

Q. Now, on the 5th December, "Attendance at the police court all day" is charged at \$50, and allowed at \$30?—A. Yes.

Q. On an average you allowed attendance at the police court for a full day at \$30?—A. That was the arrangement.

Q. That was the arrangement for Mr. Hall, independent of the question of letters, telegrams, and so forth?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Bennett:

Q. What was the other man allowed?—A. Mr. Bisailon, \$500 retainer and \$50 a day. I may explain that the \$30 was allowed because it was Mr. Sharp who was doing the work.

Mr. Sharp was junior in the firm?—A. Yes.

Q. Then, in addition to the \$30 per diem allowance, you allowed the letters and all the interviews and the witnesses, &c., as appears by the accounts?—A. Yes, subject to the reductions.

By Mr. Powell:

Q. Was that examination of witnesses on the same day or other days; how is that?—A. I don't understand your question.

Q. Do you make an allowance for the examination of witnesses and also \$30 per day on the same day or different days?—A. I think there may be some cases.

Q. Not that there may be; I am asking you for facts?—A. I think there are.

Q. Have you an instance in that bill in which \$30 were allowed for attendance before the magistrate and also a further allowance for examination of witnesses on the same day?—A. There is a half day on 21st January on which other charges were allowed.

Q. That is not allowed at \$30 a half day?—A. It is allowed at \$15.

Q. You never allowed \$30 more for being in court or examination of witnesses alone?—A. I do not quite understand your question; \$30 was the fee allowed Mr. Sharp every time for a full day in the police court.

Q. Where they had examination of witnesses?—A. No, that is exactly work in the police court.

Q. You have an allowance of \$15 there?—A. That is a half day.

Q. Do you ever allow a man more than \$30 for the same day, whether a whole day, a half day or a quarter day?—A. I do not think so.

Q. The fact I enforce is, he gets \$30 and then a similar fee for examining witnesses?—A. No, I certainly do not mean that. There may have been cases such as this, that he was engaged in the police court all day, which we allow at \$30.

Q. You have the account there; let us see what there was.

By Mr. Fitzpatrick:

Q. There is a charge of that description on the 21st of November; what is it?—A. "Interview with Mr. Lavery and Mr. McLeod, 9.30 to 10.30, \$5. Attendance at police court all day conducting case, \$50 (case adjourned till 26th instant). Further interview with Mr. McLeod and Commissioner Sherwood, 5 to 5.30, \$3." That appears to have been deducted entirely (\$3.00).

Q. Yes, that was thrown off entirely?—A. Yes. Then, there is a letter to Mr. Hogg on that day which is charged for, too.

Q. Take 25th January. Will you look over and see what the charge is for attendance at police court?—A. \$50.

Q. That was allowed, was it?—A. It was reduced to \$30.

Q. On the 25th?—A. On the 25th.

Q. On the 31st, attendance at library was charged \$10?

Mr. POWELL.—What day was that?