

14076. What is the next contract on which you are ready to give evidence? Have you the papers connected with the transportation of rails from Fort William to Emerson of which you spoke yesterday when explaining contract 34?—Yes; I produce it. (Exhibit No. 16.)

Transportation
of rails—
Fort William
to Emerson.
Part of Con-
tract No. 34.

14077. The beginning of this transaction appears to be a telegram, is that as you understand it?—Yes.

14078. Read it?—

“To Mr. HENRY BEATTY:

“What price per ton will you charge for moving say 1,000 tons of rails from Fort William to Emerson.”

“F. BRAUN.”

Braun's telegram
to Beatty asking
rate for trans-
porting 1,000 tons
of steel rails.

14079. What is the date?—It is dated 26th September, 1878.

14080. What was the next communication on the subject?—It was letter from Mr. Beatty to Mr. Braun.

14081. Read it?—

“In reply to your telegram of yesterday, I beg to say I will transport 1,000 tons of rails, more or less, from Fort William to Emerson for \$18 per gross ton. This rate includes all charges for loading, unloading, piling, wharfage, harbour dues, storage and insurance. This rate may seem out of proportion to the price you are paying from Kingston, but if you will consider a special steamer will have to be sent to do this work, and that she will return light from Duluth to Fort William, and also that the usual rate of freight to St. Boniface and Emerson are the same, you will readily see that it will not much more than cover expenses.

Beatty to Braun
saying \$18 per
ton.

(Signed) “H. BEATTY.”

The letter is dated 29th December, 1878.

14082. This letter appears to be written at Ottawa?—Yes; it is dated Ottawa.

14083. In support of his proposition, he points out that it will be necessary to send a special steamer for this work: had the Department such information on that subject as would enable them to consider whether or not a special steamer would be required?—I find no record of that.

14084. Do you mean record in writing?—Yes.

14085. Have you any record in your memory?—I do not recollect.

14086. Do you recollect anything of the other circumstances which he urges, such as the necessity of returning light from Duluth to Fort William, and that the freights to St. Boniface and Emerson were the same? These are all circumstances which he seems to think that the Department would be aware of: do you remember anything on the subject, or whether it was discussed with you?—Those points were probably discussed between the Minister and Mr. Fleming, but I was not present.

14087. Then you do not state that as a fact but as a probability?—Yes, only.

14088. In this transaction it appears that the distance over which the transportation took place was very much shorter than in contract No. 34; in that contract the transportation was from Kingston to St. Boniface; in this case it commenced at Fort William and ended at Emerson: do you know any other reason, besides those mentioned in Mr. Beatty's letter, why the same prices should be paid for this short distance as for the long one?—No.

Knows no reason
other than those
mentioned in
Beatty's letter
why the same
price should be
paid from Fort
William to Em-
erson as was paid
from Kingston to
St. Boniface.