

February 6, 1882.

*To Bank of Montreal, Ottawa;*

Referring to your telegram to-day, please strike out for two days only from our acceptance stamp. The cheque will be good until paid.

[Signed]

SHADBOLT, Manager.

After reading these documents, so formal and explicit, can there be the shadow of a doubt in any impartial mind as to their meaning?

How does it come, however, that this answer of the Bank communicated to the Minister in the afternoon of the 6th, as is shown by the letter of his private secretary, should in the Minister's report of the 6th or 7th, and laid before the Council on the 8th, have been made the ground of a decision so contrary to precedent, equity and common sense?

And, by what miracle of foresight could the Minister of Railways have known, on the 4th February, the irregularity of the Charlebois-McDonald cheque, when it is officially established that the report addressed to the Minister by one of the officials appointed to open the tenders, Mr. Schreiber, the engineer in chief, did not reach the Minister till the 6th February?

There is more. We are assured that the officials who examined the tenders could not have pointed out the irregularity of the cheque, for the excellent reason that not one of them noticed it.

Were there two reports—one drawn up on the 1st February and the other on the 6th?

The fact is worth clearing up.

We shall recall, only as a memorandum, the interference of Mr. Schreiber in a special question, outside of his official attributions. We refer to that portion of his report in which he delivered his judgment on the validity or nullity of the Charlebois-McDonald cheque.

This case reveals a singular mode of proceeding. Relations of professional courtesy are reversed, an engineer treats of