5．The Chief Engineer is not，by the contract，made an arbitrator between the parties，so as to bind either of them by his conclusion on the value of contract work， or extra work，or the state of the accounts．

6．The contractor cannot，as a matter of right，recover from the Crown interest on money over due to him．

We have made a special report on each claim which we have investigated，in all fifty－four，and we set out in Schedule $C$ a list of those claims，and（without interest）the respective amounts demanded，in all $\$ 4,146,207.06$ ，and the amounts，if any，allowed，in all \＄148，705．62．

GEO．M．CLARK， FRED．BROUGHTON． D．E．BOULTON．

Hon．J．a．Ceipleat，Secretary of State．<br>Ottawa，26th March， 1884.

## SCHEDULE A．

Showing for each section（1．）The bulk price diminished or undiminished as the case was，by changes of grade or location，and omission of bridge superstructure． （2．）The work expected to be done for it．（3．）The work actually done for it．And （4．）The net dimination in favor of the contractor．

|  | Name of Contractor． |  |  | Work actually done for it exclusive of Extras． | Diminutions． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \＄ | \＄ | \＄ | \＄ |
| 3 | Berlinquet \＆Co．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 451，340 | 434，433 | 266，892 | 167，541 |
| 4 | Smith \＆Pitblado ．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 435，125 | 406，511 | 389，924 | 16，587 |
| 6 | Alex．McDonell \＆Co．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 513，400 | 499，741 | 455，226 | 44，515 |
| 6 | Berlinquet \＆Co．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 412，946 | 429，506 | 295，820 | 133，686 |
| 7 | E．A．Jones \＆Uo ．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 549，450 | 525，041 | 488，921 | 36，120 |
| 8 | Duncan Macdonald．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 98，709 | 111，064 | 100，652 | 10，412 |
| 9 | Bertrand \＆Co ．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 341，480 | 339，394 | 234，044 | 105，350 |
| 10 | Duncan Macdonald ．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 393，237 | 514，702 | 497，293 | 17，409 |
| 11 | Grant，Davis \＆Sutherland．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 61，713 | 72，013 | 65，055 | 6，958 |
| 12 | Sumner \＆Somers．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 560，100 | 689，5？4 | 651,224 | 38，300 |
| 13 | W．E．McDonald \＆Co．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 919，653 | 894，558 | 751，810 | 142，748 |
| 14 | Neilson \＆McGaw ．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 237，075 | 235，683 | 186，798 | 48，885 |
| 15 | Bertrand \＆Co．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 317，440 | 299，279 | 147，401 | 151，878 |
| 17 | S．P．Tuck．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 416，400 | 470，179 | 370，541 | 99，638 |
| 18 | R．H．McGreevy ．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 588，374 | 622，521 | 524，083 | 98，438 |
| 23 | Grant \＆Sutherland．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． | 276，750 | 275，686 | 193，454 | 82，232 |
|  |  | 6，573，193＊ | 6，819，835 | 5，619，138 | 1，200，697 |

[^0]
[^0]:    ＊In addition to this specified work，some not specified was，in almost every case，expected to be done，and was covered only by the item Omissions and Contingencies－for this the respective contrac－ tors named in their tender schedules sums or percentages，which in the aggregate amount to $\$ 277,422$ ． We take no notice of this undefined work on either side of the account，which in our judgment has the effect of making the comparison more favourable to the executed work than it should strictly be．

