38

1889. Sept. 25.—Paid balance of Graving Dock funds in the hands of Commissioners July, 1.—To balance due L. C. & Co. this date, and for which a letter of recognizance has been given, bearing interest at 6 per cent. per annum.	3,466 8,528	
(Pencil figures in margin.) \$57,000 00 3,466 88 8,528 71	\$726,901	6
\$68,995 59 3,095 59 (less interest).		
\$65,900 00		
By total amount of main and supplementary contracts claimed at \$841,241.98 and settled at		
Jan., 1887	03	
\$726,901	65	

When it is considered that the original contract was \$330,000, and that the Dock as then contracted for was 55 feet longer than the one actually built, some

idea can be formed of the amounts improperly paid these contractors.

Before January, 1887, Larkin, Connolly & Co. had rendered their account of \$814,241.98, to be found at page 1171 of the Evidence. On this they had been paid, as appears by Perley's estimate, \$562,516.22, leaving a sum of \$251,726 claimed by them as due. This account and the balance claimed by them serves to explain the meaning of the memo. drawn up by Micheal Connolly, and to be found at page 114, in which the firm agreed to give all over \$200,000 due on Lévis Dock to their friends by way of donation.

FINDINGS.

We find that Mr. Tarte's charges with respect to this work were true, and that Thomas McGreevy did agree with the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. to secure for them a contract for the completion of the Graving Dock at Levis on condition that he should receive from them any excess over the sum of \$50,000 of the contract price, and that he was successful in procuring such contract for them, and did receive from them, in pursuance of the corrupt agreement, the sum of \$22,000.

The Accountants' report to us, and we find accordingly that the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. realized as profits out of this contract the sum of \$80,895.96. We also find that, in addition to these profits, there was corruptly paid by Larkin, Connolly & Co., out of the receipts from this contract, the sum of \$45,035.28, of which Thomas

McGreevy received \$22,000.

We find that the supplementary contract for \$74,000, except that part which related to the building of the caisson for \$10,000, was entered into without any