

the clerk did. I couldn't find you the other day and I had asked the clerk to produce them and they will be pleased to present them on your request.

These cases I find, sir, are referred to in R—22, Auditor General's Report, "land and damages, Fenelon" and "land and damages, Somerville," and they are as follows:—John L. Brown, damages, \$100, and I find on page R—23 that Barron & Steers, for their legal work in connection with this case, received \$28.35. The second item is Birnell, R. W. and E. E. received \$275, and the legal fees to Barron & Steers, who were then the government agents, were \$55.30. Wm. Isaac received \$300 and Barron & Steer's legal fees were \$71.10. Peter Moffat received \$75 for damages and the government paid Barron & Steers \$30.70. R. M. Moffat received \$25 for damages and the government paid Barron & Steers \$30.65 for legal fees. Nancy McIntyre received from the government \$30 and the government paid Barron & Steers for their fees \$40.25. John Palmer received \$150 and Barron & Steers \$42.15. The two Pearnés received \$200 and the legal fees for the government agents, the government paid in this matter, was \$47.50. John Potts and Andrew Potts received \$30 from the government and the government paid Barron & Steers for their services in connection with this case \$46.20. George and Sarah Quinn and W. H. Stevens, we will say George Quinn, received \$100 and the legal fees to Barron & Steers were \$32.. George Sackett received \$90 and the government fees to Barron & Steers were \$30.70. W. T. Eades received \$75 and the government fees were \$47.05. Margaret Graham received \$30 for damages and the government paid \$29.85 for legal fees, in connection with this case. R. R. Graham received \$50 and Barron & Steers were paid \$28.65. In addition to that there were some other claims that I haven't found in here. One was that of Edward Johnston, for instance, of \$100; I don't find it in the Auditor General's Report, and Mr. McLaughlin was acting in this case also. But I haven't been able to turn it up. But there is the case of John Sackett, who was allowed damages of \$60, and Mr. McLaughlin was paid—I am subject to correction in general—Mr. McLaughlin, mark you, was the government agent at this time when John Sackett, subsequent to Barron throwing up the job, obtained \$24.90 besides his commission on Sackett's \$60 fee. Therefore my statement is borne out. Now, sir, in addition to this the government of the people of Canada paid in this, Mr. McLaughlin received, in general terms, 20 per cent commission on this sum of \$1,895 which is paid out here; in other words, Mr. McLaughlin is in evidence, is in sworn evidence, where he charges these people on damages of \$1,895 from the government of Canada for damages to their lands, he charges them \$365, according to his own sworn evidence there. The next point I wish to come at is this, Mr. McLaughlin was solicitor—

By Mr. Cowan :

Q. Do you know that of your own knowledge?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. How?—A. I have seen the letter and Mr. McLaughlin admitted this. I don't wish this to injure Mr. McLaughlin. My point is, is the government interested and I will prove this.

Mr. COWAN.—This seems to me the most astonishing proceeding I ever saw.

The CHAIRMAN.—You had better give the evidence.

Mr. HUGHES.—Very well, then. I now submit, sir, that Mr. McLaughlin—but, sir, I think I am right in this.

Mr. SPROULE.—This has taken place in 1891, when we brought men here and they were allowed to make their statements under oath?

The CHAIRMAN.—Certainly, but the matter of comment should not be in evidence.

Mr. COWAN.—In that case the man was charged, in this case Mr. Hughes is not.

Mr. SPROULE.—I refer to parties who came before this committee and were either misreported or misunderstood.