

904. Then, with reference to questions 369, 370 and 371?—They have reference to the Order in Council which has been read. (See question 880.)

905. Turn now to question 412?—Mr. Fuller is asked if he knows of any reason why Mr. Fensom had to include \$8,000 in the amount of his tender to be paid to Mr. Charlebois. I want to say that I merely referred to access to the building. I considered Charlebois would have the right to charge for the use of his engines, derricks, tackle, scaffolding and other appliances which he might furnish to the contractor.

906. Turn now to question 419?—There was no need to guarantee right of way, as Charlebois, under his contract, had no power to prevent access.

907. Question 420 is put to show that he had to arrange with Charlebois?—That only applies to carrying on the work, and not to access.

908. With respect to question 432, were the conditions in the original contract with Charlebois the same as the usual specification?—I want to add to that some instances. In 1870 the finishing of the Parliamentary Library was by separate contracts under precisely the same conditions. The contract for the masonry, iron roof and putting on the roof were separate. The Western Block extension in 1875, the contract for the foundation was let to one person, the masonry and brickwork to another, the carpenter and joinerwork to another, and the iron joists and iron roof to another. The Hamilton Post Office, in 1882, is another instance. The contracts for the main building, heating and elevators were all separate. We had no trouble of any kind whatever. In 1883, the contract for the Montreal Drill Hall included separate contracts for the masonry and iron roof, and there was no trouble of any kind. These were all under the same conditions. In 1885, there were the Montreal armouries. The contracts for the masonry, iron girders and the iron roof were separate. The iron roof was put on by Rousseau & Mather under the same conditions precisely. The sub-contractors were always allowed access.

909. From which we learn, that although the contracts in the past, from 1870 to the present time, until you had this difficulty, have never had a provision in the contract to compel the contractor for the masonry work to permit access, there has been no trouble?—We always took it for granted that they had the right.

910. And that was subsequently decided by the Minister of Justice?—Yes.

911. Turn now to question 445?—The same answer as previously, with respect to the specification.

912. Then turn to questions 615, 616 and 617?—The same answer again.

913. Then with respect to 698, 699, 700 and 701, and also all questions to 710?—By their letter of the 11th of August, they withdrew their tender. They had from the 2nd of August to the 11th to make their arrangements for hoisting, but they said they had made no arrangement whatever.

914. Then look at questions 782 to 807?—Rousseau states that Sir Hector told him: "You have come in the right time, because I was going to give the contract to Charlebois." This must have been on the 12th of August, as the letter of withdrawal was dated the 11th, and Rousseau states he arrived in Ottawa at midnight on that date and waited on the Minister next morning. This remark could hardly have been made at that time, because the next tender was from the Hamilton Bridge Company and they had not then been asked if they were prepared to enter into the contract.

915. Then with respect to question 832?—I refer to my memorandum, where at page 10 I state that at an interview Messrs. Rousseau & Mather said there was a mistake of several thousand dollars in their tender, but of course they did not expect that to be allowed them.

916. Can you state the price paid for the iron—the rate per pound as compared with those used in other roofs of a similar character?—This was 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ cents per pound.

917. We have had this before, but it is not what I mean. Can you tell us the rate per pound as compared with other roofs? Was it dearer or cheaper—about the average, or what?—It was rather higher; but I do not know. I have no doubt Mr. Ewart can state that.