

agreement with the said Larkin, Connolly & Co., whereby, for the consideration of \$25,000 to be paid to him, he agreed to secure the contract for the Cross-wall for the said firm, notwithstanding they were not the lowest tenderers.

We find also that the fact of Peters & Moore's tender being lower than that of Larkin, Connolly & Co. was well known to said Thomas McGreevy, and was communicated by him to the members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. before their tender was accepted, and that in pursuance of the corrupt arrangement made between said McGreevy and the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., he, McGreevy, so manipulated and arranged matters in the Department of Public Works that the tender of Larkin, Connolly & Co. was falsely made to appear lower than any of Peters & Moore, and was accepted.

We find also that the said McGreevy was paid by Larkin, Connolly & Co. the sum of \$25,000.

We find that the loss to the public treasury arising from the acceptance of Larkin, Connolly & Co.'s tender, instead of that of Peters & Moore, amounted to, at least, the sum of \$69,860.96, and that, in addition to this loss, there was improvidently paid to Larkin, Connolly & Co. a sum of \$22,412 for placing certain material they dredged from the Wet Basin in the Cross-wall.

We find there must have been a conspiracy between McGreevy and some one, or more, of the engineers of the Department of Public Works to procure the contract for Larkin, Connolly & Co., and we find it difficult to absolve the Minister from a knowledge of the existence of that conspiracy.

We find the Minister to have been guilty of a breach of public trust in permitting the double payment to be made for the dredging material used in filling the Cross-wall.

No. 5.

CONTRACT FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE ESQUIMALT DOCK, 8TH NOVEMBER, 1884.

“(a.) That before Larkin, Connolly & Co. tendered for the completion of the Graving Dock at Esquimalt the said Thomas McGreevy agreed to help, and did help them, in divers ways, amongst others, by obtaining from the Department of Public Works information, figures and calculations in respect of the proposed work and communicating the same to them.

“(b.) That with the knowledge and consent of the said Thomas McGreevy Larkin, Connolly & Co. took into partnership with them his brother, Robert H. McGreevy, for the purpose of securing the influence of the said Thomas McGreevy, the said Robert H. McGreevy taking a 20 per cent. interest in the work.

“(c.) That during the execution of the contract the said Thomas McGreevy acted as a paid agent of Larkin, Connolly & Co. in dealing with the Department of Public Works, and that he obtained for them at their request important alterations in the works and more favourable conditions, which enabled them to realize very large profits.

“(d.) That large sums were paid by Larkin, Connolly & Co. to the said Thomas McGreevy, for his services in dealing with the Minister of Public Works, the officers of the Department, and generally for his influence as a member of Parliament, and that in consideration of these sums the said Thomas McGreevy furnished a great deal of information, and procured to be made, by the Department and the Minister of Public Works, alterations in the plans and in the works, which alterations have cost large sums of money to the public.

“(e.) That in consideration of offers of large sums of money by members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. the said Thomas McGreevy