

Q. Get your minute book for 1890 and give me the date, please?—A. I have it here in minute book No. 7, page 232. It was on the 8th September, 1890. “Resolved, unanimously, that Mr. St. George Boswell, the present resident Engineer is hereby named and appointed Engineer in chief of the Harbour Commission at a salary of \$3,000 per annum.”

Q. Is there anything in the minutes to show why and how Mr. Boswell was appointed Chief Engineer when Mr. Perley does not appear to have been dismissed?—A. Nothing further than I have read to you now.

Q. Do you know whether any written notice had been given to Mr. Perley that the Commission intended to dispense with his services?—A. None was given to him.

Q. Is there anything in the minute book showing when Mr. Perley ceased to be Chief Engineer of the Commission?—A. Yes, Sir. In 1891 his resignation was received and accepted. I read it yesterday.

Q. I know—read it again?—A. The date is 9th February, 1891. The minute reads—“The order of the day having been called, the letter of Mr. Henry F. Perley, dated the 13th ult., tendering his resignation as Chief Engineer to this Commission was taken into consideration, and said resignation accepted, when it was unanimously resolved,” then follows resolution of thanks to Mr. Perley. “That in accepting the resignation of the Chief Engineer, Mr. Henry F. Perley, this Board desires to place on record their sense of the valuable services which he has rendered this commission, and the skill and ability displayed in his superintendence of the harbour improvements, which has greatly assisted the Commissioners in bringing those works to a successful termination.”

Q. Do you know whether at the same sitting the Board appointed an assistant Chief Engineer?—A. At the same sitting that Mr. Boswell was appointed the Board also appointed an assistant engineer.

Q. Will you read the minute?—A. “Resolved unanimously that Mr. H. LaForce Langevin is hereby named and appointed assistant Engineer of the Harbour Commission at a yearly salary of \$1,800.

Q. Do you know whether this Mr. Langevin is related to the Minister of Public Works?—A. Yes, Sir.

Q. What is his relation to the Minister?—A. He is his son.

By Mr. Lister.

Q. Is the Mr. Langevin who was appointed assistant Engineer, an engineer by profession?—A. I could not answer that; I do not know.

By Mr. Geoffrion.

Q. Are there any outstanding certificates or claims against the Harbour Commissioners in favour of the contractors?—A. At present?

Q. Yes?—A. Yes; there is a shop account for, I suppose, about \$2,000; an account for levelling sand, about \$5,000, not quite as much as that, \$4,695, if my memory serves me. There is also an amount due to them on account of the Graving Dock of \$8,000, with considerable interest by this time. It was \$8,000, at the time the accounts were settled up. I should estimate that there is about \$9,000 due on account of Graving Dock now. Those are all the accounts before the Commission.

Q. Can you, without taking up much time, say when the last payment was made to the contractors?—A. There are quite a number of contracts; I could not do it readily.

Q. I will waive that question for the moment then. Did you find out anything to explain those pencil figures that were found yesterday in the corner of the letter asking for the chequè?—A. Yes, Sir. I examined the minutes last night. I find that we returned to Larkin, Connolly, & Company the cheque for dredging and the cheque for the cross-wall. The amounts of the cheques are not in the books, but I have telegraphed to get the receipt which I took when I surrendered the cheques. Speaking from recollection, I think one was for \$12,500, and I think the other was for \$23,500. I would not be positive, however, as to the amount; but as I said I have