Is it with a view to water crossings or as to the fills beyond?—It is the water crossings they intend to run the trains over after the bank is partially filled.

By the Honorable Mr. McLelan :—

Q. How far is the track laid on the two sections?—The track is laid by this time I think, over Cross Lake, that is ten chains on Section 15. They are using the track now to run their material over for two miles on Contract 15.

Mr. ROWAN recalled :—

By the Honorable Mr. Macpherson :—

Q. What is the cause of the increase of rock and earth-work on that section over the original estimate?—It is owing to incomplete data. When the quantities were computed, we had only a trial line run over the ground and no cross-sections. The calculations were made from centre heights only.

Q. What was the length of the section?— $36\frac{1}{2}$ miles now. It was longer at first. Permit me to say a word with reference to the statement I have heard now, for the first time, as to what Mr. Smith approved, and what he did not approve. My idea of what he did approve is conveyed in the letters I wrote to Mr. Carre immediately on his departure from Winnipeg, and I recapitulated it to himself in March. He now says that he just glanced at that letter and put it on one side. I was not aware that he had treated my letter in that way, but Mr. Smith explains the reason,—that he was so busy he could not attend to it, and put it aside. I stated at the time that the data were incomplete, but did not feel warranted in withholding Mr. Whitehead's offer any longer. Therefore I put it forward with such explanations as I could then give; but in the beginning of April I received a detailed estimate from Mr.