Contract No. 1—Telegraph.

not included in either case. The work awarded to Messrs. Sifton, Glass & Co. embraced the construction of the telegraph from Winnipeg or Fort Garry to Selkirk and Livingston, near Fort Pelly.

States prices asked by Sifton, Glass & Co.

Forest, $492 per mile.
Prairie, $189 per mile.
Maintenance, $16 per mile per annum.

656. You say, then, that the contract as awarded followed the proper construction of the original tender, in your opinion?—What I say is that the prices of $492 and $189 per mile did not include maintenance.

Explains how meaning contended for could be gathered from the document.

657. Is that all you mean by the explanation that you have just read this morning?—I mean to show that this conclusion could be arrived at from the tender. It is independent of any explanation given by Sifton, Glass & Co.

658. Which conclusion?—That maintenance was not included in these prices.

659. Then do you consider that the contract was awarded according to the proper interpretation of his first tender?—The only objection I have to it—

Witness finds only objection to be $16 instead of $15.83 per mile.

660. Have you any objection to it?—The only objection I have to it is that the exact figure for maintenance was $15.83 per mile instead of $16, making a difference of 17 cents per mile per annum for the maintenance.

Contractor is obliged to operate the line for the profits.

661. With that exception, do you say that your opinion is that contract was awarded according to the proper interpretation of his tender?—In the contract Sifton & Glass are obliged to operate the line for the profits. There is nothing said of that in the tender; but with those exceptions, I think that the contract was a proper interpretation of the tender.

This feature not in the tender.

662. Then the feature of profits was one which did not appear in the tender?—It did not appear in the tender.

First mention of profits in letter of Sifton, Glass & Co. Oct. 15.

663. How were the particulars of that feature arrived at between the Government and Sifton, Glass & Co.?—In a letter dated October 14th to Mr. Fleming, Sifton, Glass & Co. offer to work and receive the profits of the line.

664. Do you say that they offered to work?—He says so in his letter.

665. Read the context?—"Contractors are to maintain, work and "receive the profits of the line."

This letter the first negotiation on the subject of operating the line.

666. Do you mean that this letter of the 14th of October was the first negotiation on the subject of operating the line?—It is the first that I know of.

22nd July the date for receiving tenders.

667. At different times in giving evidence you have named the date for receiving tenders as the 22nd of July, and also the 26th of July; which is the correct date?—In a printed copy of the advertisement which I have in my hand the 22nd of July is given.

668. Do you believe that to be the correct date?—I do.

669. Has any return of the correspondence and documents connected with the letting of these two contracts been asked for by either House of Parliament—either by themselves or with any other contract?—Yes.

670. By which House?—The House of Commons.