

Minister that the names of Gallagher and Murphy might cause trouble with the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., because he was one of its members, and that he did not, from that, seem to me to be a different firm, and that it might cause trouble. He said: 'I have spoken to Mr. McGreevy about that; vote for that, and follow Mr. McGreevy, and I tell you everything will be all right.' He said to me finally: 'Whenever you come across anything like that, just follow Mr. McGreevy. You know that we meet frequently and that we consult together.' Therefore, I have always considered that I had the opinion of Mr. Langevin in the chair occupied by Mr. McGreevy beside me, and whenever an important vote was to be given I have always consulted Mr. McGreevy, because I believed such were the views of Mr. Langevin.

"Q. This was after all the conversations that you held?—A. It was very nearly always the same thing repeated. I had several conversations with the Minister. Every time anything important came up I consulted him, and always had very nearly the same answer.

"Q. Well, you say you consulted him. Did you consult him specially about the South Wall contract?—A. Yes, sir; because I believed that that would entail difficulties such as I have just now told you of; because I saw that one of the firm had separated himself from the others, and then he told me not to be troubled about the matter for everything was all right.

"Q. Did you consult him on other matters besides that of the South-wall?—A. Yes, sir; I consulted him on other matters very often.

"Q. Had you an occasion to consult him, to confer with the Minister with reference to the contract for dredging in 1887?—A. Yes, sir; I spoke to him about that. He told me that from information he had received he believed the change was desirable, and that he had spoken of it, he said, to Mr. McGreevy, and that he believed it was the best thing to do.

*"By the Chairman :*

"Q. You said that you consulted the Minister about the dredging?—A. Yes; explained the matter of the dredging to him.

"Q. Did you give him your advice?—A. Yes; I gave him my opinion.

"Q. But there was a difference of opinion between you and Mr. McGreevy?—A. Well, it was merely with reference to the right of giving information. I wanted to speak to the Minister to know whether he approved of the matter.

"Q. Did you give any information contrary to Mr. McGreevy's?—A. No; I wanted to know whether it was his advice, because I would not do anything until the Commission were informed, because it was money voted by Parliament."

Again, on cross-examination, page 498:

"Q. You were appointed Chairman of the Harbour Commission by the Government yourself?—A. Yes; that is to say, I was elected by the votes of the Commission.

"Q. But it was understood that it was the Government that appointed you?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, when you were appointed chairman of the Harbour Commission, were you put there as a safeguard to the interests of the Commission, or to do as Mr. McGreevy would tell you to do?—A. That is what I told at my examination-in-chief. When I saw that Mr. McGreevy wanted to take the control, then I asked the Minister whether I did well in following his advice or not.

"Q. Then, when Mr. McGreevy proposed anything before the Commission you considered you had nothing to do except accepting his propositions?—A. Not always, since on various occasions I consulted the Minister of Public Works. If you want to know a little more, Mr. Fitzpatrick, I will tell you. On one occasion Mr. Langevin said to me: If the Commission does not act properly I shall dissolve it.

"Q. Will you tell us what the different points were upon which you consulted with Sir Hector, and with respect to which you considered that the Committee was not doing its duty—in other words, did you ever complain to Sir Hector Langevin that Mr. McGreevy was doing something in the Harbour Commission that he ought