

**Railway Construction—
Contract No. 41.**

Time extended
after second advertisement.

1217. Were all the tenders which were considered by the Department in reference to this contract received before the time named in the second advertisement?—No; the time was again extended.

1218. Was this extension advertised before the time named in the second advertisement had expired?—Yes.

List of tenders.

1219. Have you any statement or report showing the relative positions of the different parties who tendered, after the tenders were opened?—There is a printed copy of a report by Mr. Fleming, containing a list of the tenders received. (Exhibit No. 66.)

1220. This report which you have produced numbers seventeen tenders in this work. I notice in the Blue Book dated 1880, and purporting to give information on the same subject, that twenty tenders were received: can you explain this discrepancy?—In the Blue Book, there are two columns; in the first column there are seventeen tenders. These are the seventeen tenders given at page 40 of the return.

1221. Then there is no discrepancy?—There is no discrepancy.

1222. What does this column relate to in this Blue Book?—Tenders for work to be completed by the 1st of July, 1882, and ready for through trains by the 1st of July, 1881.

1223. Then the seventeen tenders mentioned in Mr. Fleming's report do not relate to this particular condition?—No.

Contractors:
Marks, Ginty,
Purcell & Ryan.

1224. Was the contract let to the persons who made the lowest tender?—The contract was made with Messrs. Marks, Ginty, Purcell & Ryan.

Lowest tenderers:
Marks & Conmee.

1225. Who made the lowest tender?—Marks & Conmee.

1226. Persons are named in the contract who are not named in the tender?—Yes.

Letter from
Marks & Conmee
to Minister suggesting the association with themselves of Purcell, Ginty & Ryan.

1227. Do you know why that was done or what led to it?—A letter dated February 13th, from Marks & Conmee to the Minister, says: "In the event of section A of the Canadian Pacific Railway being awarded to our tender, we will associate with us in the contract Messrs. Purcell, Ginty & Ryan, the contractors for the section east of the one in question, and all preliminary arrangements made by them with the Government respecting our tender will be satisfactory."

1228. Was that what led to the introduction of the new parties?—Yes.

Tenders based on
estimated quantities
and schedule of prices.

1229. Were these tenders based upon estimated quantities and schedule of prices to apply to those quantities?—Yes.

1230. The moneying out of these quantities and prices gave the information which would show the relative position of the tenders?—Yes.

Return of correspondence to Parliament.

1231. Has the correspondence between the Department and persons who have made tenders for this work been the subject of a return to either House of Parliament?—Yes.

1232. When was the order for the return made?—16th February, 1880.

1233. Was the correspondence returned?—Yes.

1234. Do you know when?—March 31st, 1880.