

Contract No. 4—
Telegraph.

"Telegraph. What time would be convenient to have the matter closed with the Department? Could it stand over until after the Ontario elections? Please advise and oblige yours,

"(Signed) OLIVER, DAVIDSON & Co.,
"By A. OLIVER."

756. Had you any other information than that letter that Sutton, Thompson & Co. had parted with their interest in their tender, that you know of?—I do not know of any other.

Dept. had no other information than this letter that Sutton, Thompson & Co. had parted with their interest in tender.

757. Is it the habit of the Department to deal with a person who represents himself to be an assignee of one who has tendered without any evidence from the party himself who has tendered?—No.

Not the practice of Dept. to deal with a person who represents himself as the assignee of a tenderer.

758. Can you explain why that was done in this case?—I cannot.

Witness cannot explain why that was done in this case.

759. Is it according to rule or contrary to rule?—We have no written rules.

760. Is it according to the usual practice?—It is not according to the usual practice.

It was contrary usual practice.

761. Have you any evidence of any communication to Sutton & Thompson, informing them that their tender would be accepted—that is, after you had decided to negotiate no further with Sutton & Thirkell?—We have not on record.

No correspondence with Sutton, Thompson & Co., informing them that their tender would be accepted.

762. Can you explain how either Sutton & Thompson or Oliver, Davidson & Co. would know on the 24th December that their tender would be accepted?—No; there is no record.

No means of explaining how they or Oliver, Davidson & Co. could know that their tender was accepted.

763. Is it the practice of the Department to deal with persons under the circumstances in which this proposition is made by Oliver, Davidson & Co. without any transfer and without any notification that you were ready to deal with them?—It is not the practice.

Dealing with Oliver, Davidson & Co. contrary to practice of Dept.

764. In this case you did deal with them?—Yes.

765. Can you explain why you did not follow the usual practice?—No.

766. Were you present when it was decided to give them the contract?—No.

767. Will you give me the names of Oliver, Davidson & Co. separately?—Adam Oliver, of the Town of Ingersoll; Joseph Davidson, of the City of Toronto and Peter Johnson Brown, of Ingersoll.

768. Have you ever before noticed the absence of any communication from Sutton, Thompson & Co. on this subject with the Department?—I was aware of it.

769. Did you enquire into it?—I did not enquire into it very deeply. The transaction was managed by the Minister.

Witness did not enquire into transaction very deeply; it was managed by Minister.

770. Was that the reason for your not enquiring into it?—It was.

This is the reason why witness did not make enquiries