

## BENNETT'S DISMISSAL.

We find abundant evidence of the truth of the charge with reference to the corrupt endeavours made by Thomas McGreevy, at the request of Larkin, Connolly & Co., to procure the dismissal of Bennett, the engineer.

The contractors complained of his action towards them, and desired his removal, and Thomas McGreevy was requested to have that done. As one result of his influence, we find Perley, in his letter of 10th of April, 1885, complaining of Mr. Bennett's "too literal adherence to the plans, even where the contractors show him that the changes are for the benefit of the Dock."

This accusation Trutch resented, and in his reply to Perley's letter said he had not observed any indication of such a spirit on Bennett's part.

On the 2nd of May, 1885, Thomas McGreevy writes to his brother Robert :

"It is now understood that Bennett, the engineer at British Columbia, will not suit ; so the Minister and Perley are prepared to change him. He asked if I could recommend one. Could you think of one that would suit, and I would have the Minister appoint him." And again in May :

"Perley went to see Page this morning to try and get an engineer to send out at once and dismiss Bennett. He that goes out will get his instructions before going out."

An engineer named Williams was offered the appointment by Perley, but in his examination he stated that after considering the matter he decided to decline, and that he both wrote to Sir Hector and saw him on the subject, and that Sir Hector approved of his reasons for refusing the appointment.

No other engineer was obtained, and Bennett remained until the work was completed.

The Dock appears to have been finished somewhere about the end of the year 1887, and the Accountants' report shows the cost to have been \$581,841.43, being \$207,168.27 more than the amount of their tender.

Our Accountants in their report state that the profits realized by the contractors out of this contract amounted to the sum of \$240,979.05, in addition to \$27,085 paid in "donations," &c.

This would leave the actual cost of the works at \$313,777.38.

If from this is deducted the \$53,897 reported by the Accountants' as paid to the contractors for extras, we find the actual cost of the works as originally contracted for to have been \$259,880.38, or in round figures \$50,000 more than the amount at which Starrs & O'Hanly tendered for the contract, and which the Chief Engineer reported was "too small for the completion of the work in a satisfactory manner."

## FINDINGS.

In concluding this branch of the inquiry, we find that all of Mr. Tarte's charges respecting the letting and construction of the Esquimalt Dock have been proved, excepting the one charging that Thomas McGreevy took steps to induce certain members of Parliament to assist him in obtaining alterations and additional works, and that members of Parliament were approached to this end by members of the firm.

That Thomas McGreevy corruptly agreed with Larkin, Connolly & Co., in consideration of large sums of money to be paid him by them, to use his influence with the Minister of Public Works, and the Department in the first instance, to obtain for them the contract for this Dock, and afterwards to procure changes and alterations in the contract for the interest of the contractors. That said Thomas McGreevy successfully used his influence for these purposes, and received large sums of money from the contractors, pursuant to this corrupt agreement.

That other large sums of money were paid out of the moneys received by the contractors for the construction of this Dock for corrupt purposes, but your Committee are unable, owing to the conflicting and uncertain evidence, to arrive at any definite conclusion as to the destination of these moneys.

That before the contract was entered into Sir Hector Langevin had secretly assented to changes and modifications of the contract which were to be afterwards