

made in the interests of the contractors, amongst which was a rebate of part of the \$50,000 to be paid for plant.

That the change made in the re-coursing of the Dock was applied for by the contractors in their own interest, they having discovered a quarry within accessible distance, which furnished suitable stone for the proposed change, and was assented to by the Minister on the distinct understanding that it should not increase the cost of the work to the Crown; nor does it appear why it should have done so, inasmuch as Engineer Perley pointed out at the time the cost of the work to the contractors, in the use of the larger stone, would be lessened.

That notwithstanding these facts, the Minister subsequently improperly paid to the contractors for this change the sum of at least \$32,839.

That the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and Thomas McGreevy, also attempted corruptly to procure a change in the character of the stone from sandstone to granite, at an enormously increased cost, and that both Perley and the Minister were induced to assent and recommend this change to the Governor in Council.

That at or about the time this change was being submitted to the Governor in Council, the contractors again changed their minds, and desired to retain the sandstone, and were able, through the improper influence of Thomas McGreevy, used with the Minister, to induce him to have the change which the Minister and his engineer had strongly reported in favour of, abandoned.

That the contractors being desirous of increasing the length of the Dock 100 feet, corruptly proposed to pay a large sum of money, if the change could be secured.

That the Minister consented to the proposed extension, and both he and his engineer officially reported in its favour. In recommending this extension to Council, the Minister reported that the Imperial Government should be asked to share in the additional cost involved. His report was adopted by Council, but on the matter being submitted to the Imperial Government they declined assuming any part of the expense, and the proposed change was abandoned.

No. 6.

USE OF NAME OF THE HONOURABLE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.

“ That the name of the Honourable Minister of Public Works was made use of by the said Thomas McGreevy in his dealings with Larkin, Connolly & Co., so as to give the impression that he had control over him; the said Thomas McGreevy undertaking to obtain his co-operation, or declaring he had secured it, and that in the name of the Minister of Public Works large sums of money were corruptly demanded by the said Thomas McGreevy from Larkin, Connolly & Co. That he used the Minister's name before the Harbour Commissioners, and that from 1882 to the present Session of Parliament he lived in the same house as the Minister, thereby giving the impression to Larkin, Connolly & Co. that he had absolute control over him and that he was acting as the Minister's representative in his corrupt transactions with them.

59. That the said Thomas McGreevy on several occasions demanded in the name of the Hon. Minister of Public Works and received from Larkin, Connolly & Co. sums of money.

60. That from 1882 to the present Session the said Thomas McGreevy has always lived in the same house as the Hon. Minister of Public Works, and he seems to have done so in order to put in the mind of Larkin, Connolly & Co. the impression that he had over said Hon. Minister an absolute control, and that he was acting as his representative in his corrupt transactions with them.

61. That in fact on many occasions he used the name of the Hon. Minister of Public Works in his dealings with them, undertaking to obtain his co-operation or declaring that he had secured it.

We find this charge substantially proved.
