

had not been sooner made. But the style of the proposition first made to us by Mr. Hunter and of the telegraphic communications to our operators and other parties was such that it could not be expected that the Company should look favorably upon them. On the 25th we telegraphed to you in perfect good will that should you wish to continue the arrangement legally terminated on the first May for one message more under the peculiar circumstances of the case, to prevent any dispute we should consider the lines at your service. To that message Mr. Hoyt received, and of course, as you must have expected, laid before the Committee, a reply so violent and harsh that we think you must have formed a strange opinion of us if you imagined that we could feel disposed to go out of our way to accommodate you. We regret extremely that business matters cannot be settled, when controversies arise, without having recourse to hard language.

As to the "shameful conduct" of our Company we cannot see where-in we have been so guilty. Our bargain with you was a very simple one. When a Cunard Steamer arrived we were to send on so many words at such a price. That agreement with you shut us out from every offer. We acted honestly and fairly and refused large sums for preferential use of the wires. At length a Cunard Steamer is intercepted off Newfoundland and because you get all the news you want by her, you tell us that the residue of the news despatch will not be paid for on the same terms. In answer we simply told you that such a state of things would be one-sided. You would have complained if we had broken our part of the contract if it had suited us, and the remedy in all such cases was expressly provided should either party find that a better bargain could be made—six months notice would terminate the contract. You might have given it but did not. We therefore did—and that you call shameful conduct, besides denouncing us in no measured terms in a Boston paper intended for very great circulation. You have continually talked as though it was a very great favor and condescension on your part to pay us such a sum not allowing us to hint that the obligation was mutual. When we endeavor to prove that we think so by telling you that we want it no longer your indignation seems to know no bounds. You "have no favors to ask, none to give, and least of all do you want any extension of peace." Three days after this message we receive your letter of the 18th with a note from Mr. Hunter, much more courteous than your first communication, using language of the most unobjectionable kind. As already remarked it is to be regretted that you had not always observed a style of communication which ~~would~~ have disarmed hostilities and led to most amicable arrangements. *would*

Mr. Hunter's letter to us of the 1st April, as also your telegram of the 25th above alluded to, seem to allude to something threatening to us and to any with whom we may dare to have dealings. We hardly understand you. You have for many years had the preferential use of our wires and therefore it hardly computes with fairness that you should object to our continuing the system with others. What your intentions may be we cannot imagine. Certain threats followed by certain facts may have an injurious effect upon the opinion of the public.

It is because we look upon the telegraph as a great commercial engine