

Sir Hector and that hee would not inger us on the contrary would help us all he could I told him if that was the case ther would bee now truble. But wee would succeed. Sow you want two prepair the folkes ther for thees thknages wee want them all we want the courses of stone increased in sise & allowed for sade increase, If now more at last the scedule of rait, if corse wee can get a long with the sandstone and build verey well with it but there is maney cole vainis in it and hard laired of iron that is verey bad and it scales off with the wether and the other kind that is heer is hard and full of iron and discolors verey much this is the kind the mintt is built of in Sanfrancisco But if wee have to use sandstone wee will get it about 40 miles from heer and softer than what the used for the mint the quarry that the got the stone for the mint out."

On 12th of January, 1885, Michael Connolly writes Murphy. (P. 189.):

"If you have a chance, see Mr. McGreevy and have him arrange to have the second entrance at head done away with, and a circular head, same as at Point Lévis, substituted."

On the 16th of January, 1885, Michael Connolly again writes. (P. 205):

"The people here are also very anxious to have granite substituted for sandstone in the lock, and I think Mr. Trutch will also bring this matter to the attention of the Hon. Minister of Public Works. If there is a change made we cannot afford to make the substitution for less than \$75,000, in addition to the present sum, and if it was a hundred thousand it would be all the better, and we can then afford to devote more to charitable purposes."

Shortly afterwards they changed their mind, and on the 8th of February we find Michael Connolly writing Murphy as follows. (P. 191):

"Nick at first was very anxious to have the stone changed to granite, but I hope no such change shall be made, for the granite here is terribly hard and the quarry about 180 miles distant. If possible get them to extend the Dock 150 feet and do away with the double entrance, but put in a circular head, the same as at Lévis, and let sandstone go in as it is. Be sure and do what you can in this matter. Dispensing with the double entrance head is very important, as it is very difficult work."

On the 21st of February, 1885, Perley reported to the Minister strongly supporting this proposed change from sandstone to granite, and stating that the extra cost would be about \$45,000.

Murphy says (page 176) he got letters from his partners urging to have the sandstone retained, and if they got the larger courses of stone and beds they would make up the loss, and that Robert McGreevy started immediately for Ottawa, and had the granite cancelled.

Larkin says (page 812) that Nicholas Connolly wired him from British Columbia to see that the changes to granite were not made, and he took some part in the negotiations.

Before Perley's recommendation was acted upon the news that the contractors had changed their minds reached their partners in Quebec.

Robert and Thomas McGreevy came to Ottawa and were successful in stopping the change.

How this came about is shown by the following letter, which was put in evidence (P. 190) as (Exhibit "L7"):

"(Private.)

"OTTAWA, 24th February.

"DEAR MURPHY,—The 2nd entrance has been done away with, and circular head substituted at an increase of \$35,000. The granit substitution was just about being sent to Council, but happily my letter came in time to put it back to sandstone, where it is now; high courses and beds will be put—the additional length will be hereafter settled. I think this is what you want, but it was a close shave. The \$1 foot was to be given.

"I remain, yours, &c.,

"ROBERT H. MCGREEVY."