

"Mr. OSLER objected.

"WITNESS continued:—"I ask him how he came to give this money and he stated that a letter was brought to him by Laforce Langevin. He said he gave the money the first time to Laforce. I asked him how he gave the second and he told me he gave the second direct to himself."

Robert McGreevy's evidence substantially agrees with that of Murphy.

N. K. Connolly denies ever having made such a payment, or having told Murphy or Robert McGreevy that he had done so.

Sir Hector Langevin's statement is as follows :

2nd. "In answer to the statement made by the said O. E. Murphy, that Nicholas K. Connolly told him that he had given 'to my son for me and also to me personally each time \$5,000, making in all \$10,000, I swear positively that the said Nicholas K. Connolly did not pay me, directly or indirectly, any sum of money, and especially the said above-mentioned two sums of \$5,000 and he did not pay to my son any sum of money, as far as my knowledge goes."

Laforce Langevin denies the receipt of the \$5,000, and the carrying of any letter from Sir Hector to Nicholas Connolly.

Thomas McGreevy denies having ever asked or received the alleged payment.

In a declaration made by Owen E. Murphy in April, 1890, he says :

5. "On the 3rd of August, 1887, the Hon. Thomas McGreevy came to me and stated that Sir Hector Langevin was going away that evening and wanted money—(\$5,000), I gave him \$1,000, and on the 8th of the same month he received \$4,000 from N. K. Connolly, this sum was charged to the firm in the books, as appears by the Accountant's statement, suspense account."

R. H. McGreevy at the same time made a declaration commencing as follows (Exhibits "L14" and "M14") :

"I have read over the statement of O. E. Murphy, Esq., one of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co, for the various contracts of the Quebec Harbour Improvements and the Graving Dock in British Columbia. I have a knowledge that all the statements are correct."

Sir Hector Langevin's evidence is this :

"Q. Do you remember on the 21st July having met Mr. Thomas McGreevy, and to have stated to him that you wanted \$5,000?—A. No. Not only I do not remember, but I did not say so—at any period.

"Q. Did not Mr. McGreevy come back after a certain time, and in the evening bring only \$1,000?—A. No; not \$1, \$1,000, or any amount.

"Q. On the 8th of August following, did you not return to Quebec from Rimouski, and did not Mr. Thomas McGreevy pay to you, or hand to you an additional amount of \$4,000?—A. No; it is not so. I stated so in my examination-in-chief, or my statement.

"Q. If Mr. Thomas McGreevy made such a request, either to Murphy or Nicholas Connolly, was he authorized to do so?—No.

"Q. Was Thomas McGreevy ever authorized at any time to ask money on your behalf of Larkin, Connolly & Co., or any member of that firm?—A. No."

Robert McGreevy, it has been observed, states that he met Thomas McGreevy on Dalhousie street about 4 o'clock in the afternoon of the 21st of July, and that he told him he had received \$1,000 from Murphy. The published statement from Murphy, corroborated by Robert McGreevy's statement, published at the same time, declares that this alleged payment was made on 3rd August.

There was likewise an allegation that a payment of \$5,000 was made to Thomas McGreevy for the Minister. O. E. Murphy's evidence on that point is as follows:—

"Q. Refer again to 'B5' and say whether you find some of the items there that were paid at the request of Thomas McGreevy?—A. There is an item, August 7th, 1887, but that date is not right. Mr. McGreevy came to me and wanted \$5,000. These dates, I think, are all wrong; most of them. The book-keeper or the auditor probably can account for that. None of my partners that I know were in Quebec, and we were short of money. Mr. McGreevy stated that he wanted to try and get