

**Contract No. 1—
Telegraph.**

288. Have you obtained the Dwight correspondence that you alluded to?—We have not yet collected it.

289. Did Sifton, Glass & Co. get any other contract connected with the telegraph but this one?—No.

No tenders invited after July 22nd, 1874.

290. Was any public competition invited after July 22nd, 1874, for tenders for telegraph work?—No.

291. Is there any arrangement with Sifton, Glass & Co. about the rates which they are to charge on this section?—I cannot answer that question without inquiring.

Correspondence has taken place as to the inefficiency of Sec. 1.

292. Has there been any correspondence with the Department as to the inefficiency of this section?—Yes.

293. Has a report of it been asked for by either House of Parliament?—Yes.

294. Did you prepare a report for either House?—Yes.

295. Was it printed?—No.

296. Have you that report in manuscript?—We have.

297. Is it connected in the return with other sections?—The reports apply to all the sections.

298. Will you produce it as the report called for?—Yes; I now produce it (Exhibit No. 6).

**Contract No. 2.
—Telegraph.**

From Livingstone to Edmonton.

Dated 30th Oct., 1874.

Contractor, Richard Fuller.

This was part of Sec. No. 3 as described in advertisement for tenders.

299. What was the subject of the second contract?—It was the construction of a telegraph line from Livingstone to Edmonton.

300. What is the date of the contract?—30th October, 1874.

301. What is the name of the contractor?—Richard Fuller.

302. Was that one of the sections advertised when you asked for tenders?—It was not advertised as a section from Livingstone to Edmonton.

303. Was it a part of any of the sections advertised for?—It was.

304. A part of which section advertised for?—Of section number three.

Sect. 3 originally ran from Fort Garry to a point in longitude of Edmonton.

305. As advertised, what was section number three?—It was from Fort Garry to a point in the longitude of Edmonton.

306. Have you a list of the tenders which were submitted as to that section?—Yes; I now produce it (Exhibit No. 7).

307. This is attached to several sheets as, I notice, showing the tenders for all the sections separately?—Yes.

Fuller submitted lowest tender for the whole of Sec. 3, which originally included Sec. 1.

308. Mr. Fuller appears to have submitted the lowest tender for the whole of section number three?—Yes.

309. Did section three include originally section number one?—Yes.

He did not get contract.

310. Then can you explain why did he not get the contract for the whole of section three?—It was because for that portion of number three which corresponds with section one he wanted a higher price.