

Mr. CHAIRMAN—This, then, is the envelope which is marked as having contained the tender which was accepted. (Envelope filed, and marked Exhibit "I.")

By Mr. Geoffrion :

Q. According to your conditions published in the notices calling for tenders, what was the amount of security that was required to be deposited?—A. I do not recollect, Sir. It is not mentioned in the minutes, and I do not remember seeing it anywhere else.

Q. Could you ascertain also whether there was any security to be deposited in the cross wall contract?—A. The last part of the minute reads: "Each of the said tenders enclosing an accepted bank cheque for \$7,500, according to the order of the Honourable the Minister of Public Works." That is at page 493 of minute book No. 4.

By Mr. Stuart :

Q. Is that for the south wall contract?—A. No, the cross wall.

By Mr. Geoffrion :

Q. You say \$7,500 according to the resolution of the board?—A. This was when the tenders were received.

Q. Is there anything to show what became of the deposit when the contract was awarded?—A. Not that I am aware of.

Q. The minutes do not show?—A. The minutes will show, but I have not seen anything to that effect.

Q. By referring to Exhibit "H" filed by you, I see that the amount deposited by the contractor for the south wall was \$25,000. Do you know how that deposit was made?—A. I do not, Sir.

Q. Have you any money or cheque amongst the papers of the Commission representing that deposit?—A. I have.

Q. Will you file it, if it is not money. Is this the cheque?—A. That is the cheque. It is dated 29th October, 1887. (Cheque filed and marked Exhibit "J.")

Q. I asked you whether it was money or a cheque. It is only a cheque?—A. Yes.

Q. An accepted cheque?—A. An unaccepted cheque.

Q. Signed by?—A. By O. E. Murphy, and payable to the order of N. K. Connolly.

Q. It is not certified?—A. No.

Q. I see this cheque bears date 29th October, 1887, and the contract filed by you as Exhibit "H" was passed before Charlebois, Notary, on the 16th February, 1887. Will you see whether you had another guarantee before that cheque. I mean not you but the Commission?—A. There was another guarantee.

Q. Have you any papers to show it?—A. I have. This is a receipt:

(Exhibit "K.")

"HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS' OFFICE,
"QUEBEC, 31st October, 1887.

"Received from the Secretary-Treasurer of the Quebec Harbour Commission certificate of deposit No. 0481, amounting to \$25,627.17, delivered by the Union Bank of Canada on the 30th August, 1886, to Mr. N. K. Connolly, said certificate having been surrendered against a cheque for \$25,000, signed by me to the order of the said N. K. Connolly and endorsed by him, which said cheque is substituted for said certificate of deposit which had been given as security in connection with the contract for the south wall harbour works.

"O. E. MURPHY."

Q. Is there any minute relating to this?—A. No; there is none.

Q. No mention of it, or entries of that substitution in any of the books of the Commission?—A. None.

Q. So the only official trace of that substitution is this cheque and the receipt you have just filed?—A. That is all.