

**Transportation
of Rails—
Fort William
to Emerson.**

14089. This correspondence appears to have taken place between the Department and Mr. Henry Beatty on his own account, and not on account of any company: is that right?—It is signed Henry Beatty, simply.

Does not know why contract is described as part of contract 34.

14090. Do you know why it is described as part of contract No. 34, which was with the North-West Transportation Co.—I mean in the printed report of 1879?—I do not.

Contract made by authority of Minister.

14091. Can you say by what authority the agreement was finally made?—By the authority of the Minister.

14092. Do you know how the acceptance of the offer was communicated; in the two papers which you have read there is no evidence of that?—I see that the Department has written a letter to Mr. Beatty which I have not got. I shall produce it.

14093. In contract 34 where the price is the same from Kingston to St. Boniface as that given in this agreement from Fort William to Emerson, was a similar labour performed in respect to the freight as in this case: I mean such things as loading, unloading, piling, and other items of that kind?—Yes.

\$27,864 paid Beatty.

14094. What was the total amount paid to Mr. Beatty for this work, in round numbers?—About \$27,864.

14095. Was there anything further in connection with this agreement with Mr. Beatty which you think requires explanation?—No.

14096. What is the next contract which we have not investigated, or can you go back to any of those which have been omitted?—Yes; I can go back.

Contract No. 18.

14097. Can you take up the Red River Transportation Co.'s contract, No. 18?—Yes.

14098. That was transportation for which, as I understand, the Department had two offers, one from Fuller & Milne and the other from N. W. Kittson: can you say what quantities were actually carried by the contractors—the Red River Transportation Co.?—I produce a statement prepared by the engineers. (Exhibit No. 164.)

14099. This statement has been prepared for your information since you gave evidence on this subject?—Yes.

14100. I suppose the correctness of this statement is not within your own personal knowledge?—No.

15,822 tons of 2,000 lbs. to ton moved.

14101. According to the information from the engineering branch of your Department, will you say how many tons altogether were moved under this contract?—15,822 tons of 2,000 lbs. each.

14102. From what point?—From Duluth.

14103. Was the whole quantity moved to one point or distributed at different points?—It was distributed at different points.

12,525 tons at St. Boniface, 2,378 tons at nine miles north of Winnipeg, 918 tons at Selkirk.

14104. Will you please name the respective points and quantities?—12,525 tons at St. Boniface, 2,378 tons at Pritchard's.

14105. Where is Pritchard's?—About nine miles north of Winnipeg; and 918 tons at Selkirk.

14106. Was all this quantity destined for Selkirk: was not the object of this contract to get all the rails if possible to Selkirk?—The letters