

whatever. It looked to him as if it might be said that it was not a free subscription to the elections at Quebec which Sir George Cartier had promised him, and unless it was he would not take it at all; and, moreover, he would on his arrival at Quebec return the \$15,000 which Sir George Cartier had previously caused to be sent him. He appeared to me to be a little excited about the matter. I left him upon his expressing his determination not only to refuse that money but to send back the \$15,000 which was the sum first paid. I telegraphed Sir Hugh Allan, saying that Mr. Langevin did not feel disposed to give any receipt, and asking his authority to give Mr. Langevin the money without a receipt. I did not get an answer within two or three days, and knowing that the elections were going on, and that the money would probably be wanted, I took the responsibility of sending the money to Mr. Langevin by express, and wrote him at the same time telling him that I had done so.

The second sum, namely:—\$20,000, was paid to the Montreal Central Committee, I getting Sir Hugh Allan's authority to pay it, by telegraph. The third sum was \$10,000, respecting which Sir John Macdonald telegraphed me. That I also informed Sir Hugh of, and obtained by telegraph his authority to pay it. I think these were all the sums of money I had anything to do with. I kept these vouchers, these letters and telegrams, in my private drawer in my office until Sir Hugh Allan returned from Newfoundland, and then I gave them to him.

Question—Were they out of your possession at all?

Answer—Not that I know of.

Question—The \$20,000 was given upon this letter of Sir George Cartier's to you of August 24th?

Answer—Yes.

Question—You are familiar, of course, with the terms of it, namely: "On the same conditions as the amount written by me at the foot of the letter to Sir Hugh Allan of the 30th ultimo. Please send Sir John Macdonald \$10,000 more on the same terms." What did you understand by those expressions in Sir George's letter to you?

Answer—I understood him to refer to the letter of the 30th July, in which he informed Sir Hugh Allan that any advances he made would be recouped.

Question—There were two letters of that date, both drafted by you in the first instance, then portions of them rejected, and the whole modified by Sir George. Do you remember the terms of your draft of your letter?

Answer—No, I do not. My impression is that the third sheet of the longer letter was rejected because the conclusion did not please him, and my idea was that the objection was hypercritical, as it only referred to the phraseology.

Question—Not to the matter, but only to the form of expression?

Answer—Yes. You will perceive that the conclusion of the letter is a sort of statement that these being his views he would urge them upon his colleagues. The form in which the draft concluded was a little different from that, but not materially. He preferred his form, and he dictated it to me, and I wrote it as you see it.

Question—What was your draft relating to the money?

Answer—I think it was about the same length as the one produced, but I cannot say positively. I had great difficulty, I remember, in saying anything about the details, because I did not understand how it could be recouped, and did not believe that Sir George could raise such a sum of money, as he described, from his party.

Question—Were there in the draft any special terms or conditions upon which the money was to be advanced?

Answer—I think not.

Question—Do you think it corresponded in general meaning with the letter that is produced?

Answer—I think so. I think it made some mention of the money being repaid out of such money or fund as could properly be appropriated to the purpose. It was a perfectly harmless letter, and one perhaps less open to misconstruction than the one which has been produced.