Honorable H. From this deduct amount of previous payments, the H. Killally. prices of which were objected to, and received by the Con17th May, 1862 tractors as but progress rates.

\$77,836 49

Increase by revised prices and measurements

\$106,581 00

This increase of \$106,581.00 represents the additional amount allowed to the Contractors by applying the system of measuring beds and joints to limestone ashlar. This is a very general principle of measurement elsewhere, but I am bound to say it is not the custom here. I had no hesitation in allowing it upon the wrought gothic mouldings in Ohio stone. Very little work has been done in the Province in the style of these buildings. The architects were of opinion, (in which I entirely agreed) that the mode of measurement in England, where so much of the same kind of work had been done, should be applied here, and it has been. The Contractors claimed that the same rule should apply to the limestone ashlar, this I objected to. Subsequently, finding that the settlement with the contractors must be a compromise, and their claims for compensation for stoppage of works, &c., must be taken into account, I found that by agreeing to apply the same principle of measurement to the lime stone ashlar, I would be enabled to come to a final settlement very favorable to the Province, and one tending materially to a speedy completion of the buildings.

- 34. Was any of the rock excavation used in building the walls and to what extent?—There was; see my reply to Mr. Ross's 14th question, but to what extent I did not consider it necessary to enquire, as the Contractors were entitled to it by the Contract.
- 35. Was any of the earth excavation used in filling, and to what extent?—In the Departmental Buildings the filling came from spoil bank; the excavation was first wheeled or carted out, subsequently rehandled and wheeled to filling. In the Parliament Buildings (see my report, page 373) it is stated, that "Filling to walls most of which had "to be brought from the city, and afterwards wheeled a considerable distance through apertures in the walls, and rammed down hard, "ought to be paid for at 80 cents a yard."
- 36. Are you aware whether any of the excavation was done by sub-contractors, and the rates at which they were paid for it?—I made no enquiry in this matter. By the Contract, sub-letting was forbidden; but, in any case, the prices paid a sub-contractor would not governme in estimating the value of work; every one knows that Sub-Contractors will take work at any price, and that in most such cases it ends in their pocketing the money and making away, leaving the laborer unpaid.
- 37. Did you take any steps to ascertain what has been the cost of any part of the work to the Contractors?—Most carefully. See my answer to Mr. Ross's question, No. 14, and my reports.
 - 38. In your estimate of 1242 cubic yards of block stone in boiler house