

The retaining walls of the canal have been removed entirely and abutments built there at greater depth.

Q. Has the abutment been built at all into the canal?—A. No, no, no; flush with the side of the canal.

Q. These excavations were just completing the remaining side, as it were, of the retaining wall?—A. Yes.

Q. What is the size of these abutments?—A. I will have to measure it again. The figures show them to be 68 feet wide. Then the fifth item is "stone filling in piers."

Q. You did not tell me about the 75 cents per cubic yard you allowed for excavation. Is that a fair price?—A. On 9,720 yards I consider it a fair price. Now, the stone filling in piers is the next item—the fifth item. This is stone filling in the extreme western pier and the extreme eastern pier, 3,700 cubic yards at \$2 per cubic yard, \$7,400. Then the sixth item is the masonry, and that is the most important item, the details of which are: centre pier of the Wellington bridge, 1,560 cubic yards; south abutment of the Wellington bridge, 804 cubic yards, and the north abutment, 807 cubic yards; two ballast walls, 200 cubic yards, making the masonry on the Wellington bridge 3,371 cubic yards. On the Grand Trunk Railway bridge we have the north abutment—

Q. What are the two ballast walls?—A. Two small walls to keep the earth back from falling in. The north abutment of the Grand Trunk Railway bridge is 415 cubic yards, and the south abutment of the Grand Trunk bridge is 441 cubic yards; two ballast walls 91 cubic yards and two new cross walls or new courses in the pivot pier 52 cubic yards, making a total for the Grand Trunk bridge of 999 cubic yards.

Q. As against 3,371 cubic yards for the Wellington street bridge?—A. Yes, making a total of 4,370 cubic yards for both bridges, which we placed at \$17 per cubic yard, making \$74,290.

By Mr. Haggart:

Q. What depth did you calculate this?

Mr. DAVIES—He takes the figures of the commissioners.

By Mr. Haggart:

Q. What depth did you calculate it?—A. 26 feet.

By Mr. Davies:

Q. You have not said anything about the price you have allowed, whether it is large?—A. We allowed \$17 which we consider a very large price indeed, seeing that bridges have been built on that canal, and even in the commissioners' report, for \$13 per cubic yard and for \$14 per cubic yard. We allowed \$17 per cubic yard so that there could be no cause for complaint.

By Mr. Gibson:

Q. What class of masonry was the centre pier built of?—A. It was boucharded on the outside guards. As far as the inside guards are concerned, we could not ascertain that as we were not there during the construction of the work.

Q. Do I understand you to say that the centre pier is boucharded or rock-faced?—A. Boucharded.

Q. The whole of the pier?—A. I think so, as far as I could see. When I examined it the water was in the canal.

Q. How does the work upon the outside of the abutments compare with the walls of the old canal itself as to the point of finish in the cutting?—A. The new masonry seems to have been very well done. It seems to be first class.

Q. Just as well done as the other?—A. Yes, I think so.

By Mr. Davies:

Q. I want you to explain. The minister asked you the depth you went down. Will you explain about the location of each of these abutments, the north and south