

Whereas all we should have paid was \$4,702, making an over-payment of \$5,600, or 119 per cent.

No. 19—The engineer's note is 'All common excavation.' We paid \$697 for the little work done there. Whereas, all we should have paid was \$311, making an over-payment of \$385, or 123 per cent.

No. 19a—The engineer's note is 'No rock; say 1,000 yards loose rock, rest common excavation.' Yet we paid for 5,790 yards of rock and 3,850 yards of loose rock. Or in all we paid \$11,735, whereas, on a proper classification, we should only have paid \$4,400, making an over-payment of \$7,295, or 164 per cent.

The importance of these items is this, that they show the hollowness of the arguments of the Grit press that the opposition members on the committee retired because there was no evidence of wrong-doing. What better evidence could they want? It seems to me that the evidence is very strong. It seems to me strong enough to satisfy the right hon. the Prime Minister that when he narrows the inquiry into a trial of Mr. Lumsden and diverts it from the true issue, as to whether that road is costing more than it should, he is not doing justice to the country.

Take No. 20—The engineer's note is 'Dug in places to test it; good ballast; whole cut common excavation, might be a few yards of rock in boulders.' Well, we paid for 4,730 yards of solid rock at \$1.70 and 9,672 yards loose rock at 60 cents, and 2,007 yards only of common excavation at 30 cents. We paid a total of \$14,686, whereas, we only should have paid \$5,054, making an over-payment of \$9,231, or 169 per cent. We over-paid \$9,231, or at the rate of 169 per cent.

No. 21—The engineer's note says 'This seems all common excavation, no rocks, but a per cent of loose rock, say 25 per cent for boulders, some of it good ballast.' It cost us \$84,771.34 according to the classification. The engineer says it should have cost us \$29,993.59. In that case there was an over-payment of \$54,777.76, or 182 per cent.

No. 21a—Mr. Lumsden says 'Little or no rock. Considerable loose rock, say one-third; rest common excavation.' We paid for this \$16,577.45; we should have paid \$5,844.25, an over-payment of \$10,733.20, or 183 per cent.

No. 22—The engineer says 'May have been a few yards rock, one-fifth loose rock, remainder common excavation.' We paid for that \$43,270.13; we should have paid \$15,129.06, an over-payment of \$28,141.07, an excess of 186 per cent.

No. 23—The engineer's note reads 'May have been a few yards, say 20, of rock, one-fifth loose rock, remainder common excavation.' The quantity of solid rock return-

ed was 20,267 yards, and of loose rock 18,409 yards. We paid \$43,269.65, when, according to the judgment of the engineer, we should have paid \$15,068.43, an over-payment of \$28,201.22, or 187 per cent.

No. 24—The engineer's note says 'May have been 10 yards rock, and say 1,000 yards of loose rock, the rest common excavation.' We over-paid, in that case, according to the government engineer's estimate, \$6,854.32, or 190 per cent.

No. 25—The engineer's note says 'Say 2 boulders, 5 yards rock, one-eighth loose rock, the remainder common excavation.' For these two boulders, we paid for 4,127 yards of solid rock and 4,210 yards of loose rock. The excess payment amounted to \$6,079.25, or 194 per cent.

No. 26—'Nothing but common excavation in sight,' says the engineer's note. We paid \$10,833.57 more than, according to the figures given by the engineer, we should have paid. That is, we made an excess payment of 245 per cent—three and a half times more than we should have paid.

No. 27—In this case, 'No rock in sight, say one-eighth loose rock, the remainder common excavation,' is the way the engineer's note reads. We paid \$23,990.27, when we should have paid \$6,826.45, an excess payment of \$17,162.82, or 251 per cent.

No. 28—The engineer's note says 'No rock in sight, one-eighth loose rock, remainder common excavation.' We paid \$5,863.45, when we should have paid \$1,611.95, an excess of \$4,241.50, or 263 per cent.

No. 29—The engineer's note 'No rock, only say 100 yards loose rock, the rest common excavation.' Yet, there were returned 2,142 yards of rock, and 1,395 of loose rock. We paid \$4,198, where we should have paid \$1,059.89. That is, we over-paid \$3,138.73, or 296 per cent—about four times what we should have paid.

No. 30—The engineer's note says 'Except 150 feet east end, all common excavation—say 600 yards loose rock at east end.' We paid \$7,711.93, when we should have paid \$1,735.35, an over-payment of \$5,976.58, or 344 per cent.

And yet, this pious editor of the 'Globe,' the gentleman who, when he is not praying or pretending to, is negotiating our treaties at Washington, or is slandering somebody, is very much concerned because he thinks that the members of the minority of the committee were so athirst for gore, that they were not satisfied with these disclosures. I have only touched the fringe of what Mr. Lumsden gave in the first two days of his investigation. What he has done since is easy to ascertain for anybody who will follow the investigation. He has given some answers to Mr. Chrysler which will do neither harm nor good. He has been in the hands of Mr. Smith for many days in an honest endeavour to show that the government had an engineer who was