Contract No. 1-Telegraph.

- 243. Can you name any earlier date than that when the Department so understood?—I do not think that before that the tenders had been sufficiently. sufficiently analyzed to enabled the Department to form an opinion.
- 244. Do you think they have been sufficiently analyzed now?—They were given to Mr. Fleming for the purpose of being analyzed, and Mr. Fleming's report was admitted as an analysis of them.
- 245. You told us that on the 16th September, 1874, Mr. Fleming had S. Fleming reported that Fuller wanted from \$50,000 to \$60,000 more than the wanted \$50,000 or \$60,000 more than \$50,000 more than amount of his tender for construction, did you not?—Yes.
- 246. At that date (16th September, 1874) was there any document Up to that date which assumed to be a tender for anything more than construction from ed from sifton, Glass & Co.?—The tender received from Sifton, Glass & Co. stated that the price was \$1,290,000; this includes maintenance. stated that the price was \$1,290,000; this includes maintenance.
 - 247. But that was for the whole line?—Yes.
- 248. At that date (16th September, 1874) was there any document which assumed to be a tender for anything more than construction from Sifton, Glass & Co. as to section one alone?—I am not aware.
- 249. Then, at that time the only matter upon which Fuller and Sifton, Glass & Co. had both tendered as to section one, was for construction?-Fuller tendered by sections.
- 250. I am speaking of section one; they, that is Sifton, Glass & Co., had not then tendered for the maintenance, had they?—Fuller tendered for maintenance, and Sifton, Glass & Co. had tendered for the whole, including maintenance.
- 251. I am speaking of number one by itself?—Sifton, Glass & Co. had nothing for section one.
- 252. Were you in a position to compare the tenders as to mainten. At that time the ance of section one, at that time, made by Fuller and Sifton, Glass & and Sitton, Glass Co. respectively?—No.

& Co. as to main-tenance of Sec. 1 alone could not be compared.

- 253. Then, the only matter upon which you could compare their relative value was the construction, as far as it relates to section one?—
- 254. As to that matter, which was the most favorable to the Govern-Fuller's highest medt at that time? Give the figures. For instance, what was Mr. tion and clearing Fuller's highest offer at that time—the 16th September, 1874—includ. up to 18th Sept., ing the increase for clearing the increase for clearing the increase for clear in t ing the increase for clearing?-\$98,750.

- 255. What was Sifton, Glass & Co.'s offer for the same matter—that sinton, Glass & is the construction?—Sheet number one, prepared by Mr. Fleming, Co's offer \$107,850. states that the gross construction is \$107,850.
- 256. That is the same sheet which shows Mr. Fuller's to be \$38,750? -Yes.
- 257. And by adding the \$60,000 for clearing to that you arrive at the \$98,750 of which you have spoken?—Yes.
- 258. Then, at that time (16th September, 1874) for construction alone of section number one, which was the most favorable offer to the Government?—Mr. Fuller's.

\$60,000 more than tender for construction.

≥1,200,0°0.